

**YONGE STREET CORRIDOR PUBLIC TRANSIT
IMPROVEMENTS**

FROM STEELES AVENUE TO 19TH AVENUE

**ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT COMPLIANCE MONITORING
ITEM TO REVIEW**

FOR

Y2

**Y2 SEGMENT
(HIGHWAY 7 – 19th AVENUE)**

Legend for Ecoplans Review:

	Not being reviewed due to any of the following reasons: future issue; not applicable or redundant
	Reviewed
<u>Bold and Underlined</u>	Indicated item that was reviewed
ECF	Evidence found
NSE	Not sufficient evidence
ENF	Evidence not found

Section 1.0 – Background & Purpose of the Program							
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
					Item matches	Commitment Verified	Notes
1.	CMP Section 1.1 - "... Therefore implementation of the O&M facility will likely not proceed in the location identified in the EA. At this time, a detailed search for an alternative site for the O&M facility has not commenced. Progress on this issue will be reported in the ACR."	York Region	YC provided guidelines / parameters for a property search by the Region by memo dated January 8, 2008.	Viva O&M Facilities Guidelines / Parameters for a Property Search - YC 6.05 (ID#2173)	Yes		
2.	CMP Section 1.1 - "... the extension of the Yonge Subway from Finch Station to the Highway 7 area (Richmond Hill Centre) is now being planned, which depending on timing, may affect whether or not the Yonge Street Transitway Y1 segment is implemented as approved in the EA. Progress on this issue will also be reported in the ACR"	York Region	Not applicable during Y2 PE Design		Yes		

Section 2.0 - Monitoring of Conditions of Approval								
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	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
						Item matches	Commitment Verified	Notes
3.	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. This also includes the summaries of commitments for additional work, built in attributes and monitoring identified in Tables 11-1 to 11-4 and Tables 12-1 to 12-3 of the EA.	York Region - (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. This condition will be addressed once all commitments have been met.) Refer to tables in Appendix 1 of this document for monitoring against Tables 11-1 to 11-4. Issues in Table 12-1 are monitored through items 33 to 55, 73 and 76 below. Issues in Table 12-2 and 12-3 relate to the construction and operations stages respectively and are not monitored in this document.		Yes		
4.	1.2 The Proponent shall implement any additional commitments made and recorded in their response and attachments dated October 13, 2005, except as provided for in these conditions or as provided by other approvals, authorizations or permits required for the undertaking.	York Region	Design, Construction and Operation as specified	Status - ongoing. Refer to Appendix 2 and 3 for monitoring against responses to the Government Review Team and the Public respectively	October 13, 2005 response documents - YC 4.6 (ID #'s 3564 to 3569)	Yes		
5.	1.3 These proposed conditions do not prevent more restrictive conditions being imposed under other statutes.	York Region	As applicable	Status - ongoing. Currently not aware of any more restrictive conditions imposed under other statutes.		Yes		
6.	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 the Regional Director's Office, and the Clerk's Office of: the Regional Municipality of York; the Towns of Richmond Hill and Markham; and the City of Vaughan. These documents may also be provided through other means as considered appropriate by the Proponent.	York Region	Design, Construction and Operation as specified	Status - ongoing. <u>Letter of approval notes that the CMP will be placed in the ministry's public record file.</u> The CMP is posted on York Regions york.ca website.	<u>Letter of approval - YC 4.6 (ID#3146)</u>	Yes	ECF	
7.	3.0 Compliance Monitoring and Reporting 3.1 The Proponent shall prepare and submit to the	York Region	Design stage (Timing	Status – Condition addressed with the approval of the CMP. The date of the approval of the EA for the undertaking was	MOE approval of Yonge EA – YC 4.6 (ID 1675)	Yes		

Section 2.0 - Monitoring of Conditions of Approval								
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	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
						Item matches	Commitment Verified	Notes
	<p>Director for review and approval and for placement on the Public Record and EA Compliance Monitoring Program (Program). This Program shall be submitted one year from the date of approval of the undertaking, or 60 days before the commencement of construction, whichever is earlier. The Program shall be prepared for the monitoring of the Proponent's fulfillment of the provisions of the EA for mitigation measures, built in attributes to reduce environmental effects, public and Aboriginal community consultation, additional studies and work to be carried out, conditions of approval and for all other commitments made during the preparation of the EA and the subsequent review of the EA.</p> <p>Once approved, copies shall be submitted to those agencies, affected stakeholders and/or members of the public who expressed an interest in the activity being addressed or being involved in subsequent work.</p>		as specified in condition 3.1)	<p>April 19, 2006.</p> <p>The draft CMP was submitted to the Director of the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch (EAAB) of the Ministry of the Environment for public review and comment on July 20, 2007.</p> <p><u>The final CMP was submitted to the Acting Director, Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch on March 10, 2008 and approved on April 11, 2008.</u></p>	<p>EA Compliance Monitoring Program July 2007 – YC 4.6 (ID 1669)</p> <p>EA Compliance Monitoring Plan dated March 10, 2008 – YC 4.6 (ID#3145)</p> <p><u>Letter of submission - YC 4.6 (ID#3144)</u></p> <p><u>Letter of approval - YC 4.6 (ID#3146)</u></p>		<p>ECF</p> <p>ECF</p>	
8.	3.2 The Program shall include the actions required to address the Region's commitments, a schedule for when commitments shall be completed and indicators of compliance. The Program shall specifically include, but not be limited to, the additional commitments outlined in Tables 11-1 to 11-4 and Tables 12-1 to 12-3 in the EA, and Proponent's letter and attachments dated October 13, 2005.	York Region	Design Stage	Status – Condition addressed with the approval of the CMP.	<p>EA Compliance Monitoring Plan dated March 10, 2008 – YC 4.6 (ID#3145)</p> <p>Letter of submission - YC 4.6 (ID#3144)</p> <p>Letter of approval - YC 4.6 (ID#3146)</p>	Yes		
9.	3.3 A statement must accompany the Program when submitted to the Director indicating that the Program is intended to fulfill this condition.	York Region	Design, Construction and Operation as specified	<p>Status – Condition addressed with submission of the CMP for approval</p> <p>Status – ongoing until the final ACR</p>	Letter of submission - YC 4.6 (ID#3144)	Yes		
10.	3.4 i) The Proponent shall prepare an Annual Compliance Report (ACR) which describes the results of the Proponent's EA Compliance Monitoring Program. The Proponent shall submit to the Directors of the EAAB and Central Region, for placement on the Public Record, a copy of the ACR. The timing for the submission of the ACR shall be set out in the Program. The Proponent shall submit the ACR until all conditions are	York Region	Design, Construction and Operation as specified	<p>Status – ongoing,</p> <p>Conditions will be addressed with the submission of ACR's until all conditions are satisfied.</p>		Yes		

Section 2.0 - Monitoring of Conditions of Approval								
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	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
						Item matches	Commitment Verified	Notes
	satisfied. When all conditions have been satisfied, the Proponent shall indicate in the ACR that this is the final submission.							
11.	3.4 ii) The Proponent shall make the documentation available to the MOE or its designate upon request in a timely manner during an on-site inspection or audit, in response to a pollution incident report, or when information concerning compliance is requested by the MOE.	York Region	Design, Construction and Operation as specified	Status – Pending a request. CMP/ACR documentation will be provided to MOE upon request.		Yes		
12.	4.0 Transit Technology 4.1 i) The Proponent shall prepare and submit to the City of Toronto and the TTC the results of their Ridership Monitoring Program (Ridership Program) as committed in Section 5.2.2.3 of the EA.	York Region	Prior to conversion from BRT to LRT technology as required	Status - ongoing Relates to Section 5.2.2.3, Step 3, of the EA. The ridership monitoring period is 2007 – 2011 and the major review will not take place until 2011/2012. <u>In the mean time ridership monitoring is ongoing as evidenced by the referenced reports.</u>	<u>YRTViva 2007 Revenue Ridership Summary, YRTViva 2007 Ridership Summary - Specialized Services - Mobility Plus, Viva Monthly Operations Summary December 2007</u> <u>YC 8.02 (ID#'s 3106, 3107, 3108)</u>	Yes	ECF	3106 – 2007 Ridership Summary Specilized Services 3107 – 2007 Revenue Ridership Summary and monthly Ridership Summary 3108 – Viva Operations Monthly Summary
13.	4.1 ii) The Proponent shall prepare a Technology Conversion Plan (TCP) that identifies when and if conversion from a bus rapid transit (BRT) system to a light rail rapid transit (LRT) facility will occur. If conversion is to occur prior to 2021, the TCP shall provide an implementation schedule.	York Region	Prior to conversion from BRT to LRT technology as required	Status – Ongoing A draft Transition Plan was prepared and submitted on March 02, 2007 and is presently under review as part of the ongoing Network Plan update. The draft Transition Plan included general indications of alternative schedules. Transit network analysis is ongoing including LRT / subway technology conversion considerations. A 2008/9 Network Update Report is planned and will address the overall sequence of implementation. Per EA Section 5.2.2.3, a major ridership and technology review is proposed for 2011/2012.	Transition Plan – Draft (March 2, 2007) – YC 2.4 (ID 910) Transmittal Memo YC 2.4 (ID 910)	Yes		
14.	4.1 iii) The Ridership Program and TCP shall be placed on the Public Record file at the EAAB and the MOE's Central Regional Office.	York Region	Prior to conversion from BRT to LRT technology as required	Status - pending conditions 4.1(i) and (ii). Refer to items 12 and 13 above.		Yes		
15.	4.1 iv) A copy of the Ridership Program and TCP shall be provided to the City of Toronto, GO Transit, the Ministry of Transportation, the Towns of Markham and Richmond Hill, and the City of Vaughan for review.	York Region	Prior to conversion from BRT to LRT technology as required	Status - pending conditions 4.1(i) and (ii). Refer to items 12 and 13 above.		Yes		
16.	5.0 Complaints Protocol 5.1 Prior to construction, the Proponent shall prepare and develop a protocol 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	York Region	Design	Status - pending submission prior to construction. Will be addressed during detailed design.		Yes		

Section 2.0 - Monitoring of Conditions of Approval								
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	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
						Item matches	Commitment Verified	Notes
	protocol to the Central Region Director for placement on the Public Record							
17.	6.0 Consultation and Other Work Required 6.1 The Proponent will consult with affected stakeholders and Aboriginal communities and obtain all necessary approvals prior to any watercourse alteration of Pomona Mills Creek.	York Region	Design	No watercourse alteration of Pomona Mills Creek planned for Y2 and therefore not relevant to Y2 PE Design.		Yes		
18.	6.2 The Proponent will undertake a Stage II Archaeological Assessment and any subsequent Archaeological Assessments that may be required. The Proponent is to consult with affected stakeholders and Aboriginal communities on their findings and obtain any necessary approvals prior to proceeding with construction.	York Region	Design	Status - Pending a Stage II Archaeological Assessment and any subsequent Archaeological Assessment. A Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment will be undertaken during the detail design phase.		Yes		
19.	6.3 The Proponent will undertake and consult on a Streetscape Plan for the Yonge Street Corridor.	York Region	Design	Status - Ongoing The Y2 Design Basis and Criteria Report (Y2 DBCR) is under development. Y1 PE Design principles will be applied to Y2 PE Design, as appropriate. The Y2 Design Basis and Criteria Report (Y2 DBCR) will incorporate streetscape recommendations under Streetscape Design Guidelines (Section 4.8), General Guidelines (Section 4.9), etc Y2 PE Design "Open House" format public consultations have not yet commenced.	Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue- Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 - YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)	Yes		
20.	6.4 The Proponent has committed to incorporating specific details of the Thornhill Yonge Street Study into the final design of the undertaking and to consult with the Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill.	York Region	Design	Not applicable to Y2 PE Design		Yes		
21.	7.0 Amending the Undertaking 7.1 i) Except as prescribed in the condition below, in the event that there is a minor change to the design of the undertaking which does not affect the expected net effects of the undertaking or result in a change to the undertaking as described in the EA, these changes may be considered minor and dealt with by the Proponent as described in section 12.5 of the EA report.	York Region	Design stage as necessary	Status- Ongoing as necessary. Minor changes, if any, dealt with during PE design are described under item 61 below.		Yes		
22.	7.1 ii) In the event that the Proponent determines that a major amendment to the approved undertaking as described in the EA is required, the amendment to the undertaking will be subject to section 12 of the EAA.	York Region	Design stage as necessary	Status - Ongoing as necessary (as provided by Section 6.0 of the CMP). Changes requiring a major amendment have not been identified during PE Design. See also item 62 below.		Yes		

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments							
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
					Item matches	Commitment Verified	Notes
23.	CMP Section 4.1 - Ability of infrastructure design to maximize safety for vehicles and pedestrians and of streetscaping plan to enhance corridor and community environment;	York Region	The Y2 DBCR is under development. Y1 PE Design principles will be applied to Y2 PE Design, as appropriate. Vehicle Safety: The Y2 DBCR will deal with road design standards and vehicle safety - Section 3.8 Roadway Elements. Pedestrian Safety: Architectural drawings will show platform and canopy design. The Y2 DBCR will address 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 4.23), etc. Streetscaping Plan: Y2 DBCR examples will include: Streetscape Design Guidelines (Section 4.8), General Guidelines (Section 4.9), etc.	Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue– Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR) Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19th Avenue – Storage Length Analysis (August 2008) – YC 3.12 (ID# 3781)	Yes		
24.	CMP Section 4.1 - Application of design standards that permit future conversion to LRT technology;	York Region	The Y2 DBCR is under development. Y1 PE Design principles will be applied to Y2 PE Design, as appropriate. The Y2 DBCR will address this requirement, for example BRT Standards (Section 2.0), Station Platform Length (Section 3.7.2), etc.	Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue– Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)	Yes		
25.	CMP Section 4.1 - Effectiveness of infrastructure design and service plans in enhancing connectivity to local and inter-regional transit services;	York Region	Effectiveness of infrastructure design: Discussions with YRT during the Y2 PE design process will cover connectivity with local transit and GO Transit. <u>Effectiveness of service plans:</u> <u>The Transition Plan – Draft (March 2, 2007), Section 4.6.1 - The Evaluation of Qualitative Measures – Includes a discussion of Network Connectivity.</u>	<u>Transition Plan – Draft (March 2, 2007) – YC 2.4 (ID 910), Transmittal Memo YC 2.4 (ID 910)</u>	Yes	ECF	
26.	CMP Section 4.1 - Simulation of intersection performance to verify transit service reliability and effects on general traffic;	York Region	The Y2 DBCR is under development. Y1 PE Design principles will be applied to Y2 PE Design, as appropriate. Y2 DBCR - Section 3.6.4 Traffic Modeling and Section 3.8 Roadway Elements will document the results of VISSUM traffic modeling and traffic analysis.	Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue– Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR) Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19th Avenue – Storage Length Analysis (August 2008) – YC 3.12 (ID# 3781)	Yes		
27.	CMP Section 4.1 - Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment;	York Region	A Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment will be undertaken during the detail design phase.		Yes		
28.	CMP Section 4.1 - Inclusion of measures to mitigate construction effects on residences, businesses, road	York Region	The Y2 DBCR is under development. Y1 PE Design principles will be applied to Y2 PE Design, as appropriate.	Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue– Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis & Criteria Report -	Yes		

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments							
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
					Item matches	Commitment Verified	Notes
	traffic and pedestrians in contract specifications;		Traffic management concepts and plans will be developed during Y2 PE Design. Measures to be further developed in the Detailed Design phase. Measures will be referenced in the Y2 DBCR: Refinement During Detail Design (Section 4.7), Construction Specifications (Section 3.15.14), etc.	Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)			
29.	CMP Section 4.1 - Opportunities to obtain input from affected communities, First Nations and heritage associations;	York Region	<p>Y2 PE Design "Open House" format public consultations have not yet commenced. However, Y1 PE Design principles, informed by Y1 "Open House" format public consultations, will be applied to Y2 PE Design, as appropriate. Accordingly, Y1 "Open House" format public consultations are referenced at this time.</p> <p>"Open House" format public consultations were held on February 8 2007 (#1), February 21 2007 (#2) and March 28 2007 (#3) during PE design. PE design workshops were held with the public on May 3 2007 (#1) and June 7 2007 (#2). A Heritage Design Focus Group was held with the public on May 28 2007.</p> <p><u>First Nations Groups and Provincial/Federal First Nations agencies who were on the EA contact list received notifications of public consultation opportunities.</u></p>	<p>February 8, 2007 "Open House" #1 – YC 3.04 (Presentation ID 755), YC 3.03 (Collaterals ID 768), YRRTC Minutes (YC 3.05 ID#3028)</p> <p>February 21, 2007 "Open House" #2 - YC 3.04 (Presentation ID 877) + YC 3.03 (Boards ID 851), YRRTC Minutes (YC 3.05 ID#3029)</p> <p>March 28, 2007 "Open House" #3 – YC 3.04 (Presentation ID#1667), YRRTC Minutes (YC 3.05 ID#3031)</p> <p>May 3, 2007 Public PE design workshop #1 – YC 3.01 (Presentation ID#??), YRRTC Minutes ID# 3034, YC 3.06 (Questionnaire Comments ID#1278), YC 3.01 (Email ID#1196)</p> <p>June 7, 2007 Public PE design workshop #2 – YC 3.04 (Presentation ID 1373) + YC 3.03 (Boards ID 1334, 1351, 1350, 1363, 1362, 1359), YRRTC Minutes (YC 3.05 ID#3035)</p> <p>May 28, 2007 Heritage Design Focus Group – YRRTC (Minutes ID#1758)</p> <p><u>Notice and distribution lists for CMP notice of submission (Yonge Street EA CMP Stakeholders and Public.xls, and Yonge Street EA CMP GRT and First Nations.doc) - YC 4.6 (ID 1673)</u></p> <p><u>Mailing lists used for notification during Y1 PE Design: (Concerned Citizen address list.xls, Property owner reps.xls, Property Owners.xls) - YC 4.6 (ID 1750)</u></p> <p><u>First Nations mailing list and 2007-01-22 Viva Update letter - YC 3.03 (ID#3026)</u></p> <p><u>Letter from Alderville First Nation - YC 3.03 (ID#3030)</u></p> <p><u>Mailing lists, 2007-01-22 Viva Update letter, 2007-04-24 Yonge Street Stakeholder letter and post card mail drop - YC 3.03 (ID#3027)</u></p>	Yes	ECF	<p>Items 1673, 1750, 3026, and 3030 were provided in hard copy in YC office on 2-Oct-09</p> <p>Yonge Street Stakeholder letter and post card mail drop - YC 3.03 (ID#3027) was not provided. This item should be located.</p>
30.	CMP Section 4.1 - Inclusion of built-in attributes to mitigate adverse effects in design solutions;	York Region	The Y2 DBCR is under development. Y1 PE Design principles will be applied to Y2 PE Design, as appropriate.	Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19 th Avenue– Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)	Yes		

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments							
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
					Item matches	Commitment Verified	Notes
			Y2 DBCR: - Island protection at intersections (Section 3.15.8) – Created to prevent uninhibited access to the station area by errant vehicles; Median (Section 4.19) – Introduces softscape treatment to visually narrow the appearance of a widened street; Passenger Assistance Alarm (Section 4.26) - Installed at stations to reduce vandalism and provide patrons with a sense of security; etc.				
31.	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	<p>The Y2 DBCR is under development. Y1 PE Design principles will be applied to Y2 PE Design, as appropriate.</p> <p>Y2 DBCR: - The Transition zone or the continuity strip (Section 4.18.1) - eco pavers allow for water percolation improving quality and reducing quantity. The median island also includes softscape wherever possible to achieve same.</p> <p><u>Y2 DBCR: - Appendix H – The design includes oil grit separators to treat the runoff from impervious areas ensuring a net improvement in runoff quality for all release points.</u></p>	<p>Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue– Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)</p> <p><u>Appendix H – Drainage & Hydrology Report - Dec 2008 YC 3.05 (ID # 3693).</u></p>	Yes	ECF	Draft dated Feb-09 was provided for review. Table should be updated to reflect more recent draft. This draft included in Section 6.3 OWS References should be updated.
32.	CMP Section 4.1 - Procedures to obtain regulatory approvals and input from municipal departments.	York Region	<p>The Y2 DBCR is under development. Y1 PE Design principles will be applied to Y2 PE Design, as appropriate.</p> <p>The Y2 DBCR will outline approval requirements - Section 6 Approvals and Permits.</p> <p>Preliminary consultation with municipalities regarding regulatory approvals and PE design workshops with the municipalities have not yet commenced for Y2.</p> <p>The formal municipal approval process will begin at the commencement of the detailed design phase.</p>	Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19 th Avenue– Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778)	Yes		

Note: Monitoring requirements for the Construction Phase (Section 4.2 of the CMP) and the Operations and Maintenance Phase (Section 4.3 of the CMP) are omitted from this document

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments								
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
						Item matches	Commitment Verified	Notes
33.	Fisheries and Aquatic Habitat	EA Chapter 12, Table 12-1, Appendix E: CMP I.D. # 1.1 - Transitway design compliance with MTO's Environmental Protection Requirements for Transportation Planning and Highway Design, Construction, Operation and Maintenance, including the Oak Ridges Moraine Component, and the Environmental Best Practices and a copy of these documents to be obtained during the detailed design phase once they are finalized.	York Region	The Y2 DBCR is under development. Y1 PE Design principles will be applied to Y2 PE Design, as appropriate. Y2 north of Elgin Mills Avenue is within the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan area. The section of Yonge Street from Leonard St to 19 th Avenue is referred to in ORM Document Maps as Map 3 and is designated as a Settlement Area. <u>Y2 DBCR - Appendix H - Chapter 2 examines the ORM Component - Y2 PE Design is conformant.</u> A meeting has still to be arranged with TRCA to discuss proposed Y2 work.	<u>Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue- Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 - YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)</u> <u>Appendix H - Drainage & Hydrology Report - Dec 2008 YC 3.05 (ID # 3693).</u>	Yes	ECF	Draft dated Feb-09 was provided for review. Table should be updated to reflect more recent draft.. This draft included Section 5. Oak Ridges Moraine. References in this table should be updated
34.		EA Chapter 12, Table 12-1, Appendix E : CMP I.D. # 1.2 - A Fisheries Act authorization for any Pomona Mills Creek realignment at the MSF site.	York Region	Not Applicable to Y2 PE Design		Yes		
35.		EA Chapter 12, Table 12-1 Appendix E: 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	This commitment relates to a culvert extension HADD (Harmful Alteration, Disruption or Destruction of fish habitat) in Y2 (see Table 8 of Appendix E of the EA). Culvert extension mitigation work will be discussed with TRCA and addressed in the detailed design stage of the Y2 work, as required.		Yes		
36.		EA Chapter 12, Table 12-1 Appendix E: CMP I.D. # 1.4 - Natural Channel Design principles to be followed in the construction of the realignment of the Pomona Mills Creek at the proposed MSF site. Consultations held with regulatory agencies during detail design to address the proposed realignment and naturalization of this watercourse.	York Region	Not Applicable to Y2 PE Design		Yes		
37.		EA Chapter 12, Table 12-1, Appendices E & M: CMP I.D. # 1.5 - The MSF design coordination with the Pomona Mills Creek Environmental Rehabilitation Project.	York Region			Yes		

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments								
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
						Item matches	Commitment Verified	Notes
				Not Applicable to Y2 PE Design				
38.		EA Chapter 12, Table 12-1 Appendix E: CMP I.D. # 1.6 - Any proposed in-stream work and site-specific mitigation measures carried out as outlined in Table 8 of the Natural Science Report	York Region	Provision for in-stream work and site-specific mitigation measures will be made in the detailed design phase, as required. <u>The Y2 "Notes for Detailed Design" will indicate "Erosion Control protection shall be designed at all culverts, storm sewers inlets/outlets and ditch inlets/outlets"</u>	Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19 th Avenue– Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR) <u>Appendix H – Drainage & Hydrology Report - Dec 2008 YC 3.05 (ID # 3693).</u>	Yes	ECF	Draft dated Feb-09 was provided for review. Table should be updated to reflect more recent draft. This draft included Section 7. Temporary Erosion and Sediment Control measures. References in this table should be updated
39.	Groundwater Resources	EA Chapter 12, Table 12-1 Appendix H : CMP I.D. # 4.1 - Well inspection conducted prior to construction to establish baseline conditions. 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.	York Region	EA Appendix E, Section 4.2.3 & 2.2.6 – Large majority of wells historically documented are no longer active. However, additional water supply wells that are unregistered in the MOE database may exist. Well inspection to be undertaken in the future, prior to construction.		Yes		NOTE : No document is provide to validate the claim of the wells being decommissioned. This should be confirmed in the well survey.
40.	Surface Water Resources	EA Sect. 10.6, Chapter 12, Table 12-1, Appendices E & M: CMP I.D. # 5.1 - The Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP) developed in accordance with the MOE's Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual (2003) and compliance with the objectives in Section 46(1) of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP).	York Region	A draft (SWMP) has been prepared during PE design as detailed in Y2 DBCR - Appendix H. SWMP to be completed in the detailed design phase. <u>Y2 DBCR - Appendix H - Chapter 2 examines the ORM Component - Y2 PE Design is conformant.</u>	Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19 th Avenue– Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR) <u>Appendix H – Drainage & Hydrology Report - Dec 2008 YC 3.05 (ID # 3693).</u>	Yes	ECF	Draft dated Feb-09 was provided for review. Table should be updated to reflect more recent draft..
41.		EA Chapter 12, Table 12-1 Appendix E: CMP I.D. # 5.2 - The planning, design and construction practices included in Section 45(2) of ORMCP to protect water resources.	York Region	<u>Y2 DBCR - Appendix H - Chapter 2 examines the ORM Component - Y2 PE Design is conformant.</u>	Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19 th Avenue– Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR) <u>Appendix H – Drainage & Hydrology Report - Dec 2008 YC 3.05 (ID # 3693).</u>	Yes	ECF	Draft dated Feb-09 was provided for review. Table should be updated to reflect more recent draft.. This draft included Section 5. Oak Ridges Moraine. References in this table should be updated

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments								
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
						Item matches	Commitment Verified	Notes
42.		EA Chapter 12, Table 12-1 Appendices E & M: CMP I.D. # 5.3 - Compliance with ORMCP Section 45(8), which prohibits new stormwater management ponds in key natural heritage features or hydrologically sensitive features.	York Region	<u>Y2 DBCR - Appendix H - Chapter 2 examines the ORM Component - Y2 PE Design is conformant. There are no new stormwater management ponds in the Y2 segment.</u>	Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19 th Avenue– Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR) <u>Appendix H – Drainage & Hydrology Report - Dec 2008 YC 3.05 (ID # 3693).</u>	Yes	ECF	Draft dated Feb-09 was provided for review. Table should be updated to reflect more recent draft.. This draft included Section 5. Oak Ridges Moraine. References in this table should be updated
43.		EA Chapter 12, Table 12-1 Appendices E & M: CMP I.D. # 5.4 - Water quality 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, also in Section 45(6) of ORMCP.	York Region	Y2 DBCR - Appendix H – “The proposed improvements will result in an increase in impervious area..... oil grit separators are best suited to provide stormwater quality control for the project.” <u>TRCA has agreed that it is not feasible to meet their condition of: “Where possible, all post development run-off rates be limited to pre-development run-off rates”</u> Y2 DBCR - Appendix H – “It is recommended that the units be chosen to treat the runoff from an impervious area equal to or greater than the increased pavement for each Yonge Street catchment, thus ensuring a net improvement in runoff quality for all release points.” Y2 PE design complies with the MOE water quality guideline of Enhanced Level (80% total suspended solids removal) Confirm approach during detailed design. Y2 DBCR - Appendix H - Chapter 2 examines the ORM Component - Y2 PE Design is conformant.	Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19 th Avenue– Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR) <u>Appendix H – Drainage & Hydrology Report - Dec 2008 YC 3.05 (ID # 3693).</u>	Yes	ENF	No evidence has been found in the documents cited that TRCA has agreed that it is not feasible to meet their condition
44.		EA Chapter 12, Table 12-1 Appendices E & M: CMP I.D. # 5.5 - A SWMP following the approach, described in Section 46(2) of ORMCP, to stormwater management where applicable.	York Region	<u>Y2 DBCR - Appendix H - Chapter 2 examines the ORM Component - Y2 PE Design is conformant. No conditions that would trigger the requirements of Section 46(3) of the ORMCP have been identified.</u> <u>A draft (SWMP) has been prepared during PE design as detailed in Y2 DBCR - Appendix H –SWMP to be completed in the detailed design phase)</u>	Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19 th Avenue– Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR) <u>Appendix H – Drainage & Hydrology Report - Dec 2008 YC 3.05 (ID # 3693).</u>	Yes	ECF	Draft dated Feb-09 was provided for review. Table should be updated to reflect more recent draft.. This draft included Section 5. Oak Ridges Moraine. References in this table should be updated
45.		EA Chapter 12, Table 12-1 Appendices E & M: CMP I.D. # 5.6 - A SWMP prepared in accordance with the Rouge River Comprehensive Basin Management Study (TRCA 1990) as required in Section 46(3) of ORMCP.	York Region	<u>EA Appendix E, Section 2.3.3 Rouge River – Describes the location of the Rouge River watershed in the study area (i.e. north of Bernard Ave).</u> <u>Y2 DBCR - Appendix H - Chapter 2 examines the ORM Component - Y2 PE Design is conformant. No conditions that would trigger the requirements of Section 46(3) of the ORMCP have been identified.</u>	Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19 th Avenue– Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR) <u>Appendix H – Drainage & Hydrology Report - Dec 2008 YC 3.05 (ID # 3693).</u>	Yes	ECF	Draft dated Feb-09 was provided for review. Table should be updated to reflect more recent draft.. This draft included Section 5. Oak Ridges Moraine. References in this table should be updated

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments								
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
						Item matches	Commitment Verified	Notes
				A draft (SWMP) has been prepared during PE design as detailed in Y2 DBCR - Appendix H -SWMP to be completed in the detailed design phase)				
46.		EA Chapter 12, Table 12-1 Appendices E & M: CMP I.D. # 5.7 - The SWMP avoidance of new rapid infiltration basins and columns facilities within Plan Areas as required in Section 47(1) of ORMCP.	York Region	<u>Y2 DBCR - Appendix H - Chapter 2 examines the ORM Component - There are no rapid infiltration basins and column facilities required for the Y2 segment - Y2 PE Design is conformant.</u>	Yonge Street Rapidway Highway 7 – 19 th Avenue -Preliminary Engineering – Design Basis and Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR) <u>Appendix H – Drainage & Hydrology Report - Dec 2008 YC 3.05 (ID # 3693).</u>	Yes	ECF	Draft dated Feb-09 was provided for review. Table should be updated to reflect more recent draft.. This draft included Section 5. Oak Ridges Moraine. References in this table should be updated
47.		EA Chapter 12, Table 12-1 Section 11.4.3: CMP I.D. # 5.8 - Storm water management controls to be applied for the construction of the proposed MSF.	York Region	Not applicable to Y2 PE Design		Yes		
48.		EA Chapter 12, Table 12-1 Section 10.6: CMP I.D. # 5.9 - An Erosion and Sediment Control Plan developed to manage the flow of sediment into storm sewers and watercourses and to monitor erosion and sedimentation control measures during construction.	York Region	<u>Y2 DBCR - Appendix H – Summarizes proposed stormwater management measures throughout the study area. Describes Temporary Erosion and Sediment Control Measures which will be finalized in the detail design phase.</u> Confirm approach during detailed design.	Yonge Street Rapidway Highway 7 – 19 th Avenue -Preliminary Engineering – Design Basis and Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR) <u>Appendix H – Drainage & Hydrology Report - Dec 2008 YC 3.05 (ID # 3693).</u>	Yes	ECF	Draft dated Feb-09 was provided for review. Table should be updated to reflect more recent draft. This draft included Section 7. Temporary Erosion and Sediment Control measures. References in this table should be updated
49.	Groundwater	Proponent Response to Government Review Team Comments: CMP I.D. # 6 - The need for any dewatering and any additional analysis needed to determine if linkages exist between dewatering and local surface features and any resulting mitigation requirements. Detailed geotechnical and hydrogeological studies addressing impacts	York Region	This relates to item 13a. of the responses to the Government Review Team. The draft Pavement Engineering Services report indicates that free water was not encountered in any of the boreholes. No requirement for dewatering has been identified during the Y2 PE design phase. Accordingly, the EA Proponent's response holds true i.e. that "Dewatering is not expected for the construction or operation of the proposed undertaking. However, the Region will commit to doing the necessary work as an addition to commitments if the need for dewatering is determined during the detailed design phase."	Draft Report – Pavement Engineering Services for New Median Rapidway – Yonge Street from Highway 7 to 19 th Avenue - YC 3.04 (ID # 3105) Appendix H – Drainage & Hydrology Report - Dec 2008 YC 3.05 (ID # 3693).	Yes		
50.	Contaminated	EA Chapter 12, Table 12-1	York Region			Yes		

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments								
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
						Item matches	Commitment Verified	Notes
	Soil	Proponent Response to Government Review Team Comments Appendix I: CMP I.D. # 7 - 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 Brownfield's legislation and the Record of Site Condition Regulation (O.Reg. 153/04) The application of the Federal Contaminated Site Risk Assessment in Canada guidelines in assessing potential health risks.		Contingency planning to address contaminated sites will be considered during the detailed design phase.				
51.	Noise and Vibration	EA Section 11.3: CMP I.D. # 8 - Effectiveness of design elements incorporated to mitigate vehicle maintenance and storage activity noise levels exceeding acceptable levels.	York Region	Not applicable to Y2 PE Design		Yes		
52.	Effects on Businesses and Other Land Uses	EA Section 10.1.7, Chapter 12, Table 12-1: CMP I.D. # 9 - The parking need assessment and management study developed.	York Region	Work has commenced during the PE design phase and is ongoing.	Eight Steps to A Viva Park-and-Ride Strategy – YC 8.21 (ID#1037) Memo - Viva Cornell Terminal Park-and-Ride Development – Preliminary Analysis of Alternatives – YC 8.21 (ID#1117) Memo - To: Terry Gohde From: Al Raine Re: VIVA Park-and-Ride Initiative Dates: September 29, 2006 –YC 8.21 (ID#1739) Commuter Park N Ride Strategy Work Plan Description – YC 8.21 (ID#978) Technical Memorandum – Park-and-Ride Best Practices (Draft) – January 25, 2008 - YC 8.21 (ID#2232) Technical Memorandum – Park-and-Ride Siting Criteria and Methodology - (Draft) – February 29, 2008 - YC 8.21 (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	Yes		

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments								
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
						Item matches	Commitment Verified	Notes
53.	Level of Accessibility	EA Chapter 12, Table 12-1 Section 13.2: CMP I.D. # 10 - Catholic Cemeteries' involvement with and acceptance of, details of the intersection design at the Holy Cross cemetery entrance design.	York Region	Not applicable to Y2 PE Design		Yes		
54.	Archaeological Resources	Proponent Response to Government Review Team Comments and Appendix J: CMP I.D. # 11 - Completion of a Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment and procedure for continued consultation with the Ministry of Culture. Records of consultation with First Nations.	York Region	A Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment will be undertaken during the Detail Design phase and will be provided to the Six Nations of the Grand River when completed. No heritage or cultural resources have been encountered during PE design.		Yes		
55.	Heritage Resources/ Cultural Landscape	EA Section 11.3.2, EA Chapter 12, Table 12-1 CMP I.D. # 12 - Continue to work with Thornhill Heritage Committee during the design phase with respect to the existing community settings. Relocation or burying of hydro lines where widening places lines unacceptably close to existing culturally sensitive areas. Consultation with municipal heritage planners, heritage committees and other local heritage stakeholders, specifically	York Region	Consultation with the Thornhill Heritage Committee is not applicable to Y2 PE Design The reference to burying hydro lines can be found in Table 11-2, Goal B6 of the EA report. Studies to determine the best way to relocate utilities are ongoing.	Memo - To: Mary-Frances Turner Date: February 28, 2007 From: Terry Gohde Subject: Hydro Relocation for South Yonge Street, Viva Segment Y1 - YC 5.06 (ID#903) Yonge Street Overhead Power Distribution System Relocation Report – Final Report – Revision A – August 3 rd 2007, prepared by Giffels Associates – YC 5.06 (ID#3749) Memo - To: Mary-Frances Turner Date: March 15, 2007 From: Terry Gohde Subject: Recommendation for Hydro Relocation for South Yonge Street, Viva Segment Y1 – YC 5.06 (ID#965) Minutes - Go Forward Project Focus Meeting September 11, 2007 – YC 3.05 (ID#1717) – Section 5	Yes		Denise Moreau indicated that this was not relevant to Y2. via email September 18, 2009. If not relevant then should be removed from the table.

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments								
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
						Item matches	Commitment Verified	Notes
		Markham Heritage regarding preservation of two built heritage features on Langstaff MSF site. Design solutions adopted for curb-side stations in Richmond Hill CBD to avoid adverse effects on cultural heritage buildings.		Consultation regarding preservation of two built heritage features on Langstaff MSF site is not applicable to Y2 PE Design. Y2 PE Design of curbside stops in the Richmond Hill CBD has still to be concluded and is currently limited to the existing pair of stops. Consultation with relevant community groups representing heritage associations have not been undertaken to date during Y2 PE Design	Various Correspondence – YC 5.16 (ID# 771 & 1729)			
56.	Community vistas and street and neighbourhood aesthetics	EA Sections 10.6 and 11.3.2 and Proponent's Response to Gov't Review Team Comments: CMP I.D. # 13 - Development of a comprehensive streetscaping plan based on guidelines from the Thornhill Yonge Street Study and incorporation of design features to mitigate adverse effects on residential and pedestrian environment. Consultation with the Thornhill Heritage Community during detailed design development.	York Region	The Y2 DBCR is under development. Y1 PE Design principles will be applied to Y2 PE Design, as appropriate. The Y2 DBCR will incorporate streetscape recommendations under Streetscape Design Guidelines (Section 4.8), General Guidelines (Section 4.9), etc Examples of design features that could mitigate adverse effects on residential and pedestrian environments include reductions of lane widths and median island widths to minimize widening. Further attention will be given to these matters in detailed design. Consultation with the Thornhill Heritage Community is not applicable to Y2 PE Design	Yonge Street Rapidway Highway 7 – 19 th Avenue -Preliminary Engineering – Design Basis and Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)	Yes		
57.	Traffic and Pedestrian circulation and access during construction	EA Section 10.6 and Proponent's Response to Gov't Review Team Comments: CMP I.D. # 14 - Development of a comprehensive Construction and Traffic Management Plan including consultation with school board officials to ensure safe, uninterrupted access to schools affected by the works.	York Region	Traffic management concepts and plans will be developed during PE Design. Community liaison procedures and construction staging plans will be developed further during detailed design.		Yes		
58.	Safety of traffic and pedestrian circulation and access during	EA Section 10.6 and Gov't Review Team Comment response (6.a.iv and 6.a.vi): CMP I.D. # 15 - Infrastructure design features, built-in safety	York Region	The Y2 DBCR is under development. Y1 PE Design principles will be applied to Y2 PE Design, as appropriate. Detailed design not yet commenced.	Yonge Street Rapidway Highway 7 – 19 th Avenue -Preliminary Engineering – Design Basis and Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2	Yes		

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments								
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
						Item matches	Commitment Verified	Notes
	rapid transit operations	measures and operating procedures adopted in the preparation of the detailed design solution. Analysis of the need for speed limit reductions to address safety concerns. Inclusion of numerical countdown pedestrian lights in detailed design.		Notwithstanding, built-in safety features will include station platform railings, station canopy rear wall, station canopy, station platform edge treatment and platform height, etc. The Y2 DBCR will indicate provisions to be made with respect to speed limit (DBCR Sections 2.0 BRT Standards, 3.8.3 Design Criteria, etc.). Detailed design will include analysis and recommendations for intersection crosswalk timing to meet pedestrian safety requirements. The Y2 DBCR will recommend the installation of countdown signals (Y2 DBCR Section 3.7.6 – Further Station Specifications)	DBCR)			
59.	Interface with City of Toronto Yonge Street Transitway undertaking	EA Section 10.1: CMP I.D. # 16 - Consultation with City of Toronto staff on the status of the Undertaking during the detailed design and construction to provide coordination between projects.	York Region	Not applicable to Y2 PE Design		Yes		
60.	Interface with MTO future 407 Transitway undertaking	Proponent's Response to Gov't 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.	York Region	The Y2 detailed design and construction phases have not yet commenced. However, MTO has been consulted regarding the future 407 Transitway during the Yonge Subway Extension Transit Project Assessment Process.		Yes		

Note: Requirements for Construction Monitoring (Section 5.2 of the CMP) and Operations and Maintenance Monitoring (Section 5.3 of the CMP) are omitted from this document.

Section 6.0 – Modifying the Design of The Undertaking							
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Item matches Measure / Commitment	Commitment Verified	Notes
61.	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.	York Region	Minor changes to the design of the undertaking during Y2 PE Design have included: - Minor changes to intersection approaches / configurations supported by the requisite traffic modelling; - Minor reductions in general purpose lane widths; - Minor adjustments to Rapidway alignments to minimise environmental impacts. Other potential changes at this time include: - Richmond Hill CBD work is currently limited to the existing pair of stops	Yonge Street Rapidway Highway 7 – 19 th Avenue -Preliminary Engineering – Design Basis and Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)	Yes	ENF	Draft dated Feb-09 was provided for review. Table should be updated to reflect more recent draft. It was not evident what minor changes were made and that the difference in environmental impacts (both positive and negative) that such changes could have. It is suggested that a list of such be kept.
62.	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	At this time there is <u>no</u> change to the design of the undertaking that results in a material increase in the expected net environmental effects of the undertaking.		Yes	ENF	Draft dated Feb-09 was provided for review. Table should be updated to reflect more recent draft. It was not evident what minor changes were made and that the difference in environmental impacts (both positive and negative) that such changes could have. It is suggested that a list of such be kept.

Section 7.0 – Consultation							
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
					Item match	Verified	Notes
63.	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	Y2 PE Design "Open House" format public consultations have not yet commenced.		Yes		
64.	CMP Section 7.1.1 - A design development workshop with community groups representing heritage associations within the segment to be implemented, (e.g. the Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill and other participants in the Thornhill Yonge Street Study).	York Region	Design development workshops with community groups representing heritage associations have not been undertaken to date during Y2 PE Design		Yes		
65.	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 and construction phases.	York Region	A Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment will be undertaken during the detailed design phase and circulated when completed.		Yes		
66.	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	A Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment will be undertaken during the detailed design phase. York Region has provided responses to comments received throughout the EA process, including those from First Nations Groups and or Provincial/Federal First Nations agencies.	First Nations mailing list and 2007-01-22 Viva Update letter - YC 3.03 (ID#3026) Letter from Alderville First Nation - YC 3.03 (ID#3030)	Yes		Denise Moreau indicated that this was not relevant to Y2. via email September 18, 2009. It should be removed from the table.
67.	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, particularly regarding works associated with any alteration of Pomona Mills Creek. 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.	York Region	First Nations Groups and Provincial/Federal First Nations agencies who were on the EA contact list continue to receive notifications. Consultation will continue in detail design.	<u>Notice and distribution lists for CMP notice of submission (Yonge Street EA CMP Stakeholders and Public.xls, and Yonge Street EA CMP GRT and First Nations.doc) - YC 4.6 (ID 1673)</u> <u>First Nations mailing list and 2007-01-22 Viva Update letter - YC 3.03 (ID# 3026)</u> <u>Letter from Alderville First Nation - YC 3.03 (ID#3030)</u> <u>Mailing lists, 2007-01-22 Viva Update letter, 2007-04-24 Yonge Street Stakeholder letter and post card mail drop - YC 3.03 (ID#3027)</u>	Yes	ECF	Items 1673, 1750, 3026, and 3030 were provided in hard copy in YC office on 2-Oct-09 Yonge Street Stakeholder letter and post card mail drop - YC 3.03 (ID#3027) was not provided. This item should be located.

Note: Monitoring requirements for the Construction Phase (Section 7.1.2 of the CMP) and the Operations and Maintenance Phase (Section 7.1.3 of the CMP) are omitted from this document

Section 9.0 - Submission and Circulation of the CMP							
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
					Item match	Verified	Notes
68.	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	The date of the approval of the EA for the undertaking was April 19, 2006. The draft CMP was submitted to the Director of the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch (EAAB) of the Ministry of the Environment for public review and comment on July 20, 2007. The final CMP was submitted to the Acting Director, Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch on March 10, 2008 and approved on April 11, 2008.	MOE approval of Yonge EA – YC 4.6 (ID 1675) EA Compliance Monitoring Program July 2007 – YC 4.6 (ID 1669) EA Compliance Monitoring Plan dated March 10, 2008 – YC 4.6 (ID#3145) Letter of submission - YC 4.6 (ID#3144) Letter of approval - YC 4.6 (ID#3146)	Yes		
69.	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	The letter of submission includes a statement indicating that the CMP is intended to fulfill Condition 3 of the Conditions of Approval. Letter of approval notes that the CMP will be placed in the ministry's public record file.	Letter of submission - YC 4.6 (ID#3144) Letter of approval - YC 4.6 (ID#3146)	Yes		
70.	CMP Section 9.0 - Additional copies [following approval] will be provided by the Proponent for public access at: a) The Regional Director's Office; b) The Clerk's Office of the Regional Municipality of York, the Town of Richmond Hill, the Town of Markham and the City of Vaughan.	York Region			Yes	ENF	No evidence was cited to show copies of the CMP was provided to the clerk's office.
71.	CMP Section 9.0 - The document will also be available for public information on the Proponent's website at www.vivayork.ca .	York Region	The CMP is posted on York Regions york.ca website.		Yes	ECF	Website has changed to www.vivanext.com
72.	CMP Section 9.0 - Once approved, copies of the CMP will be submitted to agencies, affected stakeholders and/or members of the public who expressed an interest in activities being addressed in the CMP or being involved in subsequent work.	York Region			Yes	ENF	No evidence was cited to show copies of the CMP was submitted to agencies, affected stakeholders and/or members of the public who expressed an interest in activities being addressed in the CMP or being involved in subsequent work.

Section 11.0 - Other Documents required by the Conditions of Approval							
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
					Item match	Verified	Notes
73.	Ridership Monitoring Program: CMP Section 11.1 - York Region will prepare the results of its Ridership Monitoring Program as committed in Section 5.2.2.3 of the EA and EAA Condition 4.1(iv). 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.	York Region	Relates to Section 5.2.2.3, Step 3, of the EA. The ridership monitoring period is 2007 – 2011 and the major review will not take place until 2011. <u>In the mean time ridership monitoring is ongoing as evidenced by the referenced reports</u>	<u>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.)</u>	Yes	ECF	3106 – 2007 Ridership Summary Specilized Services 3107 – 2007 Revenue Ridership Summary and monthly Ridership Summary 3108 – Viva Operations Monthly Summary
74.	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.	York Region	A draft Transition Plan 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. A 2008/9 Network Update Report is planned.	Transition Plan – Draft (March 2, 2007) – YC 2.4 (ID 910) Transmittal Memo YC 2.4 (ID 910)	Yes		
75.	CMP Section 11.2 - If conversion is found to be required prior to 2021, the Plan will include an implementation schedule.	York Region	The draft Transition Plan included general indications of alternative schedules. The 2008/9 Network Update Report will address the overall sequence of implementation.	Transition Plan – Draft (March 2, 2007) – YC 2.4 (ID 910) Transmittal Memo YC 2.4 (ID 910)	Yes		
76.	CMP Section 11.2 - The Ridership Monitoring Program and Technology Conversion Plan 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 Markham and Richmond Hill and the City of Vaughan for review.	York Region	As per above, the pending 2008/9 Network Update Report will address technology conversion. <u>Ridership monitoring is ongoing as evidenced by the referenced reports.</u>	<u>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.)</u>	Yes	ECF	3106 – 2007 Ridership Summary Specilized Services 3107 – 2007 Revenue Ridership Summary and monthly Ridership Summary 3108 – Viva Operations Monthly Summary
77.	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. The protocol will be submitted to the Central Region Director for placement on the Public Record.	York Region	Protocol will be prepared by YRRTC during the Detail Design phase.		Yes		

Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-1 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective A - Mobility													Compliance Monitoring						
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	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)			
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Item match	Commitment Verified	Notes	
OBJECTIVE A: To improve mobility by providing a fast, convenient, reliable and efficient rapid transit service																			
A1	Maximize Inter-regional and local transit connectivity	Connections to inter-regional services and future gateways	✓		✓	Hwy 7 and Hwy 407 crossing	Better connection to GO Stations and future provincial inter-regional transit station will improve ridership on all transit services	Yonge Street transitway will provide a direct connection from the Richmond Hill Centre Intermodal Terminal to GO Rail's Langstaff Station. It will also have a connection to York's Hwy. 7 transitway and the future provincial transit corridor along Hwy. 407.	Increased potential for infill development around Langstaff Station	R.O.W protection along the GO Line corridor to achieve an additional connection	Positive effect	Monitor ridership and the need to develop connection to GO Richmond Hill Station	York Region	Enclosed pedestrian bridge between the Viva Richmond Hill Terminal and the Bala Go Rail Platform was constructed and opened for use April 2008.	Pedestrian Bridge Drawings 100 % Submission – YC file path: P:\YC2002\QS Detail Design\Langstaff Pedestrian Bridge\Transmittal	Ridership monitoring is ongoing. See item 12 of this document.	Yes		
		Compatibility with proposed local network	✓		✓	Entire Corridor	Inconvenient transfer between local transit and Yonge Rapid Transit may discourage transit ridership	Stations generally located on east-west local transit routes ensuring convenient transfers between services. Integrated fare system proposed.	Project may change the configuration of local transit.	Local services will be configured as a grid where practical, providing community coverage and feeder roles	Positive effect	Regular review of effectiveness of local service plans.	York Region	Regular review of effectiveness of local service plans is an ongoing YRT task.			Yes		
A2	Maximizes speed and ride comfort and minimizes safety risks and maintenance costs with an optimized alignment geometry	Grade in East Don River Valley at 7% hence > min. LRT standard of 6%	✓		✓	East Don River Valley	LRT vehicle may not be able to negotiate grade	Length of grade is extremely short, < 100 m	None expected	None required	Negligible	None required	York Region	East Don River Valley location is not applicable to Y2 PE Design			Yes		
		Grades at station in excess of standards	✓		✓	Southbound Platform at Clark Avenue	Running way grade at platform is approaching a 6% grade. LRT may not be able to negotiate grade	Proposed platform grade reduced to 3% and will be adequate for BRT operation.	May encounter problems for LRT operation	Consider relocating the station for LRT	Moderately Significant	Review situation once LRT is needed	York Region	Southbound platform at Clark Avenue is not applicable to Y2 PE Design			Yes		
		Grades at station in excess of LRT standards	✓		✓	Southbound platform at John Street	Running way grade at platform is on a 2% grade. LRT may not be able to negotiate grade	Reduced gradient at station to 1.8% in the southbound direction. And 1.2% in the northbound direction.	May not be feasible for LRT operation	Revise profile for LRT using small retaining walls	Insignificant	Redesign running way once LRT is needed	York Region	Southbound platform at John Street is not applicable to Y2 PE Design			Yes		
		Grades at station in excess of LRT standards	✓		✓	Southbound platform at Royal Orchard Blvd	Running way grade at platform is in excess of 3%. Only an issue for LRT as LRT may not be able to negotiate grade	Redesign vertical profile to reduce downward grade. Since the direction of travel is in a downgrade direction concern is not serious.	Remains in excess of standard for LRT	Revise profile for LRT using small retaining walls	Insignificant	Redesign running way once LRT is needed	York Region	Southbound platform at Royal Orchard Blvd is not applicable to Y2 PE Design			Yes		

Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-1 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective A - Mobility											Compliance Monitoring							
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			
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation								
OBJECTIVE A: To improve mobility by providing a fast, convenient, reliable and efficient rapid transit service																		
													Compliance Review (Ecoplans)					
													Item match	Commitment Verified	Notes			
		Grades at station in excess of LRT standards	✓		✓	Both platforms at Scott Drive/Bantry Avenue	Running way grade at platform grade in excess of LRT standard. LRT may not be able to negotiate grade	Redesign vertical profile to reduce grade either side of intersection.	None	None required	Negligible	None required Yes	York Region	Scott Drive / Bantry Avenue is within the Y2 segment Y2 PE Design was undertaken for a BRT service so as not to preclude a future LRT service - Redesign vertical profile once LRT is needed The Y2 DBCR is under development and will describe the design approach.	Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19 th Avenue – Preliminary Engineering – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)	Yes		
		Grades at station in excess of BRT & LRT standards	✓		✓	Both platforms at Major Mackenzie Drive	Running way grade at platform grade in excess of BRT & LRT standards	A 4.0% grade is to be maintained for BRT. A revised alignment is shown in the plates for LRT to reduce the grade to 2.0%.	Concerns remain for LRT Station with regard to urban integration and visual impacts	Review design of LRT station or consider relocating the station once LRT is being considered	Moderately Significant	Review location of station/design/integration once LRT is needed Yes	York Region	Major Mackenzie Drive is within the Y2 segment. Y2 PE Design was undertaken for a BRT service so as not to preclude a future LRT service – Consider proposed mitigation measures once LRT is needed. The Y2 DBCR is under development and will describe the design approach.	Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19 th Avenue – Preliminary Engineering – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)	Yes		
		Grades at station in excess of LRT standards	✓		✓	Both platforms at 19th Avenue/ Gamble Road	Running way grade at both platforms grade in excess of LRT standard. LRT may not be able to negotiate grade	A 4.0% grade is to be maintained for BRT.	Running way grade at platform in excess of LRT standard. LRT may require grade reduction.	Consider relocating the station once LRT is needed	Moderately Significant	Review location of station/design once LRT is needed Yes	York Region	19th Avenue / Gamble Road is within the Y2 segment. Y2 PE Design was undertaken for a BRT service so as not to preclude a future LRT service – Consider proposed mitigation measures once LRT is needed. The Y2 DBCR is under development and will describe the design approach.	Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19 th Avenue – Preliminary Engineering – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)	Yes		

Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-1 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective A - Mobility													Compliance Monitoring					
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	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Item match	Commitment Verified	Notes
OBJECTIVE A: To improve mobility by providing a fast, convenient, reliable and efficient rapid transit service																		
A3	Maximize operational efficiency of maintenance and storage facility	Location of facility and access routes	✓	✓	✓	Langstaff Industrial Area	Potential effect of transit vehicle access to facility on local traffic circulation	Preferred facility location enables transit vehicles to enter or leave the transitway directly through a single signalized crossing of Langstaff Road. Deadheading on neighbourhood roads is avoided.	Minor delay to traffic on Langstaff Road at crossing.	Signal timing adjustments can reduce any delay	Insignificant	Monitor signal operations. Yes	York Region	Not Applicable to Y2 PE Design		Yes		
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.	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 Yes	York Region	The Y2 DBCR is under development. Y1 PE Design principles will be applied to Y2 PE Design, as appropriate. Section 3.6.4 of the Y2 DBCR will indicate - 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 Section 1.3.1 of the Y2 DBCR will indicate - Signal controlled transit priority at all major intersections	Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19 th Avenue - Preliminary Engineering – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)	Yes		
A5	Locate stations to maximize ridership potential and convenience of access for all users	Residents or employees within walking distance of stations. Accessibility for mobility impaired	✓		✓	Entire Corridor	Stations at locations without transit-oriented land use and convenient access could discourage rapid transit use.	<u>Station locations selected to serve supportive land use. Facilities designed with weather protection, direct barrier free access and attractive streetscapes within surrounding residential neighbourhoods.</u>	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	<u>York Region has developed guidelines for assessing potential locations for new viva stations.</u>	<u>Memo - Station Location Optimization YC 8.01 (ID # 640)</u> <u>Other supporting documents YC 8.01 (ID # 639 & 689)</u>	Yes	NSE	Evidence does not support that guide lines have been developed. 640 – Briefing and email no memo 639 – Email 689 – drafts of presentation and emails

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

Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-2 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective B - Social Environment											Compliance Monitoring							
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	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)				
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation				Item match	Verified	Notes		
OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor																		
B1	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.	Avoided known locations of distinct features to minimize impact; Incorporated streetscaping and road furniture to enhance corridor and community environment.	None expected	None expected	Negligible	Future community consultation	York Region	The Y2 DBCR is under development. Y1 PE Design principles will be applied to Y2 PE Design, as appropriate. The Y2 DBCR will incorporate streetscape recommendations under Streetscape Design Guidelines (Section 4.8), General Guidelines (Section 4.9), etc Y2 PE Design "Open House" format public consultations have not yet commenced.	Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19 th Avenue - Preliminary Engineering – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)	Yes		
		Effect on Community Cohesion			✓	Entire corridor	Median transitway in widened Yonge Street may be perceived as a barrier between east and west communities	Provided safe crosswalks with median refuge. Improved streetscaping in order to create a more pedestrian-friendly environment	None expected	None necessary	Overall positive effect	None required	York Region	The Y2 DBCR is under development. Y1 PE Design principles will be applied to Y2 PE Design, as appropriate. <u>The Y2 DBCR will incorporate pedestrian friendly guidelines – Section 4.9.1 of the Y2 DBCR</u>	<u>Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19th Avenue - Preliminary Engineering – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)</u>	Yes	ECF	Draft dated Feb-09 was provided for review. Table should be updated to reflect more recent draft. This draft included Section 4.9.1 "The design of the various streetscape elements must prioritize the needs of pedestrians and users..."
		Community facility utilization			✓	Entire corridor	Improved transit access increases 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 existing communities.	Include mitigation measures in community facility expansion.	Positive effect	Monitoring of registration levels at the various facilities.	York Region	No action required during Y2 PE Design		Yes		

Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-2 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective B - Social Environment													Compliance Monitoring				
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	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)			
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation				Item match	Verified	Notes	
OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor																	
B2	Maintain or improve road traffic and pedestrian circulation	Potential transition to Toronto transit system, south of Steeles Avenue, in the event a curb reserved bus lanes option is selected as the preferred design for Toronto's Yonge St. EA Study. (Ultimate transit system provisions have not been identified south of Steeles Avenue.)			✓	Intersection Yonge/Steeles Avenue	A transition from a median transitway system to curb- side transit provisions will require a dedicated phase and transition area at a signalized intersection on Yonge Street. Given the existing and future operating conditions at the Yonge Street/Steeles Avenue intersection, it is not recommended that the transition, if required, be located at the Steeles Avenue intersection. It is recommended that the transition from the median RT system to the HOV system be undertaken at a less critical intersection such as Yonge Street/Meadowview Avenue. Accordingly, two alternative configurations have been provided for the preferred alternative between Steeles Avenue and Meadowview Avenue, i.e. HOV configuration or RT median design.	None expected	None necessary	Insignificant	Ongoing discussions with City of Toronto Staff regarding Class Environmental Assessment status / recommendations for Yonge Street from Steeles Avenue to Finch Avenue.	York Region	Not applicable to Y2 PE Design.		Yes		
		Access to minor side streets and properties along Yonge Street.	✓	✓	✓	Entire Corridor	Median transitway will eliminate random left turns into minor side streets and properties thereby requiring an alternative access route U-turns provided at major intersections for safe manoeuvres into side streets and to properties. Random permissive left turns eliminated thus increasing left safety. Develop traffic management plans for construction.	Conflict with U-turns and Right Turns on Red from side streets at Meadowview Av., Uplands Av., Langstaff Road East, Weldrick Road, Devonsleigh Blvd may decrease safety	None necessary	Moderately significant	Monitor traffic and prohibit Right Turns On Red movements from the side street at these locations if necessary	York Region	Consideration will be given in detailed 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.	Yes			
		North-south vehicular and RT capacity on Yonge Street.			✓	Glen Cameron Road and Arnold Avenue/Elgin Street	The required pedestrian crossing times at these locations have the potential to reduce the green time allocated to the north-south traffic flows on Yonge Street. A two-stage crossing would reduce the time required. A centre median refuge will allow for a two-stage pedestrian crossing decreasing the required east-west phase time.	Reduction in pedestrian level of service	None necessary	Negligible	The decision to implement these special provisions should be deferred until post-operation conditions are monitored and the need is identified.	York Region	Not applicable to Y2 PE Design.	Yes			

Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-2 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective B - Social Environment													Compliance Monitoring					
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					
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation			Item match	Verified	Notes			
OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor													Compliance Review (Ecoplans)					
B2	Maintain or improve road traffic and pedestrian circulation	Potential for Traffic Infiltration			✓	Thornridge Drive Jane Street Colbourne Street Helen Street Spruce Avenue	The preferred RT design will restrict left turn access at these Yonge Street intersections. Non-residential traffic may choose to use neighbourhood roadways to gain access to alternative routes.	Provide U-turns at signalised intersections. Increased the number of signalised intersections on Yonge Street to provide direct access to side streets.	Infiltration may remain.	Traffic management measures or alternative access arrangements would be undertaken, as required.	Moderately Significant	Undertake "before" and "after" traffic volume observations on affected roadways to determine any changes in traffic infiltration levels	York Region	Consideration will be given in detailed design to "before" traffic volume observations on affected roadways.		Yes		
		Potential for Traffic Infiltration			✓	Woodward Avenue/Grandview Avenue/Highland Park	Southbound left turns at the Highland Park, Woodward and Grandview intersections will be restricted in the preferred RT design. This additional restriction may divert traffic to Doncaster Avenue, Meadowview Avenue, Glen Cameron Road and Clarke Avenue, and ultimately to Henderson Avenue.	Traffic management measures such as turn restrictions could be implemented during detail design.	Infiltration may remain.	Traffic management measures or alternative access arrangements would be undertaken, as required.	Moderately Significant	Undertake "before" and "after" traffic volume observations on affected roadways to determine any changes in traffic infiltration levels. Traffic management measures such as turn restrictions, partial closures or traffic calming would be implemented, as required in consultation with City of Toronto.	York Region	Not Applicable to Y2 PE Design		Yes		
		Parking Prohibitions in Richmond Hill Commercial Business District.			✓	Richmond Hill CBD	RT operations during the "shoulder" periods may necessitate parking restrictions.	Existing parking prohibition may not be sufficient during shoulder period. It is recommended that on-street parking should be restricted in both directions during the peak periods.	None expected	None necessary	Insignificant	Monitoring of "shoulder" periods prior to and after the peak periods will need to be undertaken to determine the need to extend the parking restriction at specific locations in the CBD.	York Region	Not applicable to Y2 PE Design; Monitoring of "shoulder" periods prior to and after the peak periods applies after transitway construction		Yes		

Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-2 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective B - Social Environment													Compliance Monitoring					
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	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)				
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation				Item match	Verified	Notes		
OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor																		
		NB/SB U-turn movements and the corresponding side street right-turn-on-red (RTOR) movements			✓	Meadowview Avenue Uplands Avenue Langstaff Road East Weldrick Road Devonsleigh Blvd	The estimated future u-turn movements at these intersections are greater than one per cycle and conflicts between the u-turns may result in conflicts and right-turn-on-red (RTOR) movements should be monitored.	None required	None expected	None necessary	Significant	Monitor the intersection operations and conflict potential. If necessary, prohibit RTOR movements from the side street at these locations.	York Region	Consideration will be given in detailed 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	Yes			
B3	Maintain a high level of public safety and security in corridor	Access for emergency vehicles	✓	✓	✓	Yonge Street	Incorporation of median and construction will have adverse effects on Emergency Response Services (ERS) access and time	U-Turns provided at intersections. Consultation with emergency services representatives to develop access across the median at 75-100m intervals for Emergency Response Vehicles only.	Some risk may remain as access method will change after implementation of mitigation	Address during detail design in consultation with ERS staff.	Insignificant	Obtain feedback from ERS staff on performance of access provisions.	York Region	<u>Based on comments from the Richmond Hill Fire Department a strategy has been developed to provide access for EMS to properties and developments along the Y2 segment.</u> This strategy will be discussed with EMS in 2009	Memo - Fire and Emergency Service Access - Median Crossover Provisions - January 28 - YC 3.02 (ID # 3788)	Yes	ECF	
B4	Minimize adverse noise and vibration effects	Noise effect for BRT and LRT due to Widening of Yonge Street			✓	Entire corridor in proximity of residential uses	Combine effect of median Transitway operation and general traffic on the widened Yonge Street roadway may result in increased noise levels for residents.	Modeling of future traffic activities indicated that expected noise increases will not exceed the 5dB threshold at which mitigation measures are required. BRT and LRT sound levels expected to be marginal to none.	None expected	None necessary	Negligible	Conduct audit measurements to confirm compliance once the Transitway is fully operational. Yes	York Region	No action required during Y2 PE Design	Yes			
		Vibration effect for BRT and LRT due to Widening of Yonge Street			✓	Entire corridor in proximity of residential uses	Combine effect of median Transitway operation and general traffic on the widened Yonge Street roadway 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	Conduct audit measurements to confirm compliance once the Transitway is fully operational. Yes	York Region	No action required during Y2 PE Design	Yes			

Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-2 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective B - Social Environment											Compliance Monitoring						
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				
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation							
OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor													Compliance Review (Ecoplans)				
													Item match	Verified	Notes		
		Noise and vibration due to BRT and LRT vehicle maintenance and storage activity			✓	Langstaff Road	No adverse environmental effect. Vehicle maintenance noise levels experienced by nearest sensitive receptors will not exceed ambient levels by more than acceptable limits.	All maintenance activities, including the use of compressed air, will be performed in enclosed garage areas screened from any future residential development east of the site by retaining wall along CN Rail R.O.W.	None expected	None necessary	Negligible	Conduct audit measurements to confirm compliance once the facility is fully operational. Yes	York Region	Not Applicable to Y2 PE Design		Yes	
		Noise and vibration due to vehicle movements within the Maintenance and storage facility			✓	Langstaff Road	No adverse environmental effect. Vehicle movement noise levels experienced by nearest sensitive receptors will not exceed ambient levels by more than acceptable limits	A 6 m high retaining wall will be constructed along the east property line of the Maintenance Facility. Internal BRT vehicle movements will be shielded by the wall, thus reducing noise levels in the direction of the closest potential receptors. While the LRT lines are outside the wall, noise from LRT will be buffered by the existing elevated (6 m high) CN rail bed.	None expected	None necessary	Negligible	Conduct audit measurements to confirm compliance once the facility is fully operational. Yes	York Region	Not Applicable to Y2 PE Design		Yes	
B4	Minimize adverse noise and vibration effects (continued)	Noise due to BRT vehicle idling within the Maintenance Facility			✓	Langstaff Road	Vehicle idling noise levels experienced by nearest sensitive receptors will potentially exceed ambient levels by more than acceptable limits	A 6 m high enclosure wall will be constructed along the east property line of the Maintenance facility.	Excess Noise With the vehicle exhausts at roof height, the proposed 6 m high fence does not seem to provide adequate shielding.	A building enclosure is recommended to mitigate against the excess noise due bus idling noise. Further data and discussions are necessary to confirm the appropriate mitigation measures.	No significant effects are anticipated after mitigation.	Conduct audit measurements to confirm compliance once the facility is fully operational. Yes	York Region	Not Applicable to Y2 PE Design		Yes	

Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-2 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective B - Social Environment												Compliance Monitoring						
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					
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation								
OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor												Compliance Review (Ecoplans)						
		Noise & vibration to be experienced during construction activities		✓		Entire Corridor	Potential adverse environmental effects from noise and vibration resulting from construction activities.	Construction equipment to comply with MOE NPC-115 noise emission standards. Further, construction activities to comply with local noise by-laws, especially time and place restrictions.	Short-duration noises from safety devices such as back-up beepers.	If practicable, measures such as temporary hoarding may be used to mitigate residual noise under certain limited circumstances.	No significant effect is anticipated after mitigation. However, due to the very nature of the work, certain noise sources are likely to be audible at nearby receptors.	Monitoring may be undertaken in response to certain specific complaints relating to noise and vibration. However, on-going or continuous monitoring is not recommended.	York Region	Measures to mitigate noise and vibration as a result of construction will be considered during detailed design.		Yes		
		LRT movements around curves in track		✓		Langstaff Road	Potential noise exceedance	None	Based on the available data, the LRT wheel squeal noise is predicted to marginally exceed the sound level limit.	No. Exceedance determined to be insignificant based on the available data.	Negligible	Conduct audit measurements to confirm compliance once the facility is fully operational.	York Region	Not Applicable to Y2 PE Design		Yes		
B5	Minimize adverse effects on cultural resources	Displacement of Built Heritage Features (BHF) Displacement of Cultural Landscape Units (CLU)		✓		75 & 77 Langstaff Road East, Markham	The potential development of intermodal bus and admin. facility will occur with the likely removal of the two BHF's - 75 & 77 Langstaff Road East, Markham	Although these buildings are old they are not designated heritage buildings	None expected	None required	Negligible	None required	York Region	Not Applicable to Y2 PE Design		Yes		

Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-2 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective B - Social Environment											Compliance Monitoring							
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					
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation			Item match	Verified	Notes			
OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor													Compliance Review (Ecoplans)					
		Disruption of Built Heritage Features (BHF) Displacement of Cultural Landscape Units (CLU)		✓		Thornhill Heritage District Conservation, Vaughn & Markham.	There is potential for disruption from changes in the visual, audible and atmospheric environment to cultural heritage features within the heritage district areas.	Considerable community and municipal liaison to address concerns. Developed streetscaping and urban design plan to identify opportunities to mitigate effects of widened roadway. Reduced transit and traffic lane widths to minimise impacts. Relocated station platforms to more desirable locations. Adjusted road/transit alignment to balance impacts on either side.	Detail design must address concerns of community.	Liaise with community and municipalities to obtain desired detail design solutions, especially for architectural treatment of stations in heritage districts	Positive effect	None required	York Region	Not Applicable to Y2 PE Design		Yes		
		Disruption of Built Heritage Features (BHF) Displacement of Cultural Landscape Units (CLU)		✓		Richmond Hill CBD area.	There is potential for disruption from changes in the visual, audible and atmospheric environment to cultural heritage features within the Central Business District areas.	Median transitway eliminated as an option through the CBD. A mixed traffic option has been chosen. Stations limited in the area	None expected	None	Negligible	None required	York Region	Y2 PE Design of curbside stops in the Richmond Hill CBD has still to be concluded and is currently limited to the existing pair of stops. Consultation with relevant community groups representing heritage associations have not been undertaken during Y2 PE Design to date		Yes		

Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-2 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective B - Social Environment											Compliance Monitoring					
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			
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						
OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor													Compliance Review (Ecoplans)			
		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 2 Archaeological Assessment: field survey to identify any sites that may be present within the proposed impact area. 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. 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.	Archaeological sites may be identified during the course of Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment.	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 Assessment, if archaeological resources are identified during survey.	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 results of Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment.	York Region	A Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment will be undertaken during the detail design phase	Yes		

Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-2 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective B - Social Environment											Compliance Monitoring							
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					
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation			Item match	Verified	Notes			
OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor											Compliance Review (Ecoplans)							
B6	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	<u>Introduction of a comprehensive landscaping and streetscaping plan for the corridor. Lane width reductions and smaller turning radii in heritage districts to allow wider pedestrian zones.</u> <u>Relocate or bury hydro lines in areas where widening places overhead lines unacceptably close to existing culturally sensitive areas.</u>	Narrow sections of ROW where property cannot be acquired may limit incorporation of streetscaping		Significant	Monitor redevelopment and acquire property through redevelopment applications	York Region	The Y2 DBCR is under development. Y1 PE Design principles will be applied to Y2 PE Design, as appropriate. The Y2 DBCR will incorporate streetscape recommendations under Streetscape Design Guidelines (Section 4.8), General Guidelines (Section 4.9), etc Y2 PE Design "Open House" format public consultations have not yet commenced. Selection of the preferred option for relocation of hydro lines is pending a York Region decision - Section 8.1.3 of the Y2 DBCR	Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19 th Avenue – Preliminary Engineering – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)	Yes	NSE	Draft dated Feb-09 was provided for review. Table should be updated to reflect more recent draft. Streetscape recommendations were found within the draft. However, <u>lane width reductions and smaller turning radii in heritage districts to allow wider pedestrian zones were not found within the draft.</u>
		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	Insignificant	Monitor health of landscaping continuously.	York Region	The Y2 DBCR is under development. Y1 PE Design principles will be applied to Y2 PE Design, as appropriate. The Y2 DBCR will address sustainability of landscape features and a greater degree of greening – e.g. Section 4.19 of the Y2 DBCR	Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19 th Avenue – Preliminary Engineering – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)	Yes		

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

Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural Environment											Compliance Monitoring							
GOAL	Environment al Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issue/ 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	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Item match	Verified	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
C1	Minimize adverse effects on Aquatic Ecosystems	Fuel spills, due to accidents during construction refueling and accidents during operation, entering the watercourses.	✓	✓		Entire Corridor	Fish kills due to chemical spills resulting in short term population decline.	No refueling within 10 m of a watercourse. Emergency Response Plan	Short term population decline. Some contaminants within storm water system.	None practical	Insignificant	None required	York Region	An Emergency Response Plan will be developed during detailed design		Yes		
		Sediment laden storm water 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. <u>Erosion and Sediment Control Plan will be included.</u>	Short term population decline.	None practical	Significant, only if erosion and sediment control measures fail due to an event during winter.	Monitor sediment accumulation after rain events during construction to ensure that the proposed mitigation measures in the ESCP have been satisfied.	York Region	A draft Stormwater Management Plan has been developed during Y2 PE Design and will be developed further during detailed design – Y2 DBCR – Appendix H	Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19 th Avenue – PE – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR) <u>Appendix H – Drainage & Hydrology Report - Dec 2008 YC 3.05 (ID # 3693).</u>	Yes	ECF	Draft dated Feb-09 was provided for review. Table should be updated to reflect more recent draft. This draft included Section 8.4 which includes “A detailed erosion and sediment control plan will be implemented during construction of proposed works.”
		Sediment laden storm water entering watercourses during operation.			✓	Entire Corridor	Loss of aquatic habitat resulting in population decline.	Storm water management facilities such as grassed swales, oil and grit separators, storm water ponds. Opportunities to improve stormwater quality will be investigated.	Short term population decline.	Clean-out facilities as required.	Insignificant	Monitor sediment accumulation in storm water management facilities.	York Region	A draft Stormwater Management Plan has been developed during Y2 PE Design and will be developed further during detailed design – Y2 DBCR – Appendix H	Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19 th Avenue – PE – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR) Appendix H – Drainage & Hydrology Report - Dec 2008 YC 3.05 (ID # 3693).	Yes	ENF	Draft dated Feb-09 was provided for review. Table should be updated to reflect more recent draft. Evidence was not found that monitoring of sediment in the SWM facilities would be done.

Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural Environment											Compliance Monitoring							
GOAL	Environment al Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issue/ 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	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Item match	Verified	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
		Loss of site-specific habitat		✓		All watercourses within entire corridor	Potential loss of fish habitat as a result of culvert/bridge extension, repair or replacement and development of a vehicle maintenance and storage facility.	Design transitway cross-sections to avoid modifications at culverts/bridges. 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. Perform all in-water work in the dry using a temporary flow bypass system.	A harmful alteration of fish habitat may result from a culvert extension at Rouge River Tributary 2 and development of the vehicle maintenance and storage facility at Langstaff Road at Don River Tributary 3.	Negotiations with regulatory agencies during detail design. Compensation for the harmful alteration of fish habitat. Opportunity to enhance enclosed and degraded stream at vehicle maintenance and storage facility through stream daylighting, realignment and restoration.	Insignificant	On-site environmental inspection during in-water work. Post-construction monitoring of fish habitat compensation measures.	York Region	The Rouge River Tributary 2 culvert extension is in Y2 (see Table 8 of Appendix E of the EA) - Mitigation Measures will be developed further in Y2 Detailed Design The Maintenance and Storage Facility (MSF) is not applicable to Y2 PE Design		Yes		
		Fish mortality		✓		All watercourses within entire corridor	Fish may be injured or killed by dewatering or physical harm.	Design transitway cross-sections to avoid modifications at culverts/bridges. Avoid in-water work to the extent possible. Perform all in-water work in the dry using a temporary flow bypass system. Capture fish trapped during dewatering of the work zone and safely release upstream. Prohibit the entry of heavy equipment into the watercourse.	None expected.	None	Negligible	On-site environmental inspection during in-water work.	York Region	Provision for site-specific measures for in-water work will be made in the detailed design phase – See also item 38 of this document.		Yes		

Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural Environment											Compliance Monitoring							
GOAL	Environment al Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issue/ 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	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Item match	Verified	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
C1	Minimize adverse effects on Aquatic Ecosystems (continued)	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. The culvert extension will be designed to maintain fish passage.	The culvert extension at Rouge River Tributary 2 will be designed to avoid the creation of a barrier to fish movement. No barrier to fish movement will be created at the vehicle maintenance and storage facility at Langstaff Road at Don River Tributary 3.	Negotiations with regulatory agencies during detail design.	Negligible	On-site environmental inspection during in-water work.	York Region	The Rouge River Tributary 2 culvert extension is in Y2 (see Table 8 of Appendix E of the EA). The culvert extension will be designed to avoid the creation of a barrier to fish movement in the Y2 detailed design stage. The Maintenance and Storage Facility (MSF) is not applicable to Y2 PE Design		Yes		
		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. Use storm water management practices that encourage infiltration and recharge of groundwater.	None expected.	None	Negligible	<u>Post-construction inspection of storm water management facilities to evaluate their effectiveness.</u> On-going maintenance as required.	York Region	The proposed improvements will result in an increase in impervious area - Appendix H of Y2 DBCR <u>A draft Stormwater Management Plan has been developed during Y2 PE Design and will be developed further during detailed design – Appendix H of Y2 DBCR</u>	<u>Yonge Street Rapidway Highway 7 to 19th Avenue – PE – Design Basis & Criteria Report- Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)</u> <u>Appendix H – Drainage & Hydrology Report - Dec 2008 YC 3.05 (ID # 3693).</u>	Yes	NSE	No evidence was found in the documents cited that indicated that post-construction inspection of storm water management facilities to evaluate their effectiveness will be done.

Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural Environment											Compliance Monitoring							
GOAL	Environment al Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issue/ 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	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Item match	Verified	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
		Baseflow alterations – realignment of watercourse	✓	✓		Pomona Mills Creek at the proposed Maintenance and Storage Facility	Fish habitat may be destructed or disturbed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> erosion and sedimentation control provide Level 1 stormwater treatment for vehicle storage and maintenance facility convey existing flow through the site during construction of the new watercourse create new channel using natural channel design construct new channel off-line in the dry stabilize new channel prior to diversion divert flow into new channel capture and safely release stranded fish in-water construction timing restriction Negotiations will occur with regulatory agencies during detail design to address the proposed realignment and naturalization of this watercourse.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> alteration of approximately 700 m² of highly degraded fish habitat anticipated opportunity to create and enhance approximately 900 m² of fish habitat through channel realignment therefore, net gain of 200 m² of fish habitat anticipated opportunity to enhance this highly degraded watercourse through natural channel design. 	None required	Positive	Monitor the newly altered fish habitat	York Region	Not applicable to Y2 PE Design		Yes		
		Increased temperature	✓	✓		All watercourses within entire corridor.	Clearing of riparian vegetation and storm water management practices can impact temperature regimes.	Minimize the area of stream bank alteration to the extent possible. Use storm water management practices that encourage infiltration and recharge of groundwater.	Shading provided by culvert/bridge offsets shading lost through removal of riparian vegetation.	Restore riparian areas disturbed during construction with native vegetation.	Negligible	<p>Post-construction inspection of storm water management facilities to evaluate their effectiveness.</p> On-going maintenance as required. Post-construction inspection of riparian plantings to confirm survival.	York Region	<p>An Environmental Control Plan will be developed during detailed design.</p> A draft Stormwater Management Plan has been developed during Y2 PE Design and will be developed further during detailed design – Appendix H of Y2 DBCR	Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19 th Avenue – PE – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR) Appendix H – Drainage & Hydrology Report - Dec 2008 YC 3.05 (ID # 3693).	Yes	NSE	Appendix H – Drainage & Hydrology Report - Dec 2008 YC 3.05 (ID # 3693) included reference to a Environmental Control Plan being developed that included: mminimizing disturbed areas and preserve existing vegetation where possible. There was no evidence found of minimizing stream bank alteration, of shading by the structures is equivalent to removed vegetation, or of riparian areas being restored with native vegetation. Draft dated Feb-09 was provided for review. Table should be updated to reflect more recent draft.

Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural Environment											Compliance Monitoring							
GOAL	Environment al Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issue/ 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	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Item match	Verified	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
		Disturbance to rare, threatened or endangered species		✓	✓	East Don River	Redside dace resident approximately 2 km upstream of Yonge Street. None known to be resident within zone of influence of the project.	No species-specific mitigation required.	None expected	None required	Negligible	None required.	York Region	An Environmental Control Plan will be developed during detailed design.		Yes		
C2	Minimize adverse effects on Terrestrial Ecosystems	Destruction/ Disturbance of wildlife habitat.		✓	✓	Entire corridor Rouge River Tributary 2	Construction of the transitway and associated facilities will result in the removal of vegetation and the wildlife habitat that it supports. Activities such as site grubbing, staging & stockpiling during construction could result in destruction or disturbance of migratory birds Extension of existing culvert may have potential adverse effects on migratory birds.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimize the area of vegetation removals to the extent possible. Minimize grade changes to the extent possible. Use close cut clearing and trimming to minimize the number of trees to be removed. Delineate work zones using construction fencing/tree protection barrier. Protect trees within the clear zone using guide rail, curbs, etc. to prevent removal. No bird nesting was observed in this culvert.	Removal of 0.026 ha of cultural meadow vegetation community at the CN-Bala/GO Line and 0.013 ha of cultural meadow vegetation community at the hydro corridor south of Highway 407. Community has low habitat structure and diversity.	Restore natural areas disturbed during construction with native vegetation, where feasible. Replace ornamental vegetation as part of landscaping.	Negligible	Post-construction inspection of vegetation plantings to confirm survival.	York Region	A draft Stormwater Management Plan has been developed during Y2 PE Design and proposes corresponding mitigation measures for an Environmental Control Plan, which will be developed during detailed design – Appendix H of Y2 DBCR The Rouge River Tributary 2 culvert extension is in Y2 (see Table 8 of Appendix E of the EA) - Mitigation Measures will be developed further in Y2 Detailed Design	Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19 th Avenue PE – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR) Appendix H – Drainage & Hydrology Report - Dec 2008 YC 3.05 (ID # 3693).	Yes		
		Wildlife mortality.		✓		Entire corridor	Removal of wildlife habitat may result in wildlife mortality.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perform vegetation removals outside of wildlife breeding seasons (typically April 1 to July 31). Perform bridge/culvert extension, repair and replacement outside of wildlife breeding seasons. 	None expected	None required	Negligible	None required.	York Region	An Environmental Control Plan will be developed during detailed design.		Yes		

Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural Environment											Compliance Monitoring							
GOAL	Environment al Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issue/ 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	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Item match	Verified	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
C2	Minimize adverse effects on Terrestrial Ecosystems (continued)	Barriers to wildlife movement.	✓	✓	Entire corridor	Increase in the width of Yonge Street to accommodate transitway and associated facilities may create an additional impediment to wildlife movement. Culvert/bridge extension, repair or replacement may create a barrier to wildlife movement.	Enhance wildlife passage under transitway, where feasible through culvert/bridge modifications. Culvert extension at Rouge River Tributary 2 will not impede wildlife passage under Yonge Street. The function of this culvert, to provide wildlife passage by small mammals, will be maintained. Opportunities to enhance wildlife passage at vehicle maintenance and storage facility through stream daylighting, realignment and restoration.	Transitway represents an incremental increase in road width compared to existing barrier created by Yonge Street.	Use of existing culverts/bridges maintains wildlife passage under transitway and does not offer opportunities to enhance wildlife passage.	Negligible.	None required.	York Region	Existing culverts/bridges will be used, maintaining wildlife passage under transitway. The Rouge River Tributary 2 culvert extension is in Y2 (see Table 8 of Appendix E of the EA) - Mitigation Measures will be developed further in Y2 Detailed Design The MSF is not applicable to Y2 PE Design		Yes			
		Wildlife/vehicle conflicts.		✓	Entire corridor	Increase in the width of Yonge Street to accommodate transitway and associated facilities may increase the potential for wildlife/vehicle conflicts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Span bridges across the meander belt. Use oversized culverts to promote wildlife passage under the road. Stagger culvert inverts to create wet and dry culverts. 	Transitway represents an incremental increase in road width compared to existing hazard to wildlife created by Yonge Street.	None required	Insignificant	None required.	York Region	Existing culverts/bridges will be used, maintaining wildlife passage under transitway		Yes			
		Disturbance to rare, threatened or endangered wildlife.		✓	Entire corridor	No rare, threatened or endangered wildlife identified within study area.	No species-specific mitigation required	None expected	None required	Negligible	None required.	York Region	An Environmental Control Plan will be developed during detailed design.		Yes			
		Disturbance to vegetation through edge effects, drainage modifications and road salt.		✓	✓	Entire corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearing of new forest edges may result in sunscald, windthrow, and invasion by exotic species. Ditching, grading and other drainage modifications may alter local soil moisture regimes. Road salt may result in vegetation mortality and dieback. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimize the area of vegetation removals to the extent possible. Minimize grade changes and cut/fill requirements to the extent possible. Use close cut clearing and trimming to minimize encroachment on remaining vegetation. Delineate work zones using construction fencing/tree protection barrier. Manage the application of road salt to the extent possible. 	Vegetation communities within the study area are primarily cultural in origin and have been impacted by Yonge Street. Transitway represents an incremental encroachment into these already disturbed communities.	Landscape treatments	Insignificant	None required.	York Region	An Environmental Control Plan will be developed during detailed design.		Yes		

Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural Environment											Compliance Monitoring							
GOAL	Environment al Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issue/ 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	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Item match	Verified	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
		Rare, threatened or endangered flora.		✓		Yonge Street and High Tech Road, Yonge Street at Railway Underpasses	Three regionally rare tree species are located within the study limits including black walnut, juniper and red cedar. The significance of these trees is diminished since they have been planted.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimize the area of vegetation removals to the extent possible. Minimize grade changes to the extent possible. Use close cut clearing and trimming to minimize the number of trees to be removed. Delineate work zones using construction fencing/tree protection barrier. Protect trees within the clear zone using guide rail, curbs, etc. to prevent removal. 	Trees may be removed by the transitway and its associated facilities.	None required	Insignificant	None required.	York Region	An Environmental Control Plan will be developed during detailed design.		Yes		
C3	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 proposed Rapid Transit 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 and 4.4 of Appendix K, 1.6% decrease in PM ₁₀ , 2.0% decrease in NO _x , 1.9% decrease in SO ₂ , and 3.0% decrease in CO)	None required	Positive Effect	None required.	York Region	No action required during Y2 PE Design		Yes		
		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	Reduced per capita emissions of GhGs (overall annual reduction of 54 kilotonnes of CO ₂ forecast in 2021)	None required	Positive Effect	None required.	York Region	No action required during Y2 PE Design		Yes		
		Degradation of air quality during construction		✓		Yonge Street 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	None recommended	York Region	An Environmental Control Plan will be developed during detailed design.		Yes		
		Air quality impacts due to Rapid Transit vehicle maintenance and storage activity			✓	Langstaff Road	Vehicle maintenance emissions experienced by nearest sensitive receptors will/will not exceed ambient standards	All maintenance activities will improve the operation of the engines thereby emitting fewer pollutants.	Increased impact on some local receptors but applicable standards not expected to be exceeded.	None required	Negligible	None recommended.	York Region	Not applicable to Y2 PE Design		Yes		

Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural Environment											Compliance Monitoring							
GOAL	Environment al Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issue/ 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	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Item match	Verified	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
C4	Minimize adverse effects on corridor hydro-geological, geological and hydrological conditions	Increased pavement; decreased infiltration			✓	Entire corridor Proposed Maintenance & Storage Facility	Minor increase in quantity of surface runoff. Minor decrease in quantity of groundwater. Lower quality of surface water.	Storm water management facilities such as grassed swales and storm water ponds. Stormwater Management Plan should comply with the applicable provisions of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan. Water quality controls up to the MOE water quality guideline of Enhanced Level (i.e. 80% TSS removal) will be required for area where an increase in impervious surface is observed. Storm water management controls (quality, quantity and erosion) will also be required for the construction of the proposed Maintenance & Storage Facility (MSF).	Minor increase in peak streamflows. Minor decrease in groundwater.	None practical	Negligible	None required	York Region	A draft Stormwater Management Plan has been developed during Y2 PE Design and will be developed further during detailed design – Appendix H of Y2 DBCR See also item 43 above. Maintenance and Storage Facility is not applicable to Y2 PE Design	Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19 th Avenue PE – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR) Appendix H – Drainage & Hydrology Report - Dec 2008 YC 3.05 (ID # 3693).	Yes		

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

Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-4 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective D – Economic Environment											Compliance Monitoring							
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issue/ 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	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Item match	Verified	Notes
OBJECTIVE D: To promote smart growth and economic development in the corridor																		
D1	Support Regional and Municipal Planning Policies and approved urban structure	Need for pedestrian-friendly streets and walkways for access to stations	✓	✓		Entire corridor	Social and economic environment could be affected if Yonge St. is not attractive and safe for pedestrian traffic.	Signalized pedestrian crosswalks will be provided at all stations and intersections; Pedestrian safety will be considered in designs for station precincts and road signage will be highly visible to both pedestrians and automobiles.	Potential for jaywalking in vicinity of stations	Platform edge treatment will discourage illegal access	Insignificant and positive	Monitor traffic accidents involving pedestrians to establish whether cause is transit related.	York Region	The Y2 DBCR is under development. Y1 PE Design principles will be applied to Y2 PE Design, as appropriate. The Y2 DBCR will incorporate pedestrian friendly guidelines – Section 4.9.1 of the Y2 DBCR <u>Pedestrian safety has been considered during Y2 PE Design - e.g. Sections 4.17, 4.20.2, and 4.21 of the Y2 DBCR</u>	<u>Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19th Avenue PE – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)</u>	Yes	ECF	Draft dated Feb-09 was provided for review. Table should be updated to reflect more recent draft.
		Locating higher density and transit-oriented development where it can be served by transitway		✓		New and redevelopment locations	Change in existing land use patterns along transit corridor may not be attainable	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	No design action required during Y2 PE Design		Yes		

Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-4 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective D – Economic Environment											Compliance Monitoring							
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issue/ Concerns	Project Phase ¹			Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures			Level of Significan ce after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendatio n	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Item match	Verified	Notes
OBJECTIVE D: To promote smart growth and economic development in the corridor																		
		Reflection of historical districts through urban design and built form.		✓	✓	Thornhill Heritage District/ Richmond Hill historical district	Station aesthetics may not be compatible with the character of heritage districts along the corridor.	Incorporate station designs and features that reflect the surrounding historical districts where further redevelopment is limited through consultation with community and heritage groups.	Rapid transit availability could encourage incompatible re-development	Apply Municipal Site plan approval process	Insignificant	Municipalities to monitor nature of re-development in sensitive districts	York Region / Vaughan / Markham / Richmond Hill	Thornhill Heritage District is not applicable to Y2 PE Design Consultations regarding the Richmond Hill historical district with community groups representing heritage associations have not been undertaken to date during Y2 PE Design The Y2 DBCR is under development. Y1 PE Design principles will be applied to Y2 PE Design, as appropriate. The Y2 DBCR will incorporate Streetscape Design Guidelines (Section 4.8), General Guidelines (Section 4.9) and Heritage Area (Section 4.22), etc.	Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19 th Avenue PE – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)	Yes		
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 Town Hall, hospital, malls, parks, etc.	Construction Traffic and Pedestrian Management Plan will avoid wherever possible, barriers to entrances/exits to large attractors along Yonge Street. Transitway median design to incorporate frequent access paths during operations, particularly at community facilities	Alternative access routes to facilities may affect adjacent properties	Mark detours and alternative access points clearly	Insignificant	Monitor congestion levels during construction and traffic patterns during operations.	York Region	Construction Traffic and Pedestrian Management Plans will be developed during detailed design. <u>Transitway design retains crossing opportunities at all existing crosswalk locations.</u>	Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19 th Avenue PE – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)	Yes	ENF	Evidence that all existing crosswalks were retained is not evident from the document cited. Draft dated Feb-09 was provided for review. Table should be updated to reflect more recent draft.
D3	Minimize adverse effects on business activities in corridor	The potential for an increase in business activity.	✓	✓	✓	Entire corridor	As Yonge Street is a highly developed corridor, increased activity could require a change in urban form.	Intensification of underutilized sites along with the development of infill locations and any vacant land can be pursued under municipal planning guidelines for transit-oriented development.	Increase in 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	No action required during Y2 PE Design		Yes		

Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-4 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective D – Economic Environment											Compliance Monitoring							
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issue/ 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	Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Item match	Verified	Notes
OBJECTIVE D: To promote smart growth and economic development in the corridor																		
		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 and work force population will be offset by increased activity due to improved transit service.	Encourage alternative compatible development	Insignificant and positive	Cooperative response to business loss concerns addressed to municipalities.	York Region	The Y2 DBCR is under development. Y1 PE Design principles will be applied to Y2 PE Design, as appropriate. Traffic management concepts and plans will be developed during Y2 PE Design. Community liaison procedures and construction staging plans will be developed further during detailed design.	Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19 th Avenue PE – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)	Yes		
D4	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	Intersections with no station in median does not allow sufficient turning width for WB 17(articulated trucks)	Traffic signs prohibit large truck at stations with no stations in median. Designate truck routes	Insignificant	Monitor and widen Yonge with right turn tapers at side streets to allow for movement	York Region	The Y2 DBCR is under development. Y1 PE Design principles will be applied to Y2 PE Design, as appropriate. Section 3.8.12 of the Y2 DBCR will list the permissible U-turns and vehicle types at each of the intersections. Section 3.3 of the Y2 DBCR will document the justification for right turn lanes. For design consistency and to improve pedestrian circulation, right turn tapers will not be included in the design.	Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19 th Avenue PE – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)	Yes		
		Ease of Truck Movement		✓		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	Construction Traffic Management Plans will be developed during detailed design		Yes		

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

Action for comments received from the Government Review Team on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Item match	Verified	Notes
Ministry of Transportation	Mr. Steve Ganesh, Senior Planner	1	<p>a. MTO overall supports the final EA as it supports provincial policy direction in increasing modal split, making transit a priority for investment and providing transit along major corridors.</p> <p>b. It is the MTO's understanding that Transit Signal Priority (TSP) and queue jump lanes were an important component of the Viva services and assumed that Yonge Street would now (or very shortly) have these amenities at many of the key intersections. In light of this issue MTO would like some clarification on the demand estimates used in the EA. If the demand estimates do not reflect the TSP and queue jump lanes as part of Phase 1 of Viva, they may not be accurately portrayed. MTO requests further clarification on the use of TSP and queue jump lanes in the demand estimates.</p> <p>c. There is little reference in the EA on the relationship between the proposed transit improvements on Yonge Street and land use. Given the current provincial policy direction in the Draft Growth Plan to connect urban growth centres by transit, the final EA for this major transit initiative should clearly outline examples as to how the Corridor transit initiatives will support the proposed land use along Yonge Street. MTO suggests the final EA make reference to the relationship between the proposed transit improvements and land use.</p> <p>d. The EA does not reference the relationship of the Yonge Street Corridor transitway with a potential transitway in the Highway 7 or Highway 407 corridor. MTO suggests the final EA document address the interaction of the corridors with respect to proposed technology (BRT and LRT) and potential connections.</p>	<p>a. Comment noted.</p> <p>b. The demand estimates were developed on the assumption that rapid transit would operate in dedicated lanes within the Yonge Street right-of-way with TSP capability for recovery of schedule. The Viva 1 queue jump lanes would be available for general traffic use after installation of the dedicated rapid transit lanes.</p> <p>c. Section 1.2 of the EA report makes reference to the Region's Official Plan and the Centres and Corridors Policy which establishes the framework for land use along the corridors making up the proposed rapid transit network.</p> <p>In the Highway 7 Corridor EA report, the Regional Context for the policy and its relationship to rapid transit is described in more detail in Section 12.1.1 of Chapter 12.</p> <p>d. Section 1.3 of the EA report discusses the relationship of the Yonge Street corridor with the east-west corridor including both Highways 7 and 407. The intermodal terminal at Richmond Hill Centre (Langstaff Gateway), where transfers between the corridors will take place, is not part of the undertaking. The 407 Transitway EA will address the specific interface needs for the 407 transitway. The Region will work with the MTO in the detailed design phase to ensure protection for appropriate interface with future 407 Transitway services.</p>	York Region	<p>a. No action required</p> <p>b. No action required</p> <p>c. No action required</p> <p>d. No action required during Y2 PE Design. MTO has been consulted regarding the future 407 Transitway during the Yonge Subway Extension Transit Project Assessment Process</p>		Yes		
Ministry of the Environment - Noise	Mr. Thomas Shevlin	2a	<p>a. Traffic data used in the noise report and the EA should be peer-reviewed, especially as to the areas of appropriate baseline volumes, volume growth over time, and day/night volume ratios.</p> <p>b. STAMSON calculations should be redone using peer-reviewed traffic volume data, and other corrected data and calculation techniques as described above.</p> <p>c. Tables 5.6 and 5.9 of the noise report should be revised based upon a and b above.</p> <p>d. The conclusions of the noise report (which should be also reflected in the EA) as to whether noise mitigation is required as a result of the undertaking should be based upon the revised Tables 5.6 and 5.9 as per item c above.</p>	<p>a. Additional STAMSON modelling has been carried out using alternative assumptions for the day/night volume ratios and more specific transit operating scenarios during the 24hr period. A supplementary memo to MOE Approvals Branch provides the Region's response to all comments.</p>	York Region	<p>a. No action required</p>		Yes		
Ministry of the Environment - Air Quality	Mr. Ernie Hart, Supervisor Air Pesticide and Environmental Planning (APEP)	2b	<p>a. Based upon the Region's response to our comments on the draft EA, and the subsequent changes to the final EA, APEP is satisfied that the comments provided have been addressed appropriately.</p> <p>b. With respect to environmental commitments and monitoring, revisions to Chapter 12 provide a more substantial level of detail than provided for in the draft EA. APEP is encouraged by the outline of construction and operations monitoring and the commitment to establish an independent Environmental Compliance Manager.</p> <p>c. 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 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</p>	<p>a. Comment noted.</p> <p>b. Comment noted.</p> <p>c. Comments noted and will be carried forward for consideration during development of the detailed Monitoring Program to be finalized during the detailed design phase.</p>	York Region	<p>a. No action required</p> <p>b. No action required</p> <p>c. No design action required during Y2 PE Design</p>		Yes		

	<p>experienced have been addressed.</p> <p>2b The York Region EA report does not adequately incorporate data from the Senes Air Quality (AQ) Impact Assessment concerning "Future" cases and the approach taken in the Senes report does itself raise specific concerns in terms of methodology used and results obtained.</p> <p><u>Lack of Detail in EA Report on AQ Impacts of the Project (Future Case)</u> d. The details on AQ impacts of the project, or those related to the Future Base Case and Future BRT Case, are not included in the body of the EA document in support of statements made in Table 11-3 related to Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural Environment. It is Technical Support's (TS) position that any evaluation of AQ impacts of the project, such as the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements should be the focus of the EA report as it relates to AQ. York Region has made existing conditions the primary focus and has relied solely on referring the reader to the Senes report. YR should revise the EA accordingly to resolve this issue.</p> <p><u>Focus of EA Report and Senes Report on PM Emissions</u> e. Although TSP is discussed with respect to its role as a pollutant of concern in the EA and Senes reports, it is then dropped from the assessment. Since TSP is a parameter regulated by the MOE, TC might have wished to see some further discussion of TSP and its role in defining "existing air quality", however TS does acknowledge that it is not a health based parameter and agree to its being excluded from further discussion in the Yonge St Corridor Project Air Quality Impact Assessment. f. PM_{2.5} is included in the existing conditions discussion but does not appear in the subsequent evaluation in the EA. TS wishes further explanation as to why PM_{2.5} was not included since it is a health based parameter. TS recommends that PM_{2.5} is included in all aspects of the AQ impact assessment.</p> <p><u>Comparison of "Historical & Measured AQ Data" with MOE AAQC</u> g. The averaging time used in Tables 6-23, 6-24 & 6-25 of the EA Report & in Tables 2.5, 2.6 & 2.7 of the Senes Report for the designated pollutants, do not in all cases, correspond with times over which applicable MOE Ambient AQ Criteria are actually averaged. 1. Table 6-25 of EA Report is intended to be identical to Table 2.7 of the Senes Report & yet Table 6-25 for SO₂, O₃ & NO_x has a 30-hr standard whereas Table 2.7 has 30-day standards for the same parameters, yet the values depicted are identical in both cases. 2. For CO, the 8-hr value of 36,200 ug/ m³ & the 24-hr value of 15,700 ug/ m³ as listed in the Table 2.5 (Senes) & 6-23 (EA Report) are incorrect. It is the 1-hr value which should be 36,200 ug/ m³ & the 8-hr which should be 15,700 ug/m³. In Tables 2.6, 2.7 (Senes) & 6-24, 6-25 (EA Report) the 1-hr value of 36,200 ug/m³ is listed correctly, however, the 8-hr value of 15,700 ug/ m³ has been omitted. 3. For O₃, the averaging time to be used in the comparison is the 1-hr value of 165 ug/m³ not a "calculated equivalent standard". 4. For NO_x, both the 24-hr value of 200 ug/m³ & the 1-hr value of 400 ug/m³ should be listed & used in the comparison & it should be clear that using NO_x as NO₂ is a conservative assumption but is considered acceptable. (Note: NO_x = NO + NO₂) 5. For SO₂, O₃ and NO_x, the 30-day values as listed in Table 2.7 of the Senes Report are inappropriate and should not be included. h. The above noted corrections should be made to these tables and the appropriate comparisons re-calculated so that all applicable MOE AAQC's and Canada Wide Standards are properly included in the assessment of the historical and measured MOE data. i. The comments in the 'preamble' to Tables 6-24, 6-25 of the EA Report & Tables 2.6, 2.7 of the Senes Report regarding the historical data are not necessarily correct since the AAQC values used in the tables are not accurate and/or complete. For example (see Memo for details): 1. Table 6.-25/2.7 – the SO₂ values for Locations #3 & #4 don't seem</p>	<p>The EA report was circulated in draft format in February 2005, and the comments received from MOE – Air, Pesticides, and Environmental Planning were adequately addressed. The review of the final EA report (August 2005) by MOE – APEP resulted in the additional comments noted below. Further clarification of the issues raised by the MOE – APEP branch is included in the attached supplementary air quality memorandum.</p> <p>d. The results of the AQ assessment are summarized in Chapter 11 (Table 11-3) of the EA report consistent with the summary of other potential environmental effects. The EA document references Appendix K which provides the detailed AQ assessment. The Proponent does not believe that a revision to the EA document is warranted.</p> <p>e. Comment noted.</p> <p>f. The supplementary air quality memorandum addresses PM_{2.5}.</p> <p>The supplementary air quality memorandum includes updated Tables 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7.</p> <p>g. 1. There is a typographical error in Table 6-25 of the EA report. The reference to 30 hour in Table 6-25 should be 30 day. 2. The supplementary air quality memorandum includes updated Tables 2.5, and 2.6.</p> <p>3. The supplementary air quality memorandum includes updated Tables 2.5, 2.6 and 2.8. 4. The supplementary air quality memorandum provides a response to this comment.</p>	<p>York Region</p>	<p>d. No action required</p> <p>e. No action required</p> <p>f. No action required</p> <p>g.1. No action required</p> <p>g.2. No action required</p> <p>g.3. No action required</p> <p>g.4. No action required</p> <p>g.5. No action required</p> <p>h. No action required</p>		<p>Yes</p>		
--	---	--	--------------------	--	--	------------	--	--

	<p>reasonable & must be clarified/ confirmed.</p> <p>2. Table 6-25/2.7 – O₃ values for Location #3 are also somewhat questionable.</p> <p>3. Table 6-25/2.7 – 1-hr CO values for Locations #4, #3 should also be confirmed.</p> <p>j. The perceived concern regarding the accuracy of the above mentioned values needs to be addressed not so much from the standpoint of the actual number, since they appear well under the MOE AAQC, but more so in terms of how they give rise to a trend that could undermine the overall credibility of the monitoring data as provided in the Table.</p> <p><u>Development of Vehicle Emissions Data</u></p> <p>k. On the basis of statements which appear on p.3-2 (Senes) as a preamble to Table 3.1, it is uncertain what vehicle speeds or travelling speeds were used in development of the vehicle emissions data. The 2nd sentence on p.3-2 says 90 km/hr for 407 Highways and 60 km/h for major roads while the 5th sentence on the page says 32.8 km/hr for travelling on streets & 66.6 km/hr for highways. This apparent discrepancy should be clarified by Senes.</p> <p>l. No roadway lengths or distances travelled are provided with the discussion that would enable Tech Support to check the data as presented in Tables 3.2, 3.3 & 3.4. Such lengths or distances travelled should be confirmed & added to the Senes Report.</p> <p>m. A ratio of CO/SO₂ was used by TS as an alternate approach to substantiating some of the road link data in Tables 3.2 and 3.3. There are some discrepancies in the results (see Memo for details). As a follow-up to above comments, Senes should review the Existing Base Case data of Table 3.2 to confirm its accuracy.</p> <p><u>Dispersion Modelling/ Assessment of AQ</u></p> <p>n. Figure 2.2 as provided in Section 2.3 of the Senes Report does not clearly depict the location of the study initiated air quality monitoring locations. As such, despite the descriptions which follow, it is not clear exactly which stations are actually within the Project study area. This creates a problem for TS in evaluating the data as included in Table 5.6. The concern here is that only one station appears to be in the study area and it is only at that station that the modelling concentration data exceeds the monitoring data. Further clarification from Senes is needed in terms of the location of the Monitoring stations used in their Assessment and how these stations reflect representative locations with respect to AQ Impacts of the Yonge Street Corridor Project.</p> <p>o. Although there is a reference in the second last paragraph of Section 5.3 of the Senes Report (p.5-8) that the monitoring period used in the Senes Measurement Program was "limited", there is no clear statement of how long the period was. Such a statement is required in order for Tech Support to appreciate the extent of the data base collected.</p> <p><u>Matching of Alt. Assessed in EA Report with Those in Senes'</u></p> <p>p. Some confusion remains with Senes removing Section 3 out of their air quality report, as to what the specific implications of this difference in screening approaches may be since the "Detailed Air Quality Screening Used to Evaluate the Yonge Street South Alternatives is included in Appendix A of the Senes report. TS's suggestion is that Senes remove the screening details from the Appendix of their report and York Region confirm that Senes' approach on screening with respect to air quality did not provide any different results on selection of the preferred alternative from that shown in Section 8 of the EA report.</p> <p><u>Identification of Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>q. The reference in Table 11-3 to Tables 4.3 and 4.4 of the Senes report are incorrect and should read Table 3.3 and 3.4.</p> <p>r. Table 11-3 under Proposed Mitigation Measures-Potential Residual Effects suggests an improvement (or decrease) in PM₁₀ concentrations of some 1.6% when comparing 2021 (future) forecasts with and without the proposed rapid transit. The major difficulty TS has with this conclusion is that it does not include consideration of Table 3.2, the existing base case pollutant concentration estimates. It is of TS opinion to include consideration of the fact that PM₁₀ emissions will increase markedly from the existing base case (2001) to the future base case (2021). As a result, there will be a 40% increase in PM₁₀ 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 TS can easily</p>	<p>5. The supplementary air quality memorandum includes an updated Table 2.8.</p> <p>h. The supplementary air quality memorandum includes updated Tables 2.5, 2.6, 2.7 and 2.8.</p> <p>i. The supplementary air quality memorandum includes updated preambles to Tables 2.6 and 2.8</p> <p>j. Comment noted.</p> <p>k. The supplementary air quality memorandum includes an updated preamble to Table 3.1.</p> <p>l. The modelling data can be made available upon request.</p> <p>m. The existing data shown in Tables 3.2 and 3.3 of Appendix K was reviewed and both are accurate and reasonable. The modelling data can be made available upon request.</p> <p>n. The locations and descriptions of the monitoring stations have been described in Section 2.3, SENES Measurement Program in Appendix K.</p> <p>o. The supplementary air quality memorandum provides a response. Table 2.7, as shown in the memo should be added to the Air Quality Impact Assessment (Appendix K) which summarizes the number of valid observations that were made as part of the sampling program for this project.</p> <p>p. The supplementary air quality memorandum provides a response to this comment.</p> <p>q. Comment noted. Table 11-3 of the EA report should refer to Tables 3.3 and 3.4 of the AQ report, and not Tables 4.3 and 4.4.</p> <p>r. 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.</p> <p>s. The enhancement of the streetscape by tree planting is identified as an objective or commitment in several sections and exhibits in the report.</p> <p>t. There will be a net positive effect to the environment from PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀, therefore no further mitigation is required.</p> <p>u. Table 11.3 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</p>	<p>i. No action required</p> <p>j. No action required</p> <p>k. No action required</p> <p>l. No action required</p> <p>m. No action required</p> <p>n. No action required</p> <p>o. No action required</p> <p>p. No action required</p> <p>q. No action required</p> <p>\</p> <p>r. No action required</p> <p>s. No action required</p> <p>t. No action required</p> <p>u. No action required</p>				
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

			<p>agree to. At the very least TS feels that the change from 2001 to 2021 could be characterized in terms of BRT slowing the increase but it should include consideration of further mitigation based on the significant initial increase in PM₁₀ concentrations.</p> <p>s. TS would identify such efforts as tree planting (as noted in Section 10.1.1) as a factor in such mitigation and requests that they be considered and the appropriate revisions reflected in Table 11-3.</p> <p>t. TS is of the opinion that the issue of PM_{2.5} concentrations also needs further review and as such, Table 11-3 should be modified to include consideration of PM_{2.5} as well as PM₁₀.</p> <p><u>Monitoring of Construction PM Emission</u></p> <p>u. Table 11-3 of the EA Report includes comments on "Degradation of AQ 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 info provided in Sec. 12.4.1 of the EA Report ("Construction Monitoring"), which does indicate that "Monitoring" will be done in the form of regular inspections of dust & vehicular emissions control. Although TS is strongly in favour of the need to do such monitoring it is important that YR clarify what appears to be contrary statements in Table 11-3 that no "Monitoring" is recommended.</p> <p><u>Senes Project Description</u></p> <p>v. The content of Sec. 1.1 of the Senes Report is confusing to the reader in light of the apparent focus of Senes' AQ Assessment on airborne dust/ PM emissions from roadways & vehicular traffic. Other than an implied reference in the outline of Phase 1 of YRTP, which Senes states is not assessed in this report, there is virtually no reference to vehicular traffic. Notwithstanding the focus of the Project on Public or Rapid Transit improvements, Senes must explain in this Section their role in the Project and how their description of work relates to the content of their assessment which clearly includes PM emissions from roadway/ vehicular traffic.</p> <p><u>Executive Summaries</u></p> <p>w. For both the YR EA Report (Section E) and the Senes AQ Impact Assessment (Executive Summary) both of the Summaries need to be revised in accordance with changes to the bodies of the reports as recommended by TS and noted in the Memo.</p> <p><u>Overall Assessment of AQ</u></p> <p>x. The "Overall Assessment" as noted in Section 7.0 of the Senes Report and quoted in the EA document needs to be revised further to accommodate the comments on the body of the report as provided by TS in this Memo.</p>	<p>requirements of the standard contract conditions as described in Section 12 of the EA Report.</p> <p>v. The supplementary air quality memorandum provides additional information.</p> <p>w. The supplementary air quality memorandum includes an updated Executive Summary.</p> <p>x. The supplementary air quality memorandum provides a response. An updated Section 7.0 is provided.</p>		<p>v. No action required</p> <p>w. No action required</p> <p>x. No action required</p>			
Ministry of the Environment – Surface Water and Groundwater	Ms. Ellen Schmarje, Supervisor, Water Resources Unit	2c	<p>a. The Central Region-Water Resources Unit has no additional comments or outstanding issues.</p> <p>b. There are no outstanding surface water issues. All comments previously indicated have been satisfactorily addressed. Additional input during the detailed design phase may be required.</p> <p>c. There are no outstanding groundwater issues.</p>	a. All comments are noted.	York Region	a. No action required		Yes	
CEAA	Mr. Eric Advokaat	3	a. CEAA is satisfied with the EA and do not have any comments. CEAA noted that a federal EA may eventually be required should federal funding ever be identified for this project.	a. Comment noted. CEAA approval will be sought once a Federal EA trigger has been identified.	York Region	a. No action required		Yes	
York Region District School Board	Ms. Jane Ross, Manager of Land Use Planning	4	<p>a. The Board wishes to ensure the construction of the proposed undertaking will not negatively alter the use of the following facilities: Uplands Community Learning Centre at 8210 Yonge Street in Vaughan, and Thornhill Public School located at 7554 Yonge Street in Vaughan.</p> <p>b. In particular, safe pedestrian access and bus access to these facilities needs to be maintained. The York Region District School Board would like sufficient notice as to when this project will commence, so they are able to prepare and plan for the construction near the Board's properties.</p>	<p>a. Comment noted and will be carried forward for consideration during detailed design and development of the Monitoring Program as outlined in Chapter 12 of the EA report.</p> <p>b. Comment noted and will be carried forward for consideration during detailed design. During detailed design, a construction staging plan will be developed. The staging plan, as it relates to the effects on the school sites, will be provided to the School Boards for review.</p>	York Region	<p>a. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p> <p>b. Traffic management concepts and plans will be developed during PE Design. Community liaison procedures and construction staging plans will be developed further during detailed design.</p>		Yes	
Ministry of	Jackie	5	a. The Stage 1 Archaeological assessment report was reviewed and notes that the	a. Lands along the south side of Langstaff Road	York	a. A Stage 2 Archaeological		yes	

Culture	Dolling, Heritage Planner/Archaeologist		<p>proposed storage and maintenance facility at Langstaff Road was not addressed as part of the report. The archaeological assessment including subsequent Stage 2 work, must address the full extent of the corridor in detail including storage and maintenance facilities as well as all stormwater management ponds, construction staging and access areas. etc.</p> <p>b. All lands within the project impact area must be surveyed and documents. No disturbances should be undertaken by this project until this Ministry has issued a letter recommending that there are no further concerns for impacts to archaeological resources.</p> <p>c. As the project is implemented, this Ministry recommends continued consultation and involvement of this Ministry, municipal heritage planners, municipal heritage committees and other local heritage stakeholders.</p>	<p>preferred alignment were assessed between Yonge Street and the CN Rail right-of-way. While not specifically referenced in the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Report, these lands do include the preferred site for the Maintenance Facility, which will be investigated in detail in the Stage 2 work.</p> <p>b. Comment noted and will be included in the development of the Mitigation Plan to be completed as part of the detailed design phase.</p> <p>c. Consultation with the Ministry of Culture will be undertaken as required during the design and implementation of the project.</p>	Region	<p>Assessment will be undertaken during the Detail Design phase.</p> <p>Maintenance and Storage Facility is not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p> <p>b. No action required during Y2 PE Design</p> <p>c. Consultation regarding the Richmond Hill historical district with community groups representing heritage associations have not been undertaken to date during Y2 PE Design</p>				
Health Canada	Ms. Carolyn Dunn, Environmental Assessment Officer	6	<p>a. Section E.4.3: HC has some road safety concerns related to the location of the transit station in the median section of the road. Road crossings in urban areas with high traffic roads can be dangerous, particularly for seniors. To decrease the risk of pedestrian accidents associated with a median transitway, HC recommends that the following mitigation measures be followed:</p> <p>i. Create an urban environment that permits an efficient management of traffic conflicts and is pedestrian friendly;</p> <p>ii. Form a permanent security committee for the Yonge Street Corridor where all the organizations that are involved in the transitway operation will be present;</p> <p>iii. Put in place a suitable police surveillance along the transitway;</p> <p>iv. Reduce the speed of the vehicles on the Yonge Street Corridor;</p> <p>v. Require the minimal distance between buses to be 150 m while they are circulating on the transitway;</p> <p>vi. Equip all of the intersection with numerical countdown pedestrian lights;</p> <p>vii. Equip the raised medians with fences that allow no infringement on the totality of the Yonge Street Corridor length in order to minimize conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians;</p> <p>viii. Ensure that bus drivers have a good visibility (e.g. avoid packed buses); and</p> <p>b. Equip all the buses circulating on the transitway with a distinctive horn sound to capture pedestrians' attention more easily.</p> <p>c. Section 6.2.5 Well Distribution: It is mentioned in this section that some individual residents continue to obtain their water supplies from private wells in the area between Highway 7 and Carville Road, and along the west side of Yonge Street between Elgin Mills Road and Gamble Road. It is also mentioned that water supply wells may be in use at other locations with the Study Area. All of the drinking water wells must be identified on a map and mitigation measures must be put in place to protect the wells' users from any drinking water shortage or contamination due to construction and/or operation activities related to the project. Also identify the municipal water supplies present in the study area (if any).</p> <p>d. Section 6.2.10 Contaminated Sites: It is mentioned that a total of 98 properties along the Yonge Street Corridor and adjacent route options are identified as potential environmental concerns. To help with the assessment of the potential health risks that might be involved with these contaminated sites, HC has developed a series of documents called <i>Federal Contaminated Site Risk Assessment in Canada</i> that are available through the Contaminated Site Division. These documents included <i>Guidance on Human Health Preliminary Quantitative Risk Assessment</i> and <i>Health Canada Toxicological Reference Values</i>.</p> <p>e. Section 6.5.2 Approach Used for Noise Assessment: It is encouraged that the</p>	<p>a.</p> <p>i. Pedestrian and safety consideration were considered extensively in the development of the undertaking, and was included as one of the goals listed in Table 9-2 of the EA report.</p> <p>ii. Comment noted. The York Region Transportation and Works Department, Traffic Engineering and Safety Section will be involved throughout the detailed design and implementation phase.</p> <p>iii. The Traffic Act is enforced on all local and Regional roads by York Region Police, including Yonge Street transitway corridor.</p> <p>iv. Speed limit reduction comment noted and will be carried forward for consideration during the detailed design phase.</p> <p>v. The minimum vehicle headway on the transitway if 2021 projected ridership is attained is expected to be approximately 1 minute in the southern portion of the corridor. This would correspond to a BRT vehicle spacing in the 500 metre range.</p> <p>vi. Comment noted and will be carried forward for consideration during the detailed design phase.</p> <p>vii. The proposed median will include periodic breaks to provide for emergency vehicle access. Installation of a continuous fence along the median would severely impact the emergency vehicle access.</p> <p>viii. Existing transit driver training includes extensive consideration of safety issues.</p> <p>b. All of the buses will have horns in accordance with the requirements of the Traffic Act.</p> <p>c. Comment noted and will be carried forward for inclusion in the Monitoring Program to be developed during the detailed design phase.</p> <p>d. Comment and reference to the series of documents, Federal Contaminated Site Risk Assessment in Canada, are noted and will be carried forward for consideration during development of the mitigation plan during detailed design.</p> <p>e. There are currently no approved National Guidelines for Noise Assessment. Comment</p>	York Region	<p>a. i The Y2 DBCR is under development. Y1 PE Design principles will be applied to Y2 PE Design, as appropriate. The Y2 DBCR will incorporate <u>pedestrian friendly guidelines – Section 4.9.1 of the Y2 DBCR</u>. Pedestrian safety has been considered during Y2 PE Design - e.g. Sections 4.17, 4.20.2, and 4.21 of the Y2 DBCR</p> <p>a.ii York Region Transportation and Works Department, Traffic Engineering and Safety Sections will be consulted during Y2 PE Design in 2009. Other relevant parties involved will include YR Police, YR EMS, and the <u>City of Vaughan and Town of Markham Fire Services. These parties will be consulted further during detailed design.</u></p> <p>a.iii No action required</p> <p><u>a.iv Speed limits were considered and Y2 PE Design supports the continuation of existing speed limits.</u></p> <p>a.v No action required</p> <p>a.vi Pedestrian countdown signals will be installed – Section 3.7.6 of Y2 DBCR.</p>	<p><u>a.i. Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19th Avenue PE – Design Basis & Criteria Report – Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)</u></p> <p><u>a.ii. Memo - Fire and Emergency Service Access - Median Crossover Provisions – January 28 - YC 3.02 (ID # 3788)</u></p> <p><u>a.iv Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19th Avenue PE – Design Basis & Criteria Report – Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)</u></p>	Yes	a.i ECF	a.i Draft dated Feb-09 was provided for review. Table should be updated to reflect more recent draft.
									a.ii ECF	a.ii Draft dated Feb-09 was provided for review. Table should be updated to reflect more recent draft.
									a.iv ECF	a.iv Draft dated Feb-09 was provided for review. Table should be updated to reflect more recent draft.

			<p>noise assessment not be simply restricted to the audible range. The <i>Draft National Guidelines for Environmental Assessment: Health Impacts of Noise</i> are included for your consideration.</p> <p><u>Section 6.6 Existing Air Quality and Criteria</u></p> <p>f. Air quality predictions should include prediction for the levels of ozone and PM_{2.5} and a comparison to the National Ambient Air Quality Objectives (NAAQO).</p> <p>g. Predict the cumulative air emissions (for construction and operation). These predictions should include a comparison to NAAQO and an estimate of possible exceedences.</p> <p>h. Indicate the measures to be taken to control dust during construction.</p> <p>i. Estimate the contribution of emissions from operations to the formation of regional air pollution problems (ground level ozone and particulate matter). Place those emissions/contribution (e.g. NO/NO_x a precursor to ground-level ozone formation) in the context of regional emissions and air quality.</p>	<p>noted for further consideration during the Federal EA process once a CEAA trigger has been determined.</p> <p>f. Supplementary memo to MOE addresses these issues. The assessment of ozone was not included in the TOR where the protocol for this EA was approved by MOE. If there is a federal EA the Proponent will address federal information requirements as it relates to air quality.</p> <p>g. As noted in Section 12 of the EA report, measures to limit construction emissions will be a requirement of contract documents and monitored during construction. Operation through construction zones will use the general traffic lanes and the availability of the initial stage of improved public transit (rapid transit service) will reduce overall corridor emissions by attracting more trips from polluting private automobiles. An assessment of the cumulative effects will be provided should CEAA approval be required in the future.</p> <p>h. Table 12-2 of the EA report notes the Region's commitment to monitor effects of construction activities on air quality (dust and odour).</p> <p>i. Appendix K, Tables 3.3 and 3.4 indicate the effect of operations of the undertaking on Regional air pollution problems. The supplementary memo to MOE will also address this issue.</p>		<p>a.vii No action required</p> <p>a.viii No action required</p> <p>b. No action required</p> <p>c. No action required during Y2 PE Design</p> <p>d. No action required during Y2 PE Design</p> <p>e. No action required during Y2 PE Design</p> <p>f. No action required</p> <p>g. No action required during Y2 PE Design</p> <p>h. No action required during Y2 PE Design</p> <p>i. No action required</p>				
City of Vaughan	Mr. Roy McQuillan, Manager of Corporate Policy	7	<p>a. The MOE be advised that the City of Vaughan supports the approval of this EA report as submitted by York Region.</p> <p>b. That York Region be advised that, given the importance of achieving quality streetscapes on Yonge Street particularly in, but not limited to the heritage areas, the City of Vaughan and affected communities continue to be consulted in the development of detailed designs for the road allowance, with the final plans resulting from the joint Markham-Vaughan "Thornhill Yonge Street Study" being incorporated as required.</p> <p>c. The preferred alternative, once selected, was subjected to a further analysis of the environmental effects and mitigation measures. Two issues in Vaughan stand out which are: 1) The implication of the Yonge Street corridor from an urban design perspective, and 2) The economic and traffic issues associated with the form and operation of the transitway within a centre median, which confines the opportunities for left turns to signalized intersections.</p> <p>d. There will be inconveniences to those properties fronting on Yonge Street where the left turn access/egress is restricted. The transitway provides for "U-turns" at the signalized intersections. For this response to be effective, the design of the intersections will have to ensure that the U-turns can be performed comfortably. The people destined to or leaving the affected properties will need to be advised of how best to proceed. The EA acknowledges that traffic may attempt to use residential roads to gain access to specific sites. It recommends that this situation be monitored and remedial measures taken if it proves to be a problem.</p> <p>e. It is noted that there are some inconsistencies between the initial results of the Thornhill Yonge Street Study and the recommendations of the Yonge Street EA Study. It is recommended that the Region continue to work with the municipalities to reconcile any discrepancies in order to maintain and optimize the heritage/streetscape character of the affected area. This review should be conducted during the detailed design of the project. A recommendation has been</p>	<p>a. Comment noted.</p> <p>b. The final streetscape plan is to be developed as part of the detailed design phase and will be subject to Regional Council approval and Vaughan Council endorsement. As noted in Table 12-1 of the EA report, the Proponent will continue to work with the Thornhill Heritage Community during the design phase with respect to the existing community settings.</p> <p>c. Opportunities to enhance the Yonge Street corridor during implementation of the transitway infrastructure have been highlighted in the EA report. Analysis of traffic movements after insertion of the transitway indicates that signalized left and U-turn provisions at regular intervals will accommodate the anticipated traffic activity during the planning period. In addition, intersection operations will be monitored after implementation of the median transitway as noted in Table 12-3 of the EA report (Operations Monitoring).</p> <p>d. All U-turns will be designed based on vehicle turning templates for up to a B-12 vehicle. A signage plan will be developed as part of the detailed design phase.</p>	York Region	<p>a. No action required</p> <p>b The Y2 DBCR is under development. Y1 PE Design principles will be applied to Y2 PE Design, as appropriate.</p> <p>The Y2 DBCR will incorporate streetscape recommendations under Streetscape Design Guidelines (Section 4.8), General Guidelines (Section 4.9), etc</p> <p>c. No action required</p> <p>d. The Y2 DBCR is under development. Y1 PE Design principles will be applied to Y2 PE Design, as appropriate. Section 3.8.12 of the Y2 DBCR will list the permissible U-turns and vehicle types at each of the intersections. A signage plan will be developed as part of the detailed design phase</p>	Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19th Avenue PE – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)			

			<p>included advising the Region of the significance the City of Vaughan attaches to the Heritage Districts and the need to continue to work towards achieving the best possible results.</p> <p>f. The implementation of the YRTP will be an enormously 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.</p> <p>g. The implementation of the undertaking entails some substantial changes to the Yonge Street road allowance. Yonge is the signature street in York Region acting as both a gateway and main artery. Therefore, it is important that it maintain the highest aesthetic standards possible. This imperative is compounded by the fact that it passes through some of the Region's most historic areas. Functionally, the introduction of the transitway will have an impact on access and egress to and from a number of sites. Mitigation measures include the ability to make U-turns at signalized intersections and the introduction of more signalized intersection north of Royal Orchard Boulevard.</p> <p>h. A streetscape/landscape plan designed to mitigate the effects of the changes resulting from the transitway has been prepared and it is considered to be an appropriate response. Given the importance of this area, continued involvement of the municipalities and the affected communities will be essential to ensuring that the final designs meet expectations.</p>	<p>e. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p> <p>e. The Region will work with the area municipalities during detailed design to incorporate final recommendations from the Thornhill Yonge Street Study (refer to Table 12-1, Environmental Commitment 12.1 in the EA report).</p> <p>f. Comment noted.</p> <p>g. Comment noted.</p> <p>h. Comment noted. Vaughan, Markham and Richmond Hill will all be consulted during the detailed design phase. Where possible, the detailed streetscape plan will incorporate final recommendations from the Markham-Vaughan Thornhill Yonge Street Study.</p>		<p>f. No action required</p> <p>g. No action required</p> <p>h. Markham-Vaughan Thornhill Yonge Street Study is not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p>				
Town of Richmond Hill	Mr. Marcel Lanteigne, Manager, Transportation and Site Plans	8	<p>a. There is concern with Figure 10-9. This figure shows, in the background, a facility layout for the crossing of the CNR and for a pedestrian walkway along the Town's lands on the west side of the CNR and on the east of the CNR through private lands. These facilities have not yet been approved. In addition, the recent concepts that I have recently been shown shows a different layout. As such, I wish to ensure that the Town will not be bound by the background information shown on this figure.</p>	<p>a. As noted on Figure 10-9 the facilities to cross the CNR are not part of the undertaking of this EA.</p>	York Region	<p>a. No action required</p>				
Town of Markham	Mr. Arup Mukherjee, Manager of Transportation	9	<p>a. The Town is generally satisfied with the report and request that the following three items (i through iii) below are addressed in the detailed design phase.</p> <p>i. Section 10.3 identifies the location of the Rapid Transit Maintenance and Storage Facility east of Yonge Street and south of Highway 407. The Town is currently underway with a study for improving the fish habitat in the Pomona Mills Creek in this location, as well as a feasibility study for the Langstaff Sewer and Watermain system and SWM Plan for the area which includes the site proposed for the Rapid Transit Maintenance and Storage Facility.</p> <p>ii. In Section 10.3.3, it is proposed that the Pomona Mills Creek have 350 m of its length realigned to allow the Region's facility to be developed. 450 m of realigned watercourse is identified as increasing the fish habitat by 200 sq.m.</p>	<p>a. Comment noted. Items i through iii will be addressed in the detailed design phase of the project and through subsequent permit approval from TRCA.</p> <p>b. The Proponent will commit to work with the Town of Markham and the Thornhill Heritage Committee through the detailed design process.</p> <p>c. The Proponent will commit to work with the Town of Markham through the detailed design process.</p> <p>d. The Proponent will commit to work with the</p>	York Region	<p>a.i – a.iii The Maintenance and Storage Facility is not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p> <p>b. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p> <p>c. The Maintenance and Storage Facility is not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p> <p>d. No action required during Y2 PE Design</p> <p>e. Selection of the preferred</p>	<p>e. <u>Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19th Avenue PE – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)</u></p>	Yes	ECF	Draft dated Feb-09 was provided for review. Table should be updated to reflect more recent draft.

			<p>The report does not identify the location of the realigned creek within the site, nor does it indicate the extent of creek naturalization. This item is deferred until the detailed design stage.</p> <p>iii. The flows in the Pomona Mills Creek will also be affected by the site development and creek realignment proposed by the Region. There are concerns downstream of erosion potential and the addition of the Region's facility will increase runoff quantity and quality. The Town would request that the Region commit to returning the flows in the Pomona Mills Creek to agricultural levels as well as consider some form of water balance in the site to minimize erosion impacts on the Pomona Mills Stream.</p> <p>The following items below are from the council resolution and the Town requests that they are also addressed in the project during implementation.</p> <p>b. The Region and YRTP continue to work with Town staff to finalize the Thornhill Yonge Street Study and an implementation strategy.</p> <p>c. The Region and YRTP continue to work with Town staff and the Langstaff Ratepayers Associations to finalize plans for the Operations and Maintenance facility and ensure compatibility with the Langstaff land use study.</p> <p>d. The Region and YRTP monitor traffic volumes on local roads and work with Town staff to develop appropriate mitigating measures including but not limited to traffic calming and traffic operational changes.</p> <p>e. That the Town, City of Vaughan, the Region and YRTP hold further discussions regarding the implementation and financing of burying hydro lines within the Thornhill Yonge Street Study Area.</p>	<p>Town of Markham through the detailed design process. Intersection traffic operations will be monitored as noted in Table 12-3 of the EA report.</p> <p>e. The Proponent will commit to work with the Town of Markham through the detailed design process. The commitment to burying hydro lines can be found in Table 11-2, Goal B6 of the EA report.</p>		<p><u>option for relocation of hydro lines is pending a York Region decision - Section 8.1.3 of the Y2 DBCR</u></p>			
Six Nations of the Grand River	Ms. Jo-Ann E.C. Greene, Director Lands and Resources Department	10	<p>a. Sustainability: Generally, the Six Nations of the Grand are supportive of transit improvement projects. However, in the future, more stringent measures such as financial incentives or penalties may need to be considered to encourage more wide spread use of public transit.</p> <p>b. The Government of Ontario will need to develop a more comprehensive approach to address the impact of urban sprawl and the negative effects of auto emissions in the GTA.</p> <p>c. Archaeological Assessment: The Six Nations are asking that we condition the project approval to ensure that they be provided copies of any reports produced as part of a "Stage 2" archaeological assessment. Further, if any heritage and cultural resources are encountered during construction, Six Nations requests that it be directly notified.</p> <p>d. We note that the EA concludes that the project has the potential to result in a harmful alteration, disruption or destruction (HADD) of fish habitat. The DFO has signed a Level 3 Agreement with the local conservation authority to make such a determination. Six Nations will require DFO to enter into direct consultation regarding this determination and address Six Nations interests in the design of a fish habitat compensation plan (if required).</p> <p>e. To be informed of the statutory decision maker's decision and provide us with the reasons for the decision. New information, studies and supporting documentation in relation to the implementation of this project can be forwarded to Six Nations Lands and Resources, 2498 Chiefswood Road, P.O.Box 5000, Ohsweken, ON, NOA 1M0.</p> <p>f. Six Nations has two governments in place, an elected council and its traditional government, the Six Nations Confederacy Council. The Six Nations Confederacy Council should be contacted to determine their interest in the project and any concerns they may have with respect to environmental assessment process and eventual decision. I advise that you contact Mr. Tom Deer, Confederacy Council Secretary at 905-765-1749.</p>	<p>a. Comment noted.</p> <p>b. Comment noted.</p> <p>c. Copies of any reports produced as part of a Stage 2 archaeological assessment will be forwarded to Six Nations of the Grand River. Further, if any heritage or cultural resources are encountered, the proponent will contact Six Nations of the Grand River.</p> <p>d. Comment noted (DFO authorization is identified in Section 12.2.1 of the EA report as a potential post EA approval).</p> <p>e. A Notice of Decision for this EA will be published and sent to the Six Nations of the Grand River by the MOE.</p> <p>f. Comment noted. The Six Nations Confederacy Council will be contacted by the MOE.</p>	York Region	<p>a. No action required</p> <p>b. No action required</p> <p>c. A Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment will be undertaken during the Detail Design phase.</p> <p>d. This commitment relates to a culvert extension HADD (Harmful Alteration, Disruption or Destruction of fish habitat) in Y2 (see Table 8 of Appendix E of the EA). Culvert extension mitigation work will be discussed with TRCA and addressed in the detailed design stage of the Y2 work, as required.</p> <p>e. No action required during Y2 PE Design</p> <p>f. No action required during Y2 PE Design</p>	Yes		
City of Toronto and Toronto Transit Commission (TTC)	Mr. Rod McPhail, Director, Transportation Planning	11	<p>a. Prior to the full implementation of the recommended median busway service on Yonge Street, the City of Toronto and TTC request that York Region continue to coordinate detailed design and construction activities with them to ensure appropriate infrastructure requirements are in place for the new service. <u>Vehicle Technology Requirements south of Steeles</u></p> <p>b. There are several references made in the EA report that grade separated options</p>	<p>a. York Region will consult with the City of Toronto/TTC during the detailed design phase of the project to ensure appropriate interface at the Steeles Ave boundary (see Figures 10-1 and 10-2).</p>	York Region	<p>a. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p>	Yes		

			<p>south of Steeles Ave (i.e. subway and LRT) will likely be required in 10 to 20 years. It should be noted that City/TTC staff have not identified this need in its own forecasts, and these conclusions are derived from current projections of future demand and operations prepared by York Region exclusively.</p> <p>c. Conclusions about future technology on Yonge Street south of Steeles Ave cannot be made at this time. The technology requirements south of Steeles Ave will be better defined upon completion of the City/TTS study for transit improvements between Finch Ave and Steeles Ave.</p> <p><u>Strategy for Technology Conversion (pages 5-5, 5-6)</u></p> <p>d. The wording of Step 4 in the strategy for technology conversion implies that LRT should be implemented south of Steeles Ave in 2021 regardless of ridership conditions. If so, Step 4 is inconsistent with the previous steps which commit to consultation with City and TTC staff regarding capacity and technology requirements and service integration before such a decision on technology conversion is made.</p> <p><u>GO Finch Terminal Requirements (page 5-6)</u></p> <p>e. It is stated in the EA report that no changes would be required at the GO Finch bus terminal at Finch subway station until 2021. Little discussion is provided specifically regarding possible post 2021 requirements. An explanation of how the existing terminal would accommodate significantly increased bus and passenger volumes is recommended.</p> <p><u>Preferred Alignment south of Steeles Ave (Figure 10-1)</u></p> <p>f. In Figure 10-1, there is a note that refers to the City's "preferred alignment". It should be clarified that the preferred option/design south of Steeles Ave has not yet been confirmed. As such, the lane configuration and possible stops in the vicinity of Yonge/Steeles (and associated property implications) are still subject to review.</p>	<p>b. Comment noted. Grade separated technology is not part of the proposed undertaking. The Region of York will commit to working with the City of Toronto during detailed design to ensure an appropriate interface between transit service at Steeles Avenue</p> <p>c. Comment noted.</p> <p>d. Comment noted. Any technology conversion south of Steeles Ave will require extensive consultation with City and TTC staff as York Region has no jurisdiction south of Steeles Ave.</p> <p>e. Finch terminal requirements beyond 2021 are not part of this EA and would be dependent on ridership growth and the long term technology chosen for this corridor.</p> <p>f. Comment noted. The design south of Steeles Ave is not part of the undertaking in this EA and will be finalized by the City of Toronto/TTC Class EA study.</p>		<p>b. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p> <p>c. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p> <p>d. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p> <p>e. No action required during Y2 PE Design</p> <p>f. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p>				
Ontario Secretariat for Aboriginal Affairs (OSAA)	Mr. Richard Saunders, Director, Negotiations Branch	12	<p>a. OSAA recommends that follow-up be made with all the identified First Nations and the Aboriginal organizations regarding the EA report.</p> <p>b. OSAA recommends that MOE consult it's legal branch for advice on whether the Crown has any constitutional or other legal obligations to consult Aboriginal peoples in these circumstances.</p>	<p>a. <u>First Nations will be contacted during implementation of the undertaking as it relates to their particular interests identified during the EA.</u></p> <p>b. Comment noted.</p>	York Region	<p>a. <u>First Nations Groups and Provincial/Federal First Nations agencies who were on the EA contact list received notifications of public consultation opportunities.</u> Consultation will continue in detail design.</p> <p>b. No action required during Y2 PE Design</p>	<p><u>Notice and distribution lists for CMP notice of submission (Yonge Street EA CMP Stakeholders and Public.xls, and Yonge Street EA CMP GRT and First Nations.doc) - YC 4.6 (ID 1673)</u></p> <p><u>Mailing lists used for notification during Y1 PE Design: (Concerned Citizen address list.xls, Property owner reps.xls, Property Owners.xls) - YC 4.6 (ID 1750)</u></p> <p><u>First Nations mailing list and 2007-01-22 Viva Update letter - YC 3.03 (ID#3026)</u></p> <p><u>Letter from Alderville First Nation - YC 3.03 (ID#3030)</u></p> <p><u>Mailing lists, 2007-01-22 Viva Update letter, 2007-04-24 Yonge Street Stakeholder letter and post card mail drop - YC</u></p>	Yes	ECF	<p>Items 1673, 1750, 3026, and 3030 were provided in hard copy in YC office on 2-Oct-09</p> <p>Yonge Street Stakeholder letter and post card mail drop - YC 3.03 (ID#3027) was not provided. This item should be located.</p>

<p>Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA)</p>	<p>Ms. Beth Williston, Watershed Policy and Planning Specialist</p>	<p>13</p>	<p>a. Measures should be taken to determine whether any linkages exist between dewatering and local surface water features in terms of groundwater connections and baseflow. If linkages do exist, mitigation measures should be explored and installed as necessary to protect surface water features. Please include a statement regarding this issue in the report. The majority of previous TRCA staff concerns have been addressed in the Final EA report. The following issues were not addressed in the Final EA report, however the necessary geotechnical investigation can be deferred to the detailed design phase.</p> <p>b. The Preliminary Geotechnical Study Report prepared by Golder Associates (Appendix 2) states that groundwater control would be a critical issue for the tunneling involved in the Yonge Street route. Please revise the report to include the following information related to this alternative: a) Estimated dewatering rates; b) The duration of the project and schedule; c) Maps of all zones of influence, including all sensitive features within these zones; d) A dewatering discharge plan that will outline all discharge location, address potential impacts to all sensitive features in the study area and provide a buffer zone; e) Soil suitability for the chosen construction technology clearly articulated in the report; and f) In the event that perpetual dewatering maintenance would be required, clarification of this fact accompanied by qualified amounts in the report.</p> <p>c. It is noted in the Geotechnical Study Report that less impact is expected from the other two alternative routes, however a shallow or exposed groundwater table is present in the northern section for both routes. Please address the potential need for groundwater depressurization for filling and cut earth works for these alternatives.</p>	<p>a. Dewatering is not expected for the construction or operation of the proposed undertaking. However, the Region will commit to doing the necessary work as an addition to commitments if the need for dewatering is determined during the detailed design phase.</p> <p>b. There is no tunneling proposed as part of the proposed undertaking, which is a surface rapid transit system. The detailed geotechnical and hydrogeological study, to be undertaken as part of the design phase, will address any potential impacts to groundwater.</p> <p>c. This will be addressed as part of the detailed design phase/geotechnical investigation. Regulatory Agencies will be consulted during detailed design.</p>	<p>York Region</p>	<p><u>a, b & c. The draft Pavement Engineering Services report indicates that free water was not encountered in any of the boreholes.</u></p> <p><u>No requirement for dewatering has been identified during the Y2 PE design phase. The need for dewatering will be reviewed during the Y2 detail design phase.</u></p>	<p>3.03 (ID#3027)</p> <p><u>Draft Report - Pavement Engineering Report for New Median Rapidway along Yonge Street from Highway 7 to 19th Avenue – April 2008 - YC 3.04 (ID # 3105) (Y2 DBCR)</u></p> <p>Appendix H – Drainage & Hydrology Report - Dec 2008 YC 3.05 (ID # 3693).</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>ECF</p>	<p>The final report was used to review compliance. PAVEMENT DESIGN REPORT FOR NEW MEDIAN RAPIDWAY ALONG YONGE STREET FROM LANGSTAFF ROAD EAST TO MAJOR MACKENZIE DRIVE, AND FROM LEVENDALE AVENUE TO 19TH AVENUE A LENGTH OF APPROXIMATELY 7.1 KM Jun-09</p> <p>This table should be updated to reflect the final document.</p>
---	---	-----------	---	---	--------------------	--	---	------------	------------	---

Action for comments received from the <u>Public</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Item match	Verified	Notes
Ward One (South) Thornhill Residents Inc.	Ms. Evelin Ellison	1	<p>a. Thornhill residents have continually been assured their concerns would be respected. It appears that assurances such as no widening of Yonge Street between Clark Avenue and Royal Orchard Boulevard will not be adhered to.</p> <p>b. Hydro poles apparently are to be buried in order to accommodate the minimum expansion Yonge Street. It is not clear how this is to be done.</p> <p>c. It is our impression the vegetation shown in the project design must be mere decoration as there is no available space for planting. If in fact it is to occur, it is not clear how this will be done.</p> <p>d. The EA indicates the project is to be undertaken in coordination with the revitalization of Yonge Street between Clark Avenue and Royal Orchard Boulevard, however the revitalization plan has not been made public.</p> <p>e. It is not evident how the ambience of the Thornhill Heritage District will be maintained.</p>	<p>a. Design concepts presented at the Public Information Centres and meetings with the Thornhill Community residents last year indicated the extent of the proposed street widening. By using the absolute minimum design standards the widening was minimized in the severely constrained Heritage portion of Thornhill.</p> <p>b. The details for burying of the overhead Hydro lines where required will be determined in the detailed design phase of the project. The commitment to burying hydro lines can be found in Table 11-2, Goal B6 of the EA report.</p> <p>c. The streetscape design will be completed as part of the detailed design phase of the project. The EA presents a conceptual streetscape plan.</p> <p>d. The detailed design of the project will incorporate the guidelines set-out in the Thornhill Yonge Street Study when it is approved by Markham and Vaughan Councils.</p> <p>e. The streetscaping concepts developed and presented to the public during the Thornhill Revitalization Study provided an indication of the opportunity to improve the ambience of the Thornhill Heritage district while accommodating rapid transit facilities such as the proposed stations within the district.</p>	York Region	<p>a, c, d, e. The Y2 DBCR is under development. Y1 PE Design principles will be applied to Y2 PE Design, as appropriate. The Y2 DBCR will incorporate streetscape recommendations under Streetscape Design Guidelines (Section 4.8), General Guidelines (Section 4.9), etc</p> <p><u>b. Selection of the preferred option for relocation of hydro lines is pending a York Region decision - Section 8.1.3 of the Y2 DBCR</u></p>	<u>Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19th Avenue PE – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)</u>	Yes	ECF	Draft dated Feb-09 was provided for review. Table should be updated to reflect more recent draft.
Rueter, Scargall, Bennett Lawyers for The Beaver Valley Stone Limited Group of Companies	Mr. Paul Scargall	2	<p>a. Aside from the significant detrimental economic and social effects of this proposed undertaking to trade and industry in the district, the Region's EA is deficient in that it fails to adequately consider suitable alternative sites to locate the facility. The lack of defined parameters in the planning criteria to determine location fails to discharge the Region's onus to show that the proposed site is the best available alternative for this undertaking.</p> <p>b. In regards to the sections of the EA dealing with design, construction and operation of the Facility, the Region has also overlooked certain significant environmental consequences material to the Ministry's consideration of the EA.</p> <p>c. In response to the Region's request to carry out field inspection of watercourses on the Property, correspondence was exchanged and subsequent discussions took place between representatives of the Region and Beaver Valley Stone.</p> <p>d. The Region communicated its proposal for use of the Property for employee parking and other ancillary operations.</p>	<p>a. The Region's Official Plan policies and the subsequent Transportation Master Plan referenced in Chapter 1 of the EA report identify the significant economic and social benefits of the proposed undertaking to the Region as a whole and specifically communities located along the corridors identified in the EA. Four potential sites for the Maintenance and Storage Facility were identified in the EA and evaluated as described in Section 9.5 of the EA report. Chapter 7 of the EA report sets out the planning criteria followed in selecting candidate sites.</p> <p>b. The environmental effects of the Maintenance and Storage Facility undertaking at the preferred site are listed in the four tables listed in Chapter 11 of the EA report.</p> <p>c. Access for field inspection was refused in this correspondence.</p> <p>d. Figure 10-34 of the EA report indicates the conceptual arrangement of uses of various portions</p>	York Region	<p>a. No action required during Y2 PE Design</p> <p>b. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p> <p>c. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p> <p>d. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p> <p>e. No action required</p>		Yes		

Action for comments received from the Public on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Item match	Verified	Notes
			<p>e. The Region also advised that they hoped to have an environmental assessment concluded in January 2004, but later agreed that this was not possible since public meetings and interested party consultation would be required.</p> <p>f. Beaver Valley Stone stated that it was opposed to the use of their land in the manner proposed by the Region given inter alia the numerous alternatives available in the area.</p> <p>g. The approved terms of reference were prepared and the parameters for the YRTP were developed without comment from all interested parties. Similarly, the EA was prepared on July 20, 2005.</p> <p>h. Although a preliminary meeting took place between the Region and Beaver Valley Stone, it was not held for the preparation of the TOR or the EA, as required by section 5.1 of the Act.</p> <p>i. The Beaver Valley Stone Group of Companies has been systematically denied their right to be heard. As a consequence, the companies were unable to comment to the Ministry in respect of the TOR. Without this opportunity, the Region infringed upon procedural safeguards in the Act and was able to limit the type of alternative to be considered by it in respect of site selection.</p> <p>j. In light of Beaver Valley Stone's preliminary meeting with representatives of the Region, it would appear that the TOR and the EA were prepared with predetermined planning objectives in mind to situate the Facility at the Langstaff Industrial Land Site. Moreover, the alternatives to the preferred location considered were particularly unattractive and other more tenable sites were not considered.</p> <p>k. There appears to be no weighing of factors other than a statement that it is the Region's "intention to pursue development of a Region-owned bus Maintenance and</p>	<p>of the overall site.</p> <p>e. Submission of the EA report was not possible in January 2004 as the MOE had instructed all proponents in the Fall 2003 that all EA's based on focused Terms of Reference (TOR) could not be evaluated for approval by the Ministry due to a recent court ruling concerning an Eastern Ontario landfill EA. The Region in early 2004, elected to re-submit the TOR's for all rapid transit EA's. The further public meetings were associated with this re-submission.</p> <p>f. Lands compatible with the requirements for transit maintenance facilities to serve the proposed rapid transit network were identified during the EA and screened to the four alternatives evaluated in Section 9.5 of the EA report.</p> <p>g. The public and stakeholder's were given the opportunity to comment on the revised TOR through a notification of its availability for review on the Region's website or at the project offices published in local newspapers. Subsequently, an additional public information centre was convened, on September 9, 11 and 17, 2004, to review the EA recommendations after approval of the revised TOR. Chapter 13 of the EA report outlines the public and stakeholder communication which included public notices published in local newspapers, website, and public consultation centres that were held at four key stages during the study.</p> <p>h. Representatives of Beaver Valley Stone participated in the public consultation process for the EA, by attending and signing the sign-in sheet for the third public consultation centre which took place on June 9, 2003.</p> <p>i. The Proponent provided a notice of submission for the TOR published in the Vaughan Citizen, Richmond Hill Liberal and Markham Economist and Sun in early April 2004. The public were given an opportunity to comment on the TOR from April 1, 2004 to May 14, 2004. The alternatives identified in the EA and considered for the Maintenance and Storage Facility are presented in Section 9.5 of the EA report and were selected by criteria presented in Section 7.5.</p> <p>j. Four potential sites were identified through the EA for the Maintenance and Storage Facility using the planning criteria listed in Chapter 7 of the EA report, and evaluated as described in Chapter 9 of the EA report. This pre-screening and subsequent evaluation considered amongst many factors, the existing and adjacent land uses as well as the complexities of access to the site by both bus and rail</p>		<p>during Y2 PE Design</p> <p>f. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p> <p>g. No action required during Y2 PE Design</p> <p>h. No action required during Y2 PE Design</p> <p>i. No action required during Y2 PE Design</p> <p>j. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p> <p>k. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p>				

Action for comments received from the Public on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Item match	Verified	Notes
			<p>Storage Facility." There appears to be no quantitative site selection analysis employed by the Region in support of its conclusion that the Langstaff Industrial Land best meets the criteria for locating a central management and storage facility.</p> <p>i. It is arguable that the projected centralization of the Region's bus fleet will have considerable negative effects on the socio-economic environment of the area that cannot be offset by the propounded advantages of possible consolidation.</p> <p>m. The EA requires that the site have the capacity to store and maintain between 250 and 300 BRT vehicles and 45-50 LRT vehicles which range from 27 to 30 metres in length. It is unclear whether even the aggregate fleet of all third party contractors at present comes close to this figure.</p> <p>n. The EA makes provisions for substantial service, maintenance and storage areas for both BRT and LRT vehicles, wash and circulation tracks and a LRT test track, despite the Region having previously stated its intention to pursue mainly BRT technology due to certain constraints.</p> <p>o. The Ministry must require that the Region consider all available site alternatives in accordance with credible site criteria, as well as establish a detailed layout of the proposed facility that justifies taking of 13 ha of prime land.</p> <p>p. The Region must be required to provide expected timelines for the establishment of the facility, ranging from the current status of its outsourcing contracts to its future intentions with respect to the development of a funding plan that identifies and correlates with each step in the process. Any failure by the Region to remedy these deficiencies and to submit same for public and interested party consultation must result in denial of the EA.</p> <p>q. The catch area north of 407, funneling into the new expanded culvert, is far larger than that which existed previously.</p> <p>r. The feasibility of establishing a bus service depot is questionable given the existing use of the property as an outdoor storage depot, further studies need to be conducted and reflected in the EA in order to account for</p>	<p>transit.</p> <p>k. Chapters 5, 7 and 9 of the EA report include the description of the analysis of methods for the maintenance of vehicles for the proposed undertaking as well as an evaluation of potential sites for a facility. Chapter 5 presents the rationale for pursuing development of a Region-owned Maintenance and Storage Facility through a discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of potential maintenance strategies. Based on the site selection criteria listed in Section 7.5 of Chapter 7, the evaluation of the candidate sites described in Section 9.5 of Chapter 9 assessed the merits of each site in terms of nine primary factors. Weighting of these factors was implicit in the conclusions derived from the tabulation of the advantages and disadvantages in Table 9-6.</p> <p>l. Comment noted. Mitigation (compensation) for businesses adversely impacted by the required expropriation for the Maintenance and Storage Facility will be addressed through the Expropriation Act.</p> <p>m. The capacity identified in the EA represents the anticipated vehicle volumes to be accommodated at a central facility during the planning period. These volumes reflect growth from the local YRT and new rapid transit fleets operating in 2005 and totaling over 300 vehicles.</p> <p>n. The transition in technology from BRT to LRT is noted in Chapters 5 (Section 5.2.2.3), and 12 (Section 12.4.3) of the EA report.</p> <p>o. Comment noted. Alternative sites have been considered as noted in Section 9.5 of the EA report. A conceptual site layout for the preferred Maintenance and Storage Facility site is shown in Figure 10-34 of the EA report.</p> <p>p. Section 12.2.2 of the EA report provides an indication of the expected timeline for construction of the initial phase of the facility and an indication of the period for its anticipated expansion to the ultimate configuration.</p> <p>q. The 407 culvert discharge into the property proposed for the Maintenance Facility will be accommodated in the design of the watercourse protection/modification necessary to accommodate the proposed usage.</p> <p>r. This will be part of the detailed design work that will be carried out after approval of the EA and will be subject to approval by the TRCA (Refer to Section 12.2.1 in the EA report for other approvals).</p>		<p>i. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p> <p>m. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p> <p>n. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p> <p>o. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p> <p>p. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p> <p>q. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p> <p>r. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p>				

Action for comments received from the <u>Public</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Item match	Verified	Notes
			<p>the natural stream of water flow as well as the 100-year storm analysis.</p> <p>s. While Appendix M of the EA provides a preliminary Storm Water Management (SWM) assessment, this initial report needs to be appreciably enhanced in order to deal with the outstanding culvert and flooding issues, as well as the environmental consequences that may result from these existing conditions.</p> <p>t. The portion of the land traversed by the Pomona Mills Creek is designated inter alia Valleylands and Environmental Protection Area. (EPA). The protection of landforms, features and ecological functions within the river valley systems and the development within Valleylands is of utmost importance. Alterations to these Valleylands, including enclosure of watercourses, may be considered as part of a comprehensive environmental management strategy within an urban area. A buffer zone must also be provided adjacent to the edge of the valley slope. These types of measures remain unaddressed in the EA.</p> <p>u. Permitted land uses on lands designated EPA are restricted to conservation and environmental management activities including restoration, flood, erosion control and compatible outdoor recreational uses. These also remain unaddressed in the EA with respect to Pomona Mills Creek and should be thoroughly investigated as a requirement of the EA approval process.</p>	<p>s. Preliminary recommendations for SWM have been provided in the EA as the basis for further design of individual components of the SWM system to be developed during the detailed design phase and submitted to the TRCA for approval.</p> <p>t. All of the required measures for works adjacent to the existing creek will be addressed in the detailed design phase of the project and all measures to mitigate any effects on the landforms, features and ecological functions will be incorporated into the preferred design of the creek realignment. This design will be subject to TRCA and DFO approval.</p> <p>u. Comment noted for consideration during detailed design phase of the Maintenance and Storage Facility and will be subject to TRCA approval.</p>		<p>s. <u>A draft (SWMP) has been prepared during PE design as detailed in Y2 DBCR - Appendix H. SWMP to be completed in the detailed design phase.</u></p> <p>t. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design.</p> <p>u. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p>	<p>s. <u>Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19th Avenue PE – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)</u></p> <p><u>Appendix H – Drainage & Hydrology Report - Dec 2008 YC 3.05 (ID # 3693).</u></p>		s. ECF	s. Draft dated Feb-09 was provided for review. Table should be updated to reflect more recent draft.
	Mr. Jeff Stone	3	<p>a. Section 7.5.2: Change site distances to sight distances.</p> <p>b. Figure 9.5: Stn Names: Southbound should be "John Stn" and Northbound should be "Centre Stn" with EROW. Street Names: "Jane" should be Old Jane. This name change was made about 5 years ago to avoid confusion with main arterial.</p> <p>c. Section 10.2.2: Should you now allow for extension of bus platforms in the future?</p> <p>d. Figure 10-9: How would LRT passengers easily transfer twixt modes (YRT and LRT)?</p> <p>e. Figure 10-9: Why is the GO Station walk/overpass not farther north since the major destinations are on the North side? How will handicapped people make the intermodal transfer, what will happen in the snow or rain?</p> <p>f. Is it possible to have Mack Stn. placed on north side if region buys gas stn. site?</p> <p>g. Is it possible to have Mack Stn. on south side placed closer to Mack to provide more level site? The slope</p>	<p>a. Comment noted.</p> <p>b. Comment noted.</p> <p>c. The platform will accommodate three articulated BRT vehicles or two LRT vehicles (of at least 25 metres in length). This is expected to be within the needs through the planning period and beyond.</p> <p>d. The Langstaff terminal facility is not part of the undertaking for this EA. A concept has been developed to accommodate LRT platforms within the site adjacent to the existing bus terminal when required.</p> <p>e. The GO Station pedestrian overpass is not part of this undertaking and the location is being finalized under a separate process. Elevators are planned to make the vertical circulation available to all users.</p> <p>f. The existing road grades north and south of Major Mackenzie make location of the station platforms close to the intersection problematic.</p> <p>g. The platform gradients planned for the preferred station location are within acceptable limits for safe</p>	York Region	<p>a. No action required during Y2 PE Design</p> <p>b. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p> <p>c. No action required during Y2 PE Design</p> <p>d. No action required during Y2 PE Design</p> <p>e. A Viva / GO pedestrian bridge has been constructed and includes elevators. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p> <p>f. No action required during Y2 PE Design</p>		Yes		

Action for comments received from the Public on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Item match	Verified	Notes
			<p>may make it hard in rain and snow to stop safely and lesson wear and tear on brakes.</p> <p>h. Section 10.2: The present site of Bernard Stn./Loop does not facilitate easy transfer of RT to bus at loop, nor does it facilitate easy pedestrian crossing in all four directions.</p> <p>i. What would be involved in getting the maintenance garage at Langstaff – costs and zoning?</p> <p>j. Chapter 5: Omits discussing technological or roadway improvements.</p>	<p>operation.</p> <p>h. This is not part of the undertaking.</p> <p>i. The zoning for existing land at the proposed Langstaff site will permit use as an operation and maintenance facility. The facility will be constructed in stages, and the cost of each stage will be a function of the size placed in service at each time the facility is expanded.</p> <p>j. Roadway improvements have been considered in assessing alternatives to the undertaking as part of the Base Case Scenario or as an alternative scenario as discussed in Section 3.1 of the EA report.</p>		<p>g. No action required during Y2 PE Design</p> <p>h. Y2 PE Design permits the interim use of Bernard Station for BRT vehicles that will turn at this location as part of the service. Under the interim solution, buses terminating at Bernard will exit the median Rapidway south of Bernard and enter Bernard Sta. before making the turn to return south. BRT vehicles traveling to and from Newmarket will use the Yonge St platforms at Bernard/Canyon Hill intersection</p> <p>i. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p> <p>j. No action required during Y2 PE Design</p>	<p>Yonge Street Median Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19th Avenue- Preliminary Engineering – Design Basis and Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)</p>		h. ECF	h. Draft dated Feb-09 was provided for review. Table should be updated to reflect more recent draft.
The Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill (SPOHT)	Mr. Nigel Connell	4	<p>a. SPOHT was not aware that the EA submission had taken place and was not invited to submit comments.</p> <p>b. In the EA, the organization is referred to as The Society for the Preservation of Old Thornhill (SPOT) rather than the Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill (SPOHT).</p> <p>c. The major street in the Thornhill (Markham) Heritage Conservation District is referred to as Colbourne Drive rather than Colborne Street.</p> <p>d. Material in the appendix with these inadequacies, and maybe others, has been referred to extensively in the EA.</p> <p>e. The Unterman McPhail Associates report quoted from the Ontario Heritage Act. Has any reference been made to Bill 160 enacted in 2005?</p> <p>f. On page 10 of the Unterman report, it is stated that "In the Thornhill Heritage District, discussions are ongoing with the community". The statement may have been true</p>	<p>a. A notice of submission for the EA was sent to Mr. Robert Stitt of SPOHT.</p> <p>b. Comment noted.</p> <p>c. Comment noted.</p> <p>d. The EA report has utilized background materials and sub-consultant analysis where appropriate.</p> <p>e. Work on the Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment Report started a couple of years ago and at that time Bill 160 had not been approved, therefore this Bill is not referenced in the report. Reference to the Ontario Heritage Act is deemed sufficient because there may always be amendments to the Act.</p> <p>f. The input received from SPOHT was considered in the development of the recommended undertaking in the fall 2004.</p>	York Region	<p>a. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p> <p>b. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p> <p>c. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p> <p>d. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p> <p>e. No action required during Y1 PE Design</p> <p>f. No action required during Y2 PE Design. Further consultation will occur</p>		Yes		

Action for comments received from the <u>Public</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Item match	Verified	Notes
			in 2003, but it is not true anymore. SPOHT has not met with YRTP staff in almost a year and a half. g. It must be remembered that what is referred to as the "Thornhill Yonge Street Study" project has yet to be seen by the public, and it may have serious implications for the historic portion of Yonge Street between Elgin/Arnold and Royal Orchard Boulevard. SPOHT believes that the EA acceptance should be deferred until the "Thornhill Yonge Street Study" has been considered and acted upon.	g. The final design will incorporate specific details of the Thornhill Yonge Street Study. The Proponent will continue to work with the Thornhill Heritage Committee as noted in Table 12-1 of the EA report.		during the detail design phase, as required. g. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design				
	David and Katy Lundell	5	a. We are concerned about noise levels but the EA mentions monitoring noise levels near Yonge Street and Royal Orchard Blvd. This is not close to our home and the monitoring set back distance exceeds the distance from our back door to Yonge Street. b. The widening of Yonge Street will bring cars and pollution closer to our home. There will be less distance for contaminants to disperse and this is especially concerning for us since we have a small child. c. The report does not address the impact on daily life in the area. Yonge Street runs right through the neighbourhood and the elementary school in the Uplands area has been closed. Therefore students must walk, ride or take a bus to school and the increased traffic on Yonge Street and the widened thoroughfare is a concern. Will children be expected to cross six lanes of traffic to get to school? Who will take responsibility if an accident results from these changes. d. The installation of solid medians will result in some streets with access to Yonge Street no longer being able to support left turns but will instead require drivers to go in the opposite direction and make a u-turn at the closest traffic lights. This will not only create complications in every day life but also impact the speed with which emergency vehicles can access and exit our neighbourhood. e. There are many mature plantings along Yonge Street and we are concerned about the impact of vibration, pollution and additional paving on this vegetation. f. We are concerned about potential additional light pollution at night since we have bedrooms that back on to the project. g. Our closest Viva stop exceeds the distance of 400-500 metres originally suggested by YRT officials as being the longest distance from the midpoint between two stops to either stop. At the same time we have to wait longer for	a. Comment noted. The EA includes analysis of the effects on sensitive receptors such as backyards of residences at distances from the proposed transitway operations similar to that of the parties commenting. b. The air assessment has identified a net benefit to air quality associated with the implementation of the proposed undertaking (refer to Section 11.3.3 of the EA report). Locally, low emission transit vehicles will be concentrated in the median transitway which will be further from sensitive land uses than the present curb lane bus services. c. Improved transit service will provide increased mobility for the overall community. No additional general traffic lanes are planned for Yonge Street. Signal controlled pedestrian crossings are proposed at regular intervals to permit safe crossing with the added benefit of a landscaped refuge in the median wherever space permits. In addition, one of the key objectives in the development of a streetscape plan as part of detailed design will be to provide for a safe and attractive pedestrian environment within the corridor. d. Comment noted. Traffic operations will be monitored as noted in Table 12-3 of the EA report. Emergency vehicle access has been provided across the median as discussed in Section 10.1.1 of the EA report and developed in consultation with emergency responders. e. Comment noted. A detailed streetscape plan will be developed during the detailed design phase. The streetscape plan will include protection and preservation of existing trees where possible. f. Existing Yonge Street is an urban road and is currently illuminated. The proposed undertaking does not include additional illumination. g. The proposed rapid transit stops are generally located at 0.7 to 2.0 km spacing and are designed to improve transit travel speeds and reduce travel time (refer to Section 7.1 - Rapid Transit Design Objectives, in the EA Report).	York Region	a. No action required during Y2 PE Design b. No action required during Y2 PE Design c. The Y2 DBCR is under development. Y1 PE Design principles will be applied to Y2 PE Design, as appropriate. The Y2 DBCR will incorporate pedestrian friendly guidelines – Section 4.9.1 of the Y2 DBCR. Pedestrian safety has been considered during Y2 PE Design - e.g. Sections 4.17, 4.20.2, and 4.21 of the Y2 DBCR d. Intersection traffic operations monitoring will commence after introduction of transit service in the Rapidways <u>Based on comments from the Richmond Hill Fire Department a strategy has been developed to provide access for EMS to properties and developments along the Y2 segment. This strategy will be discussed with EMS in</u>	Yonge Street Median Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19 th Avenue- Preliminary Engineering – Design Basis and Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR) <u>d. Memo - Fire and Emergency Service Access - Median Crossover Provisions – January 28 - YC 3.02 (ID # 3788)</u>	Yes		d. ECF

Action for comments received from the <u>Public</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Item match	Verified	Notes
			our regular bus service.			<p>2009</p> <p>e. The Y2 DBCR is under development. Y1 PE Design principles will be applied to Y2 PE Design, as appropriate. The Y2 DBCR will incorporate streetscape recommendations under Streetscape Design Guidelines (Section 4.8), General Guidelines (Section 4.9), and Landscape Treatment – (Section 4.17), including preservation of existing trees where possible.</p> <p>f. Y2 PE Design has been undertaken with the objective of meeting pedestrian and road illumination standards. Mitigation of off-street lighting will be considered during detail design where appropriate.</p> <p>g. No action required during Y2 PE Design</p>	Yonge Street Median Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19 th Avenue- Preliminary Engineering – Design Basis and Criteria Report - Draft Aug 2008 – YC 3.02 (ID# 3778) (Y2 DBCR)			
	Mr. David Bradshaw	6	<p>a. Mr. Bradshaw is happy that the plan, as shown in Figure 10-4, calls for retention of the existing brick walls, which suggest that expropriation of his property is not planned.</p> <p>b. There is concern that the plan does not at present allow for the maple trees to be retained, which if true, he is strongly opposed to the current plan. The removal of the trees would subject the residents of this townhouse complex to the negative impacts of the Yonge Street Corridor. These trees shield and protect the community from the dirt, noise and negative visual impacts of the Yonge Street Corridor.</p> <p>c. There are alternatives to what is being proposed between John Street and Elgin Street that should be considered, such as 1) The median between transit lanes can be removed in this area, as has been done north of John Street; 2) The Station currently planned for the intersection of Yonge Street and John Street can be moved to the intersection of Yonge Street and Elgin Street; and 3) The transportation corridor can be moved</p>	<p>a. Comment noted.</p> <p>b. The assessment of effects of the undertaking in Chapter 11 of the EA report indicates that preservation and/or replacement of treed boulevards is a key element of the streetscaping plan to be developed in detailed design for the Thornhill Conservation District in consultation with the municipalities.</p> <p>c. Alternative station locations were considered during the EA studies and discussed during the community consultation process. The location shown was identified as the preferred location by those that participated.</p> <p>The optimum location for the transitway and adjacent traffic lanes will be developed during the detailed</p>	York Region	<p>a. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design</p> <p>b. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design.</p> <p>c. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design.</p>		Yes		

Action for comments received from the <u>Public</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (Ecoplans)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Item match	Verified	Notes
			<p>closer to the commercial properties on the west side of Yonge Street to reduce the impacts on our residential area.</p> <p>d. Mr. Bradshaw was disappointed that Confederation Way was not chosen as a receptor location for the monitoring of noise levels. Our residential area along with the townhouse complex at Royal Orchard is closet to the transportation corridor in the area south of Highway 7. He feels that the Province of Ontario is not properly looking after the health and well-being of residents when it allows people to be subjected to noise levels in excess of 45 dBA at night. He is asking that monitoring be done to measure the current sound levels in the vicinity of his townhouse complex so that when the improvements are constructed, mitigation can be provided if changes in sound levels exceed acceptable levels.</p>	<p>design phase, recognizing the land uses on each side of Yonge Street.</p> <p>d. Comment noted. The EA includes analysis of the effects on sensitive receptors such as backyards of residences at distances from the proposed transitway operations similar to that of the parties commenting.</p>		d. Not applicable to Y2 PE Design.				