

**YONGE STREET CORRIDOR PUBLIC TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS FROM  
SUMMARY LISTING OF EA COMPLIANCE DOCUMENTATION  
FOR  
Y2 SEGMENT  
STEELES AVENUE TO 19TH AVENUE  
(HIGHWAY 7 – 19th AVENUE)**

Prepared: December 2015

Completion Status		Notes
On-going / In progress		Work has begun on this item but not completed
Completed		All work completed for this item.
Future Work		No work has begun on this item.
No Action Required		No action is required to meet commitments
Does not apply		Does not apply to segment H2.
Review Status (MMM)		Notes
Any column	<b><u>Bold and Underlined</u></b>	If multiple components exist for an item, this shows which of the components were reviewed.
Review column	No	Not reviewed during this annual review
	Yes	Reviewed during this annual review
Review Results column	EF (year)	<b>Evidence Found</b> means that the evidence provided reasonably shows that a compliance action (i.e., something done to address a compliance item) has been undertaken.
	EFC (year)	<b>Evidence Found of Change</b> means that the evidence provided reasonably shows that a compliance action has been undertaken but the action is a change from the compliance item.
	EF or EFC (year)	<b>Dark blue</b> indicates that the item Completion Status is “completed” and all components of the item have been reviewed and found to be either EF or EFC. No further review is anticipated for this item.
	NSE (year)	<b>Not Sufficient Evidence</b> means that the evidence provided although applicable to the compliance action, is not adequate to reasonably show that the compliance action has been undertaken.
	ENF (year)	<b>Evidence Not Found</b> means that evidence has either not been provided or that the evidence does not appear related to the compliance action.
	Unclear (year)	Further explanation requested

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>		<b>PAGE</b>
Section 1.0	Background & Purpose of the Program	1-1
Section 2.0	Monitoring of Conditions of Approval	2-1
Section 3.0	Compliance Management and Responsibilities	3-1
Section 4.0	Program Scope - General Commitments	4-1
Section 5.0	Actions Required to Address Commitments	5A-1, 5B-1
Section 6.0	Modifying the Design of the Undertaking	6-1
Section 7.0	Consultation	7-1
Section 8.0	Program Schedule - Section Irrelevant to ACR	8-1
Section 9.0	Submission and Circulation of the CMP	9-1
Section 10.0	Annual Compliance Report - Section Irrelevant to ACR	10-1
Section 11.0	Other Documents Required by the Conditions of Approval	11-1
Appendix 1	Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA	
Table 11-1	Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective A - Mobility	A1-T1-1
Table 11-2	Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective B - Social Environment	A1-T2-1
Table 11-3	Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C - Natural Environment	A1-T3-1
Table 11-4	Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective D - Economic Environment	A1-T4-1
Appendix 2	Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team	A2-1
Appendix 3	Action for Comments Received from the Public	A3-1

**Glossary**

AAQC	Ambient Air Quality Criteria	SB	Southbound
ACR	Annual Compliance Report	SPOHT	Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill
APEP	Air Pesticide and Environmental Planning	SWM	Storm Water Management
AQ	Air Quality	SWMP	Storm Water Management Pond
BHF	Built Heritage Features	TCP	Technology Conversion Plan
BRT	Bus Rapid Transit	TOR	Terms of Reference
CBD	Commercial Business District	TRCA	Toronto Region Conservation Authority
CEAA	Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	TS	Technical Support
CLU	Cultural Landscape Unit	TSP	Transit Signal Priority
CMP	Compliance Monitoring Program	TTC	Toronto Transit Commission
DBCR	Design Basis & Criteria Report	VMS	Vehicle Management System
DFO	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	Y2DBCR	Y2 Design Basis & Criteria Report
EA	Environmental Assessment	YC or YC2002	York Consortium 2002 (completed preliminary design)
EAAB	Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch	YRRTC	York Region Rapid Transit Corporation
EPA	Environmental Protection Area	YRT	York Region Traffic
ERS	Emergency Response Service	YRTP	York Rapid Transit Program
HADD	Harmful Alteration, Disruption or Destruction		
LRT	Light Rail Transit		
MMAH	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing		
MOE	Ministry of the Environment		
MSF	Maintenance Storage Facility		
MTO	Ministry of Transportation Ontario		
NAAQO	National Ambient Air Quality Objectives		
NB	Northbound		
NPC	Noise Pollution Clearinghouse		
NWPA	Navigable Waters Protection Act		
OE	Owner's Engineer		
OGS	Oil/Grit Separator		
ORM	Oak Ridges Moraine		
ORMCP	Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan		
OSAA	Ontario Secretariat for Aboriginal Affairs		
PE	Preliminary Engineering		
PM	Particulate Matter		
RapidLINK	The consortium designing and building the project		
ROW	Right of Way		
RT	Right Turn		
RTOR	Right turn on red		

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 (MMM)		Notes
					Review 2015	Review Results	
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	Status - Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: - Status and Description ... , and - Compliance Document Reference The text modifications did not change the review. 2015 ACR: Item is Not Applicable and Closed
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	Status - Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description .... The text modifications did not change the review. 2015 ACR: Item is Not Applicable and Closed

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 (MMM)		
						Review 2015	Review Results	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	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 43 to 65, 95 and 98 below. Issues in Table 12-2 and 12-3 relate to the construction and operations stages respectively and are not monitored in this		No		Part of this review process After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Responsible Person/Agency. The text modifications did not change the review.
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 (ID #'s 3564 to 3569)	No		
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. Will continue to monitor as implementation progresses.		No		After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description ... The text modifications did not change the review.

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 (MMM)		
						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
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 [City] 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.  Letter of approval notes that the CMP will be placed in the ministry's public record file.  The CMP is posted on York Region's york.ca website.	Letter of approval (ID#3146)	No	EF 2009	No additional components to review in 2010

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 (MMM)		
						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
7.	<p>3.0 Compliance Monitoring and Reporting</p> <p>3.1 The Proponent shall prepare and submit to the 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. 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>	York Region	Design stage (Timing as specified in condition 3.1)	<p>Status – Completed.</p> <p>Condition addressed with the approval of the CMP.</p> <p>The date of the approval of the EA for the undertaking was 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>The final CMP was submitted to the Acting Director, Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch on March 10, 2008 and approved on April 11, 2008.</p>	<p>MOE approval of Yonge EA (ID# 1675)</p> <p>EA Compliance Monitoring Program July 2007 (ID# 1669)</p> <p>EA Compliance Monitoring Plan March 10, 2008 (ID#3145)</p> <p>Letter of submission (ID#3144)</p> <p>Letter of approval (ID#3146)</p>	No	EF (2009) Closed	<p>Completed in 2009. No additional review in 2010.</p> <p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description ... The text modifications did not change the review.</p>

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 (MMM)		
						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
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 – Completed. Condition addressed with the approval of the CMP.	EA Compliance Monitoring Plan dated March 10, 2008 (ID#3145) Letter of submission (ID#3144) Letter of approval (ID#3146)	No	EF (2010) Closed	In the 2009 and Oct-10, this item was not reviewed. After the Oct-10 review, text in the Status and Description column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments. The text modifications changed the review as the status of the item was changed to "completed".  On May-11, the Letter of Approval from MOE was provided by the Owner Engineer (file name \CMP approval April 08) and the Review Status and Review Results were changed
9.	3.3 A statement must accompany the Program when submitted to the Director indicating that the Program is intended to fulfill this condition. The Program, as it may be amended by the Director, must be carried out by the Proponent.	York Region	Design, Construction and Operation as specified	Status – Completed. Condition addressed with submission of the CMP for approval.	Letter of submission (ID#3144)	No	EF (2010) Closed	In the 2009 and Oct-10, this item was not reviewed. After the Oct-10 review, text in the Status and Description column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments. The text modifications changed the review as the status of the item was changed to "completed".  On May-11, the Letter of Approval from MOE was provided by the Owner Engineer (file name: letter to MOE March 4 2008 final submission of CMP) and the Review Status and Review Results were changed

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 (MMM)		
						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
10.	3.4 i) The Proponent shall prepare and Annual Compliance Report (ACR) which describes the results of the Proponent's EA Compliance Monitoring Program [1]. 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 satisfied. When all conditions have been satisfied, the Proponent shall indicate in the ACR that this is the final submission.	York Region	Design, Construction and Operation as specified	Status – ongoing. Conditions will be addressed with the submission of ACR's until all conditions are satisfied.	2009 Annual Compliance Report (February 2010)  2010 Annual Compliance Report (October 2010, revised 13-May-11) (ID Y2013-001)  2011 Annual Compliance Report – Letter to MOE, February 2, 2012 (ID Y2013-002)  2012 Annual Compliance Report (December 2012) (ID Y2013-003)  2013 Annual Compliance Report (December 2013) (ID Y2014-001)  <b><u>2014 Annual Compliance Report (December 2014) (ID Y2015-001)</u></b>	Yes	EF (2010)  EF (2012)  EF (2013)  EF (2015)	In the 2009 and Oct-10, this item was not reviewed. After the Oct-10 review, text in the Compliance Document Reference was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments. The text modifications changed the review.  2012 ACR: This and previous ACRs are a component of the ACR.  2013 ACR:.. Bold and Underline removed from 2010 and 2011 ACRs for clarity. Evidence found to support the assertion that the ACR was prepared. Going forward, it may be easier to provide a link to the submission.  2015 ACR:.. Evidence found to support the assertion that the ACR was prepared.
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 – Future work Pending a request.		No		After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: - Status and Description ... The text modifications did not change the review.

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 (MMM)		
						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
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	<p>Status – <b>Future Work</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>In the mean time ridership monitoring is ongoing as evidenced by the referenced reports.</p> <p>2011/2012 review was premised on construction of BRT by 2010. Ridership review will be part of Technology Conversion Plan (see Item 13). Ridership monitoring is ongoing.</p> <p>Ridership monitoring is reported to Committee of the Whole on a monthly basis.</p> <p><b>(continued below)</b></p>	<p>YRT/Viva 2007 Revenue Ridership Summary, YRT/Viva 2007 Ridership Summary - Specialized Services – Mobility Plus, Viva Monthly Operations Summary December 2007 (ID#s 3106, 3107, 3108 )</p> <p>York Region Transit/Viva Ridership Summaries – 2005 to 2012 (ID Y2013-004)</p> <p>York Region Transit/Viva Ridership Summaries - Nov 2013 to July 2014 (ID Y2014-007)</p> <p><a href="http://viewer.zmags.com/publication/2ac5b26d#/2ac5b26d/76">http://viewer.zmags.com/publication/2ac5b26d#/2ac5b26d/76</a> - Refer to page 70</p>	Yes	EF (2009) EF (2013) EF (2014)	<p>No additional components to review in 2010.</p> <p>No additional components to review in 2012.</p> <p>2013 ACR: Evidence found to support the assertion that monitoring is ongoing. Status should be changed to "On-going"</p> <p>2014 ACR: Evidence found to support the assertion that monitoring is ongoing.</p>

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 (MMM)		
						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
				<u>The Ridership Monitoring Program and associated consultation is related to planning for the conversion from BRT to LRT. The potential future evolution from Bus Rapid Transit to higher capacity Light Rail Rapid Transit is not being planned at this time, and is ultimately dependant on significant growth in transit ridership and available funding in the future, and at least not expected within the 2031 horizon. No Technology Conversion Plan will be finalized until new information on this issue become available. The status is being changed to "Future Work".</u>	<u>Letter from York Region to MOE, December 21, 2012 (ID Y2013-005)</u>		EF (2015)	2015 ACR: The information provided (Y2013-005) supports that assertion that the monitoring is for the LRT conversion making this a future item.
13.	4.1 ii) The Proponent shall prepare a [1] 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, [2] the TCP shall provide an implementation schedule.	York Region	Prior to conversion from BRT to LRT technology as required	Status – Future work  A draft Transition Plan was prepared and submitted on March 02, 2007. The draft Transition Plan included general indications of alternative schedules. Transition from BRT to LRT in the Y2 corridor is a longer term initiative. A Technology Conversion Plan will be prepared upon completion of a Network Update Report, and based on ongoing ridership and technology reviews.	Correspondence from York Region to MOE, December 21, 2012 (ID Y2013-005)	No	EF[2] (2013)	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: - Status and Description ... , and - Compliance Document Reference The text modifications did not change the review.  ACR 2013: Numbers added for clarity. Status noted. For [2], noted that ID Y2013-005 shows that conversion is not to occur prior to 2021

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 (MMM)		
						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
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 – Future work Pending conditions 4.1(i) and (ii). Refer to items 12 and 13 above.	Correspondence from York Region to MOE, December 21, 2012 (ID Y2013-005)	No		After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description .... The text modifications did not change the review. ACR 2013: Compliance document reference was bolded and underlined indicating items for review but as no assertion was made and the item is marked as future work, it was not reviewed.
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 [City] Markham and Richmond Hill, and the City of Vaughan for review.	York Region	Prior to conversion from BRT to LRT technology as required	Status – Future work. Pending conditions 4.1(i) and (ii). Refer to items 12 and 13 above.	Correspondence from York Region to MOE, December 21, 2012 (ID Y2013-005)	No		After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description. The text modifications did not change the review. ACR 2013: Compliance document reference was bolded and underlined indicating items for review but as no assertion was made and the item is marked as future work, it was not reviewed.
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 protocol to the Central Region Director for placement on the Public Record.	York Region	Design	Status – <b>Completed</b>  Construction is anticipated to commence on segment Y2 in 2015. Will be addressed during detailed design.  <b><u>The Community Relations Protocol has been prepared by YRRTC and submitted to MOECC.</u></b>	<b><u>Correspondence from YRRTC to MOECC, October 26, 2015 with attached Community Relations Protocol (YR15-101).</u></b>	Yes	EF (2015) Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description... The text modifications did not change the review.  <b><u>2015 ACR: Evidences provided (YR15-001) supports the assertion regarding a complaints protocol. This item is closed.</u></b>

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 (MMM)		
						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
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	Status - Future Work  No watercourse alteration for Pomona Mills Creek is planned for Y2.		No		After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description...The text modifications did not change the review.

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 (MMM)		
						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
18	6.2 The Proponent will undertake [1] a Stage II Archaeological Assessment and [2] any subsequent Archaeological Assessments that may be required. The Proponent is to consult with [3] affected stakeholders and [4] Aboriginal communities on their findings and [5] obtain any necessary approvals prior to proceeding with construction.	York Region	Design	<p>Status – Ongoing</p> <p>Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment, and any subsequent archaeological assessment required, will be undertaken during the detail design phase. Consultation with affected stakeholders and Aboriginal communities will also be carried out following completion of the Stage 2 assessment.</p> <p>[1] Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment has been completed. Upon receipt of final correspondence from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, the report and correspondence will be forwarded to First Nations representatives.</p> <p><b><u>[1] Archaeological assessments for the remaining four properties in Y2.1 were completed in 2015 and reports are being compiled. [2] The report recommends that a Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment be completed for 8890 Yonge Street. [3-5] Consultation will be carried out and approvals obtained upon completion of all studies.</u></b></p>	[1] Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of Yonge Street, Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 West of Yonge Street and Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 East of Yonge Street, Geographic Townships of Vaughan and Markham, Town of Richmond Hill, Regional Municipality of York, December 2013. (ID# Y2004-005)	No	[1] EF (2014)	<p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description...The text modifications did not change the review.</p> <p>2014: [1] Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment has been provided as evidence. Numbering added for clarity.</p> <p>2015:[1] may be closed if evidence is provided. Item [2] subsequent archeological investigations are going. Item 2 to 5 remain open.</p>

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 (MMM)		
						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
19.	6.3 The Proponent will [1] undertake and [2] consult on a Streetscape Plan for the Yonge Street Corridor.	York Region	Design	<p>Status - Ongoing</p> <p>[1] [2010]The Y2 Design Basis and Criteria Report (Y2 DBCR) has been completed. Design principles established during Y1 preliminary design were applied to Y2 preliminary design, where appropriate.</p> <p>[2010] The Y2 Design Basis and Criteria Report (Y2 DBCR) has incorporated streetscape recommendations under Streetscape Design Guidelines (Section 3.8), General Guidelines (Section 3.9), etc.</p> <p>[1] Equivalent references to Section 3 – Facilities Design of the Draft Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report can be found in Section 3 of ID#8035. The standard details have been developed as part of the H3 detailed design project and subsequent segments will be referencing the H3 Design Basis and Criteria Report (DBCR).</p> <p>[2] “Open House” format public consultations were held on June 2 2010 (#1) and included exhibits and discussion of streetscape and urban design concepts at the preliminary engineering phase.</p> <p>Further work will be completed in detailed design.</p> <p><b><u>A Landscape and Streetscape Design Report has been developed as part of the detail design (Y2015-033).</u></b></p> <p><b><u>A Boulevard Civil Streetscape Design Report was prepared during Detailed Design, and is currently under internal</u></b></p>	<p>[1] [2010]Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue– Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)</p> <p>[1] Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)</p> <p>[1] Highway 7 Rapidway, Segment H3 – Yonge St to Kennedy Rd*, Preliminary Engineering Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report, Update to Dec 2009 Final Version, Final Draft, November 2011 (ID#8035)</p> <p>[2] June 2, 2010 “Open House” #1 (Presentation ID# 6108) and sign-in sheets</p> <p><b><u>TS 8 - Landscape and Streetscape Design Report (Y2015-033)</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Y2.1 90pct Streetscape Design Report, RapidLINK, May 2015 (Y2015-004)</u></b></p>	No	<p>[1] EF (2009)</p> <p>[2] EF (2010)</p> <p>[1] EF (2012)</p>	<p>[1] Evidence found of streetscape design guidelines in the Y2DBCR in Section 3.8 and 3.9.</p> <p>[2] During Oct-2010 review, this item was found NSE as the Presentation evidence provided was deemed insufficient to determine that consultations were held. Notices and distribution lists have been provided and accepted for other consultation events. May 2011, the following additional evidence was provided by the Owner Engineer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tabloid add (file name: RichmondHill_TabloidThreeEighth_10_05_17)</li> <li>- ERA/Banner invoice for running the advert</li> </ul> <p>The ACR table was amended to include sign in sheets. These were not provided. The Owner Engineer responded in an email dated 2-May-11 that there “is no original sign-in sheet for these meetings. YRRTC provided additional staff at the front table, and they entered people’s information directly into a spreadsheet, rather than having them fill in a sign-in sheet.” The table should be revised to remove the reference to sign-in sheets</p> <p>The Owner Engineer provided on 2-May-11, the following two documents to assist with verifying that the Y2 public meeting took place in June 2010:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letters (10-May-10) to municipal Council and staff – signed letter with meeting details.</li> </ul>

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 (MMM)		
						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
				<u>review (Y2015-004; Y2015-005).</u>	<u>Y2.2 90pct Streetscape Design Report, RapidLINK, May 2015 (Y2015-005)</u>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Registered letter (13-May-10) to property owner – this has the dates and times for the public meeting. This one was returned unclaimed, but it demonstrates that a signed letter was mailed.</li> </ul> <p>2012 ACR: The DBCR was updated from draft (ID 6249) to final report (ID 8695). The final report for the Y2 DBCR references the design of H3 DBCR (ID 8035). The evidence provided was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing to detail design.</p>
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	Status - Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: - Status and Description... The text modifications did not change the review.
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 – Future work (if necessary).  Minor changes dealt with during preliminary design are described under item 81.		No		After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description... The text modifications did not change the review.

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 (MMM)		
						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
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 FAA	York Region	Design stage as necessary	Status – Future work (if necessary) Changes requiring a major amendment have not been identified during preliminary design. See also item 82.		No		After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: - Status and Description... The text modifications did not change the review.

Section 3.0 – Compliance Management and Responsibilities							
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 (MMM)		
					Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
23.	CMP Section 3.2.1 – Design Phase - York Region may decide to implement the project using the design-build delivery method. This approach requires that both the preliminary design to allow pricing of construction and the subsequent detailed design be carried out by the party responsible for construction.	York Region	<p>Status – Completed.</p> <p>[2010] Y2 preliminary design has been undertaken through the existing business relationship with York Consortium. Pricing of the design-build contract will commence in Spring 2012, with award anticipated in Fall 2010.</p> <p>Y2 preliminary design was undertaken by York Consortium. Y2 detailed design and construction is scheduled for a public bidding process commencing in 2013-2014</p> <p>Y2 Design-Build Agreement executed.</p>	<p>York Region Rapid Transit System Master Agreement, June 2006.(ID# 8947)</p> <p>VivaNext Procurement Agreement, March 2010. (ID#5587)</p> <p>Signed Agreement to Design Build, May 2014 (ID# Y2014-002)</p>	No	Closed	<p>Not included in 2009 table of commitments. This does not appear to be an EA commitment but internal processes and therefore not reviewed.</p> <p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Status and Description ... , and</li> <li>- Compliance Document Reference</li> </ul> <p>The text modifications did not change the review. The text modifications did not change the review.</p> <p>ACR 2014: Status and decryption was bolded and underlined indicating items for review but this item was identified in 2010 as not an EA commitment. Since it is not an EA commitment, it was not reviewed as part of the ACR.</p>

Section 3.0 – Compliance Management and Responsibilities							
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 (MMM)		
					Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
24.	CMP Section 3.2.1 - Design Phase - During the preliminary design phase, all design-related commitments to be fulfilled by the Proponent will be carried out by the Contractor and reviewed by York Region staff.	York Region	<p>Status – Completed.</p> <p>Y2 preliminary design has been undertaken through the existing business relationship with York Consortium, under the oversight of the Owner’s Engineer for the York Region Rapid Transit Corporation. Design-related commitments are monitored on an ongoing basis, and documented in the Annual Compliance Reports.</p> <p>Preliminary design phase is completed. Annual Compliance Reports filed 2009-2013 reflect preliminary design activities.</p>	<p>2009 Annual Compliance Report (February 2010) (ID#3901)</p> <p>2010 Annual Compliance Report (December 2011) (ID#6595)</p> <p>2011 Memo (February 2012) (ID#8087)</p> <p>2012 Annual Compliance Report (December 2012) (ID Y2013-003)</p> <p>2013 Annual Compliance Report (December 2013) (ID Y2014-001)</p>	No	Closed	<p>Not included in 2009 table of commitments. This does not appear to be an EA commitment but internal processes and therefore not reviewed.</p> <p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Status and Description ... , and</li> <li>- Compliance Document Reference</li> </ul> <p>The text modifications did change the review.</p> <p>This item was noted as UNCLEAR in the Oct-10 review . In discussion with the Owner Engineer, it was noted that this table and the undergoing review of design related commitments could be the evidence of ongoing compliance. However, this is not an EA commitment but internal processes and not part of the review</p> <p>ACR 2014: Status and decryption was bolded and underlined indicating items for review but this item was identified in 2010 as not an EA commitment. Since it is not an EA commitment, it was not reviewed as part of the ACR.</p>
25.	CMP Section 3.2.1 - Design Phase - Following the execution of a contract for construction, the Contractor will be responsible for all further actions to meet design-related commitments during its completion of the detailed design. Design solutions developed, including mitigation and consultation procedures followed will be subject to review and approval by York Region staff.	York Region	<p>Status – Completed</p> <p>Detailed design will be carried out as part of a future design-build contract.</p> <p>Requirement is specified within Agreement to Design Build, May 2014 - Schedule 14, Part 100, Section 100.2.2.2 (General Requirements).</p>	<p>Design Build Agreement May 2013, Schedule 14, Part 100 (ID# Y2014-002)</p>	No	Closed	<p>Not included in 2009 table of commitments. This does not appear to be an EA commitment but internal processes and therefore not reviewed.</p> <p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description... The text modifications did not change the review.</p> <p>ACR 2014: Status and decryption was bolded and underlined indicating items for review but this item was identified in 2010 as not an EA commitment. Since it is not an EA commitment, it was not reviewed as part of the ACR.</p>

Section 3.0 – Compliance Management and Responsibilities							
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 (MMM)		
					Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
26.	CMP Section 3.2.1 - Design Phase - The contract provisions will include a copy of the CMP and special contract provisions will be added to ensure commitments outlined in the CMP are fulfilled, including commitments to further studies and consultation as applicable.	York Region	<p>Status – Completed</p> <p>Terms of reference for the design-build contract will include these provisions, and are anticipated to be issued in Spring 2012.</p> <p>These provisions are addressed in the Agreement to Design-Build, May 2014 - Schedule 14, Part 100, Sections 100.2.2.2 (General Requirements) and 100.2.2.4 (Environmental Assessment Compliance Documentation).</p>	Design Build Agreement May 2013 (ID# Y2014-002)	No	Closed	<p>Not included in 2009 table of commitments. This does not appear to be an EA commitment but internal processes and therefore not reviewed.</p> <p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description... The text modifications did not change the review.</p> <p>ACR 2014: Status and decryption was bolded and underlined indicating items for review but this item was identified in 2010 as not an EA commitment. Since it is not an EA commitment, it was not reviewed as part of the ACR..</p>

Section 3.0 – Compliance Management and Responsibilities							
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 (MMM)		
					Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
27.	CMP Section 3.2.1 - Design Phase - The ECM will verify compliance and prepare/submit ACRs.	York Region	<p>Status – ongoing.</p> <p>The first ACR was submitted to MOE in February 2010 and will follow subsequent submissions as specified in the CMP.</p> <p>The 2010 ACR was submitted to the MOE in December 2010.</p> <p>York Region did not submit an ACR for the Y2 segment since there was no progress to report. Refer to the York Region letter to the MOE on February 2, 2011 (ID#8908)</p> <p>The 2012 ACR was submitted to the MOE in December 2012.</p> <p>The 2013 ACR was submitted to the MOE in December 2013.</p> <p><b><u>The 2013 ACR was submitted to the MOE in December 2013.</u></b></p>	<p>2009 ACR (ID#3901)</p> <p>2010 ACR (ID#6595)</p> <p>2011 ACR (ID#8908)</p> <p>2012 ACR (ID Y2013-003)</p> <p>2013 ACR (ID Y2014-001)</p> <p><b><u>2014 Annual Compliance Report (December 2014) (ID Y2015-001)</u></b></p>	Yes	<p>EF (2010)</p> <p>EF (2012)</p> <p>EF (2013)</p> <p>EF (2014)</p> <p>EF (2015)</p>	<p>In 2009, this item was ENF as no documentation was provided. In Oct-10, no additional evidence was provided and the item remained ENF. After the Oct-10 review, text in the columns: Status and Description ....., and Compliance Document Reference was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments. The text modifications changed the review.</p> <p>This and previous ACRs are considered to be evidence of compliance.</p> <p>2012 ACR: This and previous ACRs are considered to be evidence of compliance.</p> <p>2012 ACR: This and previous ACRs are considered to be evidence of compliance.</p> <p>2013 ACR:.. Going forward, it may be easier to provide a link to the submission, which includes the submission letter.</p> <p>2014 ACR: This and previous ACRs are considered to be evidence of compliance.</p> <p>2015 ACR: This and previous ACRs are considered to be evidence of compliance.</p>
28.	CMP Section 3.2.2 – Construction Phase - The Contractor will be responsible for meeting CMP requirements during construction. In accordance with stipulated contracting arrangements, the party contracted to carry out the construction will be required to meet all commitments related to the mitigation of construction effects while the Region or its consultants will monitor the contractor's actions.	Contractor	<p>Status – <b><u>Does Not Apply</u></b></p> <p>Construction is anticipated to commence in 2015.</p> <p><b><u>This is not an EA commitment and therefore is not included in the reporting process.</u></b></p>		No	Closed	<p>Not included in 2009 table of commitments. This is not an EA commitment but internal processes and not part of the review</p> <p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description ...</p> <p>The text modifications did not change the review.</p>

Section 3.0 – Compliance Management and Responsibilities							
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 (MMM)		
					Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
29.	CMP Section 3.2.2 - Construction Phase - The ECM will verify compliance and prepare/submit ACRs.	York Region	<p>Status – <b><u>Does Not Apply</u></b></p> <p>Construction is anticipated to commence in 2015.</p> <p><b><u>This is not an EA commitment and therefore is not included in the reporting process.</u></b></p>		No	Closed	<p>Not included in 2009 table of commitments. This is not an EA commitment but internal processes and not part of the review</p> <p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description ... The text modifications did change the review.</p>

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments							
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
					Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
30.	CMP Section 4.1 - Ability of infrastructure design to maximize safety for [1] vehicles and [2] pedestrians and of [3] streetscaping plan to enhance corridor and community environment;  (2009 item number : 23)	York Region	<p>Status – <b>Complete</b></p> <p>[2010] The Y2 DBCR has been completed. Design principles established during Y1 preliminary design were applied to Y2 preliminary design, where appropriate.</p> <p>Vehicle Safety: [1] [2010] The Y2 DBCR has addressed road design standards and vehicle safety - Section 2.3– Geometric Design and Other Features.</p> <p>Pedestrian Safety: [2] . [2010] Architectural preliminary design drawings show platform and canopy design. The Y2 DBCR has addressed pedestrian safety, for example: Guardrail / Railings (Section 3.5 &amp; 3.12), Safety and Security Guidelines (Section 3.9.4), Placement of Streetscape Elements (Section 3.9.8), Crosswalks (Section 3.18), etc</p> <p>[2] Equivalent references to Section 3 – Facilities Design of the Draft Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report can be found in Section 3 of ID#8035. The standard details have been developed as part of the H3 detailed design project and subsequent segments will be referencing the H3 DBCR.</p> <p>Streetscaping Plan: [3] .[2010] Y2 DBCR examples include: Streetscape Design Guidelines (Section 3.8), General Guidelines (Section 3.9), etc</p>	<p>[1,2 and 3] [2010]Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue– Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)</p> <p>[1,2 and 3] Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)</p> <p>[2,3] Highway 7 Rapidway, Segment H3 – Yonge St to Kennedy Rd*, Preliminary Engineering Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report, Update to Dec 2009 Final Version, Final Draft, November 2011 (ID#8035)</p> <p>Appendix A –Traffic Impact Analysis (Y2) Yonge Street – Highway 7 Connector Ramp to 19th Avenue/Gamble Road – April 2010 (ID# 5925)</p> <p><b><u>90 pct Traffic Analysis Report, RapidLINK, June 2015 (Y2015-003)</u></b></p>	Yes	<p>[1] EF (2010)</p> <p>[2] EF (2010)</p> <p>[3] EF (2012)</p> <p>[1,2,3] EF (2015)</p> <p>[1,2,3] Closed (2015)</p>	<p>[1] Evidence found for road design standards and vehicle safety in Section 2.3.</p> <p>[2] Evidence found for guardrail/railing provisions to create safety barriers, safety and security provisions, placement of streetscape elements that uphold the safety of pedestrians, cyclists or drivers, and crosswalks.</p> <p>In Oct-10, this component was marked as UNCLEAR: No evidence found for installation of public telephones In discussion with the Owner Engineer, it was noted that a PA system (which was not referenced in the table) was included as a public safety measure instead of public telephones. If this is the case, then this table should be updated so public telephones are not provided as an example of pedestrian safety design element.</p> <p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the Status and Description ...column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments. The text modifications did change the review and clarified the issue.</p> <p>[3] Evidence found on page 6 of Appendix A shows a review of maximum queue lengths</p> <p>2012 ACR: The DBCR was updated from draft (ID 6476) to final report (ID 8680). The final report for the H2 DBCR references the design of H3 DBCR (ID 8035). The evidence provided was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed.</p> <p>2015 ACR: Evidence found that safety of vehicles [1] and pedestrians [2] has been considered via (Y2015-003). Landscape [3] plan shows enhancements (Y2015-004 and Y2015-005)</p> <p>The 90% landscaping plan is considered sufficiently final to close the item.</p> <p>Vehicle Safety: [1], Pedestrian Safety: [2] and Streetscaping Plan: [3] are closed.</p>

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments							
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
					Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
			<p>[3]Equivalent references to Section 3 – Facilities Design of the Draft Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report can be found in Section 3 of ID#8035. The standard details have been developed as part of the H3 detailed design project and subsequent segments will be referencing the H3 DBCR.</p> <p>This work will be progressed and finalized during detailed design.</p> <p><u>A Traffic Analysis Report was prepared during Detailed Design which identifies opportunities to increase vehicle and pedestrian safety (see Section 2.7)</u></p> <p><u>A Boulevard Civil Streetscape Design Report and Drawings were prepared in accordance with Preliminary Engineering drawings and H3 IFC drawings and contract specifications. (Y2015-004, Y2015-005)</u></p> <p><u>Additionally, the Design-Build Agreement included a Road and Safety Review and Audit Plan which has been implemented as part of the detailed design. Sample Road Safety Audits for the 90% design have been provided as evidence. (Y2015-015, Y2015-016, Y2015-017, Y2015-018)</u></p>	<p><u>Y2.1 90pct Streetscape Design Report, RapidLINK, May 2015 (Y2015-004)</u></p> <p><u>Y2.2 90pct Streetscape Design Report, RapidLINK, May 2015 (Y2015-005)</u></p> <p><u>RapidLINK Road and Safety Review and Audit Plan (TS-17) (Y2015-010)</u></p> <p><u>Road Safety Audit - Y2.1 Staging Design (Y2015-015)</u></p> <p><u>Road Safety Audit - Y2.2 Staging Design (Y2015-016)</u></p> <p><u>Road Safety Audit Responses - Y2.1 Staging Design (Y2015-017)</u></p> <p><u>Road Safety Audit Responses - Y2.2 Staging Design (Y2015-018)</u></p>			

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments							
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
					Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
31.	CMP Section 4.1 - Application of design standards that permit future conversion to LRT technology;  (2009 item number : 24)	York Region	<p>Status - Future work</p> <p>[2010]The Y2 DBCR has been completed. Design principles established during Y1 preliminary design were applied to Y2 preliminary design, where appropriate.</p> <p>[2010]The Y2 DBCR has addressed this requirement, for example BRT Standards (Section 2.3.1), Station Platform Length (Section 2.3.12.1), etc.</p> <p>This work will be progressed and finalized during detailed design.</p> <p>The potential future evolution from Bus Rapid Transit to higher capacity Light Rail Rapid Transit is not being planned at this time, and is ultimately dependant on significant growth in transit ridership and available funding in the future, and at least not expected within the 2031 horizon. No Technology Conversion Plan will be finalized until new information on this issue become available.</p> <p>Status remains on-going as design standards are currently being assessed to permit future conversion to LRT technology. This work is required as part of design to accommodate a future Transition Plan without needing to construct major infrastructure.</p>	<p>[2010]Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue– Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)</p> <p>Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)</p> <p>Letter from York Region, April 3, 2012, responding MOE comments, April 3, 2012.(ID#8908)</p>	No	EF (2010)	<p>Evidence found in Section 2.3.1: The maximum in station grade of 2% is intended for Light Rail Transit (LRT) operation. In general the vivaNext BRT platforms have been designed to suit future LRT use without modification. However, on the Yonge Street Segment Y2 three locations do not conform to the maximum gradient criteria, these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Major Mackenzie (Station 18+100) where the NB and SB station gradients are 4.43%;</li> <li>- Elgin Mills (Station 20+380) where NB station gradient is 2.35% ;</li> <li>- 19th Avenue (Station 22+480) where NB station is 4.2%and the SB station is 3.8%.</li> </ul> <p>Implementation of future LRT services will require that the stations be modified to suit LRT operations at that time, these constraints were identified in the EA.</p> <p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description... The text modifications did not change the review.</p> <p>2012 ACR: The evidence provided (8908) was found to support the assertion made.</p> <p>2013 ACR: To be consistent with previous items with respect to BRT/LRT conversion, the status of the item should be changed to future.</p>

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments							
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
					Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
32.	CMP Section 4.1 - Effectiveness of [1] infrastructure design and [2] service plans in enhancing connectivity to local and inter-regional transit services;  (2009 item number : 25)	York Region	<p>Status – <b>Complete</b></p> <p><u>Effectiveness of infrastructure design:</u> [1] Discussions with YRT during the Y2 preliminary design process include connectivity with local transit at curbside stops and with GO Transit at the Richmond Hill Terminal.</p> <p><u>Effectiveness of service plans:</u> [2] The Transition Plan – Draft (March 2, 2007), Section 4.6.1 - The Evaluation of Qualitative Measures – Includes a discussion of Network Connectivity.</p> <p>This work will be progressed and finalized during detailed design.</p> <p><u>[2] A Transit Operational Design Review Report was prepared as part of the detail design. The report provides an assessment of the desired Rapidway design provisions to support transit operations along the corridor.</u></p> <p><u>[1] A Traffic Analysis Report was prepared during Detailed Design. The purpose of this study is to provide a detailed analysis of traffic signal operations along the VivaNext Yonge Street rapidway segments during both construction staging and post-construction conditions.</u></p>	<p>[2] Transition Plan – Draft, March 2, 2007 (ID# 910),</p> <p><u>[2] Transit Operational Design Review, RapidLINK, 2014 (Y2015-011)</u></p> <p><u>[1] 90 pct Traffic Analysis Report, RapidLINK, June 2015 (Y2015-003)</u></p>	Yes	<p>[2] EF (2009)</p> <p>[1,2] EF (2015)</p> <p>Closed (2015)</p>	<p>(2009 item number : 25)</p> <p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description... The text modifications did not change the review.</p> <p>ACR 2015: Numbering added for clarity. Unclear - the effectiveness of [1] infrastructure design and [2] service plans in enhancing connectivity to local and inter-regional transit services shown in Y2015-011 indicates some confusion (pages 1 and 2) with respect coordination with GO Transit and YRT conventional buses. It is also not clear how report Y2015-003 supports enhancing connectivity to local and inter-regional transportation. Post-review supplement explanation indicated the purpose of Y2015-011. Upon re-review, the information was found to support the assertion and this item is closed.</p>

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments							
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
					Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
33.	CMP Section 4.1 - Simulation of intersection performance to verify transit service reliability and effects on general traffic;  (2009 item number : 26)	York Region	<p>Status – <b>Complete</b></p> <p>[2010] Y2 DBCR - Section 2.4 Traffic Analysis documents the results of VISSUM traffic modeling and traffic analysis. Additional work will be carried out in detailed design to finalize signal timing and transit signal priority parameters.</p> <p><b><u>A Traffic Analysis Report was prepared during Detailed Design. The purpose of this study is to provide a detailed analysis of traffic signal operations along the VivaNext Yonge Street rapidway segments during both construction staging and post-construction conditions.</u></b></p>	<p>[2010]Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue– Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)</p> <p>Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)</p> <p>Appendix A – Task 3.12: traffic Impact Analysis (Y2) Yonge Street – Highway 7 Connector Ramp to 19th Avenue/Gamble Road – April 2010 (ID# 5925)</p> <p><b><u>90 pct Traffic Analysis Report, RapidLINK, June 2015 (Y2015-003)</u></b></p>	Yes	<p>EF (2010)</p> <p>EF (2012)</p> <p>EF (2015) Closed</p>	<p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description... The text modifications did not change the review.</p> <p>Appendix A: Page 4 confirms use of VISSIM traffic modeling.</p> <p>2012 ACR: the evidence provided (8695) was found to support the assertion made.</p> <p>2015 ACR: the evidence provided (Y2015-003) was found to support the assertion made. 90% complete report was deemed sufficient as evidence of completion. This item is closed.</p>

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments							
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
					Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
34.	CMP Section 4.1 - Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment; (2009 item number : 27)	York Region	<p>Status – Ongoing</p> <p>Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment, and any subsequent archaeological assessment required, will be undertaken during the detail design phase.</p> <p>Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment has been completed for most of the corridor. Remaining 4 properties to be completed prior to construction.</p> <p><u>Refer to Item 18.</u></p>	<p>Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of Yonge Street, Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 West of Yonge Street and Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 East of Yonge Street, Geographic Townships of Vaughan and Markham, Town of Richmond Hill, Regional Municipality of York, December 2013. (ID# Y2004-005)</p> <p>Correspondence from Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Recreation regarding Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of Yonge Street, Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 West of Yonge Street and Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 East of Yonge Street, March 19, 2014 (ID# Y2004-005)</p>	No	EF (2014)	<p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.</p> <p>2014: Archaeological Assessment and correspondence have been provided as evidence.</p>

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments							
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
					Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
35.	CMP Section 4.1 - Inclusion of measures to mitigate construction effects on [1] residences, [2] businesses, [3] road traffic and [4] pedestrians in contract specifications; (2009 item number :28)	York Region	<p>Status – <b>Complete</b></p> <p>[1-4] [2010] Traffic management concepts and plans have been developed during Y2 PE Design. Measures to be further developed in the detailed design phase. Measures have been referenced in the Y2 DBCR: Refinement During Detail Design (Section 3.7), Construction Specifications (Section 2.3.21), etc.</p> <p>[1-4] Equivalent references to Section 3 – Facilities Design of the Draft Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report can be found in Section 3 of ID#8035. The standard details have been developed as part of the H3 detailed design project and subsequent segments will be referencing the H3 DBCR.</p> <p><b>[1-4] From Schedule 14, Section 300.1.1 - General Design Requirements. "If a requirement is not specified in this Schedule 14 (Technical Requirements), the requirement shall be set to a standard generally being met on the urban roadway and structures of the H3 Project IFC Drawings taking into account the York Region Construction Design Guidelines and Standards (available online) including "Road Design Guidelines" and the York Region Item Specifications provided in the Electronic Data Room. (Y2015-000)</b></p>	<p>[1-4] [2010]Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue– Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)</p> <p>[1-4] Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)</p> <p>[1-4] Highway 7 Rapidway, Segment H3 – Yonge St to Kennedy Rd*, Preliminary Engineering Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report, Update to Dec 2009 Final Version, Final Draft, November 2011 (ID#8035)</p> <p><b>[1-4] York Region Construction Design Guidelines and Standards (available online) including "Road Design Guidelines" and the York Region Item Specifications provided in the Electronic Data Room. (Y2015-000)</b></p>	Yes	<p>EF (2010)</p> <p>EF (2012)</p> <p>EF (2015)</p> <p>Closed (2015)</p>	<p>Refinement During Detail Design states: Protection, relocation and or replacement in kind of existing elements disturbed by construction including but not limited to landscaping, sidewalks, curb ramps, shelters and street furniture. Construction specifications site primary, secondary, and tertiary specification references but do not explicitly include measures to mitigate construction effects which is part of detailed design. Measures to be further developed during Detail Design.</p> <p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review. It is clearer that the process of mitigation measures is beginning and will be further developed during detailed design.</p> <p>2012 ACR: The DBCR was updated from draft (ID 6476) to final report (ID 8680). The final report for the Y2 DBCR (8695) for assertions [1-4] references the design of H3 DBCR (ID 8035). The evidence provided was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing.</p> <p>2015 ACR: Evidence found to support assertion (reference material copied from Status cell to reference cell for clarity. This item is closed.</p>

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments							
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
					Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
36.	CMP Section 4.1 - Opportunities to obtain input from [1] affected communities, [2] First Nations and [3] heritage associations; (2009 item number : 29)	York Region	<p>Status – ongoing.</p> <p>[1] “Open House” format public consultations were held on June 2 2010 (#1)</p> <p>Y1 preliminary design principles, informed by Y1 “Open House” format public consultations, were applied to Y2 preliminary design, where appropriate. Accordingly, Y1 “Open House” format public consultations are also referenced at this time.</p> <p>“Open House” format public consultations for segment Y1 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).</p> <p>[3] A Heritage Design Focus Group was held with the public on May 28 2007.</p> <p>[2] First Nations Groups and Provincial/Federal First Nations agencies who were on the EA contact list received notifications of public consultation opportunities.</p> <p>Further consultation will be carried out in detailed design.</p> <p>[1], [2], [3] “Open House” format public consultations were held on November 19 and 20, 2013.</p>	<p>[1] June 2, 2010 “Open House” #1 (Presentation ID# 6108), registered notification letter to property owners (May 13, 2010), notification letter to Richmond Hill Councillors (May 10, 2010), advertisement and invoice for newspaper placement (May 30, 2010)</p> <p>February 8, 2007 “Open House” #1 (Presentation ID# 755), (Collaterals ID# 768), YRRTC Minutes (ID#3028)</p> <p>February 21, 2007 “Open House” #2 (Presentation ID 877) (Boards ID 851), YRRTC Minutes (ID#3029)</p> <p>March 28, 2007 “Open House” #3 (Presentation ID#1667), YRRTC Minutes (ID#3031)</p> <p>May 3, 2007 Public PE design workshop #1 (Presentation ID 6108), YRRTC Minutes ID# 3034),(Questionnaire Comments ID#1278), (Email ID#1196)</p> <p>June 7, 2007 Public PE design workshop #2 (Presentation ID# 1373), (Boards ID#’s 1334, 1351, 1350, 1363, 1362, 1359), YRRTC Minutes (ID#3035)</p> <p>May 28, 2007 Heritage Design Focus Group (Minutes ID#1758)</p>	No	<p>[1] EF (2010)</p> <p>[2] EF (2010)</p> <p>[3] EF (2010)</p>	<p>In the Oct-10 review, this component was identified as NSE. Presentation evidence provided is insufficient to determine that consultations were held. Notices and distribution lists have been provided and accepted for other consultation events (see below in this cell of this table).</p> <p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Status and Description ... , and</li> <li>- Compliance Document Reference</li> </ul> <p>The text modifications did change the review.</p> <p>Additional evidence of: registered notification letter to property owners (May 13, 2010), notification letter to Richmond Hill Councillors (May 10, 2010), advertisement and invoice for newspaper placement (May 30, 2010) was provided by the OE.</p> <p>Items 1673, 1750, 3026, and 3030 were provided in hard copy in YC office on 2-Oct-09</p> <p>NOTE: Yonge Street Stakeholder letter and post card mail drop - YC 3.03 (ID#3027) was not provided. This item should be located.</p>

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments							
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
					Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
				[1 & 3] 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) (ID# 1673)  [1 & 3] Mailing lists used for notification during Y1 PE Design: (Concerned Citizen address list.xls, Property owner reps.xls, Property Owners.xls) (ID# 1750)  [2] First Nations mailing list and 2007-01-22 Viva Update letter (ID#3026)  [2] Letter from Alderville First Nation (ID#3030)  Mailing lists, 2007-01-22 Viva Update letter, 2007-04-24 Yonge Street Stakeholder letter and post card mail drop (ID#3027)  [1] November 2013 invitation/ newsletters and postal walk limits, e-blast, newspaper advertisements, sample comment sheets and displays (ID# Y2014-006).			

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments							
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
					Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
37.	CMP Section 4.1 - Inclusion of built-in attributes to mitigate adverse effects in design solutions; (2009 item number : 30)	York Region	<p>Status – ongoing.</p> <p>[2010] Y2 DBCR: [1] Island protection at intersections (Section 2.3.17.1) – Created to prevent uninhibited access to the station area by errant vehicles; [2] Median (Section 3.16) – Introduces softscape treatment to visually narrow the appearance of a widened street; [3] Passenger Assistance Alarm (Section 3.23) - Installed at stations to reduce vandalism and provide patrons with a sense of security; etc.</p> <p>This work will be progressed and finalized during detailed design.</p> <p>[1] Section 2.3.17.1 Banana Wall : A low curved concrete wall has been introduced on the intersection side of each crosswalk at the Station Platforms to protect pedestrians and the traffic signal pole if there is a vehicular accident at the intersection.</p> <p>[2] Section 3.16: Medians – Low planters have been added to the medians to visually reduce the scale of the ROW and define the rapidway lanes</p>	<p>[2010]Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue– Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)</p> <p>[1,2 and 3]Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)</p> <p>[1,2 and 3] Highway 7 Rapidway, Segment H3 – Yonge St to Kennedy Rd*, Preliminary Engineering Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report, Update to Dec 2009 Final Version, Final Draft, November 2011 (ID#8035)</p> <p>[2] TRCA Meeting Notes - H3-MEM-QSD-KED-Highway 7 - RSA - Front End of Median Platform-2011-Mar-25 (ID#8500)</p>	No	<p>[1 to 3] EF (2010)</p> <p>[1 to 3] EF (2012)</p>	<p>2010 ACR: Evidence found of island protection at intersections, softscape treatment of medians, and of passenger assistance alarms.</p> <p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description ... ,The text modifications did change the review.</p> <p>2012 ACR: From ID# 8695 [1] Section 2.3.17.1 Banana Wall: EF however appears to be section 2.3.18.1 Intersection island Protection [2] Section 3.16: Medians: EF appears to be section 2.3.13 Median Islands mentions vegetated medians From ID# 8035 [3] Section 3.23 Passenger assistance alarms at Stations: EF no section 3.23, evidence of alarms found in 4.7.6 Emergency Call Box System</p> <p>Evidence ID#8035 refers to the H3 Final Design. For evidence ID#8500, it was not clear on how it supports the assertion [2] or any other assertion. Item remains ongoing.</p>

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments							
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
					Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
			<p>[3] Section 3.23 Passenger assistance alarms at Stations: Each platform has one Emergency Call Button within the heated wind enclosure and provisions for two additional have been provided on each platform. The button will call a monitored centre and will also illuminate a bright blue strobe light on the platform VMS to alert passing emergency vehicles.</p> <p>[1,2 and 3]Equivalent references to Section 3 – Facilities Design of the Draft Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report can be found in Section 3 of ID#8035. The standard details have been developed as part of the H3 detailed design project and subsequent segments will be referencing the H3 DBCR.</p> <p><u>Inclusion of built-in mitigation measures are described throughout the ACR. Refer to Section 2 for general information on the ACR and refer to Appedix 1 for all measures included as part of the design to mitigate adverse effects.</u></p>				

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments							
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
					Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
38.	CMP Section 4.1 - Adoption of design solutions that mitigate effects on [1] surface water quality and quantity and [2] aquatic habitat at watercourse crossings; (2009 item number : 31)	York Region	<p>Status – <b>Complete</b></p> <p>[1] [2010] Y2 DBCR: The Transition zone or the continuity strip (Section 3.15.1) - eco pavers allow for water percolation improving quality and reducing quantity. The median island also includes softscape wherever possible to achieve same.</p> <p>[1] Equivalent references to Section 3 – Facilities Design of the Draft Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report can be found in Section 3 of ID#8035. The standard details have been developed as part of the H3 detailed design project and subsequent segments will be referencing the H3 DBCR.</p> <p>[1] Permeable pavers will be used in the medians and in the continuity strip of the boulevards to decrease stormwater run off. This will help to reduce the strain on the stormwater system. In addition, maintenance manuals for the OGS units installed at culverts will be provided by the manufacturer. The use of permeable pavers can be seen on the Y2 41% Preliminary Design Drawing sets (ID#8726).</p> <p>[2] [2010] Y2 DBCR: - Appendix D – The design includes oil grit separators to treat the runoff from impervious areas ensuring a net improvement in runoff quality for all release points.</p>	<p>[1] [2010]Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue– Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)</p> <p>[1] Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)</p> <p>[1] Highway 7 Rapidway, Segment H3 – Yonge St to Kennedy Rd*, Preliminary Engineering Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report, Update to Dec 2009 Final Version, Final Draft, November 2011 (ID#8035)</p> <p>[2] [2010]Appendix D – Final Drainage Study for Viva Next Y2 Yonge street (Y.R.1) – June 2010 (ID# 6075)</p> <p>[1,2] Supplement to Final Drainage Study for vivaNext Y2 June 2010 (ID#8695)</p>	Yes	<p>[1] EF (2010)</p> <p>[2] EF (2010)</p> <p>[1,2] EF (2012)</p> <p>[1,2] EF (2015)</p> <p>Closed (2015)</p>	<p>ACR 2010: Evidence found of transition zone to have eco pavers of specified colour and size to allow for water percolation, proper tree root aeration and provide for a reasonable measure of salt protection for trees located in the furnishing zone. Figure 5: German Mills Creek includes oil grit separators. After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Status and Description ... , and</li> <li>- Compliance Document Reference</li> </ul> <p>The text modifications did not change the review.</p> <p>ACR 2012: ID# 8695 Section 2.7.2 includes reference to Permeable pavers and OGS Supporting the assertion [1] and [2] as well as Supplement to Final Drainage Study June 2010(ID#8695) includes impermeable area discussion for bike lane However, needed evidence was not found for the assertion that “boulevard planters are open vegetated pits designed to capture up to 75% of rainfall and surface runoff from the adjacent paved surface.”</p> <p>2012 edit: the status column was updated by the Owner Engineer to remove text. The text modifications changed the review.</p> <p>2015 ACR: Evidence found for design solution for [1] surface water quality (Y2015-014 - 90% design is considered sufficient) and [2] aquatic habitat (Y2015-019). Items [1] and [2] are closed.</p>

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments							
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
					Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
			<p>[1,2] The Supplement to Final Drainage Study June 2010(ID#8695) addresses the inclusion of 1.4m wide bike lanes along the corridor. The conclusion is the impact to the drainage design is negligible (less than or equal to 2% increase in flow) and no change to the drainage design will be required.</p> <p>This work will be progressed and finalized during detailed design.</p> <p><u>A Drainage and Hydrology Report was prepared during Detailed Design, and is currently under internal review. Section 6 of this report outlines the design strategy for Stormwater Quality Control, i.e. OGS units. Additionally, the Landscape and Streetscape Plan presents stormwater mitigation measures such as permeable pavers as part of the continuity strip.</u></p> <p><u>During construction, the implementation of the Aquatic Resources Protection Plan (Y2015-019) and Surface Water Quality Monitoring Plan (Y2015-020) will lead to mitigation of impacts to surface water quality and aquatic resources.</u></p>	<p>[1] Y2 41% Preliminary Design Drawing set (ID#8726)</p> <p><u>Drainage and Hydrology 90% Design Report, RapidLINK, June 2015 (Y2015-014)</u></p> <p><u>Y2.1 90pct Streetscape Design Report, RapidLINK, May 2015 (Y2015-004)</u></p> <p><u>Aquatic Resources Protection Plan, RapidLINK, Sept 2015 (Y2015-019)</u></p> <p><u>Surface Water Quality Monitoring Plan, RapidLINK, Jan 2015 (Y2015-020)</u></p>			

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments							
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
					Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
39.	CMP Section 4.1 - Procedures to obtain regulatory approvals and input from municipal departments. (2009 item number : 32)	York Region	<p>Status - Complete</p> <p>The Y2 DBCR outlines approval requirements - Section 4 Approvals and Permits.</p> <p>Approval processes will be undertaken in detailed design.</p> <p>Section 4.3.3.2 of the Environmental Manual and its associated Permits, Licenses, Approvals and Authorizations (PLAA) Ledger detail the procedure to obtain regulatory approvals and input from municipal departments.</p>	<p>RapidLINK Environmental Manual, Rev.0 November 2014 (ID Y2014-003)</p> <p>Permits, Licenses, Approvals and Authorizations Ledger, Rev.0 November 2014 (ID Y2014-004)</p>	Yes	EF (2014) Closed	<p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Status and Description ... , and</li> <li>- Compliance Document Reference</li> </ul> <p>The text modifications did change the review.</p> <p>The description has changes and the evidence has been removed. As such, this item has been removed from review.</p> <p>In Oct-10, this item was identified as EF. Evidence found to obtain approvals/inputs from TRCA, MOE, NWPA, CEAA, Utilities, Town of Richmond Hill, York Region, and other applicable approvals</p> <p>2014: The documents referenced Environmental Manual and its associated PLAA Ledger were found to support the assertion regarding having procedures.</p>
40.	CMP Section 4.2 - Contractor compliance with the measures stipulated in the technical specifications and contract conditions to mitigate construction effects on the natural environmental features within the influence of the works.	York Region	<p>Status – <b><u>Does Not Apply</u></b></p> <p>Construction is anticipated to commence in 2015.</p> <p><b><u>This is not an EA commitment and therefore is not included in the reporting process.</u></b></p>		No	Closed	<p>Not included in 2009 table of commitments. This does not appear to be an EA commitment but internal processes and therefore not reviewed.</p> <p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description ...</p> <p>The text modifications did not change the review.</p>

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments							
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
					Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
41.	CMP Section 4.2 - Contractor compliance with the measures stipulated in the technical specifications and contract conditions to mitigate construction effects on community activities such as pedestrian and vehicular circulation, access and ambient noise and air quality levels.	York Region	Status – <b>Does Not Apply</b> Construction is anticipated to commence in 2015. <b><u>This is not an EA commitment and therefore is not included in the reporting process.</u></b>		No	Closed	Not included in 2009 table of commitments. This does not appear to be an EA commitment but internal processes and therefore not reviewed. After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description ... The text modifications did not change the review.
42.	CMP Section 4.2 - Compliance, by all parties to construction contracts responsible for public safety and construction management and administration, with the procedures established to manage and mitigate effects on the natural or social environment of accidents or incidents during construction activities.	York Region	Status – <b>Does Not Apply</b> Construction is anticipated to commence in 2015. <b><u>This is not an EA commitment and therefore is not included in the reporting process.</u></b>		No	Closed	Not included in 2009 table of commitments. This does not appear to be an EA commitment but internal processes and therefore not reviewed. After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description ... The text modifications did not change the review.

Note: Monitoring requirements for the Operations and Maintenance Phase (Section 4.3 of the CMP) are not shown here, and will be added prior to commencement of revenue service.

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments								
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
43.	Fisheries and Aquatic Habitat	EA Chapter 12, Table 12-1, Appendix E:  CMP I.D. # 1.1 - Transitway design compliance with [1] MTO's Environmental Protection Requirements for Transportation Planning and Highway Design, Construction, Operation and Maintenance, including the Oak Ridges Moraine Component, and the [2] Environmental Best Practices and a copy of these documents to be obtained during the detailed design phase once they are finalized. (2009 item number : 33)	York Region	<p>Status – Ongoing</p> <p>[2] Y2 north of Elgin Mills Avenue is within the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP) area. The section of Yonge Street from Leonard St to 19th Avenue is referred to in ORM Document Maps as Map 3 and is designated as a Settlement Area.</p> <p>As per Section 18 of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, the undertaking is consistent with York Region's growth and development plans as defined in the York Region Official Plan. The Y2 transitway is part of York Region's system of Regional Centres and Corridors since the transitway serves one of the four Regional Corridors.. For further details, see the following website: <a href="http://www.york.ca/Departments/Planning+and+Development/Long+Range+Planning/Centres+Corridors+and+Subways.htm">http://www.york.ca/Departments/Planning+and+Development/Long+Range+Planning/Centres+Corridors+and+Subways.htm</a>.</p> <p>- The preliminary design of the transitway is primarily within the road right-of-way which minimizes the effects on key natural heritage features. Tributaries 1 and 2 of the Rouge River are located within the Plan Area and constitute as key natural heritage features and hydrologically sensitive features according to the ORMCP. A preliminary Drainage Study, developed through the use of environmental best practices such as the Erosion &amp; Sediment Control Guideline for Urban Construction (December 2006) and the Ministry of Environment's Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual (March 2003), was carried out during preliminary design. The Drainage Study identifies proposed works and mitigation measures which examine and conform to the ORMCP.</p> <p>As per the requirements outlined in Section 45 of the ORMCP, the proposed mitigation measures for Tributaries 1 and 2 of the Rouge River include:Oil/Grit Separators at outlets South of 19th Avenue, South of Devonsleigh Boulevard, North of Naughton Drive, and South of Bernard Avenue;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Permeable pavement within boulevard; and</li> <li>- Matching the existing road grades at the culvert crossing</li> </ul> <p>For further details, refer to Figures 2, 3, and 4 of the preliminary Drainage Study.</p> <p>This issue will be further assessed in detailed design, including a detailed stormwater management plan and consultation with TRCA.</p> <p>The Supplement to Final Drainage Study June 2010(ID#8695) addresses the inclusion of 1.4m wide bike lanes along the corridor. The conclusion is the impact to the drainage design is negligible (less than or equal to 2% increase in flow) and no change to the drainage design will be required.</p> <p><u>A Drainage and Hydrology Report (Y2015-014) prepared by RapidLINK as part of the Detailed Designin accordance with the Preliminary Design. Refer to Appendix G for details on conformance with the ORMCP.</u></p>	<p>[2] [2010]Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue– Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)</p> <p>[2] Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)</p> <p>[2] [2010]Appendix D – Final Drainage Study for VivaNext Y2 Yonge Street (Y.R.1) – June 2010 (ID# 6075)</p> <p>[2] Supplement to Final Drainage Study for vivaNext Y2 June 2010(ID#8695)</p> <p><u>Drainage and Hydrology Design Report, RapidLINK, 2015 (Y2015-014)</u></p>	Yes	<p>[2] EF (2010)</p> <p>[2] EF (2012)</p> <p>[2] EF (2015)</p>	<p>ACR 2010: After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description ... The text modifications did change the review.</p> <p>In Oct-10, the review found this item to be NSE with the following notes:. MOE Environmental Requirements, Oak Ridges Moraine Component, and Environmental Best Practices are identified, but no explicit reference is made to what components or provision commitments of these documents are required and how they are addressed.</p> <p>The revised description that the preliminary design does begin the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will completed and shown in detail design. The evidence supports this.</p> <p>The section of Yonge Street from Leonard St to 19th Avenue being designated as Settlement Area appears to be consistent with the Oak Ridges Moraine Atlas Map found on the MMAH website.</p> <p>Note: In Appendix D, it was not found where the designation of a settlement area was shown.</p> <p>ACR 2012: The evidence (ID#8695) supports the assertion regarding bike lanes and that preliminary design does begin the process of meeting the commitment and will completed in detail design.</p> <p>ACR 2015: Evidence found with respect to Hydrology. The [1] MTO's Environmental Protection Requirements are a operational version of legieslation and as such it may be simpler to include how legislation is adressed in the works. For item [2], it may be similar to show how best practices have been integrated into the process.</p>

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments								
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
44.		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. (2009 item number : 34)	York Region	Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description ... The text modifications did not change the review.
45.		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. (2009 item number : 35)	York Region	Status – <b>Complete</b>  [2010]Culvert extension mitigation work will be discussed with TRCA and addressed in the detailed design stage of the Y2 work, including HADD determination and Fisheries Act authorization as required.  At a meeting with TRCA meeting March 15, 2012 – TRCA indicated that HADD should be avoidable through appropriate design and mitigation.  <b><u>A Request for Review (Y2015-021) was prepared by RapidLINK and submitted to DFO for the extension of a culvert on the Rouge River Tributary, south of Bernard Avenue. DFO reviewed the application and confirmed that a Fisheries Act authorization would not be required for this work. (Y2015-022)</u></b>	TRCA Meeting Minutes H2Y2_MOM_2012-03-15 Update to TRCA_R00_2012-04-30_BJW.pdf (ID#8500)  <b><u>DFO Request for Review (Y2015-021)</u></b>  <b><u>DFO Response Letter to Request for Review (Y2015-022)</u></b>	No	EF (2012)  EF (2015) Closed	ACR 2010: After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description ... The text modifications did not change the review.  ACR 2012: Status changes to Ongoing as work was done. The evidence (ID#8500) supports the assertion regarding FAA and more work will be done in detail design.  <b><u>ACR 2015:</u></b> <b><u>The evidence (Y2015-022) supports the assertion regarding FAA. This items is closed</u></b>
46.		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. (2009 item number : 36)	York Region	Status - Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description ... The text modifications did not change the review.
47.		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. (2009 item number : 37)	York Region	Status - Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description ... The text modifications did not change the review.

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments								
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
48.		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 (2009 item number : 38)	York Region	<p>Status – <b>Complete</b>.</p> <p>[2010]A preliminary Drainage Study was carried out during preliminary design, which identified the impacts of the proposed work and preliminary mitigation strategies. Provision for in-stream work and site-specific mitigation measures, along with erosion and sediment control requirements, will be further developed in the detailed design phase.</p> <p>The Supplement to Final Drainage Study June 2010(ID#8695) addresses the inclusion of 1.4m wide bike lanes along the corridor. The conclusion is the impact to the drainage design is negligible (less than or equal to 2% increase in flow) and no change to the drainage design will be required.</p> <p><b>Table 8 from the Natural Science Report includes the following mitigation measures applicable to Y2 (evidence of mitigation measure in brackets):</b>  <u>[1]-Erosion and Sediment Control (Y2015-028)</u>  <u>[2]-Level 1 Stormwater Treatment (Y2015-014)</u>  <u>[3]-Revise cross-section to reduce footprint area (Y2015-037)</u>  <u>[4]-Use headwalls, wingwalls, and guiderail to reduce length of culvert extension (Y2015-037)</u>  <u>[5]-In water construction timing restriction (Y2015-019)</u>  <u>[6]-Perform in-water works in the dry (Y2015-019)</u>  <u>[7]-Match inverts of existing culverts (Y2015-037)</u></p>	<p>[2010] Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue– Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)</p> <p>Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)</p> <p>[2010] Appendix D – Final Drainage Study for Viva Next Y2 Yonge Street (Y.R.1) – June 2010 (ID# 6075)</p> <p>Supplement to Final Drainage Study for vivaNext Y2 June 2010 (ID#8695)</p> <p><u>Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, RapidLINK, 2015 (Y2015-028)</u></p> <p><u>Aquatic Resources Protection Plan, RapidLINK, 2015 (Y2015-019)</u></p> <p><u>Y2.2 Structural Culvert and Retaining Wall Design Drawings (Y2015-037)</u></p>	No	<p>EF (2010)</p> <p>EF (2012)</p> <p>EF (2015)</p> <p>All items closed</p>	<p>ACR 2010: After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description ... The text modifications did change the review.</p> <p>In Oct-10, it was UNCLEAR with the following notes. The status column indicates that all actions to be undertaken in the future (i.e., "will be" and "shall be"). Therefore, it is unclear how the final documents cited relate. This should be clarified.</p> <p>This clarification was provided.</p> <p>The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown in detail design. The evidence supports this.</p> <p>ACR 2012: The evidence (ID#8695) supports the assertion and that preliminary design does begin the process of meeting the commitment and will completed in detail design.</p> <p>ACR 2015: Numbering added for clarity. The evidence provided supports the assertion</p>
49.	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[1]. 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.[2] (2009 item number : 39)	York Region	<p>Status – <b>Ongoing</b>.</p> <p>EA Appendix E, Section 4.2.3 &amp; 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.</p> <p>Well inspection to be undertaken immediately prior to construction, anticipated to be in 2015.</p> <p><b>As per the Groundwater Management Plan (Y2015-027), letters have been drafted to be sent to six addresses where a private well has been identified, inviting the occupant to participate in a well survey, should they have a well on their property. These letters and subsequent well surveys are anticipated to be completed prior to the end of 2015.</b></p> <p><b>Well decommissioning was completed in 2015 as per the Well Decommissioning Plan (Y2015-012). Well decommissioning records are provided (Y2015-023).</b></p>	<p><u>Well Decommissioning Records, RapidLINK 2015 (Y2015-023)</u></p> <p><u>Well Decommissioning Plan (Y2015-012)</u></p> <p><u>Groundwater Management Plan, RapidLINK, 2015 (Y2015-027)</u></p>	Yes	<p>EF (2015) [2]</p> <p>is closed</p>	<p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description ... The text modifications did not change the review.</p> <p>ACR 2015: Numbering added for clarity. The evidence provided (Y2015-023, and -12) supports the assertion for [2]. Item [2] is closed. Item 1 is ongoing, and the evidence provided (Y2015-023) supports that it is ongoing.</p>

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments								
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
50.	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 [1] MOE's Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual (2003) and [2] compliance with the objectives in Section 46(1) of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP). (2009 item number : 40)	York Region	<p>Status – <b>Complete</b></p> <p>[1] [2010] A preliminary Drainage Study was prepared during preliminary design. The Stormwater Management Plan will be completed in the detailed design phase.</p> <p>[2] [2010] Y2 DBCR - Appendix D - Examines the ORM Component - Y2 PE Design is conformant.</p> <p>[1,2] The Supplement to Final Drainage Study June 2010 (ID#8695) addresses the inclusion of 1.4m wide bike lanes along the corridor. The conclusion is the impact to the drainage design is negligible (less than or equal to 2% increase in flow) and no change to the drainage design will be required.</p> <p><b><u>A Drainage and Hydrology Report (Y2015-014) prepared by RapidLINK as part of the Detailed Designing accordance with the Preliminary Design. Refer to Appendix G for details on conformance with the ORMCP.</u></b></p>	<p>[1,2] [2010] Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue– Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)</p> <p>[1,2] Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)</p> <p>[1,2] [2010] Appendix D – Final Drainage Study for Viva Next Y2 Yonge Street (Y.R.1) – June 2010 (ID# 6075)</p> <p>[1,2] Supplement to Final Drainage Study for vivaNext Y2 June 2010 (ID#8695)</p> <p><b><u>Drainage and Hydrology Design Report, RapidLINK, 2015 (Y2015-014)</u></b></p>	Yes	<p>[1] EF (2010)</p> <p>[2] EF (2010)</p> <p>[2] EF (2010)</p> <p>[1,2] EF (2012)</p> <p>[1,2] EF (2015)</p> <p>Closed</p>	<p>ACR 2010: After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description ... The text modifications did not change the review.</p> <p>[1 and 2] SWMP to be completed in the detailed design phase. The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown in detail design. The evidence supports this.</p> <p>Appendix D drainage study shows that protection and mitigation measures will be incorporated, including OGS, permeable pavers and tree pit/planting areas which appears to be consistent with Section 46(1) of the ORMCP. However, the SWMP is to be completed in detailed design.</p> <p><b>ACR 2012:</b> The evidence (ID#8695) supports the assertion and that preliminary design does begin the process of meeting the commitment and will completed in detail design.</p> <p>ACR 2015: The evidence (Y2015-014) supports the assertion regarding [1] MOE guide and [2]ORMP. These items are closed.</p>

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments								
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
51.		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. (2009 item number : 41)	York Region	<p>Status –<u>Complete</u></p> <p>A preliminary Drainage Study was prepared during preliminary design and examines the ORMCP requirements. Appendix G, Erosion and Sediment Control, of the Drainage Study discusses proposed erosion and sediment control measures, designs, notes for construction, and a contingency plan which are conformant to Section 45(2) of the ORMCP.</p> <p>The Stormwater Management Plan will be completed in the detailed design phase.</p> <p>The Supplement to Final Drainage Study June 2010(ID#8695) addresses the inclusion of 1.4m wide bike lanes along the corridor. The conclusion is the impact to the drainage design is negligible (less than or equal to 2% increase in flow) and no change to the drainage design will be required.</p> <p><u>The four best practices identified in Section 45(2) of the ORMCP include: minimal removal of vegetation, grading and soil compaction; keeping all sediment that is eroded during construction within the site; seeding or sodding exposed soils as soon as possible after construction; keeping chemical applications to suppress dust and control pests and vegetation to a minimum.</u></p> <p><u>These best practices are reflected in the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, Terrestrial Resources Protection Plan, and Aquatic Resources Protection Plan (Y2015-019, Y2015-028, Y2015-029). The implementation of these plans is monitored using the Daily Environmental Inspection Checklists (Y2015-030)</u></p>	<p>[2010] Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue– Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)</p> <p>Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)</p> <p>[2010] Appendix D – Final Drainage Study for Viva Next Y2 Yonge Street (Y.R.1) – June 2010 (ID# 6075)</p> <p>Supplement to Final Drainage Study for vivaNext Y2 June 2010 (ID#8695)</p> <p><u>Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, RapidLINK, 2015 (Y2015-028)</u></p> <p><u>Aquatic Resources Protection Plan, RapidLINK, 2015 (Y2015-019)</u></p> <p><u>Terrestrial Resources Protection Plan, RapidLINK, 2015 (Y2015-029)</u></p> <p><u>Daily Inspection Checklist (Y2015-030)</u></p>	Yes	<p>EC (2010)</p> <p>EF (2012)</p> <p>EF (2015)</p> <p>All items closed</p>	<p>ACR 2010: After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description ... The text modifications did change the review</p> <p>The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown in detail design. The evidence supports this. However, in the Oct-2010 review, the item was noted as NSE with the following notes: It is unclear how the draft SWMP demonstrates compliance. The ORMCP does not recognize the TRCA "Erosion and Sediment Control Guidelines for Urban Construction" and the MOE "Stormwater Management Planning and Design Guidelines" as being compliant with Section 46(2). In other words, following the TRCA and MOE guidelines may not satisfy the ORMCP requirements. In the future, the link to how the final SWMP complies with each of subsections of Section 45(2) of the ORMCP should be made.</p> <p>ACR 2012: The evidence (ID#8695) supports the assertion that preliminary design does begin the process of meeting the commitment and will completed in detail design.</p> <p>ACR 2015: The evidence (Y2015-028,-019,-029,-030) support the assertion. This items is closed.</p>
52.		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. (2009 item number : 42)	York Region	<p>Status – <u>Complete</u></p> <p>[2010]A preliminary Drainage Study was prepared during preliminary design and examines the ORMCP requirements. New stormwater management ponds are not proposed for the Y2 segment. The Stormwater Management Plan will be completed in the detailed design phase.</p> <p>The Supplement to Final Drainage Study June 2010(ID#8695) addresses the inclusion of 1.4m wide bike lanes along the corridor. The conclusion is the impact to the drainage design is negligible (less than or equal to 2% increase in flow) and no change to the drainage design will be required.</p> <p><u>As per the Drainage and Hydrology Report (Y2015-014), no new stormwater management ponds are proposed for construction.</u></p>	<p>[2010] Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue– Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)</p> <p>Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)</p> <p>[2010] Appendix D – Final Drainage Study for Viva Next Y2 Yonge Street (Y.R.1) – June 2010 (ID# 6075)</p> <p>Supplement to Final Drainage Study for vivaNext Y2 June 2010 (ID#8695)</p> <p><u>Drainage and Hydrology Design Report RapidLINK, 2015 (Y2015-014)</u></p>	Yes	<p>EF (2010)</p> <p>EF (2012)</p> <p>EF (2015)</p> <p>All items closed</p>	<p>ACR 2010:After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description ... The text modifications did not change the review that no evidence of storm water management ponds was found. The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown in detail design. The evidence supports this.</p> <p>ACR 2012:The evidence (ID#8695) supports the assertion that preliminary design does begin the process of meeting the commitment and will completed in detail design.</p> <p>ACR 2015:The evidence (Y2015-014) supports the assertion . this item is closed</p>

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments								
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
53.		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. (2009 item number : 43)	York Region	<p>Status – <b>Complete</b></p> <p>[2010] A preliminary Drainage Study was prepared during preliminary design and provides strategies for stormwater management as follows: "Stormwater from the new Yonge Street layout will be treated by proposed off-line oil/grit separators (OGS) within the Yonge Street corridor. This will improve the overall water quality as currently all surface water, including untreated oil and grit, is carried into the existing watercourses." The preliminary drainage strategy complies with the MOE water quality guideline of Enhanced Level (80% total suspended solids removal).</p> <p>The preliminary Drainage Study also examines ORM requirements.</p> <p>The drainage requirements including a detailed Stormwater Management Plan will be completed in the detailed design phase. Consultation with TRCA will be carried out in detailed design to obtain required permits and approvals.</p> <p>The Supplement to Final Drainage Study June 2010(ID#8695) addresses the inclusion of 1.4m wide bike lanes along the corridor. The conclusion is the impact to the drainage design is negligible (less than or equal to 2% increase in flow) and no change to the drainage design will be required.</p> <p><u>The Drainage and Hydrology Report (Y2015-014) prepared by RapidLINK as part of the Detailed Design indicates that the preliminary design for the EA was developed following the MOE Stormwater planning and Design Manual.</u></p> <p><u>The final drainage design complies with the MOE water quality guideline of Enhanced Level (80% total suspended solids removal).</u></p>	<p>[2010] Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue– Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)</p> <p>Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)</p> <p>[2010] Appendix D – Final Drainage Study for Viva Next Y2 Yonge Street (Y.R.1) – June 2010 (ID# 6075)</p> <p>Supplement to Final Drainage Study for vivaNext Y2 June 2010 (ID#8695)</p> <p><u>Drainage and Hydrology Design Report, RapidLINK, 2015 (Y2015-014)</u></p>	Yes	<p>EF (2010)</p> <p>EF (2012)</p> <p>EF (2015)</p> <p>All items closed</p>	<p>ACR 2010: After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description ... The text modifications did change the review.</p> <p>In the 2009 review, the item was noted as ENF with the following notes: Lack of evidence citing that TRCA had agreed it was not feasible to meet their condition</p> <p>The revised description has removed the assertion of TRCA agreement.</p> <p>Appendix D – Drainage Study, Page 7 (Design Criteria) states that the proposed OGS are designed to remove 80% of Total Suspended Solids.</p> <p>However, the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown in detail design. The evidence supports this.</p> <p>ACR 2012: The evidence (ID#8695) supports the assertion .</p> <p>ACR 2015: The evidence (Y2015-014) supports the assertion. This item is closed</p>

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments								
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
54.		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. (2009 item number : 44)	York Region	<p>Status – <b>Complete</b></p> <p>[2010]A preliminary Drainage Study was prepared during preliminary design and provides strategies for stormwater management and ORM requirements. As per Section 46(2) of the ORMCP, the Preliminary Drainage Report identifies treatment approaches that minimize the impacts of the road widening for the transitway. The Drainage Report does not identify lot level controls that direct roof discharge to rear yard ponding areas or the use of wet ponds due to lack of space within the road right-of way. There may be conveyance controls such as grassed swales, if space permits, but this will be determined in the detail design phase. The drainage requirements including a detailed Stormwater Management Plan will be completed in the detailed design phase. Thorough examination of recommendations outlined in the Rouge River Water Shed Plan and consultation with TRCA, will be carried out in detailed design to obtain required permits and approvals.</p> <p>The Supplement to Final Drainage Study June 2010(ID#8695) addresses the inclusion of 1.4m wide bike lanes along the corridor. The conclusion is the impact to the drainage design is negligible (less than or equal to 2% increase in flow) and no change to the drainage design will be required.</p> <p><b><u>The Drainage and Hydrology Report (Y2015-014) prepared by RapidLINK as part of the Detailed Design indicates that OGS units will provide water quality treatment prior to discharge to Rouge River and Don River. A treatment train approach was evaluated during the EA and discarded due to lack of available space within the right of way.</u></b></p>	<p>[2010] Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue– Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)</p> <p>Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)</p> <p>[2010] Appendix D – Final Drainage Study for Viva Next Y2 Yonge Street (Y.R.1) – June 2010 (ID# 6075)</p> <p>Supplement to Final Drainage Study for vivaNext Y2 June 2010 (ID#8695)</p> <p><b><u>Drainage and Hydrology Design Report, RapidLINK, 2015 (Y2015-014)</u></b></p>	Yes	<p>EF (2010)</p> <p>EF (2012)</p> <p>EF (2015)</p> <p>All items closed</p>	<p>ACR 2010: After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description ... The text modifications did change the review</p> <p>In the 2009 review, the item was noted as NSE with the following notes The commitment cited refers to Section 46(2) of the ORMCP. It is unclear how the reference to Section 46(3) is relevant.</p> <p>It is unclear how the draft SWMP demonstrates compliance. The ORMCP does not recognize the TRCA "Erosion and Sediment Control Guidelines for Urban Construction" and the MOE "Stormwater Management Planning and Design Guidelines" as being compliant with Section 46(2). In other words, following the TRCA and MOE guidelines may not satisfy the ORMCP requirements.</p> <p>Appendix D does not make an explicit link to how their SWMP complies with each of Subsections A, B, and C of Section 46(2) of the ORMCP. This link should be made."</p> <p>The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown in detail design. The evidence supports this.</p> <p>ACR 2012: The evidence (ID#8695) supports the assertion that preliminary design does begin the process of meeting the commitment and will completed in detail design.</p> <p>ACR2015: The evidence (Y2015-014) supports the assertion. This item is closed</p>

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments								
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
55.		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. (2009 item number : 45)	York Region	<p>Status – <b>Complete</b></p> <p>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).</p> <p>[2010] A preliminary Drainage Study was prepared during preliminary design and provides strategies for stormwater management and ORM requirements. No conditions that would trigger the requirements of Section 46(3) of the ORMCP have been identified.</p> <p>[2010] The drainage requirements including a detailed Stormwater Management Plan will be completed in the detailed design phase. Consultation with TRCA will be carried out in detailed design to obtain required permits and approvals.</p> <p>The Supplement to Final Drainage Study June 2010(ID#8695) addresses the inclusion of 1.4m wide bike lanes along the corridor. The conclusion is the impact to the drainage design is negligible (less than or equal to 2% increase in flow) and no change to the drainage design will be required.</p> <p><b><u>A Drainage and Hydrology Report (Y2015-014) prepared by RapidLINK as part of the Detailed design in accordance with the Preliminary Design. New OGS units will provide water quality treatment prior to discharge to Rouge River and Don River. A treatment train approach was evaluated during the EA and discarded due to lack of available space within the right of way.</u></b></p>	<p>[2010] Yonge Street Rapidway - Highway 7 to 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue– Preliminary Engineering - Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)</p> <p>Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)</p> <p>[2010] Appendix D – Final Drainage Study for Viva Next Y2 Yonge Street (Y.R.1) – June 2010 (ID# 6075)</p> <p>Supplement to Final Drainage Study for vivaNext Y2 June 2010 (ID#8695)</p> <p><b><u>Drainage and Hydrology Design Report, RapidLINK, 2015 (Y2015-014)</u></b></p>	Yes	<p>EF (2010)</p> <p>EF (2012)</p> <p>ENF (2015)</p>	<p>ACR 2010: After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description ... The text modifications did change the review. In the Oct-2010 review, the item was noted as ENF with the following notes: The commitment is to make a SWMP in accordance with the Rouge River Comprehensive Basin Management Study. Evidence should be provided that this commitment is no longer required (i.e. do not trigger the requirements of Section 46(3)). The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown in detail design. The rationale for not being in the Rouge River Comprehensive Basin Management Study area should be provided at that time. ACR 2012: The evidence (ID#8695) supports the assertion that preliminary design does begin the process of meeting the commitment and will completed in detail design. <b><u>ACR 2015: The evidence (Y2015-014) was not found to support that the drainage design was prepared in accordance with the RRCBMS 1990.</u></b></p>
56.		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. (2009 item number : 56)	York Region	<p>Status – <b>Complete</b></p> <p>[2010] A preliminary Drainage Study was prepared during preliminary design and provides strategies for stormwater management and ORM requirements. There are no rapid infiltration basins and column facilities proposed for the Y2 segment.</p> <p>[2010] The drainage requirements including a detailed Stormwater Management Plan will be completed in the detailed design phase. Consultation with TRCA will be carried out in detailed design to obtain required permits and approvals.</p> <p>The Supplement to Final Drainage Study June 2010(ID#8695) addresses the inclusion of 1.4m wide bike lanes along the corridor. The conclusion is the impact to the drainage design is negligible (less than or equal to 2% increase in flow) and no change to the drainage design will be required.</p> <p><b><u>A Drainage and Hydrology Report (Y2015-014) prepared by RapidLINK as part of the Detailed design in accordance with the Preliminary Design. No new infiltration basins and column facilities are included in the design.</u></b></p>	<p>[2010] Yonge Street Rapidway Highway 7 – 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue - Preliminary Engineering – Design Basis and Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)</p> <p>Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)</p> <p>[2010] Appendix D – Final Drainage Study for Viva Next Y2 Yonge Street (Y.R.1) – June 2010 (ID# 6075)</p> <p>Supplement to Final Drainage Study for vivaNext Y2 June 2010 (ID#8695)</p> <p><b><u>Drainage and Hydrology Design Report, RapidLINK, 2015 (Y2015-014)</u></b></p>	Yes	<p>EF (2009)</p> <p>EF (2012)</p> <p>EF (2015) Closed (2015)</p>	<p>ACR 2010:After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description ... The text modifications did not change the review In 2009 review, the item was noted as ECF with the following notes: No evidence of new rapid infiltration basins and new rapid infiltration columns were found in the Drainage Study. The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown in detail design. The evidence supports this. ACR 2012:The evidence (ID#8695) supports the assertion that preliminary design does begin the process of meeting the commitment and will completed in detail design. <b><u>ACR 2015: The evidence (Y2015-014) supports the assertion that no new rapid infiltration basins have been used. This item is closed.</u></b></p>

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments								
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
57.		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. (2009 item number : 47)	York Region	Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	
58.		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. (2009 item number : 48)	York Region	<p>Status – <b>Complete</b></p> <p>[2010]A preliminary Drainage Study was prepared during preliminary design and provides strategies for stormwater management and erosion and sediment control. Refer to Appendix G of the Drainage Study for further details on the proposed Erosion and Sediment Control Plans.</p> <p>[2010]The drainage requirements including a detailed Stormwater Management Plan and Erosion and Sediment Control Plan will be completed in the detailed design phase. Consultation with TRCA will be carried out in detailed design to obtain required permits and approvals.</p> <p>The Supplement to Final Drainage Study June 2010(ID#8695) addresses the inclusion of 1.4m wide bike lanes along the corridor. The conclusion is the impact to the drainage design is negligible (less than or equal to 2% increase in flow) and no change to the drainage design will be required.</p> <p><b><u>An Erosion and Sediment Control Plan was prepared by RapidLINK as part of the detailed design. (Y2015-028)</u></b></p>	<p>[2010] Yonge Street Rapidway Highway 7 – 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue - Preliminary Engineering – Design Basis and Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)</p> <p>Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)</p> <p>[2010] Appendix D – Final Drainage Study for Viva Next Y2 Yonge Street (Y.R.1) – June 2010 (ID# 6075)</p> <p>Supplement to Final Drainage Study for vivaNext Y2 June 2010 (ID#8695)</p> <p><b><u>Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, RapidLINK, 2015 (Y2015-028)</u></b></p>	Yes	<p>EF (2009)</p> <p>EF (2012)</p> <p>EF (2015) Closed</p>	<p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description ... The text modifications did not change the review</p> <p>In 2009 review, the item was noted as EF.</p> <p>The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown in detail design. The evidence supports this.</p> <p>ACR 2012: The evidence (ID#8695) supports the assertion that preliminary design does begin the process of meeting the commitment and will be completed in detail design.</p> <p>ACR 2015: The evidence (Y2015-028) supports the assertion. This item is closed.</p>

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments								
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
59.	Groundwater	<p>Proponent Response to Government Review Team Comments:</p> <p>CMP I.D. # 6 - The need for any dewatering and any additional analysis needed to determine if linkages exist between [1] dewatering and [2] local surface features and [3] any resulting mitigation requirements. Detailed geotechnical and hydrogeological studies addressing impacts (2009 item number : 49)</p>	York Region	<p>Status – <b>Complete</b></p> <p>[2010]A Pavement Design Report was prepared during preliminary design including borehole testing at various locations along the corridor. Free water was not encountered in any of the boreholes.</p> <p>The EA Proponent's response in the EA was 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."</p> <p>Foundation investigations for culvert extensions (if required) and retaining walls will be carried out in detailed design, including recommendations for dewatering.</p> <p>Approvals for dewatering (if required) will be obtained during detailed design.</p> <p>The Supplement to Final Drainage Study addresses the inclusion of 1.4m wide bike lanes along the corridor. The conclusion is the impact to the drainage design is negligible (less than or equal to 2% increase in flow) and no change to the drainage design will be required.</p> <p><u>PTTWs have been obtained for Y2.1 and Y2.2. (Y2015-025, Y2015-026). A Groundwater Management Plan was prepared by RapidLINK (Y2015-027) to outline the guidelines and procedures to ensure that groundwater is managed according to applicable legislation, municipal bylaws and industry Best Management Practices.</u></p>	<p>[2010] Yonge Street Rapidway Highway 7 – 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue - Preliminary Engineering – Design Basis and Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)</p> <p>Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)</p> <p>[2010] Appendix B – Final Pavement Design Report for New Median Rapidway Along Yonge Street from Langstaff Road to Major Mackenzie Drive and from Levensdale Road to 19th Avenue, Region of York, Ontario – June 2009 (ID# 4634)</p> <p>[2010] Appendix D – Final Drainage Study for Viva Next Y2 Yonge Street (Y.R.1) – June 2010 (ID# 6075)</p> <p>Supplement to Final Drainage Study for vivaNext Y2 June 2010 (ID#8695)</p> <p><u>Y2.1 PTTW 1042-9Y2SDR, RapidLINK, 2015 (Y2015-025)</u></p> <p><u>Y2.2 PTTW 1618-A2LRGT, RapidLINK, 2015 (Y2015-026)</u></p> <p><u>Groundwater Management Plan, RapidLINK, 2015 (Y2015-027)</u></p>	Yes	<p>EF (2010)</p> <p>EF (2012)</p> <p>EF (2015) Closed</p>	<p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description ... The text modifications did not change the review</p> <p>In the Oct-10 review, the item was noted as EF with the following notes: Appendix D – Drainage Study indicates on page 7 that free water was not encountered in any of the boreholes. The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown in detail design. The evidence supports this.</p> <p><b>ACR 2012:</b> The evidence (ID#8695) supports the assertion and that preliminary design does begin the process of meeting the commitment and will be completed in detail design. The following assertion does not appear relevant to this item: <i>Pavement Design Report has been updated to reflect the decision to use "long life pavement"</i> <b>Please advise for the for the 2013 review.</b></p> <p>2012 edit: the status and compliance document reference columns were updated by the Owner Engineer to remove text. The text modifications did not change the review.</p> <p>ACR 2015: The evidence (Y2015-025,-026,-027) support the assertion. This item is closed.</p>

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments								
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		Notes
						Review 2015	Review Results	
60.	Contaminated Soil	EA Chapter 12, Table 12-1 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. (2009 item number : 50)	York Region	Status – <b>Complete</b>  Contingency planning to address contaminated sites will be considered during the detailed design phase, based on the results of Phase 1 ESAs to be undertaken in 2014 for property acquisition.  The DBA Schedule 18 - Impacted Material, Disclosed Conditions and Undisclosed Conditions and the Geotechnical and Geo-environmental Investigations Plan (Component-Specific Environmental Management Plan), constitute procedures to address impacted materials and waste management during construction and utility relocation. Under development is the Waste Management and Contamination Plan (Generic Environmental Management Plan) which will further include additional procedures for the management of impacted materials.  <b><u>A Waste Management and Contamination Plan (WMCP) was prepared as part of the Detailed Design (Y2015-024). This plans outlines procedures to follow in the event that contaminated sites are identified after construction activities begin.</u></b>	<b>WMCP and Earth MP, RapidLINK, 2015 (Y2015-024)</b>	Yes	EF (2015) [2] is closed	ACR 2015: The evidence (Y2015-025,-026,-027) support the assertion. This item is closed.
61.	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. (2009 item number : 51)	York Region	Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments								
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
62.	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. (2009 item number : 52)	York Region	<p>Status – <b>Complete</b></p> <p>Strategic planning for parking needs for the Viva corridors commenced during the preliminary design phase as a separate study, and will continue to be developed. [1]</p> <p>The Urban Street Design Standards references parking guidelines for on-street parking based on the posted speed limit for the street.[2]</p> <p>On-street parking can help lower speeds, increase commercial activity and provides buffer between the roadway and the pedestrian realm</p> <p><b>Commuter Park &amp; Ride Strategy developed and presented to Council.</b></p>	<p>Eight Steps to A Viva Park-and-Ride Strategy (ID#1037)</p> <p>Memo - Viva Cornell Terminal Park-and-Ride Development – Preliminary Analysis of Alternatives (ID#1117)</p> <p>Memo - To: Terry Gohde From: Al Raine Re: VIVA Park-and-Ride Initiative Dates: September 29, 2006 (ID#1739)</p> <p>Commuter Park N Ride Strategy Work Plan Description (ID#978)</p> <p>Technical Memorandum – Park-and-Ride Best Practices (Draft) – January 25, 2008 (ID#2232)</p> <p>Technical Memorandum – Park-and-Ride Siting Criteria and Methodology - (Draft) – February 29, 2008 (ID#2363).</p> <p>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</p> <p>Urban Street Design Standards Technical Report 2011-09-14 (ID#7235)</p> <p><b>York Region Rapid Transit Corporation, Commuter Park &amp; Ride Strategy, Final Report, June 2009 (ID# YR15-102)</b></p> <p><b>Council Agenda and Council Minutes, May 20, 2009 (annotated to identify relevant agenda item (ID# YR15-103 and YR15-104)</b></p>	Yes	<p>EF (2012)</p> <p>EF (2015)</p> <p>Closed (2015)</p>	<p>ACR 2010: After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description ... The text modifications did change the review</p> <p>In the Oct-10 review, the item was not reviewed</p> <p>The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown in detail design. The evidence supporting this assertion could be reviewed.</p> <p>ACR 2012: The evidence (ID#7235) supports the assertions regarding [2] on-street parking and that the process of meeting the commitment has begun preliminary engineering and will be completed in detail design [1].</p> <p>ACR 2015: The evidence (YR15-102, -104) supports the assertions regarding a parking strategy. Item is closed .</p>
63.	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. (2009 item number : 53)	York Region	Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		No		After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description ... The text modifications did not change the review

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments								
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
64.	Archaeological Resources	<p>Proponent Response to Government Review Team Comments and Appendix J:</p> <p>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. (2009 item number : 54)</p>	York Region	<p>Status – Ongoing</p> <p>Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment, and any subsequent archaeological assessment required, will be undertaken during the detail design phase. Consultation with the Ministry of Culture and First Nations (Six Nations of the Grand River) will also be carried out following completion of the Stage 2 assessment.</p> <p>Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment has been completed for most of the corridor. Remaining 4 properties to be completed prior to construction. Final reports to be circulated to First Nations upon completion of all studies.</p> <p><u>Refer to Item 18.</u></p>	<p>Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of Yonge Street, Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 West of Yonge Street and Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 East of Yonge Street, Geographic Townships of Vaughan and Markham, Town of Richmond Hill, Regional Municipality of York, December 2013. (ID# Y2004-005)</p> <p>Correspondence from Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Recreation regarding Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of Yonge Street, Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 West of Yonge Street and Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 East of Yonge Street, March 19, 2014 (ID# Y2004-005)</p>	No	EF (2014)	<p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description ... The text modifications did not change the review</p> <p>2014: Archaeological Assessment and correspondence have been provided as evidence.</p> <p>ACR 2015: Not reviewed as evidence was not available.</p>
65.	Heritage Resources/ Cultural Landscape	<p>EA Section 11.3.2, EA Chapter 12, Table 12-1</p> <p>CMP I.D. # 12 - Continue to work with Thornhill Heritage Committee during the design phase with respect to the existing community settings.</p> <p>Relocation or burying of hydro lines where widening places lines unacceptably close to existing culturally sensitive areas.</p> <p>Consultation with municipal heritage planners, heritage committees and other local heritage stakeholders, specifically Markham Heritage regarding preservation of two built heritage features on Langstaff MSF site.</p> <p>Design solutions adopted for curb-side stations in Richmond Hill CBD to avoid adverse effects on cultural heritage buildings. (2009 item number : 55)</p>	York Region	<p>Status – Does not apply.</p> <p>Does not apply to segment Y2.</p> <p>Does not apply to segment Y2.</p> <p>Does not apply to segment Y2.No changes to existing curbside stops in the Richmond Hill CBD are proposed as part of this project.</p>		No	Closed	<p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description ... and compliance Document Reference. The text modifications did not change the review but the following notes made in are no applicable "Owner Engineer indicated that this was not relevant to Y2. via email September 18, 2009. If not relevant then this should be indicated in the table."</p> <p>However, the status is marked as completed and may be better noted as Does not apply...</p>

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments								
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
66.	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. (2009 item number : 56)	York Region	Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description ... and Compliance Document Reference. The text modifications did not change the review
67.	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 [1] including consultation with school board officials [2] to ensure safe, uninterrupted access to schools affected by the works. (2009 item number : 57)	York Region	Status – ongoing.  [2010] Traffic management concepts and plans have been developed during Y2 PE Design. Measures have been referenced in the Y2 DBCR: Refinement During Detail Design (Section 3.7), Construction Specifications (Section 2.3.21), Measures to be further developed in the detailed design phase, including consultation with affected stakeholders.  Equivalent references to Section 3 – Facilities Design of the Draft Design Basis & Criteria Report can be found in Section 3 of ID#8035. The standard details have been developed as part of the H3 detailed design project and subsequent segments will be referencing the H3 DBCR.	[2010] Yonge Street Rapidway Highway 7 – 19 <sup>th</sup> Avenue - Preliminary Engineering – Design Basis and Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)  Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis & Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)  Highway 7 Rapidway, Segment H3 – Yonge St to Kennedy Rd*, Preliminary Engineering Design Basis & Criteria Report, Update to Dec 2009 Final Version, Final Draft, November 2011 (ID#8035)	No	EF (2010)	ACR 2010: After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was added in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description... and Compliance Document Reference. The text modifications did change the review In the Oct-10 review, the item was not reviewed The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown in detail design. ACR 2012: It is not clear how the evidence (ID#s 8695 and 8035) supports the assertions regarding construction access for schools. 2012 Edit: upon discussion with the Owner Engineer this item was clarified as having no further work until the construction phase. The item was changed to Not Reviewed.

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments								
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
68.	Safety of traffic and pedestrian circulation and access during rapid transit operations	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 measures and operating procedures adopted in the preparation of the detailed design solution.  [1] Analysis of the need for speed limit reductions to address safety concerns.  [2] Inclusion of numerical countdown pedestrian lights in detailed design. (2009 item number : 58)	York Region	<p>Status – <b>Completed</b>.</p> <p>Safety features built into the preliminary design include station platform railings, station canopy rear wall, station canopy, station platform edge treatment and platform height, etc. These elements will be further developed and finalized in detailed design.</p> <p>[1] [2010] The Y2 DBCR indicates provisions to be made with respect to speed limit (DBCR Sections 2.3.1 BRT Standards, 2.3.4 Posted Speed, etc.). Detailed design will include analysis and recommendations for intersection crosswalk timing to meet pedestrian safety requirements.</p> <p>Email from YR indicating speed to be set at 60km/h for corridor [1] (E-mail September 21 2012 adopting system wide 60km speed limit)</p> <p>[2] Countdown signals will be provided at all signalized intersections (Y2 DBCR Section 2.3.12.4 – Platform Safety). Signal design will be completed in detailed design.</p> <p><b><u>A Traffic Analysis Report was prepared during Detailed Design. The purpose of this study is to provide a detailed analysis of traffic operations along the VivaNext Yonge Street rapidway segments during both construction staging and post-construction conditions. Section 5.2 of the report provides analysis for pedestrian crossings [2]. Section 9 of the report provides analysis of posted speed limits [1].</u></b></p>	<p>[1, 2] [2010] Yonge Street Rapidway Highway 7 – 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue -Preliminary Engineering – Design Basis and Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)</p> <p>[1, 2] Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)</p> <p>[1] E-mail September 21, 2012 adopting system wide 60km speed limit (ID#9006)</p> <p><b><u>90 pct Traffic Analysis Report, Sections 5.2 and 9, RapidLINK, June 2015 (Y2015-003)</u></b></p>	Yes	<p>[1] EF (2010)</p> <p>[2] EF (2010)</p> <p>[1] EF (2012)</p> <p>[1,2] EF (2015)</p> <p>[1,2] Closed</p>	<p>ACR 2010:</p> <p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was added in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description... and Compliance Document Reference. The text modifications did not change the review</p> <p>The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown in detail design. The evidence supports this.</p> <p>With respect to speed, Section 2.3.1 BRT Standards has provisions for Maximum Design Speed, and Section 2.3.4 has provisions for posted speed. Section 2.3.12.4 has a provision for "pedestrian "safe havens" on the median, if possible, at all east-west crosswalks and install countdown signals at all crosswalks"</p> <p><b>ACR 2012:</b></p> <p>[1] The evidence (ID#9006) references H2-VMC and does not appear to apply to Y2 (i.e. the use of a 60 km/h design speed is a system-wide decision). However, the OE provided the following additional information that supports assertion [1]. The Region has a policy (<a href="#">Report No. 4 of the Transportation Services Committee Regional Council Meeting of April 21, 2011</a>) of having a speed limit of 60 km/h on streets in urban areas, towns and villages (including Y2),</p> <p>which was endorsed by Council (<a href="#">Minutes of Council – April 21, 2011 Council of the Regional Municipality of York</a>). This is supported by email from York Region (<a href="mailto:Gary.Cosgrove@york.ca">Gary.Cosgrove@york.ca</a>, Sent: December 14, 2012 4:21 PM.) The Status column and Compliance Document Reference column should be revised to reflect the above.</p> <p>ACR 2015:</p> <p>[2] The evidence (Y2015-003) supports the assertion. This item is closed. However, it does not support (evidence not found) that pedestrian countdown lights are being used [1]. Post review follow: Additional evidence was provided for the countdown timers (Y2015-039 Countdown_Pedestrian_Signal_Specs.pdf). This evidence supports the assertion and the result was changed. Item [1] is closed.</p>
69.	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. (2009 item number :59)	York Region	Status - Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description... The text modifications did not change the review

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments								
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		Notes
						Review 2015	Review Results	
70.	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. (2009 item number : 60)	York Region	Status - Does not apply to segment Y2.  Interface with the proposed Highway 407 Transitway is at the Richmond Hill Terminal, which will be reconstructed as part of the Yonge Subway Extension.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review

Section 5.0 Actions Required to Address Commitments												
Construction and Compliance Monitoring					Changes to Mitigation Protection and/ or Monitoring	Agency Responses and Dates	New Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Date of Permit Approval or Authorization	Record of Compliance (ECM Signature and Date)	Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<p>ITEMS 71 TO 80: Status – <b>Ongoing</b>. Construction is anticipated to commence in 2015. <b>As of November 01, 2015, there has been no construction in Y2.</b></p> <p><b><u>Daily Environmental Inspection Checklist (Y2015-030) has been prepared by the Contractor as part of the Environmental Management System (EMS) to ensure regular monitoring of Mitigation Measures as outlined in the various Environmental Management Plans. These Daily Checklists when completed, will be attached to the Monthly Environmental Reports which will be provided as evidence of monitoring in future submissions once construction in Y2 begins.</u></b></p>									No		After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description... and Compliance Document Reference. The text modifications did not change the review	
71.	Effect of construction on water quality and quantity in watercourses	To confirm that water quality is not being adversely affected by construction activity	Monitor sediment accumulation after rain events during construction to ensure that the proposed mitigation measures in the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan have been satisfied.	After first significant rain event						No		Not included in 2009 table of commitments
72.	Potential Loss of site-specific aquatic habitat due to structural work and development of a vehicle maintenance and storage facility.	To avoid or reduce the potential loss of site specific aquatic habitat	On-site environmental inspection during in-water work. Post-construction monitoring of fish habitat compensation measures.	As required by construction schedule for in-water work activities. As well as on completion of construction works on structures.						No		Not included in 2009 table of commitments
73.	Fish may be injured or killed by dewatering or physical harm.	To avoid or reduce fish mortality.	On-site environmental inspection during in-water work.	As required by construction schedule for in-water work activities.						No		Not included in 2009 table of commitments
74.	Culvert/bridge extension, repair or replacement may create a barrier to fish movement.	To maintain fish passage.	On-site environmental inspection during in-water work.	As required by construction schedule for in-water work activities.						No		Not included in 2009 table of commitments

Section 5.0 Actions Required to Address Commitments												
Construction and Compliance Monitoring					Changes to Mitigation Protection and/ or Monitoring	Agency Responses and Dates	New Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Date of Permit Approval or Authorization	Record of Compliance (ECM Signature and Date)	Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
75.	Destruction/ Disturbance of wildlife habitat due to removal of vegetation during construction	To ensure minimum disturbance to wildlife habitat	Post-construction inspection of vegetation plantings to confirm survival.	On completion of construction works adjacent to vegetative areas.						No		Not included in 2009 table of commitments
76.	Noise generated by construction activities	To ensure noise levels comply with Municipal by-laws and construction equipment complies with NPC-115 noise emission standards.	Site measurements of levels produced by representative equipment/activities	At time of introduction of equipment/ activities producing significant noise level with potential to disturb sensitive areas.						No		Not included in 2009 table of commitments
77.	Effect of construction activities on air quality(dust, odour,)	To confirm that local air quality is not being adversely affected by construction activity	Regular inspections of site dust control measures and of construction vehicle exhaust emissions	Monthly during construction seasons.						No		Not included in 2009 table of commitments
78.	Condition of heritage homes adjacent to transitway alignment	To determine if any damage/deterioration is due to construction activity	Pre-construction inspection to obtain baseline condition and monitoring during nearby construction	As required by construction schedule for work adjacent to heritage features.						No		Not included in 2009 table of commitments
79.	Effect of construction on boulevard trees	To ensure the survival of boulevard trees	Inspection of protective measures and monitoring of work methods near trees	Prior to commencement of work and bi-weekly during work activities.						No		Not included in 2009 table of commitments
80.	Potential barrier effects during construction and operation	To avoid barriers to entrances/exits to large attractors along Yonge Street and to ensure the effectiveness of the Construction Traffic and Pedestrian Management Plan	Monitor congestion levels during construction and traffic patterns during operations.	After temporary access works have been installed and during ongoing inspection of construction works.						No		Not included in 2009 table of commitments

Note: Monitoring requirements for the Operations and Maintenance Phase (Section 5.3 of the CMP) are not shown here, and will be added prior to commencement of revenue service.

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	Compliance Review (MMM)		
					Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
81.	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. (2009 item number :61)	York Region	<p>Status – Ongoing work.</p> <p>[2010] Minor changes to the design of the undertaking during Y2 preliminary design have included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Minor changes to intersection approaches / configurations supported by the requisite traffic modelling;</li> <li>- Minor reductions in general purpose lane widths;</li> <li>- Minor adjustments to Rapidway alignments to minimise environmental impacts.</li> <li>- A 1.4 m wide bicycle lane has been added, as per York Region’s Pedestrian and Cycling Master Plan (<a href="http://www.york.ca/departments/planning+and+development/pedestrian+and+cycling+master+plan.htm">http://www.york.ca/departments/planning+and+development/pedestrian+and+cycling+master+plan.htm</a>), without a buffer strip between Highway 7 and Major Mackenzie Drive and with 0.5m buffer strip between the 1st signal north of Elgin Mills to 19th Ave. Refer to Memo - Yonge Street Y2 Segment - Bicycle Lanes (ID#8677) for further details.</li> <li>- Preliminary Engineering cross section drawings have been updated to reflect the inclusion of bike lanes in the corridor.(ID#8726)</li> </ul>	<p>[2010] Yonge Street Rapidway Highway 7 – 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue -Preliminary Engineering – Design Basis and Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)</p> <p>Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)</p> <p>Memo - Yonge Street Y2 Segment - Bicycle Lanes (ID# 8677)</p> <p>Y2 41% Preliminary Design Drawing set (ID#8726)</p> <p>E-mail Y2 at Major Mackenzie to Hopkins Viv Station Location (ID#9009)</p>	No	<p>EF (2010)</p> <p>EF (2012)</p>	<p>ACR 2010: After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review</p> <p>The list in the status column was taken to be the evidence of compliance as meeting compliance requires a statement of minor changes in the Annual Compliance Report.</p> <p><b>ACR 2012:</b> The evidence (ID#8677 et al.) supports the assertions regarding minor changes being reported.</p>

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	Compliance Review (MMM)		
					Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
82.	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. (2009 item number : 62)	York Region	Status – Future work (if necessary).  [2010]At this time there is no change to the design of the undertaking that results in a material increase in the expected net environmental effects of the undertaking.		No		ACR 2010: After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review It is not possible to determine that no changes were made. Therefore not reviewed. ACR 2012: It is unclear how the evidence (e.g., ID#9017) supports the assertions that the process set out in the CMP for modifying the design of the undertaking (including submission of an amendment report to the MOE) was / is being followed.  2012 edit: discussion with the Owner Engineer clarified an error and the status and compliance document reference columns were updated to remove text. The text modifications changed the review.

Section 7.0 – Consultation							
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
					Review 2014	Review Results	Notes
83.	CMP Section 7.1.1- One [1] "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 [2] the design solution presented and modified as necessary to address public comment, will be the basis for the detailed design. (2009 item number : 63)	York Region	Status: Completed  [1] "Open House" format public consultations were held on June 2 2010 (#1)  [1] "Open House" format public consultations were held on November 19 and 20, 2013. [2] No written comments were received at the PIC.	[1] June 2, 2010 "Open House" #1 (Presentation ID# 6108), registered notification letter to property owners (May 13, 2010), notification letter to Richmond Hill Councillor's (May 10, 2010), public meeting advertisement and invoice for newspaper placement (May 30, 2010)  [1] November 2013 invitation/newsletters and postal walk limits, e-blast, newspaper advertisements, sample comment sheets and displays (ID# Y2014-006).	Yes	[1] EF (2010)  EF (2014) Closed	ACR 2010: In Oct-10 review the item was deemed NSF with the following notes: Presentation evidence provided is insufficient to determine that consultations were held. Notices and distribution lists have been provided and accepted for other consultation events (see other cells of this table). After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... And Compliance Document Reference The text modifications did change the review as additional evidence was provided. As the item [2] has not been addressed, the status should be changes to "ongoing"  2014: Documentation provided is appropriate as evidence for the completion of the Open House. 2015: "Closed" added to results for clarity
84.	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). (2009 item number : 64)	York Region	Status – Does not apply to segment Y2. No construction is planned through the heritage district of the Town of Richmond Hill. Viva will operate in mixed traffic and use curbside stations, as per existing condition.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review

Section 7.0 – Consultation							
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
					Review 2014	Review Results	Notes
85	CMP Section 7.1.2 - One "Open House" format public information centre prior to commencement of construction to present the construction staging and methods to be adopted including temporary works and methods to maintain traffic and pedestrian access and circulation, protect the existing natural and built environment and minimize noise, vibration and air pollution during construction.	York Region	Status – Future work.  Construction is anticipated to commence in 2015.		No		Not included in 2009 table of commitments After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review
86.	CMP Section 7.1.2 – Availability of a "Community Relations Officer" throughout the construction period to provide information to, consult with and respond to complaints from, property and business owners and the general public. This Officer will prepare a protocol for dealing with and responding to inquiries and complaints during the construction and subsequent operation. The protocol will be submitted to the MOE for placement on the Public Record prior to commencement of construction.	York Region	Status – <b>Complete</b>  Construction is anticipated to commence in 2015. YRRTC has already retained Community Liaison Coordinators to engage with property and business owners during the property acquisition phase, and later during construction and operation. A general protocol for dealing with inquiries is being developed for other segments and will be customized for the Y2 segment and submitted to MOE prior to construction in 2015.  <b><u>The Community Relations Protocol has been prepared by YRRTC and submitted to MOECC.</u></b>	<b><u>Correspondence from YRRTC to MOECC, October 26, 2015 with attached Community Relations Protocol (YR15-101).</u></b>	Yes	EF (2015) Closed (2015)	Not included in 2009 table of commitments After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review  ACR 2015: Evidence provided (YR15-101) supports the assertion regarding the complaints protocol. This item is closed.

Section 7.0 – Consultation							
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Review 2014	Compliance Review (MMM)	
						Review Results	Notes
87.	CMP Section 7.2.1 - [1] The findings of the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment and [2] any subsequent assessments will be circulated to [3] all affected stakeholders and [4] First Nations that have asked to be kept informed of the outcome of any archaeological investigations during the design and construction phases. (2009 item number : 65)	York Region	<p>Status – Ongoing</p> <p>Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment, and any subsequent archaeological assessment required, will be undertaken during the detail design phase. Consultation with the Ministry of Culture, First Nations and other interested stakeholders will also be carried out following completion of the Stage 2 assessment.</p> <p>Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment has been completed for most of the corridor. Remaining 4 properties to be completed prior to construction. Final reports to be circulated to First Nations upon completion of all studies.</p> <p><b><u>Refer to Item 18.</u></b></p>	<p>Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of Yonge Street, Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 West of Yonge Street and Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 East of Yonge Street, Geographic Townships of Vaughan and Markham, Town of Richmond Hill, Regional Municipality of York, December 2013. (ID# Y2004-005)</p> <p>Correspondence from Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Recreation regarding Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of Yonge Street, Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 West of Yonge Street and Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 East of Yonge Street, March 19, 2014 (ID# Y2004-005)</p>	No		<p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review</p> <p>2014: Numbering added for clarity. The assertion is that the findings of the Arch. Assessments have not yet been forwarded to stakeholders and First Nations. As such, there is nothing to review.</p>

Section 7.0 – Consultation							
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
					Review 2014	Review Results	Notes
88.	CMP Section 7.2.1 - The Region and/or designate will [1] consult and [2] respond to First Nations concerns regarding its findings on the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment. The Region and/or designate will [3] obtain any necessary approvals and [4] conduct any additional studies that may be required as a result of the findings and recommendations of the Stage 2 Assessment. (2009 item number : 66)	York Region	<p>Status – Ongoing.</p> <p>Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment, and any subsequent archaeological assessment required, will be undertaken during the detail design phase. Consultation with the Ministry of Culture, First Nations and other interested stakeholders will also be carried out following completion of the Stage 2 assessment.</p> <p>Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment has been completed for most of the corridor. Remaining 4 properties to be completed prior to construction. Final reports to be circulated to First Nations upon completion of all studies.</p> <p><b><u>Refer to Item 18.</u></b></p>	<p>Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of Yonge Street, Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 West of Yonge Street and Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 East of Yonge Street, Geographic Townships of Vaughan and Markham, Town of Richmond Hill, Regional Municipality of York, December 2013. (ID# Y2004-005)</p> <p>Correspondence from MTCR regarding Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of Yonge Street, Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 West of Yonge Street and Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 East of Yonge Street, March 19, 2014 (ID# Y2004-005)</p>	No		<p>2009 Compliance Review: This was noted that Owner engineer indicated that this was not relevant to Y2. via email September 18, 2009. It should be removed from the table. In a subsequent conversation in 2010, it was noted that this was not the case and this requirement applies.</p> <p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description... and Compliance Document Reference. The text modifications did not change the review</p> <p>2014: Numbering added for clarity. The assertion is that the findings of the Arch. Assessments have not yet been forwarded to stakeholders and First Nations [1]. As such, there is nothing to review for items [1] and [2]. There is no assertion with respect to approvals [3] or conducting of additional studies [4]</p> <p>ACR 2015: Evidence was not available</p>

Section 7.0 – Consultation							
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored (2009 item # if different)	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
					Review 2014	Review Results	Notes
89.	<p>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.</p> <p>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. (2009 item number : 67)</p>	York Region	<p>Status – Ongoing work.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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) (ID# 1673)</p> <p>First Nations mailing list and 2007-01-22 Viva Update letter (ID# 3026)</p> <p>Letter from Alderville First Nation (ID#3030)</p> <p>Mailing lists, 2007-01-22 Viva Update letter, 2007-04-24 Yonge Street Stakeholder letter and post card mail drop (ID#3027)</p>	No	EF (2009)	<p>2009 Compliance Review: 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>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review</p>

Note: Monitoring requirements for the Operations and Maintenance Phase (Section 7.1.3 of the CMP) are not shown here, and will be added prior to commencement of revenue service.

**Section 8.0 – Program Schedule – section is not applicable to the ACR**

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 (MMM)		
					Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
90.	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. (2009 item number : 68)	York Region	<p>Status – Completed.</p> <p>The date of the approval of the EA for the undertaking was 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>The final CMP was submitted to the Acting Director, Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch on March 10, 2008 and approved on April 11, 2008.</p>	<p>MOE approval of Yonge EA (ID# 1675)</p> <p>EA Compliance Monitoring Program July 2007 (ID# 1669)</p> <p>EA Compliance Monitoring Plan dated March 10, 2008 (ID#3145)</p> <p>Letter of submission (ID#3144)</p> <p>Letter of approval (ID#3146)</p>	Yes	EF (2010) All items closed	<p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did change the review</p> <p>Evidence provided in the column Compliance Document Reference titled "Letter of approval (ID#3146) satisfies compliance.</p> <p>ACR 2015: "Closed" added to Results column</p>
91.	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	<p>Status – Completed.</p> <p>The letter of submission includes a statement indicating that the CMP is intended to fulfill Condition 3 of the Conditions of Approval.</p> <p>Letter of approval notes that the CMP will be placed in the ministry's public record file.</p>	<p>Letter of submission (ID#3144)</p> <p>Letter of approval (ID#3146)</p>	No	EF (2010) All items closed	<p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did change the review</p> <p>Evidence provided in the two documents cited.</p> <p>ACR 2015: "Closed" added to Results column</p>

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 (MMM)		
					Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
92.	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 [City] of Markham and the City of Vaughan. (2009 item number : 70)	York Region	Status – Completed.	Letter to MOE Submission of Final CMP (March 4, 2008), Letter of CMP approval from MOE (April 11, 2008)	No	EF (2010) All items closed	<b>2009 Compliance Review:</b> No evidence was cited to show copies of the CMP was provided to the clerk's office. After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description... and Compliance Document Reference. The text modifications did change the review Evidence found provided in the two documents cited.  ACR 2015: "Closed" added to Results column
93.	CMP Section 9.0 - The document will also be available for public information on the Proponent's website at <a href="http://www.vivayork.ca">www.vivayork.ca</a> . (2009 item number : 71)	York Region	Status – Completed.	Letter to MOE Submission of Final CMP (March 4, 2008), Letter of CMP approval from MOE (April 11, 2008) <a href="http://www.vivanext.com">www.vivanext.com</a>	No	EF (2010) All items closed	2009 Compliance Review: website has changed to <a href="http://www.vivanext.com">www.vivanext.com</a> After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description... and Compliance Document Reference. The text modifications did not change the review ACR 2015: "Closed" added to Results column

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 (MMM)		
					Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
94.	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. (2009 item number : 72)	York Region	Status – Completed.	Letter to MOE Submission of Final CMP (March 4, 2008), Letter of CMP approval from MOE (April 11, 2008)	No	EF (2010) All items closed	<p><b>2009 Compliance Review:</b> 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.</p> <p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description... and Compliance Document Reference. The text modifications did change the review. Evidence found provided in the two documents cited.</p> <p>ACR 2015: "Closed" added to Results column</p>

Section 10.0 – Annual Compliance Report – section is not applicable to the ACF

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 (MMM)		
					Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
95.	<p>Ridership Monitoring Program:</p> <p>CMP Section 11.1 –[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 [2] City of Toronto, GO Transit, Ministry of Transportation, TTC, the Towns [City] of Markham and Richmond Hill and the City of Vaughan for review. (2009 item number : 73)</p>	York Region	<p>Status – <b>Future Work</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>In the interim, ridership monitoring is ongoing as evidenced by the referenced reports.</p> <p>2011/2012 review was premised on construction of BRT by 2010. Ridership review will be part of Technology Conversion Plan (see Item 13). Ridership monitoring is ongoing.[1]</p> <p>[1] Ridership monitoring is reported to Committee of the Whole on a monthly basis. [2] Transportation Fact Book provided to municipalities and other stakeholders and made available to the public on York Region website.</p> <p><b>Refer to Item 12</b></p>	<p>YRTViva 2007 Revenue Ridership Summary, YRTViva 2007 Ridership Summary - Specialized Services – Mobility Plus, Viva Monthly Operations Summary December 2007 YC 8.02 (ID#'s 3106, 3107, 3108 )</p> <p>[1] York Region Transit/Viva Ridership Summaries – 2005 to 2012 (ID Y2013-004)</p> <p>[1] York Region Transit/Viva Ridership Summaries - Nov 2013 to July 2014 (ID Y2014-007)</p> <p><a href="http://viewer.zmags.com/publication/2ac5b26d#/2ac5b26d/76">http://viewer.zmags.com/publication/2ac5b26d#/2ac5b26d/76</a> - Refer to page 70</p>	Yes	<p>EF (2009)</p> <p>EF [1] (2013)</p> <p>[1] EF (2014)</p> <p><b>Closed (2015)</b></p>	<p>3106 – 2007 Ridership Summary Specialized Services 3107 – 2007 Revenue Ridership Summary and monthly Ridership Summary 3108 – Viva Operations Monthly Summary</p> <p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description...The text modifications did not change the review</p> <p>ACR 2013: Numbers added for clarity. Evidence was found to support the assertion that [1] the Ridership monitoring is ongoing.</p> <p>2014: [1] Evidence found to support the assertion that monitoring is ongoing. [2] Evidence was found to support the assertion that the information is available on the website. However, Evidence was not found to support that the Fact Book was provided to City of Toronto, GO Transit, Ministry of Transportation, TTC, the Towns [City] of Markham and Richmond Hill and the City of Vaughan. Upon further explanation from OE, the distribution of results is part of a future consultation process. This should be explained in the status column for the 2015 ACR. Item 1 is ongoing. Item 2 is future.</p> <p><b>2015: As this item is the same as item 12, this item can be closed for ease of reporting and Item 12 referred to for compliance.</b></p>

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 (MMM)		
					Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
96.	<p>Technology Conversion Plan</p> <p>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. (2009 item number : 74)</p>	York Region	<p>Status – Future work</p> <p>A draft Transition Plan was prepared and submitted on March 02, 2007. The draft Transition Plan included general indications of alternative schedules. Transition from BRT to LRT in the Y2 corridor is a longer term initiative. A Technology Conversion Plan will be prepared upon completion of a Network Update Report, and based on ongoing ridership and technology reviews.</p> <p><b><u>Refer to Item 13</u></b></p>	Correspondence from York Region to MOE, December 21, 2012 (ID Y2013-005)	Yes	Closed (2015)	<p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description... and Compliance Document Reference. The text modifications did not change the review</p> <p>ACR 2013: Compliance document reference was bolded and underlined indicating items for review but as no assertion was made and the item is marked as future work, it was not reviewed.</p> <p><b><u>2015: As this item is the same as item 13, this item can be closed for ease of reporting and Item 13 referred to for compliance.</u></b></p>
97.	<p>CMP Section 11.2 - If conversion is found to be required prior to 2021, the Plan will include an implementation schedule. (2009 item number : 75)</p>	York Region	<p>Status – Future work.</p> <p>Refer to Item 96 above.</p>	Correspondence from York Region to MOE, December 21, 2012 (ID Y2013-005)	No	EF (2013)	<p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description... and Compliance Document Reference. The text modifications did not change the review</p> <p>ACR 2013: Numbers added for clarity. Status noted. Noted that ID Y2013-005 shows that conversion is not to occur prior to 2021. Status column and its colour should be revised.</p>

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 (MMM)		
					Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
98.	CMP Section 11.2 – [1] 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. [2] A copy of these documents will also be provided to the City of Toronto, TTC, GO Transit, the Ministry of Transportation, the Towns [City] of Markham and Richmond Hill and the City of Vaughan for review. (2009 item number : 76)	York Region	Status – <b>Future Work</b>  Refer to Items 95, 96 and 97 above.  Ridership monitoring is ongoing as evidenced by the referenced reports.  <b>Refer to Item 14</b>	YRTViva 2007 Revenue Ridership Summary, YRTViva 2007 Ridership Summary - Specialized Services – Mobility Plus, Viva Monthly Operations Summary December 2007 YC 8.02 (ID#s 3106, 3107, 3108 )  Correspondence from York Region to MOE, December 21, 2012 (ID Y2013-005)	Yes	EF (2009)  Closed (2015)	3106 – 2007 Ridership Summary Specialized Services 3107 – 2007 Revenue Ridership Summary and monthly Ridership Summary 3108 – Viva Operations Monthly Summary After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description...The text modifications did not change the review ACR 2013: Numbers added for clarity. Compliance document reference was bolded and underlined indicating items for review but as no assertion was made, it was not reviewed. <b>2015 ACR: As this item is the same as item 14, this item can be closed for ease of reporting and Item 14 referred to for compliance.</b>
99.	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. (2009 item number : 77)	York Region	Status – <b>Complete</b>  Construction is anticipated to commence on segment Y2 in 2015. The Protocol will be prepared during detail design.  <b>Refer to Item 16.</b>		Yes	EF (2015) Closed (2015)	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review  ACR 2015: Evidence not available. <b>2015 ACR: Evidences provided in Item 16 (YR15-001) supports the assertion regarding a complaints protocol. This item is closed.</b>

Appendix 1 Table 11-1 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 <sup>1</sup>			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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-in Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations (A1)	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2014	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE A: To improve mobility by providing a fast, convenient, reliable and efficient rapid transit service</b>																		
A1 (a)	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 [1] a direct connection from the Richmond Hill Centre Intermodal Terminal to GO Rail's Langstaff Station. It will also have [2] 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	[3] R.O.W protection along the GO Line corridor to achieve an additional connection	Positive effect	[4] Monitor ridership and the need to develop connection to GO Richmond Hill Station	York Region	Status – Completed.  [1] Enclosed pedestrian bridge between the Viva Richmond Hill Terminal and the GO Rail Platform was constructed and opened for use April 2008.  [2 to 4] Future reconstruction of Richmond Hill Terminal is not part of segment Y2 works.	Pedestrian Bridge Drawings 100 % Submission – YC file path: P:\YC2002\QS Detail Design\Langstaff Pedestrian Bridge\Transmittal	No	[1] EF (2010) Completed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description...and Compliance Document Reference. The text modifications did change the review  The Owner Engineer confirmed that the completed bridge is shown on the street-view image on Google maps.
A1 (b)		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.	[1] Local services will be configured as a grid where practical, providing community coverage and feeder roles	Positive effect	[2] Regular review of effectiveness of local service plans.	York Region	Status – Ongoing work.  Regular review of effectiveness of local service plans is an ongoing YRT task. Local service plans are updated approximately quarterly according to YRT Board Periods.	[1] York Region Transit – Transit Service Guidelines, May 2006 ( <a href="http://www.yrt.ca/assets/pdfs/2006_Transit_Guidelines.pdf">http://www.yrt.ca/assets/pdfs/2006_Transit_Guidelines.pdf</a> )  [2] York Region Transit – Five Year Service Plan 2010-2015 ( <a href="http://www.yorkregiontransit.com/w-hats-ahead/YRT_VIVA_5yr_plan_PIC_presentation.pdf">http://www.yorkregiontransit.com/w-hats-ahead/YRT_VIVA_5yr_plan_PIC_presentation.pdf</a> )	No	[1] EF (2010) [2] EF (2010)	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description...and Compliance Document Reference. The text modifications did change the review. It was not reviewed previously.
A2 (a)	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	Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did change the review
A2 (b)		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	Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did change the review

Appendix 1 Table 11-1 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 <sup>1</sup>			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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-in Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations (A)	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2014	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE A: To improve mobility by providing a fast, convenient, reliable and efficient rapid transit service</b>																		
(c)		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	Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did change the review
(d)		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	Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did change the review
(e)		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	York Region	Status – Future work.  [2010] Y2 preliminary design was undertaken for a BRT service so as not to preclude a future LRT service. Transition to LRT is a longer term initiative – vertical profile to be adjusted when implemented.  The Y2 DBCR describes the design approach.	[2010]Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19 <sup>th</sup> Avenue – Preliminary Engineering – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)  Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis & Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)	No		Section 2.3.1 BRT Standards states: The maximum in station grade of 2% is intended for Light Rail Transit (LRT) operation. In general the vivaNext BRT platforms have been designed to suit future LRT use without modification. However, on the Yonge Street Segment Y2 three locations do not conform to the maximum gradient criteria, these are: - Major Mackenzie (Station 18+100) where the NB and SB station gradients are 4.43%; - Elgin Mills (Station 20+380) where NB station gradient is 2.35% ; - 19th Avenue (Station 22+480) where NB station is 4.2%and the SB station is 3.8%.  Implementation of future LRT services will require that the stations be modified to suit LRT operations at that time, these constraints were identified in the EA. After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review  The revised description indicates that the Transition to LRT is a longer term initiative and will be met in the future. The Owner Engineer stated that this is documented in the Transition plan Transition Plan – Draft, March 2, 2007 (ID# 910),

Appendix 1 Table 11-1 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 <sup>1</sup>			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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-in Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations (A)	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2014	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE A: To improve mobility by providing a fast, convenient, reliable and efficient rapid transit service</b>																		
(f)		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	York Region	Status – Future work.  Y2 preliminary design was undertaken for a BRT service. Major Mackenzie Drive is the southern entrance to the Richmond Hill heritage area and as such options to reconstruct Yonge Street were limited. Therefore, the existing grades was maintained.  Transition to LRT is a longer term initiative on the Y2 corridor – mitigation measures such as shifting the station and providing alternative pedestrian access will be explored when implemented.  [2010] The design approach is described in the Y2 DBCR.	[2010] Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19 <sup>th</sup> Avenue – Preliminary Engineering – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)  Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis & Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)	No		After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did change the review that included the following notes: Section 2.3.1 BRT Standards states: The maximum in station grade of 2% is intended for Light Rail Transit (LRT) operation. In general the vivaNext BRT platforms have been designed to suit future LRT use without modification. However, on the Yonge Street Segment Y2 three locations do not conform to the maximum gradient criteria, these are: - Major Mackenzie (Station 18+100) where the NB and SB station gradients are 4.43%; - Elgin Mills (Station 20+380) where NB station gradient is 2.35% ; - 19th Avenue (Station 22+480) where NB station is 4.2%and the SB station is 3.8%.  Implementation of future LRT services will require that the stations be modified to suit LRT operations at that time, these constraints were identified in the EA.  The revised description indicates that the transition to LRT is a longer term initiative and will be met in the future.
(g)		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	York Region	Status – Future work.  [2010]Y2 preliminary design was undertaken for a BRT service so as not to preclude a future LRT service. Transition to LRT is a longer term initiative – vertical profile to be adjusted when implemented.  The design approach is described in the Y2 DBCR.	[2010] Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19 <sup>th</sup> Avenue – Preliminary Engineering – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)  Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis & Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)	No		Section 2.3.1 BRT Standards states: The maximum in station grade of 2% is intended for Light Rail After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did change the review that included the following notes: Transit (LRT) operation. In general the vivaNext BRT platforms have been designed to suit future LRT use without modification. However, on the Yonge Street Segment Y2 three locations do not conform to the maximum gradient criteria, these are: - Major Mackenzie (Station 18+100) where the NB and SB station gradients are 4.43%; - Elgin Mills (Station 20+380) where NB station gradient is 2.35% ; - 19th Avenue (Station 22+480) where NB station is 4.2%and the SB station is 3.8%.  Implementation of future LRT services will require that the stations be modified to suit LRT operations at that time, these constraints were identified in the EA.

Appendix 1 Table 11-1 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 <sup>1</sup>			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 (MMM)										
			P	C	O			Built-in Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2014	Review Results	Notes								
<b>OBJECTIVE A: To improve mobility by providing a fast, convenient, reliable and efficient rapid transit service</b>																										
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.	York Region	Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	Implementation of future LRT services will require that the stations be modified to suit LRT operations at that time, these constraints were identified in the EA.  After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did change the review.								
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.	[1] Micro-simulation of rapid transit operation and general traffic movements during detailed design will be used to optimize signal timing. [2] 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	[3] Pursue an on-going intersection performance monitoring program	York Region	Status – Future work.  Intersection monitoring will be carried out by York Region Transportation Services following the commencement of operation.	No		The Oct-10 review found item to be EF with the following note: Section 2.4 Traffic Analysis states: VISSIM micro-simulation traffic analysis software was used to model, and to analyze, the through movement and right turn movement measures of performance.  After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description...and Compliance Document Reference. The text modifications did not change the review  The revised description indicates that the meeting the commitments will be completed during detailed design and after.									

Appendix 1 Table 11-1 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 <sup>1</sup>			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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-in Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations (A1)	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2014	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE A: To improve mobility by providing a fast, convenient, reliable and efficient rapid transit service</b>																		
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.	Station locations selected to serve supportive land use. Facilities designed with [1] weather protection, direct barrier free access and attractive streetscapes within surrounding residential neighbourhoods.	Continued dependence on automobile if land use objectives not achieved	Greater emphasis on supportive land use	Positive effect	[2] Regular review of land use and new or infill development potential during detailed design phases for transitway and stations.	York Region	Status – [1] Complete, [2] Ongoing  Station locations were established in the EA.  <u>All station designs include weather protection and barrier-free access as described in RapidLINK TS 1 – Design and Aesthetic Requirements. (Y2015-031). The new transit line will be fully integrated with the existing transit line along Highway 7 incorporating design consistency and uniformity as reflected in the constructed VivaNext H3 project. Architectural Design follows RapidLINK TS 9 - Architectural Design Report (Y2015-032).</u>  <u>Attractive streetscape measures including planters in medians, boulevards, and at intersections, are shown in Y2.1 and Y2.2 90pct Streetscape Design Drawings. RapidLINK, July 2015 (Y2015-006 and Y2015-007)</u>	<u>TS1 Design and Aesthetics. RapidLINK, 2015 (Y2015-031)</u>  <u>TS1 Architectural Design Report. RapidLINK, 2015 (Y2015-032)</u>  <u>Y2.1 90pct Streetscape Design Drawings. RapidLINK, 2015 (Y2015-006)</u>  <u>Y2.2 90pct Streetscape Design Drawings. RapidLINK, 2015 (Y2015-007)</u>	Yes	[1] EF (2015) [1] Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description...and Compliance Document Reference. The text modifications changed the review  <b>2009 Compliance Review found that:</b> Evidence does not support that guide lines have been developed. 640 – Briefing and email no memo 639 – Email 689 – drafts of presentation and emails In the Oct-10 review , the result of UNCLEAR was provided with the following note: 640 memos found and include guidelines for station optimization and station spacing. Memos provide minimum spacing criteria and briefly discuss land use criteria. The evidence is not sufficient to support that weather protection, barrier free access, and attractive streetscape measures have been addressed in the table or are outstanding. ACR 2015: [1] Evidence found to support assertion ( (Y2015-031 and -032 for stations and Y2015-006 and -007 for landscaping). Item [1] is closed. Item 2 remain ongoing

Appendix 1 Table 11-2 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 <sup>1</sup>			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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor</b>																		
B1 (a)	Minimize adverse effects on and maximize benefits for communities in corridor	Potential displacement of community features		✓	✓	Entire Corridor	Potential displacement or loss of unique features.	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	[1] Future community consultation	York Region	Status – Completed.  "Open House" format public consultations were held on June 2 2010 (#1)  [1] "Open House" format public consultations were held on November 19 and 20, 2013.	June 2, 2010 "Open House" #1 (Presentation ID# 6108) registered notification letter to property owners (May 13, 2010), notification letter to Richmond Hill Councillors (May 10, 2010), public meeting advertisement and invoice for newspaper placement (May 30, 2010).  [1] November 2013 invitation/ newsletters and postal walk limits, e-blast, newspaper advertisements, sample comment sheets and displays (ID# Y2014-006).	No	[1] EF (2010)  EF (2014) Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description...and Compliance Document Reference. The text modifications did change the review  The Oct-10 review found EF with respect to [1] and the following notes: Section 3.8 Streetscape Design Guidelines and Section 3.9 General Guidelines provide commitments on incorporating streetscaping and road furniture to enhance corridor and community environment. There is no explicit reference to avoiding known locations of distinct features to minimize impact.  2014: Documentation (ID#YD2014-006) supports the assertion regarding community consultation.

Appendix 1 Table 11-2 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 <sup>1</sup>			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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor</b>																		
(b)		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	None required	Status – No action required.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description...and Responsible Person/Agency...and Compliance Document Reference. The text modifications did change the review. The Oct-10 review noted EF with the following notes Section 3.15.1 states that furnishing zone "features should be placed in a manner that does not obstruct the pedestrian movement. This zone provides an important comfort buffer between pedestrian and vehicular traffic." Section 3.16 includes provisions for medians, and Section 3.18 includes provisions for crosswalks, however, it is not explicitly stated that there are "Provided safe crosswalks with median refuge"
(c)		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	Status – No action required.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review

Appendix 1 Table 11-2 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 <sup>1</sup>			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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor</b>																		
B2 (a)	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	Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review

Appendix 1 Table 11-2 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 <sup>1</sup>			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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor</b>																		
(b)		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 safety. [1] 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	[2] Monitor traffic and prohibit Right Turns On Red movements from the side street at these locations if necessary	York Region	Status – [1] <b>Complete</b> , [2] <b>Future</b>  Intent is to prohibit side street Right Turn on Red at all side street intersections. Further traffic analysis will be carried out in detailed design to finalize traffic signal operations.  <u>A Traffic Analysis Report was prepared during Detailed Design which identifies why "Right Turns on Red" prohibitions were not considered for Yonge Street (see Section 5.6 of Y2015-003).</u>	<u>[1] 90 pct Traffic Analysis Report. RapidLINK, June 2015 (Y2015-003)</u>	Yes	[1] EF (2015) [1] Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.  The revised description indicates that meeting commitments will be completed during detailed design and after. ACR 2015: (numbers added for clarity) [1] Evidence found to support assertion (Y2015-003). this item is closed. Item [2] is future work.

Appendix 1 Table 11-2 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 <sup>1</sup>			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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor</b>																		
(c)		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	Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review
B2 (a)	Maintain or improve road traffic and pedestrian circulation (cont'd)	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	Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review

Appendix 1 Table 11-2 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 <sup>1</sup>			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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor</b>																		
(b)		Potential for Traffic Infiltration			✓	Woodward Avenue/Grandview Avenue/Highland Park 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	Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review	

Appendix 1 Table 11-2 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 <sup>1</sup>			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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor</b>																		
(c)		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	Status – Future work.  Monitoring of "shoulder" periods prior to and after the peak periods applies after transitway construction and will be carried out by York Region Transportation Services following the commencement of operation.		No		After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review
(d)		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	Status – Future work.  Meadowview Avenue, Uplands Avenue and Langstaff Road East do not apply to segment Y2.  Intent is to prohibit side street Right Turn on Red at all side street intersections including Weldrick Road and Devonsleigh Blvd. Further traffic analysis will be carried out in detailed design to finalize traffic signal operations.  <u>Refer to Item B2(b)</u>		No		After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review

Appendix 1 Table 11-2 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 <sup>1</sup>			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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor</b>																		
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. [1] Consultation with emergency services representatives to [2] 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	[3] Obtain feedback from ERS staff on performance of access provisions.	York Region	Status – <b>Completed</b> .  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 was discussed with EMS on June 22, 2010. A protocol is to be established between York Region, Town of Richmond Hill to cover planning and access for Fire services to redeveloping properties as part of detailed design. <u><a href="#">A Traffic Analysis Report was prepared during Detailed Design which identifies Emergency and Heavy Vehicle Access Considerations for Yonge Street (see Section 4.6 of Y2015-003).</a></u>  <u><a href="#">Consultation with ERS was completed during detail design as noted in the Emergency Response Services Meeting Minutes (Y2015-013)</a></u>	[1] Meeting notes – meetings with Richmond Hill EMS on April 21 and June 22, 2010 (JD#9022, 9023) [2] Memo - Fire and Emergency Service Access - Median Crossover Provisions – April 14, 2009 - (ID # 4216 and 4217) <u><a href="#">90 pct Traffic Analysis Report, RapidLINK, June 2015 (Y2015-003)</a></u>  <u><a href="#">Emergency Response Services Meeting Minutes (Y2015-013)</a></u>	Yes	[1] EF (2010) [2] EF (2010) [2,3] EF (2015) All items closed	[1] Evidence was provided that this was discussed with EMS in the meeting minutes provided for April 21 and June 22, 2010. [2] Strategy has been developed as per the evidence provided in 4216 and 4217. Document provided (4216 and 4217) is dated April 14, 2009 not April 15, 2010 as cited in this table. In Oct-10 review, NSE was noted for [1] as no evidence provided that this was discussed with EMS on June 22, 2010 After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description...and Compliance Document Reference. The text modifications did change the review.  <b>ACR 2015:</b> [1] Consultation with emergency services representatives: Closed in 2010. [2] develop access across the median at 75-100m intervals for Emergency Response Vehicles only. Evidence found (Y2915-003) to support assertion. This Item is closed as 90% design is sufficient evidence. [3] Obtain feedback from ERS staff on performance of access provisions. Evidence found (Y2915-013) to support assertion. This Item is closed. Given the items are closed, the status should be changed to Completed.

Appendix 1 Table 11-2 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 <sup>1</sup>			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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor</b>																		
B4 (a)	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.	York Region	Status – Future work.  Audit measurements to be carried out by York Region Transportation Services following the commencement of operation.		No		After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
(b)		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.	York Region	Status – Future work.  Audit measurements to be carried out by York Region Transportation Services following the commencement of operation.		No		After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 1 Table 11-2 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 <sup>1</sup>			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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor</b>																		
(c)		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.	York Region	Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
(d)		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.	York Region	Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 1 Table 11-2 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 <sup>1</sup>			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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor</b>																		
B4 (a)	Minimize adverse noise and vibration effects (cont'd)	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.	York Region	Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 1 Table 11-2 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 <sup>1</sup>			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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor</b>																		
(b)		Noise & vibration to be experienced during construction activities		✓		Entire Corridor	Potential adverse environmental effects from noise and vibration resulting from construction activities.	[1] Construction equipment to comply with MOE APEP-115 noise emission standards. [1] 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.	[3] 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	Status- <u>Completed</u> .  Measures to mitigate noise and vibration as a result of construction and a protocol for dealing with complaints will be considered during detailed design.  <u>The Noise and Vibration Management Plan (Y2015-009) prepared by RapidLINK in October 2015 demonstrates compliance to mitigate noise and vibration effects of construction, to be implemented during construction using the Daily Environmental Checklist (Y2015-030).</u>	<u>Noise and Vibration Management Plan (Y2015-009)</u>  <u>Daily Inspection Checklist (Y2015-030)</u>	Yes	[1] EF (2015)	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.  ACR 2015: Numbering added for clarity. Evidence found for [3] monitoring with respect to complaints (Y2015-030). Items [1] and [2] are ongoing. The status column should be changed to Ongoing.
(c)	Minimize adverse noise and vibration effects (cont'd)	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	Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 1 Table 11-2 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 <sup>1</sup>			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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor</b>																		
B5 (a)	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	Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
(b)		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	Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 1 Table 11-2 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 <sup>1</sup>			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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor</b>																		
(c)		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	None required	Status – No action required.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description...and Responsible Person/Agency. The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 1 Table 11-2 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 <sup>1</sup>			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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor</b>																		
(d)	Minimize adverse effects on cultural resources (cont'd)	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.	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	Status – Ongoing.  Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment will be undertaken during the detailed design phase. Any further work or monitoring required will be carried out at that time.  Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment has been completed for most of the corridor. Remaining 4 properties to be completed prior to construction.  <u>Refer to Item 18.</u>	Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of Yonge Street, Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 West of Yonge Street and Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 East of Yonge Street, Geographic Townships of Vaughan and Markham, Town of Richmond Hill, Regional Municipality of York, December 2013. (ID# Y2004-005)  Correspondence from Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Recreation regarding Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of Yonge Street, Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 West of Yonge Street and Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 East of Yonge Street, March 19, 2014 (ID# Y2004-005)	No		After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.  2014: The Arch Assessments have not yet been completed. These will be reviewed when completed. <b>2015 ACR: Evidence was not available</b>

Appendix 1 Table 11-2 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 <sup>1</sup>			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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor</b>																		
B6 (a)	Minimize disruption of community vistas and adverse effects on street and neighbourhood aesthetics	Visual Effects	✓		✓	Entire Corridor	Introduction of transit may reduce visual aesthetics of road	Introduction of a comprehensive landscaping and streetscaping plan for the corridor. [1] Lane width reductions and smaller turning radii in heritage districts to allow wider pedestrian zones. [2] Relocate or bury hydro lines in areas where widening places overhead lines unacceptably close to existing culturally sensitive areas.	Narrow sections of ROW where property cannot be acquired may limit incorporation of streetscaping		Significant	[3] Monitor redevelopment and acquire property through redevelopment applications	York Region	Status – Future work (if necessary).  [1] Not applicable to Y2. Lane width reductions in the heritage area is not applicable as there is mixed traffic in the district  [2] Not applicable to Y2  [3] Development proposals are reviewed by York Region and circulated to the Viva design team for review and comment.		No		2009 Compliance Review found NSE. The 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, [1] lane width reductions and smaller turning radii in heritage districts to allow wider pedestrian zones were not found within the draft. For the Oct-10 review, this item was changed to UNCLEAR with the following notes: During discussions with the Owner Engineer in 2010, it was noted that the Heritage Area within Richmond Hill has mixed traffic and therefore no need for turning radii considerations. This table should be updated to reflect this. After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did change the review.  Note: Section 2.8.3 states: Power Stream has not been requested to provide a new layout for their plant. However, it is clear that all overhead plant will require relocation as it currently is in the proposed through lanes adjacent to the... During the Oct-10 review, an assertion was made regarding consultation. This was found to be NSE with the following notes: Presentation evidence (6108) provided is insufficient to determine that consultations were held. Notices and distribution lists have been provided and accepted for other consultation events (see below in this cell of this table). After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did change the review as the assertion of consultation events has been removed.

Appendix 1 Table 11-2 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 <sup>1</sup>			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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor</b>																		
(b)	Minimize disruption of community vistas and adverse effects on street and neighbourhood aesthetics (cont'd)	Landscaping	✓		✓	Entire Corridor	Landscaping species may not survive in winter months	[1] 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	[2] Monitor health of landscaping continuously	York Region	Status – [1]Complete; [2] Future Work  Species will be selected during the detailed design phase in consultation with York Region Forestry Services.  [1] [2010] The Y2 DBCR has addressed sustainability of landscape features and a greater degree of greening – e.g. Section 3.15.2 of the Y2 DBCR  [1] Equivalent references to Section 3 – Facilities Design of the Draft Design Basis & Criteria Report can be found in Section 3 of ID#8035. The standard details have been developed as part of the H3 detailed design project and subsequent segments will be referencing the H3 DBCR.	[1] [2010] Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19 <sup>th</sup> Avenue – Preliminary Engineering – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)  [1] Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis & Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)  [1] Highway 7 Rapidway, Segment H3 – Yonge St to Kennedy Rd*, Preliminary Engineering	Yes	[1] EF (2010) [1] EF (2012) [1] EF (2015)	ACR 2010: Section 3.15.2 discusses the use of salt tolerant tree species with specified tree cover and tree gates designed with room for growth. It states that "Wherever no room is available an irrigated and drained tree pit with structural soil or Silva cells shall be used."  After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.  ACR 2012: The evidence (ID#8035) supports the assertion regarding greening and that preliminary design does begin the process of meeting the commitment and will be completed in detail design.  ACR 2015: Evidence found that [1] landscape plants are salt and drought tolerant . However, item 1 also includes buried irrigation systems. This part of [1] has not been addressed. Item [1] remain open. The Status column should be revised to say "ongoing for item [1]. Item [2] is future work.

Appendix 1 Table 11-2 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 <sup>1</sup>			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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor																		
													[2] Following the post-construction warranty period, York Region Forestry Services will monitor the health of landscaping.  [1] RapidLINK has selected plants from the York Region list of acceptable trees, shrubs, grasses, and perennials based on their hardiness to salt and drought. Table 8.3.4 in TS 8 - Landscape and Streetscape Design Report (Y2015-033) outlines a sample planting material list to be used for the Project.	Design Basis & Criteria Report, Update to Dec 2009 Final Version, Final Draft, November 2011 (ID#8035)				

Appendix 1 Table 11-3 Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural 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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations (A)	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor</b>																		
C1 (a)	Minimize adverse effects on Aquatic Ecosystems	Fuel spills, due to accidents during construction refuelling and accidents during operation, entering the watercourses.	✓	✓	Entire Corridor	Fish kills due to chemical spills resulting in short term population decline.	No 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	Status – <u>Complete</u>  <u>Refuelling and other spill-related mitigations are included in the Spill Prevention and Response Plan (Y2015-002).</u>	<u>Spill Prevention and Response Plan (Y2015-002)</u>	Yes	EF (2015) Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review. ACR 2015: Evidence found of a spill plan. It includes restricting refueling within 30 m of watercourse. This item is closed even though it is ongoing activity as the item is a restriction that has been integrated into the protection procedure.	
(b)		Sediment laden storm water entering watercourses during construction.	✓		Entire Corridor	Fish kills and loss of aquatic habitat resulting in short term population decline.	[1] Construction fencing at work areas near watercourses limiting area of disturbance.  [2] Erosion and Sediment Control Plan will be included.	Short term population decline.	None practical	Significant, only if erosion and sediment control measures fail due to an event during winter.	[3] Monitor sediment accumulation after rain events during construction to ensure that the proposed mitigation measures in the ESCP have been satisfied.	York Region	Status – <u>Complete</u>  An Environmental Management Plan and Emergency Response Plan for the construction phase will be developed during detailed design in consultation with regulatory authorities.  <u>Sediment and erosion control mitigations are included in the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (Y2015-028).</u>	<u>Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (Y2015-028)</u>	Yes	[1, 2, 3] EF (2015) [1] Closed	The Oct-10 review was determined EC with the following notes: Appendix D, Page 6 of Drainage Study states that SWMP's were "in general accordance with the MOE document 'Stormwater Management Planning and Design Guidelines' dated 2003" and that "Sediment loads will be controlled through the use of sediment control fence along the Yonge Street corridor, storm drain inlet protection at catch basin inlets, and hydroseeding along slopes to prevent erosion (p.8)". After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description...and Compliance Document Reference. The text modifications did change the review. The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown during detailed design. ACR 2015: Numbering added for clarity. The evidence provided supports assertion for item [1, 2 and 3] (Y2015-028). This item [2] is closed. Items 1 and 3 remain open during construction, as these are action items. The status column should be changes to Ongoing.	

Appendix 1 Table 11-3 Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural 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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations (A)	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor</b>																		
(c)		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	Status – Future work.  Maintenance of storm water management facilities following the construction warranty period will be carried out by York Region Transportation Services.		No		<p><b>2009 Compliance Review</b> found ENF (2009) as Draft dated Feb-09 was provided for review. Table should be updated to reflect more recent draft.</p> <p>The Oct-10 review found EF the following notes: Appendix D - Drainage Study includes mitigation measures for facilities such as OGS and tree pits. The Owner Engineer, asserted that monitoring of sediment in the SWM facilities is an EA commitment and would be a requirement for the entity undertaking the construction and/or operation / maintenance. We accept this assertion and as such are not expecting that the EA commitments applicable to detailed design, construction and operation / maintenance be reflected in the PE documents.</p> <p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description...and Compliance Document Reference. The text modifications did not change the review.</p>

Appendix 1 Table 11-3 Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural 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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations (A)	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor</b>																		
(d)	Minimize adverse effects on Aquatic Ecosystems (continued)	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.[3] Perform all in-water work in the dry using a temporary flow bypass system.[4]	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. [1] Compensate 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[2].	Insignificant	On-site environmental inspection during in-water work. Post-construction monitoring of fish habitat compensation measures.	York Region	Status – <b>Ongoing</b>  [2010] Consultation with TRCA regarding potential HADD and associated design requirements and approvals will be undertaken in detailed design.  [1] TRCA meeting on March 15 – TRCA indicated that HADD should be avoidable through appropriate design and mitigation.  An Environmental Management Plan and Emergency Response Plan for the construction phase at culvert/bridge construction sites will be developed during detailed design in consultation with regulatory authorities.  The Maintenance and Storage Facility (MSF) is not within segment Y2.  <u>An Aquatic Resources Protection Plan (Y2015-019) was prepared during Detailed Design which outlines agencies consulted [1], timing constraints for in-water construction [3], and in-water work mitigations [4] to be implemented during construction using the Daily Environmental Inspection Checklist (Y2015-030) [1] Also refer to Item 45.</u>	TRCA Meeting Notes (ID#8500)  <u>Aquatic Resources Protection Plan (Y2015-019)</u> <u>Daily Inspection Checklist (Y2015-030)</u>	Yes	[1] EF (2012)  [1,3,4] EF (2012)  [1,3,4] EF (2015)	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review. ACR 2012: The evidence (ID#8500) supports assertion [1] regarding Regulatory Agencies and that preliminary design does begin the process of meeting the commitment and will completed in detail design. The evidence (ID#8500) supports assertion [1] regarding Regulatory Agencies and that preliminary design does begin the process of meeting the commitment and will completed in detail design.  <b><u>2015 ACR: The evidence provided (Y2015-019 and -30) supports the assertion that agencies were consulted [1], timing constraints for in-water construction were developed [3], and in-water work mitigations were developed [4] and that they are being monitored</u></b>

Appendix 1 Table 11-3 Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural 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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations (A)	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor</b>																		
(e)		Fish mortality		✓		All watercourse s within entire corridor	Fish may be injured or killed by dewatering or physical harm.	[1] Design transitway cross-sections to avoid modifications at culverts/bridges.  [2] Avoid in-water work to the extent possible.  [3] Perform all in-water work in the dry using a temporary flow bypass system.  [4] Capture fish trapped during dewatering of the work zone and safely release upstream.  [5] Prohibit the entry of heavy equipment into the watercourse.	None expected.	None	Negligible	[6] On-site environmental inspection during in-water work.	York Region	Status – <u>On-going</u>  An Environmental Management Plan for in-water works will be developed during detailed design, in consultation with regulatory authorities.  <u>An Aquatic Resources Protection Plan (Y2015-019) was prepared during Detailed Design which outlines agencies consulted, timing constraints for in-water construction, and in-water work mitigations to be implemented during construction.</u>  <u>Implementation during construction will be tracked using the Daily Environmental Inspection Checklist (Y2015-030).</u>  <u>Refer to Item 48.</u>	<u>Aquatic Resources Protection Plan (Y2015-019)</u>  <u>Daily Inspection Checklist (Y2015-030)</u>	Yes	[2-6] EF [1,2,5] Closed  [2,3, 4, 5, 6] EF [2015]	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.  <u>ACR 2015: Numbering added for clarity. The evidence provided supports assertion for item [2,3, 4, 5, 6] (Y2015-030). This items [1,2 and 5] are closed. Item 3, 4, 6 remain open during construction, as these are action items.</u>

Appendix 1 Table 11-3 Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural 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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations (A)	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor</b>																		
(f)	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.	[1] Use open footing culverts or countersink closed culverts a minimum of 20% of culvert diameter. [2] The culvert extension will be designed to maintain fish passage.	[3] The culvert extension at Rouge River Tributary 2 will be designed to avoid the creation of a barrier to fish movement. [4] 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	[5] On-site environmental inspection during in-water work.	York Region	Status – <b>On-going</b>  Culvert extensions will be further developed during the detailed design phase.  An Environmental Management Plan and Emergency Response Plan for the construction phase at culvert/bridge construction sites will be developed during detailed design in consultation with regulatory authorities.  The Maintenance and Storage Facility (MSF) is not within segment Y2  <u>A Request for Review (Y2015-021) was prepared by RapidLINK and submitted to DFO for the extension of a culvert on the Rouge River Tributary, south of Bernard Avenue. DFO reviewed the application and confirmed that a Fisheries Act authorization would not be required for this work. (Y2015-022)</u>	<u>DFO Request for Review (Y2015-021)</u>  <u>DFO Response Letter to Request for Review (Y2015-022)</u>	Yes	[1-3] EF (2015)	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review. <u>ACR 2015: Numbering added for clarity. The evidence provided supports assertion for item [1,2 and 3] (Y2015-021 and -022). Items [1,2 and 3] are closed. Items [4] and [5] remain open .</u>

Appendix 1 Table 11-3 Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural 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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations (A)	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor</b>																		
(g)		Baseflow alterations		✓	✓	All watercourses within entire corridor.	New impervious surfaces can lead to changes in the frequency, magnitude and duration of flows.	[1] Reduce the area of impervious surfaces to the extent possible.  [2] Use storm water management practices that encourage infiltration and recharge of groundwater.	None expected.	None	Negligible	[3] Post-construction inspection of storm water management facilities to evaluate their effectiveness.  On-going maintenance as required.	York Region	Status – <b>Complete</b>  [1] [2010] The proposed improvements will result in an increase in impervious area - Appendix D of Y2 DBCR  [2] [2010] A preliminary Drainage Study was prepared during preliminary design and provides strategies for stormwater management – Appendix D of Y2 DBCR  A Stormwater Management Plan will be developed during detailed design in consultation with regulatory agencies.  [3] Maintenance of storm water management facilities following the construction warranty period will be carried out by York Region Transportation Services.  [1, 2] Median and continuity strip pavers are "Eco-Pavers" and allow for water infiltration. Planters B, C and D have soft plant material which will absorb rainfall. For further detail, reference section 3.3.3 and 3.3.7 of (ID#8035)	[2010] Yonge Street Rapidway Highway 7 to 19 <sup>th</sup> Avenue – PE – Design Basis & Criteria Report- Final July 2010 (ID# 6249) (Y2 DBCR)  Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis & Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)  [1,2] Highway 7 Rapidway, Segment H3 – Yonge St to Kennedy Rd", Preliminary Engineering Design Basis & Criteria Report, Update to Dec 2009 Final Version, Final Draft, November 2011 (ID#8035)  [1 & 2] [2010] Appendix D – Final Drainage Study for Viva Next Y2	Yes	[1] EFC (2010)  [2] EF (2010)  [1,2] EF (2015) All items closed	2009 Compliance Review: 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.  The Owner Engineer, asserted that post-construction inspection of SWM facilities is an EA commitment and would be a requirement for the entity undertaking the construction and/or operation / maintenance. We accept this assertion and as such are not expecting that the EA commitments applicable to detailed design, construction and operation / maintenance be reflected in the PE documents.  Note: Although impervious area increases evidence for measures to increase infiltration have been found.  In the Oct-10 review the item was marked as EF.  After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.  The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process

Appendix 1 Table 11-3 Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural 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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations (A)	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor</b>																		
													[1, 2] The Supplement to Final Drainage Study June 2010 (ID#8695) addresses the inclusion of 1.4m wide bike lanes along the corridor. The conclusion is the impact to the drainage design is negligible (less than or equal to 2% increase in flow) and no change to the drainage design will be required.  <u>A Drainage and Hydrology Report (Y2015-014) was prepared during Detailed Design which followed the recommendations of the preliminary engineering drainage study.</u>  <u>No stormwater management facilities to address quantity control are proposed, therefore [3] does not apply.</u>	Yonge Street (Y.R.1) – June 2010 (ID# 6075)  [1&2] Supplement to Final Drainage Study for vivaNext Y2 June 2010 (ID#8695)  <u>Drainage and Hydrology, 90% Design Report, RapidLINK, June 2015 (Y2015-014)</u>			of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown during detailed design. The evidence supports this. ACR 2015: Evidence found to support assertion for Items [1] and [2] from this and previous ACRs. Item [3] does not apply. All items are closed	
(h)	Minimize adverse effects on Aquatic Ecosystems (continued)	Baseflow alterations – realignment of watercourse	✓	✓	Pomona Mills Creek at the proposed Maintenance and Storage Facility	Fish habitat may be destroyed or disturbed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>erosion and sedimentation control</li> <li>provide Level 1 stormwater treatment for vehicle storage and maintenance facility</li> <li>convey existing flow through the site during construction of the new watercourse</li> <li>create new channel using natural channel design</li> <li>capture and safely release stranded fish</li> <li>in-water construction timing restriction</li> </ul> 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"> <li>alteration of approximately 700 m<sup>2</sup> of highly degraded fish habitat anticipated</li> <li>opportunity to create and enhance approximately 900 m<sup>2</sup> of fish habitat through channel realignment</li> <li>therefore, net gain of 200 m<sup>2</sup> of fish habitat anticipated</li> <li>opportunity to enhance this highly degraded watercourse through natural channel design.</li> </ul>	None required	Positive	Monitor the newly altered fish habitat	York Region	Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.	

Appendix 1 Table 11-3 Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural 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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations (A)	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor</b>																		
(i)		Increased temperature		✓	✓	All watercourses within entire corridor.	Clearing of riparian vegetation and storm water management practices can impact temperature regimes.	[1] Minimize the area of stream bank alteration to the extent possible. [2] 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.	[3] Restore riparian areas disturbed during construction with native vegetation.	Negligible	[4] Post-construction inspection of storm water management facilities to evaluate their effectiveness.  [5] On-going maintenance as required. [6] Post-construction inspection of riparian plantings to confirm survival.	York Region	Status – ongoing.  [2] [2010]A preliminary Drainage Study was prepared during preliminary design and provides strategies for stormwater management – Appendix D of Y2 DBCR  A Stormwater Management Plan will be developed during detailed design in consultation with regulatory agencies  [1 and 3] Mitigation of watercourse impacts will be developed in detailed design in consultation with regulatory agencies.  An Environmental Management Plan and Emergency Response Plan for the construction phase at culvert/bridge construction sites will be developed during detailed design in consultation with regulatory authorities.  [4 to 6] Maintenance of storm water management facilities following the construction warranty period will be carried out by York Region Transportation Services.	[2010] Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19 <sup>th</sup> Avenue – PE – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)  [1 to 3] Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis & Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)  [2] [2010] Appendix D – Final Drainage Study for Viva Next Y2 Yonge Street (Y.R.1) – June 2010 (ID# 6075)  [1 to 3] Supplement to Final Drainage Study for vivaNext Y2 June 2010 (ID#8695)  <u>Aquatic Resources Protection Plan (Y2015-019)</u>	Yes	[1] No [2] Yes [3 to 6] No (2009)	2009 Compliance Review: NSE Appendix H – Drainage & Hydrology Report - Dec 2008 YC 3.05 (ID # 3693) included reference to an Environmental Control Plan being developed that included: minimizing 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.  In the Oct-10 review, the review result was EF with the following notes: Evidence for measures to increase infiltration have been found (ID# 6075).Also, it was noted as UINCLER with the following notes: It is unclear if the DBCR (#6249) or the SWMP (when developed) will address the requirement to minimize stream bank alteration  After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did change the review.  The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown during detailed





Appendix 1 Table 11-3 Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural 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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations (A)	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor</b>																		
(b)		Wildlife mortality.		✓		Entire corridor	Removal of wildlife habitat may result in wildlife mortality.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[1] Perform vegetation removals outside of wildlife breeding seasons (typically April 1 to July 31).</li> <li>[2] Perform bridge/culvert extension, repair and replacement outside of wildlife breeding seasons.</li> </ul>	None expected	None required	Negligible	None required.	York Region	Status – <b>On-going</b>  A Natural Sciences review will be completed in final design with guidance on construction timing.  An Environmental Management Plan and Emergency Response Plan for the construction phase at culvert/bridge construction sites will be developed during detailed design in consultation with regulatory authorities.  <u>Mitigation measures to prevent wildlife mortality have been identified in the Terrestrial Resources Protection Plan 9Y2015-029) and are being implemented during construction using the Daily Environmental Inspection Checklist (Y2015-030).</u>	<b>GEMP Terrestrial Resources Protection Plan (Y2015-029).</b>  <b>Daily Environmental Inspection Checklist (Y2015-030)</b>	Yes	[1,2] ECF (2015)	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.  ACR 2015: Numbers added for clarity. Evidence not sufficient to support [1 & 2]; the evidence provided (Y2015-029) indicates that work will be done in the wildlife breeding season. Post-review follow-up provided the following clarification: <i>Mitigation measures to prevent wildlife mortality have been identified in the Terrestrial Resources Protection Plan (Y2015-029). It states that although avoidance is recommended, if any clearing or construction activities are required during the main breeding season, Environment Canada guidelines are to be followed.</i> This assertion should be included in the Status column. The evidence provided supports this assertion and evidence of change is found. Review finding updated.

Appendix 1 Table 11-3 Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural 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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations (A)	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor</b>																		
(c)		Barriers to wildlife movement.		✓	✓	Entire corridor  Rouge River Tributary 2	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.	[1] Enhance wildlife passage under transitway, where feasible through culvert/bridge modifications.  [2] 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.  [3] 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	Status – <b>Complete</b>  [1] Existing culverts/bridges will be used, maintaining wildlife passage under transitway.  [2] Mitigation measures for the Rouge River Tributary 2 culvert extension will be developed further in the detailed design phase.  [3] The MSF is not within segment Y2  <b>[1] No changes to culverts and bridges during detailed design, therefore wildlife passages are maintained.</b>  <b>[2] Culvert extension size at Rouge River Tributary 2 is maintained in detailed design, as recommended by Preliminary Engineering. No specific mitigation for wildlife passage is proposed. (Y2015-037)</b>	<b>Y2.2 Structural Culvert and Retaining Wall Design Drawings (Y2015-037)</b>	Yes	<b>EF (2015) All items closed</b>	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.  The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown during detailed design.  ACR 2015: There is no change to culverts (as shown by evidence). Therefore items [1] and [2] closed. Item [3] is not applicable.
(d)	<b>Minimize adverse effects on Terrestrial Ecosystems (continued)</b>	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"> <li>Span bridges across the meander belt.</li> <li>Use oversized culverts to promote wildlife passage under the road.</li> <li>Stagger culvert inverts to create wet and dry culverts.</li> </ul>	Transitway represents an incremental increase in road width compared to existing hazard to wildlife created by Yonge Street.	None required	Insignificant	None required.	None required	Status – Not Applicable to Y2.		No	<b>Closed</b>	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description... and Responsible Person/Agency. The text modifications did not change the review.
(e)		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.	None required	Status – No action required.		No	<b>Closed</b>	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description... and Responsible Person/Agency. The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 1 Table 11-3 Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural 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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations (A)	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor</b>																		
(f)		Disturbance to vegetation through edge effects, drainage modifications and road salt.	✓	✓	✓	Entire corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clearing of new forest edges may result in sunscald, windthrow, and invasion by exotic species.</li> <li>Ditching, grading and other drainage modifications may alter local soil moisture regimes.</li> <li>Road salt may result in vegetation mortality and dieback.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[1] Minimize the area of vegetation removals to the extent possible.</li> <li>[2] Minimize grade changes and cutfill requirements to the extent possible.</li> <li>[3] Use close cut clearing and trimming to minimize encroachment on remaining vegetation.</li> <li>[4] Delineate work zones using construction fencing/tree protection barrier.</li> <li>[5] Manage the application of road salt to the extent possible.</li> </ul>	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	<p>Status – <b>On-going</b></p> <p>Opportunities to minimize or reduce vegetation removal through revised grading will be investigated in the detailed design phase.</p> <p>An Environmental Management Plan for the construction phase will be developed during detailed design in consultation with regulatory authorities.</p> <p>[1,2,4] <b>Aquatic and Terrestrial mitigation measures are outlined in the Aquatic Resources Protection Plan and the Terrestrial Resources Protection Plan (Y2015-029).</b></p>	<p><b>Aquatic Resources Protection Plan (Y2015-019)</b></p> <p><b>GEMP Terrestrial Resources Protection Plan (Y2015-029)</b></p>	Yes	[1,2,4] EF (2015)	<p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.</p> <p>The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown during detailed design.</p> <p><b>ACR 2015: Numbering added for clarity. Evidence was found to support [1, 2, 4]. Item [3] and Items [5] not reviewed. Items [1,2,4] closed</b></p>

Appendix 1 Table 11-3 Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural 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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations (A)	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor</b>																		
(g)		Rare, threatened or endangered flora.		✓		Yonge Street and High Tech Road, Yonge Street at Railway Underpass	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"> <li>• [1] Minimize the area of vegetation removals to the extent possible.</li> <li>• [2] Minimize grade changes to the extent possible.</li> <li>• [3] Use close cut clearing and trimming to minimize the number of trees to be removed.</li> <li>• [4] Delineate work zones using construction fencing/tree protection barrier.</li> <li>• [5] Protect trees within the clear zone using guide rail, curbs, etc. to prevent removal.</li> </ul>	Trees may be removed by the transitway and its associated facilities.	None required	Insignificant	None required.	York Region	Status – <b>Complete</b>  Opportunities to minimize or reduce vegetation removal through revised grading will be investigated in the detailed design phase.  An Environmental Management Plan for the construction phase will be developed during detailed design in consultation with regulatory authorities.  <u><b>Aquatic and Terrestrial mitigation measures are outlined in the Aquatic Resources Protection Plan and the Terrestrial Resources Protection Plan (Y2015-019 and Y2015-029)</b></u>  <u><b>The Arborist Report and Tree Preservation Plan provides measures to protect trees (Y2015-035)</b></u>	<u><b>Aquatic Resources Protection Plan (Y2015-019)</b></u>  <u><b>GEMP Terrestrial Resources Protection Plan (Y2015-029)</b></u>  <u><b>Arborist Report and Tree Preservation Plan (Y2015-035)</b></u>	Yes	[1,2,4,5] EF (2015) [3] ECF (2015) [1-5] Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.  The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown during detailed design. ACR 2015: Numbering added for clarity. Evidence was found to support [1, 2, 4, 5]. Evidence not found for Item [3] Use of close cut clearing and trimming. Post-review follow-up provided the following explanation. Close cut trimming/clearing does not have any application in this project. However, the Arborist Report and Tree Preservation Plan (Y2015-035) outlines other methods of minimizing the number of trees to be removed, including selection criteria. This explanation should be included in the Status column. The evidence provided supports this assertion of a change (ECF) and this item is closed.

Appendix 1 Table 11-3 Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural 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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations (A)	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor</b>																		
C3 (a)	Improve regional air quality and minimize adverse local effects	Degradation of existing local and regional air quality when compared to MOE standards			✓	York Region	Situation expected to be unchanged or marginally better than 2001	The fleet average emissions will drop significantly due to technological improvements balancing the increase in traffic volumes. The proposed Rapid Transit will divert commuters from individual highly polluting sources (single passenger automobiles)	Forecast improvement in all pollutants assessed (PM <sub>10</sub> , NO <sub>x</sub> , SO <sub>2</sub> , 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 <sub>10</sub> , 2.0% decrease in NO <sub>x</sub> , 1.9% decrease in SO <sub>2</sub> , and 3.0% decrease in CO)	None required	Positive Effect	None required	None required	Status – No action required.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
(b)		Increase in emissions of Greenhouse Gases (Gheg)			✓	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 <sub>2</sub> forecast in 2021)	None required	Positive Effect	None required	None required	Status – No action required.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 1 Table 11-3 Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural 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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations (A)	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor</b>																		
(c)		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	Status – <b>Completed</b> .  An Environmental Management Plan for the construction phase will be developed during detailed design. .  <u>The Air Quality and Dust Control Plan (Y2015-008) prepared by the Contractor (RapidLINK) in October 2015 demonstrates compliance with the commitment to mitigate noise and air quality effects of construction on community activities.</u>	<u>Air Quality and Dust Control Plan (Y2015-008)</u>	Yes	EF (2015) Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.  ACR 2015: Evidence found to support assertion (Y2015-008). This item is closed
(d)		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	Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
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.	[1] Storm water management facilities such as grassed swales and storm water ponds.  [2] Stormwater Management Plan should comply with the applicable provisions of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan.  [3] 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.	Minor increase in peak streamflows. Minor decrease in groundwater.	None practical	Negligible	None required	York Region	Status – <b>Complete</b> .  [1 to 3] [2010] A preliminary Drainage Study was prepared during preliminary design and provides strategies for stormwater management – Appendix D of Y2 DBCR  A Stormwater Management Plan will be developed during detailed design in consultation with regulatory agencies.  See also item 53 above.  [4] The Maintenance and Storage Facility is not within segment Y2  [1 to 3] The Supplement to Final Drainage Study June 2010 (ID#8695) addresses the inclusion of 1.4m wide bike lanes along the corridor. The conclusion is the impact to the drainage design is negligible (less than or equal to 2% increase in flow) and no change to the drainage design will be required.  <u>[2,3] Refer to Item 53.</u>	[2010] Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19 <sup>th</sup> Avenue PE – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)  Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis & Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)  [1 to 3] [2010] Appendix D – Final Drainage Study for Viva Next Y2 Yonge Street (Y.R.1) – June 2010 (ID# 6075)  [1 to 3] Supplement to Final Drainage Study for vivaNext Y2 June 2010 (ID#8695)	Yes	EF (2010)  [2] EF (2012)  [1-3] EF (2015) All items are closed	ACR 2010: After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications resulted in the item being reviewed.  The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown during detailed design.  ACR 2012: The evidence (ID#8695) supports the assertion and that preliminary design does begin the process of meeting the commitment and will completed in detail design.  ACR 2015: The evidence (see 53) supports the assertions for items [1 - 3]. Item 4 does not apply to this segment.

Appendix 1 Table 11-3 Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3 Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural Environment											Compliance Monitoring							
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issue/ Concerns	Project Phase			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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations (A)	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
							[4] Storm water management controls (quality, quantity and erosion) will also be required for the construction of the proposed Maintenance & Storage Facility (MSF).											

Appendix 1 Table 11-4 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 <sup>1</sup>			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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2014	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE D: To promote smart growth and economic development in the corridor</b>																		
D1 (a)	Support Regional and Municipal Planning Policies and approved urban structure	Need for pedestrian-friendly streets and walkways for access to stations		✓	✓	Entire corridor	Social and economic environment could be affected if Yonge St. is not attractive and safe for pedestrian traffic.	[1] Signalized pedestrian crosswalks will be provided at all stations and intersections; [2] Pedestrian safety will be considered in designs for station precincts and [3] road signage will be highly visible to both pedestrians and automobiles.	Potential for jaywalking in vicinity of stations	[4] Platform edge treatment will discourage illegal access	Insignificant and positive	[5] Monitor traffic accidents involving pedestrians to establish whether cause is transit related.	York Region	Status – <b>[1-2] Completed, [5] Ongoing.</b> [1 to 3] [2010] The Y2 preliminary design has incorporated pedestrian friendly guidelines – Section 3.15.2 of the Y2 DBCR [1 to 3] [2010] Pedestrian safety has been considered during Y2 preliminary design - e.g. Sections 3.4 (Station Platform) and 3.5 (Guardrail), and 3.14, 3.17, and 3.18 of the Y2 DBCR. [1 to 3] Equivalent references to Section 3 – Facilities Design of the Draft Design Basis & Criteria Report can be found in Section 3 of ID#8035. The standard details have been developed as part of the H3 detailed design project and subsequent segments will be referencing the H3 DBCR. These elements will be further developed in detailed design. [4] Monitoring of pedestrian access and traffic accidents will be carried out by York Region Transportation Services following the commencement of operation.	[1 to 3] [2010] Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19 <sup>th</sup> Avenue PE – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Final July 2010 –(ID# 6249)  [1 to 3] Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis & Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)  [1 to 3] Highway 7 Rapidway, Segment H3 – Yonge St to Kennedy Rd*, Preliminary Engineering Design Basis & Criteria Report, Update to Dec 2009 Final Version, Final Draft, November 2011 (ID#8035)	Yes	[1 to 3] EF (2010)  [1 to 3] EF (2012)  [1-2] EF (2015)	Section 3.14 Landscape treatment states that it will be further refined during detail design to address pedestrian safety. Section 3.17 Intersections state that surface treatments will reinforce pedestrian priority. Section 3.18 Crosswalks states that Crosswalks of specified width will be located at all signalized and non signalized intersections and will have the same surface treatment as that of the pedestrian zone and intersection corners. Section 3.15.2 Furnishing Zone states that features should be placed in a manner that does not obstruct the pedestrian movement. Section 2.3.12.4 states: Provide pedestrian "safe havens" on the median, if possible, at all east-west crosswalks and install countdown signals at all crosswalks. After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review. The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown during detailed design. ACR 2012: ID# 8695 includes reference to countdown timers at all sidewalks (section 2.3.12.4 Platform Safety) supporting assertion [1] This reference should be added. The updated documents indicate that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown during detailed design.
													[1 to 2] A Traffic Analysis Report was prepared during Detailed Design (Y2015-003) in accordance with the Preliminary Design.	[1][2] 90 pct Traffic Analysis Report, RapidLINK, June 2015 (Y2015-003)			ACR 2015: Numbering revised for clarity. Evidence found (Y2015-003) for Items [1] and [2]. These Items are closed. Items [3] signage and [4] platform edge treatments are outstanding. Item [5] is future work.	

Appendix 1 Table 11-4 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 <sup>1</sup>			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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2014	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE D: To promote smart growth and economic development in the corridor</b>																		
(b)		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	Status – <b>Ongoing</b>  Development proposals are reviewed by York Region and circulated to the Viva design team for review and comment.	<a href="#">Site Plan Application Summary (YR15-105)</a>	Yes	EF (2015)	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description... The text modifications did not change the review.  <b><u>2015 ACR: Evidence provided (YR15-105) was found to support the assertion that development proposals are reviewed.</u></b>
(c)		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	Status – Does not apply:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thornhill Heritage District is not in segment Y2.</li> <li>No changes to existing conditions are proposed in Richmond Hill historical district.</li> </ul>		No	<b>Closed</b>	The Oct-10 review found compliance to be NSE with the following notes: Section 3.9 of the DBCR (# 6249) states that "All streetscape elements will broadly fall under two distinctive groups, which are system wide applicable group and Heritage zone specific group," but only provides general guidelines. Consultations with the Richmond Hill historical district and other community groups representing heritage associations have not been undertaken to date during Y2 PE Design. No evidence that such consultation are to take place has been provided.  After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description...and Compliance Document Reference. The changes include removal of the assertion that community groups will be consulted. The text modifications did change the review.

Appendix 1 Table 11-4 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 <sup>1</sup>			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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2014	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE D: To promote smart growth and economic development in the corridor</b>																		
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.	[1] Construction Traffic and Pedestrian Management Plan will avoid wherever possible, barriers to entrances/exits to large attractors along Yonge Street. [2] Transitway median design to incorporate frequent access paths during operations, particularly at community facilities	Alternative access routes to facilities may affect adjacent properties	[3] Mark detours and alternative access points clearly	Insignificant	[4] Monitor congestion levels during construction and traffic patterns during operations.	York Region	Status – <b>[1-3] Complete, [4] On-going.</b> Construction Traffic and Pedestrian Management Plans will be developed during detailed design. [4] Monitoring of traffic after construction will be carried out by York Region Transportation Services following the commencement of operation. <b>[1-3] A Traffic Analysis Report was prepared during Detailed Design to identify potential traffic impacts and mitigations (Y2015-003). Additionally, Traffic Staging and Temporary Conditions Drawings include information on signage for detours (see notes 1, 6, 9, and 10 in Y2015-038)</b>	<u>90 pct Traffic Analysis Report, RapidLINK, June 2015 (Y2015-003)</u>  <u>Y2.2 Traffic Staging and Temp Conditions Dwgs. (Y2015-038)</u>	Yes	<b>[1-3] ENF (2015) [1-3] Closed</b>	2009 Compliance Review: <u>ENF</u> with the following notes. 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. The Final DBCR provides no new evidence to confirm that crossing opportunities will be retained at all existing crosswalk locations. For the Oct-10 review, the item was marked as EF with the following notes: Through discussions with the Owner Engineer, the drawings numbered 6, 7, 26, 32, 38 (dated 24-Jul-09) were reviewed and found to provide evidence that supports the crossing opportunities commitment. The table should be updated to reference the drawings. After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications removed assertions of starting to complete this commitment. ACR 2015: Evidence (Y2015-03 and -038) support assertion for Items [1-3]. These items are closed.
D3 (a)	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	Status – Future work (if necessary).  Development proposals are reviewed by York Region and circulated to the Viva design team for review and comment.		No		After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 1 Table 11-4 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 <sup>1</sup>			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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2014	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE D: To promote smart growth and economic development in the corridor</b>																		
(b)		The potential for a decrease in business activity.		✓	✓	Entire corridor	Modification of road access could lead to displacement and/or business loss.	Implement procedures to address requests of affected businesses; [1] Incorporate design solutions and construction methods [2] 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	[3] Cooperative response to business loss concerns addressed to municipalities.	York Region	Status – Ongoing work.  [1] [2010] Access to all existing businesses along the corridor has been maintained (see DBCR Appendix F). Driveway entrances are designed to current York Region standard (see DCBR Section 2.3.14). U-turns will be provided at intersections to accommodate different vehicle types (see DBCR Section 2.3.10). Access designs will be finalized in detailed design. Construction Traffic and Pedestrian Management Plans will be developed during detailed design.  [1]The Urban Street Design Standards are being applied to the corridor in an effort to encourage development. The Standards will impact the design of the corridor and are described in the Report. The individual elements are discussed in Appendix B  [3] Community liaison procedures will be developed further during detailed design. YRRTC has already retained Community Liaison Coordinators (A. Witty and N. Raja) to engage with property and business owners during the property acquisition phase, and later during construction and operation.	[1] [2010] Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19 <sup>th</sup> Avenue PE – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)  [1] Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis & Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)  [1]Urban Street Design Standards_Tech Report_2011-09-14_revised 2011-11-24_ly (ID#7235)  <u>90 pct Traffic Analysis Report. RapidLINK. June 2015 (Y2015-003)</u>	Yes	[1] EF(2010)  [1] EF (2012)  [1,2] EF (2015)	ACR 2010: [1] Evidence provided in document ID# 6249 as described in the status column. After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did change the review. The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown during detailed design. ACR 2012: [1] Evidence provided in document ID# 7235 as described in the status column. The updated documents show the process of meeting the commitment is being undertaken in that the preliminary design and that compliance will completed and shown in detail design. The evidence supports this.

Appendix 1 Table 11-4 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 <sup>1</sup>			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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2014	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE D: To promote smart growth and economic development in the corridor																		
													[1-2] Traffic Analysis Report was prepared during Detailed Design (Y2015-003).				ACR 2015: [1-2] More explanation is needed as to how the evidence provided in document Y2015-003 satisfies items [1] and [2]. Post-review follow-up provided the following: [1] The Complaints Protocol outlines procedures to address requests of affected businesses (Evidence to be provided by Owner); [2] The Memo regarding the Portable Variable Messaging Signage (PVMS) (Y2015-040) incorporates design solutions and construction methods to minimize the number of businesses affected. This is accomplished by providing drivers with real time traveller information along the project limits, in addition to Traffic Management Communications and business support/access messaging. This assertion should be added to the Status column and the evidence added to the References column. The new evidence provided supports the above assertion. The items are ongoing.	

Appendix 1 Table 11-4 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 <sup>1</sup>			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 (MMM)		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation						Review 2014	Review Results	Notes
<b>OBJECTIVE D: To promote smart growth and economic development in the corridor</b>																		
D4 (a)	Protect provisions for goods movement in corridor	Ease of Truck Movement			✓	Entire Corridor	Median transitway will restrict truck movement in corridor	[1] 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)	[2] Traffic signs prohibit large truck at stations with no stations in median. Designate truck routes	Insignificant	[3] Monitor and widen Yonge with right turn tapers at side streets to allow for movement	York Region	Status – <b>[1,2] Complete, [3] Ongoing</b>  [1] [2010] Section 2.3.10 of the Y2 DBCR lists the permissible U-turns and vehicle types at each of the intersections.  [2] [2010] Section 2.4 of the Y2 DBCR documents the justification for right turn lanes. For design consistency and to improve pedestrian circulation, right turn tapers will not be included in the design.  [3] Monitoring of traffic after construction will be carried out by York Region Transportation Services following the commencement of operation.  <b>[1 to 2] A Traffic Analysis Report was prepared during Detailed Design (See Section 5.6 of Y2015-003).</b>	[1, 2] [2010] Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19 <sup>th</sup> Avenue PE – Design Basis & Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)  [1, 2] Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis & Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)  <b>90 pct Traffic Analysis Report, RapidLINK, June 2015 (Y2015-003)</b>	Yes	[1] EF (2010) [2] EFC (2010) [1,2] EF (2015) [1,2] Closed	Table 2-18 denotes the permissible U-turns and vehicle types at each of the intersections. Table 2-18 summarizes the Existing Right Turn Storage Lengths, the Proposed Right Turn Storage Lengths and the Proposed Left Turn Storage Lengths, with notes as appropriate. After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did change the review. <b>[2] NOTE: right turn tapers will not be included in the design.</b> The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed by York Region Transportation Services. ACR 2015: Evidence found to support assertion for items [1,2]. These items are closed. Item [3] is open.
(b)		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	Status – <b>Complete</b> Construction Traffic Management Plans will be developed during detailed design.  <b>A Traffic Analysis Report was prepared during Detailed Design (Section 4.6 of Y2015-003).</b>	<b>90 pct Traffic Analysis Report, RapidLINK, June 2015 (Y2015-003)</b>	Yes	EF (2015) All items closed	ACR 2015: Evidence provided was incorrect and does not support that a plan was made. The Traffic Staging and Temporary Conditions Drawings should have been referenced (Y2015-038). The reference should be updated.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
Ministry of Transportation	Mr. Steve Ganesh, Senior Planner	1	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.	a) Comment noted.	York Region	a) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.
			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.	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. 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.		b) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.
			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.	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.  d) 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.		c) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
			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.	e) 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.		d) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
Ministry of the Environment - Noise	Mr. Thomas Shevlin	2a	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.	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.	York Region	a) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.
			b) STAMSON calculations should be redone using peer-reviewed traffic volume data, and other corrected data and calculation techniques as described above.			b) Status – No action required		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			c) Tables 5.6 and 5.9 of the noise report should be revised based upon a and b above.			c) Status – No action required		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
			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.			d) Status – No action required		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
Ministry of the Environment – Air Quality	Mr. Ernie Hartt, Supervisor Air Pesticide and Environmental Planning (APEP)	2b	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.	a) Comment noted.	York Region	a) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.
			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.	b) Comment noted.		b) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.
			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 experienced have been addressed.	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.		c) Status – Future work, to be addressed in detailed design		No		After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.  The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown during detailed design.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
		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.	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.	York Region	Status – No action required		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			<i>Lack of Detail in EA Report on AQ Impacts of the Project (Future Case)</i> 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.	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.		d) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
			<i>Focus of EA Report and Senes Report on PM Emissions</i> 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.	e) Comment noted.		e) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.
			f) PM <sub>2.5</sub> 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 <sub>2.5</sub> was not included since it is a health based parameter. TS recommends that PM <sub>2.5</sub> is included in all aspects of the AQ impact assessment.	f) The supplementary air quality memorandum addresses PM <sub>2.5</sub> .		f) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
			<p><i>Comparison of "Historical &amp; Measured AQ Data" with MOE AAQC</i></p> <p>g) The averaging time used in Tables 6-23, 6-24 &amp; 6-25 of the EA Report &amp; in Tables 2.5, 2.6 &amp; 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.</p> <p>i. Table 6-25 of EA Report is intended to be identical to Table 2.7 of the Senes Report &amp; yet Table 6-25 for SO<sub>2</sub>, O<sub>3</sub> &amp; NO<sub>x</sub> 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.</p> <p>ii. For CO, the 8-hr value of 36,200 ug/ m<sup>3</sup> &amp; the 24-hr value of 15,700 ug/ m<sup>3</sup> as listed in the Table 2.5 (Senes) &amp; 6-23 (EA Report) are incorrect. It is the 1-hr value which should be 36,200 ug/ m<sup>3</sup> &amp; the 8-hr which should be 15,700 ug/m<sup>3</sup>. In Tables 2.6, 2.7 (Senes) &amp; 6-24, 6-25 (EA Report) the 1-hr value of 36,200 ug/m<sup>3</sup> is listed correctly, however, the 8-hr value of 15,700 ug/ m<sup>3</sup> has been omitted.</p> <p>iii. For O<sub>3</sub>, the averaging time to be used in the comparison is the 1-hr value of 165 ug/m<sup>3</sup> not a "calculated equivalent standard".</p> <p>iv. For NO<sub>x</sub>, both the 24-hr value of 200 ug/m<sup>3</sup> &amp; the 1-hr value of 400 ug/m<sup>3</sup> should be listed &amp; used in the comparison &amp; it should be clear that using NO<sub>x</sub> as NO<sub>2</sub> is a conservative assumption but is considered acceptable. (Note: NO<sub>x</sub> = NO + NO<sub>2</sub>)</p> <p>v. For SO<sub>2</sub>, O<sub>3</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub>, the 30-day values as listed in Table 2.7 of the Senes Report are inappropriate and should not be included.</p>	<p>g) The supplementary air quality memorandum includes updated Tables 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7.</p> <p>i. 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.</p> <p>ii. The supplementary air quality memorandum includes updated Tables 2.5, and 2.6.</p> <p>iii. The supplementary air quality memorandum includes updated Tables 2.5, 2.6 and 2.8.</p> <p>iv. The supplementary air quality memorandum provides a response to this comment.</p> <p>v. The supplementary air quality memorandum includes an updated Table 2.8.</p>			No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.	
			<p>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.</p>	<p>h) The supplementary air quality memorandum includes updated Tables 2.5, 2.6, 2.7 and 2.8.</p>		h) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
			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): i. Table 6.-25/2.7 – the SO2 values for Locations #3 & #4 don't seem reasonable & must be clarified/ confirmed. ii. Table 6-25/2.7 – O3 values for Location #3 are also somewhat questionable. iii. Table 6-25/2.7 – 1-hr CO values for Locations #4, #3 should also be confirmed.	i) The supplementary air quality memorandum includes updated preambles to Tables 2.6 and 2.8		i) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.
			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.	j) Comment noted.		j) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.
			<i>Development of Vehicle Emissions Data</i> 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.	k) The supplementary air quality memorandum includes an updated preamble to Table 3.1.		k) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
			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.	l) The modelling data can be made available upon request.		l) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.
			m) A ratio of CO/SO <sub>2</sub> 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.	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.		m) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.
			<i>Dispersion Modelling/ Assessment of AQ</i> 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.	n) The locations and descriptions of the monitoring stations have been described in Section 2.3, SENES Measurement Program in Appendix K.		n) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
			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.	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.		o) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.
			<i>Matching of Alt. Assessed in EA Report with Those in Senes'</i> 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) The supplementary air quality memorandum provides a response to this comment.		p) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.
			<i>Identification of Mitigation Measures</i> 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.	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.		q) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
			r) Table 11-3 under Proposed Mitigation Measures-Potential Residual Effects suggests an improvement (or decrease) in PM <sub>10</sub> 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 PM <sub>10</sub> 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 PM <sub>10</sub> 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 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 PM <sub>10</sub> concentrations.	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.		r) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.
			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.	s) The enhancement of the streetscape by tree planting is identified as an objective or commitment in several sections and exhibits in the report.		s) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.
			t) TS is of the opinion that the issue of PM <sub>2.5</sub> concentrations also needs further review and as such, Table 11-3 should be modified to include consideration of PM <sub>2.5</sub> as well as PM <sub>10</sub> .	t) There will be a net positive effect to the environment from PM <sub>2.5</sub> and PM <sub>10</sub> , therefore no further mitigation is required.		t) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
			<p><i>Monitoring of Construction PM Emission</i></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 &amp; 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) 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 requirements of the standard contract conditions as described in Section 12 of the EA Report.</p>		u) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.
			<p><i>Senes Project Description</i></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 &amp; 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>v) The supplementary air quality memorandum provides additional information.</p>		v) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
			<i>Executive Summaries</i> 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.	w) The supplementary air quality memorandum includes an updated Executive Summary.		w) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.
			<i>Overall Assessment of AQ</i> 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.	x) The supplementary air quality memorandum provides a response. An updated Section 7.0 is provided.		x) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.
Ministry of the Environment – Surface Water and Groundwater	Ms. Ellen Schmarje, Supervisor, Water Resources Unit	2c	a) The Central Region-Water Resources Unit has no additional comments or outstanding issues.	a) All comments are noted.	York Region	a) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.
			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.			b) Status – No action required.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			c) There are no outstanding groundwater issues.			c) Status – No action required.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
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) Status – Future work (if required).		No		After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
York Region District School Board	Ms. Jane Ross, Manager of Land Use Planning	4	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.	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.	York Region	a) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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	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.		b) Status – Does not apply to Segment Y2.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
Ministry of Culture	Jackie Dolling, Heritage Planner/ Archaeologist	5	a) The Stage 1 Archaeological assessment report was reviewed and notes that the 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.	a) Lands along the south side of Langstaff Road 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.	York Region	a) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
			b) [1] All lands within the project impact area must be surveyed and documents. [2] 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.	b) [3] Consultation with the Ministry of Culture will be undertaken as required during the design and implementation of the project.		<p>b) Status – Ongoing – a Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment will be carried out in the detailed design phase, and approvals will be obtained from the Ministry of Culture prior to initiating construction (anticipated to commence in 2015)</p> <p>Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment has been completed for most of the corridor. Remaining 4 properties to be completed prior to construction. Final reports to be circulated to First Nations upon completion of all studies.</p> <p><u>Refer to Item 18.</u></p>	<p>Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of Yonge Street, Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 West of Yonge Street and Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 East of Yonge Street, Geographic Townships of Vaughan and Markham, Town of Richmond Hill, Regional Municipality of York, December 2013. (ID# Y2004-005)</p> <p>Correspondence from Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Recreation regarding Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of Yonge Street, Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 West of Yonge Street and Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 East of Yonge Street, March 19, 2014 (ID# Y2004-005)</p>	No	EF (2014)	<p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.</p> <p>The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown during detailed design.</p> <p>2014: Numbering added for clarity. Evidence provided supports the status indicated [1-3], 4 properties remain and status for items [1-3] remain ongoing.</p> <p>2015 ACR: Evidence was not available</p>

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
			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.	c) Comment noted and will be included in the development of the Mitigation Plan to be completed as part of the detailed design phase.		c) Future work – consultation regarding the Richmond Hill historical district with community groups representing heritage associations will be undertaken in the detailed design phase. No construction is required in the Richmond Hill historical district. Buses will operate in mixed traffic using the existing curbside station, as per the current operation		No		After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.  The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown during detailed design.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
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>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 assess. Installation of a continuous</p>	York Region	<p>Status – <b>Complete</b>:</p> <p>i. [2010]The Y2 preliminary design has incorporated pedestrian friendly guidelines – Section 3.15.2 of the Y2 DBCR. Pedestrian safety has been considered during Y2 PE Design - e.g. Sections 3.14, 3.17.2, and 3.18 of the Y2 DBCR Equivalent references to Section 3 – Facilities Design of the Draft Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report can be found in Section 3 of ID#8035. The standard details have been developed as part of the H3 detailed design project and subsequent segments will be referencing the H3 DBCR.</p> <p>ii. York Region Transportation and Works Department, Traffic Engineering and Safety</p>	<p>i. [2010] Yonge Street Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19th Avenue PE – Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)</p> <p>ii. Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)</p> <p>iii. Highway 7 Rapidway, Segment H3 – Yonge St to Kennedy Rd*, Preliminary Engineering Design Basis &amp; Criteria Report, Update to Dec</p>	No	<p>i. EF (2010)</p> <p>ii. EF (2010)</p> <p>iv. EF (2010)</p> <p>vi. EF (2010)</p> <p>i. EF (2012)</p>	<p>ACR 2010:</p> <p>iv. Evidence provided in document ID# 6249 that this was considered.</p> <p>The DBCR includes pedestrian safety considerations that provide sufficient evidence, including the following:</p> <p>Section 3.14 Landscape treatment states that it will be further refined during detail design to address pedestrian safety.</p> <p>Section 3.17 Intersections state that surface treatments will reinforce pedestrian priority.</p> <p>Section 3.18 Crosswalks states that Crosswalks of specified width will be located at all signalized and non signalized intersections and will have the same surface treatment as that of the pedestrian zone and intersection corners.</p> <p>Section 3.15.2 Furnishing Zone states that features should be placed in a manner that does not obstruct the pedestrian movement.</p> <p>Section 2.3.12.4 states: Provide pedestrian “safe havens” on the median, if possible, at all east-west crosswalks and install countdown signals at all crosswalks.</p> <p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description...and Compliance Document Reference. The text modifications did not change the review.</p> <p>The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown during detailed design.</p> <p>AR 2012:</p> <p>i. The updated references indicate that he process of meeting the</p>

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
				fence along the median would severely impact the emergency vehicle access. viii. Existing transit driver training includes extensive consideration of safety issues.		Sections were part of the integrated preliminary design team and provided input throughout the design development.. Other relevant parties involved will include YR Police, YR EMS, YRT Enforcement, and the Town of Richmond Hill Fire Services. These parties will be consulted further during detailed design.	2009 Final Version, Final Draft, November 2011 (ID#8035)  ii. Memo - Fire and Emergency Service Access - Median Crossover Provisions – April 14, 2009 - YC 3.01 (ID # 4216 and 4217)  ii. Meeting notes – meetings with Richmond Hill Fire Services, April 21 and June 22, 2010.(ID#9022, 9023)		iv EF (2015) vi EF (2015) All items closed	commitments continues in the preliminary design and that compliance will be completed and shown during detailed design. Note that the sections have changed for the updated documents (e.g., Section 3.17 Intersections is Section 3.3.8 Intersection (ID#8035). ACR 2015: Evidence found regarding ii (-see item 30). Evidence was found for iv and vi - see item 68

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
						iii. No action required iv. Speed limits were considered and Y2 PE Design supports the continuation of existing speed limits. v. No action required vi. Pedestrian countdown signals will be installed – Section 2.3.12.4 of Y2 DBCR vii. No action required viii. No action required  <u>ii - The York Region Transportation Department reviewed the draft Traffic Analysis Report and provided comments which were included in the final Report. Refer to Item 30.</u> iv and vi - Refer to Item 68.				
			b) Equip all the buses circulating on the transitway with a distinctive horn sound to capture pedestrians' attention more easily.	b) All of the buses will have horns in accordance with the requirements of the Traffic Act.		b) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
			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).	c) Comment noted and will be carried forward for inclusion in the Monitoring Program to be developed during the detailed design phase.		c) Status – <u>Ongoing</u> : Well inspection and mitigation plans to be undertaken in detailed design.  <u>Refer to Item 49.</u>		Yes	EF (2015)	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review. The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown during detailed design.  ACR 2015: As per item 49, This Item 1 is ongoing, and the evidence provided (Y2015-023) supports that it is ongoing.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
			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> .	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.		d) Status – <b>Complete</b> contingency planning to address contaminated sites will be developed during the detailed design phase, based on the results of Phase 1 ESAs to be undertaken in 2011 for property acquisition.  <b>Refer to Item 60.</b>		Yes	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review. The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown during detailed design.  ACR 2015: The evidence from item 49 does not mention the federal guidance document or how (or if) it was considered. Post-review follow-up provided the following assertion: <i>After reviewing the Federal Contaminated Sites Inventory, it is confirmed that there are no known federal contaminated sites in the project area. In addition, there is no awareness of any federal land that is connected to any of the contaminated sites that are in the project area. Therefore, as no federal contaminated sites are being managed as part of the project, the federal guidance document has not been considered. This item is closed. The status column should be updated.</i>
			e) Section 6.5.2 Approach Used for Noise Assessment: It is encouraged that the 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.	e) There are currently no approved National Guidelines for Noise Assessment. Comment noted for further consideration during the Federal EA process once a CEAA trigger has been determined.		e) Status – Future work – if required based on Federal EA requirements		No		After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
			<p><i>Section 6.6 Existing Air Quality and Criteria</i></p> <p>f) Air quality predictions should include prediction for the levels of ozone and PM2.5 and a comparison to the National Ambient Air Quality Objectives (NAAQO).</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>		f) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.
			<p>g) Predict the cumulative air emissions (for construction and operation). These predictions should include a comparison to NAAQO and an estimate of possible exceedances.</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>		g) Status – Future work – if required based on Federal EA requirements		No		After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
			h) Indicate the measures to be taken to control dust during construction.	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).		h) Status – <b>Ongoing</b> – Environmental Management Plan to be developed in entailed design  <u>Refer to Item C3(c).</u>  <u>Monitoring of effects of construction activities on air quality are tracked using the Daily Environmental Inspection Checklist (Y2015-030)</u>	<u>Daily Inspection Checklist (Y2015-030)</u>	Yes	EF (2015)	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review. The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown during detailed design.  ACR 2015: Evidence found to support assertion (Y2015-008). This item is closed
			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 <sub>x</sub> a precursor to ground-level ozone formation) in the context of regional emissions and air quality.	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.		i) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.
City of Vaughan	Mr. Roy McQuillan, Manager of Corporate Policy	7	a) The MOE be advised that the City of Vaughan supports the approval of this EA report as submitted by York Region.	a) Comment noted.	York Region	a) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2 (not located in the City of Vaughan)		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description...and Compliance Document Reference. The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
			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.	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.		b) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2 (not located in the City of Vaughan)		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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.	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).		c) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2 (not located in the City of Vaughan).		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
			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.	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.		d) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2 (not located in the City of Vaughan).		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review. After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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 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	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).		e) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2 (not located in the City of Vaughan).		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
			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.	f) Comment noted.		f) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2 (not located in the City of Vaughan).		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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.	g) Comment noted.		g) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2 (not located in the City of Vaughan).		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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.	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.		h) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2 (not located in the City of Vaughan).		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
Town of Richmond Hill	Mr. Marcel Lanteigne, Manager, Transportation and Site Plans	8	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.	a) As noted on Figure 10-9 the facilities to cross the CNR are not part of the undertaking of this EA.	York Region	a) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.
Town [City] of Markham	Mr. Arup Mukherjee, Manager of Transportation	9	a) The Town is generally satisfied with the report and request that the following three items (i through ii) below are addressed in the detailed design phase. 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. 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. 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.	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.	York Region	a.i – a.iii Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.  After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
			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.							
			The following items below are from the council resolution and the Town requests that they are also addressed in the project during implementation. b) The Region and YRTP continue to work with Town staff to finalize the Thornhill Yonge Street Study and an implementation strategy.	b) The Proponent will commit to work with the Town [City] of Markham and the Thornhill Heritage Committee through the detailed design process.		b) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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.	c) The Proponent will commit to work with the Town [City] of Markham through the detailed design process.		c) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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.	d) The Proponent will commit to work with the Town [City] of Markham through the detailed design process. Intersection traffic operations will be monitored as noted in Table 12-3 of the EA report.		d) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2 (not located in the Town [City] of Markham)		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
			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.	e) The Proponent will commit to work with the Town [City] 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.		e) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description...and Compliance Document Reference. The text modifications did not change the review.
Six Nations of the Grand River	Ms. Jo-Ann E.C. Greene, Director Lands and Resources Department	10	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.	a) Comment noted.	York Region	a) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.
			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.	b) Comment noted.		b) Status – No action required		No	Closed	No modifications made and no change to the review.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
			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.	c) [1] 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, [2] the proponent will contact Six Nations of the Grand River.		c) Status – Ongoing a Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment will be undertaken during the detailed design phase and will be provided to the Six Nations of the Grand River. A protocol for addressing archaeological finds during construction will be developed during detailed design.  Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment has been completed for most of the corridor. Remaining 4 properties to be completed prior to construction. Final reports to be circulated to First Nations upon completion of all studies.  <u>Refer to Item 18.</u>	Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of Yonge Street, Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 West of Yonge Street and Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 East of Yonge Street, Geographic Townships of Vaughan and Markham, Town of Richmond Hill, Regional Municipality of York, December 2013. (ID# Y2004-005)  Correspondence from Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Recreation regarding Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of Yonge Street, Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 West of Yonge Street and Lots 36 to 55, Concession 1 East of Yonge Street, March 19, 2014 (ID# Y2004-005)	No		After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review. The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown during detailed design. 2014: Numbers added for clarity. Arch. Assessments have not been forwarded yet to Six Nations [1]. Therefore, this was not reviewed.  <u>2015 ACR: Not reviewed as the evidence was not available</u>

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
			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).	d) Comment noted (DFO authorization is identified in Section 12.2.1 of the EA report as a potential post EA approval).		d) [2010] Status <b>Complete</b> – 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, as required.  TRCA meeting on March 15 – TRCA indicated that HADD should be avoidable through appropriate design and mitigation.  <b>Refer to Item 45.</b>	TRCA Meeting Notes (ID#8500)	No	EF (2012) EF (2015) Closed (2015)	ACR 2010: After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.  The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown during detailed design. <b>ACR 2012:</b> Status changed to Ongoing as work was undertaken. The evidence (ID#8500) supports assertion [1] that a meeting with TRCA took place. Note: we do NOT consider the arrangements of Six Nations and DFO as reviewable commitments in the ACR. <b>ACR 2015:</b> <u>The evidence (Y2015-022) from Item 45 supports the assertion regarding FAA. This items is closed</u>
			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, N0A 1M0.	e) A Notice of Decision for this EA will be published and sent to the Six Nations of the Grand River by the MOE.		e) Status – No action required		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
			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.	f) Comment noted. The Six Nations Confederacy Council will be contacted by the MOE.		f) Status – No action required		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
City of Toronto and Toronto Transit Commission (TTC)	Mr. Rod McPhail, Director, Transportation Planning	11	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.	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).	York Region	a) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			<i>Vehicle Technology Requirements south of Steeles</i> b) There are several references made in the EA report that grade separated options 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.	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		b) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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.	c) Comment noted.		c) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
			<i>Strategy for Technology Conversion (pages 5-5, 5-6)</i> d) The wording of Step 4 in the strategy for technology conversion implies that LRT should be implemented should 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.	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.		d) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			<i>GO Finch Terminal Requirements (page 5-6)</i> 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.	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.		e) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			<i>Preferred Alignment south of Steeles Ave (Figure 10-1)</i> 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.	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.		f) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
Ontario Secretariat for Aboriginal Affairs (OSAA)	Mr. Richard Saunders, Director, Negotiations Branch	12	a) OSAA recommends that follow-up be made with all the identified First Nations and the Aboriginal organizations regarding the EA report.	a) First Nations will be contacted during implementation of the undertaking as it relates to their particular interests identified during the EA.	York Region	a) Status – Ongoing work First Nations Groups and Provincial/Federal First Nations agencies that were on the EA contact list received notifications of public consultation opportunities. Consultation will continue in detail design.	Notice and distribution lists for CMP notice of submission (Yonge Street EA CMP Stakeholders and Public and Yonge Street EA CMP GRT and First Nations) (ID 1673)  First Nations mailing list and 2007-01-22 Viva Update letter (ID#3026)  Letter from Alderville First Nation (ID#3030)	No	EF (2010)	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description... and Compliance Document Reference. The text modifications did change the review.  The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown during detailed design.
			b) OSAA recommends that MOE consult its legal branch for advice on whether the Crown has any constitutional or other legal obligations to consult Aboriginal peoples in these circumstances.	b) Comment noted.		b) Status – No action required		No		After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA)	Ms. Beth Williston, Watershed Policy and Planning Specialist	13	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.	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.	York Region	a), b) & c).  Status – <b>Complete</b> :  [2010]A Pavement Design Report was prepared during preliminary design including borehole testing at various locations along the corridor. Free water was not encountered in any of the boreholes.  Foundation investigations for culvert extensions (if required) and retaining walls will be carried out in detailed design, including recommendations for dewatering.  [2010]Approvals for dewatering (if required) will be obtained during detailed design.  The Supplement to Final Drainage Study June 2010(ID#8695) addresses the inclusion of 1.4m wide	[2010] Yonge Street Rapidway Highway 7 – 19th Avenue - Preliminary Engineering – Design Basis and Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)  Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis & Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)  [2010] Appendix B - Final Pavement Design Report for New Median Rapidway along Yonge Street from Langstaff Road East to Major Mackenzie Drive,	Yes	EF (2010) EF (2012) EF (2015) All items are closed	Appendix D, Page 7 indicates that free water was not encountered in any of the boreholes. After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description...and Compliance Document Reference. The text modifications did not change the review. The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown during detailed design. ACR 2012:The evidence (ID#8695) supports the assertion regarding bike lanes and that preliminary design does begin the process of meeting the commitment and will completed in detail design. The following assertion does not appear relevant to this item: Pavement Design Report has been updated to reflect the decision to use "long life pavement "Please advise for the for the 2013 review. 2012 edit: the status and compliance document reference columns were updated by the Owner Engineer to remove text. The text modifications did not change the review.  2015 ACR: 015 ACR: Evidence found for design solution for [1] surface water quality (Y2015-014 - 90% design is considered sufficient) and [2] aquatic habitat (Y2015-019). Items [1] and [2] are closed.

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
						bike lanes along the corridor. The conclusion is the impact to the drainage design is negligible (less than or equal to 2% increase in flow) and no change to the drainage design will be required. <b>a) Refer to Item 38 for mitigations.</b> <b>b and c) Potential groundwater impacts are addressed in the Groundwater Management Plan (Y2015-027)</b>	and from Levedale Avenue to 19th Avenue – Region of York – June 2009 (ID# 4634) (Y2 DBCR) [2010] Appendix D – Final Drainage Study for Viva Next Y2 Yonge Street (Y.R.1) – June 2010 (ID# 6075) Supplement to Final Drainage Study for vivaNext Y2 (ID#8695) <b>Groundwater Management Plan (Y2015-027)</b>			

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the <u>Government Review Team</u> on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2015	Review Results	Notes
			<p>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>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>		Status – See above.		Yes	EF (2015) All items closed	<p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.</p> <p>ACR 2015: The evidence provided above indicates that no tunneling is being proposed.</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>c) This will be addressed as part of the detailed design phase/geotechnical investigation. Regulatory Agencies will be consulted during detailed design.</p>		Status – See above.		Yes	EF (2015) All items closed	<p>After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.</p> <p>ACR 2015: The evidence provided above indicates that no shallow groundwater is present. This item is closed</p>

Appendix 3 Action for comments received from the Public on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2014	Review Results	Notes
Ward One (South) Thornhill Residents Inc.	Ms. Evelin Ellison	1	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.	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.	York Region	a) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2 (not located in Vaughan/Thornhill)		No	Closed	In the Oct-10 review, evidence was not found in document # 6249) that widening was minimized by using the absolute minimum design standards in the severely constrained Heritage portion of Thornhill.  In Oct-10 review it was changed to EF with the following note: However in discussions with the Owner Engineer, it was noted that Y2 does not include the Heritage portion of Thornhill. If this is the case, this table should be updated to reflect this assertion including reference to compliance document that supports the assertion.  After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description...and Compliance Document Reference. The text modifications did change the review.
			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.	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.		b) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2 (not located in Vaughan/Thornhill)		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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.	c) The streetscape design will be completed as part of the detailed design phase of the project. The EA presents a conceptual streetscape plan.		c) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2 (not located in Vaughan/Thornhill)		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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.	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.		d) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2 (not located in Vaughan/Thornhill)		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			e) It is not evident how the ambience of the Thornhill Heritage District will be maintained.	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.		e) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2 (not located in Vaughan/Thornhill)		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 3 Action for comments received from the Public on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2014	Review Results	Notes
Rueter, Scargall, Bennett Lawyers for The Beaver Valley Stone Limited Group of Companies	Mr. Paul Scargall	2	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.	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.	York Region	a) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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.	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.		b) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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.	c) Access for field inspection was refused in this correspondence.		c) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			d) The Region communicated its proposal for use of the Property for employee parking and other ancillary operations.	d) Figure 10-34 of the EA report indicates the conceptual arrangement of uses of various portions of the overall site.		d) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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.	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.		e) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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.	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.		f) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 3 Action for comments received from the Public on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2014	Review Results	Notes
			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.	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.		g) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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.	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.		h) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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.	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.		i) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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.	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 transit.		j) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 3 Action for comments received from the Public on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2014	Review Results	Notes
			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 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.	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.		k) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			l) 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.	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.		l) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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.	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		m) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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.	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.		n) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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.	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.		o) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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) 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) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 3 Action for comments received from the Public on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2014	Review Results	Notes
			q) The catch area north of 407, funneling into the new expanded culvert, is far larger than that which existed previously.	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.		q) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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 the natural stream of water flow as well as the 100-year storm analysis.	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).		r) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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.	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.		s) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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.	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.		t) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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.	u) Comment noted for consideration during detailed design phase of the Maintenance and Storage Facility and will be subject to TRCA approval.		u) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
	Mr. Jeff Stone	3	a) Section 7.5.2: Change site distances to sight distances.	a) Comment noted.	York Region	a) Status – No action required		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 3 Action for comments received from the Public on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2014	Review Results	Notes
			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.	b) Comment noted.		b) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			c) Section 10.2.2: Should you now allow for extension of bus platforms in the future?	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.		c) Status – No action required		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			d) Figure 10-9: How would LRT passengers easily transfer twixt modes (YRT and LRT)?	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.		d) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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?	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.		e) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			f) Is it possible to have Mack Stn. placed on north side if region buys gas stn. site?	f) The existing road grades north and south of Major Mackenzie make location of the station platforms close to the intersection problematic		f) Status – No action required		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			g) Is it possible to have Mack Stn. on south side placed closer to Mack to provide more level site? The slope may make it hard in rain and snow to stop safely and lesson wear and tear on brakes.	g) The platform gradients planned for the preferred station location are within acceptable limits for safe operation.		g) Status – No action required		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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.	h) This is not part of the undertaking.		h) Status – No action required		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			i) What would b involved in getting the maintenance garage at Langstaff – costs and zoning?	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.		i) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			j) Chapter 5: Omits discussing technological or roadway improvements.	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.		j) Status – No action required		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 3 Action for comments received from the Public on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2014	Review Results	Notes
The Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill (SPOHT)	Mr. Nigel Connell	4	a) SPOHT was not aware that the EA submission had taken place and was not invited to submit comments.	a) A notice of submission for the EA was sent to Mr. Robert Stitt of SPOHT.	York Region	k) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2 (not located in Vaughan/Thornhill)		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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).	b) Comment noted.		l) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			c) The major street in the Thornhill (Markham) Heritage Conservation District is referred to as Colborne Drive rather than Colborne Street.	c) Comment noted.		m) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			d) Material in the appendix with these inadequacies, and maybe others, has been referred to extensively in the EA.	d) The EA report has utilized background materials and sub-consultant analysis where appropriate.		n) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			e) The Unterman McPhail Associates report quoted from the Ontario Heritage Act. Has any reference been made to Bill 160 enacted in 2005?	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.		o) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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 in 2003, but it is not true anymore. SPOHT has not met with YRTP staff in almost a year and a half.	f) The input received from SPOHT was considered in the development of the recommended undertaking in the fall 2004.		p) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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.		q) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
	David and Katty 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.	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.	York Region	a) Status – No action required		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 3 Action for comments received from the Public on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2014	Review Results	Notes
			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.	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.		b) Status – No action required	[2010] Yonge Street Median Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19 <sup>th</sup> Avenue- Preliminary Engineering – Design Basis and Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)  Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis & Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)	No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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.	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.		c) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	The Oct-10 review was noted as EF with the following notes found evidence is provided in Sections 3.14 Landscape Treatment, 3.15 (Boulevard), 3.17 Intersection, and 3.18 Crosswalks of pedestrian friendly guidelines. These include things like distinct surface treatment in pedestrian zones and crosswalks, unobstructed continuity, and textures that prioritize pedestrian traffic. No section however, proposes signalized crossings at regular intervals.  After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did change the review.

Appendix 3 Action for comments received from the Public on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2014	Review Results	Notes
			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.	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.		d) Status – <b>Complete</b>  [1] Intersection traffic operations monitoring will commence after introduction of transit service in the Rapidways  [2] Based on comments from the Richmond Hill Fire Department [3] a strategy has been developed to provide access for EMS to properties and developments along the Y2 segment. This strategy was discussed with EMS June 22, 2010. [4] A protocol is to be established between York Region, Town of Richmond Hill to cover planning and access for Fire services to redeveloping properties.  <u>Refer to Item B3.</u>	[3] Memo - Fire and Emergency Service Access - Median Crossover Provisions – April 14, 2009 (ID # 4216 and 4217)  [2] Meeting Notes – YRRTC April 21 and June 22, 2010 (ID#9022, 9023)	Yes	[1] EF (2010)  [2] EF (2010)  <b>[2,3] EF (2015)</b>	[1] Evidence was found in the two documents provided "Meeting Notes – YRRTC April 21 and June 22, 2010" For the Oct review, evidence provided shows a strategy has been established but does not show that it was discussed with EMS on June 22, 2010. After the Oct-10 review, text in the following columns was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description...and Compliance Document Reference. The text modifications did change the review.  <u>ACR 2015:</u> <b>[1] This item was not reviewed. It is in the future.</b> <b>[2] Consultation with emergency services representatives: Closed in 2010.</b> <b>[3] Develop access across the median for Emergency Response Vehicles only. Evidence found (Y2915-003) to support assertion. This Item is closed as 90% design is sufficient evidence.</b> <b>[4] Not reviewed. It is in the future</b> <b>The status should be updated to Future.</b>

Appendix 3 Action for comments received from the Public on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2014	Review Results	Notes
			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.	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.		e) Status – <b>Complete</b> - Y2 preliminary design has incorporated streetscape recommendations under Streetscape Design Guidelines (Section 3.8), General Guidelines (Section 3.9), and Landscape Treatment – (Section 3.14), including preservation of existing trees where possible. Streetscape and landscape design will be further developed in the detailed design phase. [2010]  Equivalent references to Section 3 – Facilities Design of the Draft Design Basis & Criteria Report can be found in Section 3 of ID#8035. The standard details have been developed as part of the H3 detailed design project and subsequent segments will be referencing the H3 DBCR.  <u>The Arborist Report and Tree Preservation Plan (Y2015-035) provides detail on tree protection. Section 3 of this report lists all trees and any impact the construction will have on them. Trees within the right-of-way and those on private property are discussed and presented separately. This report provides tree preservation methods to be applied prior to, during and after construction for any tree to remain.</u>	[2010] Yonge Street Median Rapidway – Highway 7 to 19 <sup>th</sup> Avenue- Preliminary Engineering – Design Basis and Criteria Report - Final July 2010 (ID# 6249)  Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis & Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)  Highway 7 Rapidway, Segment H3 – Yonge St to Kennedy Rd*, Preliminary Engineering Design Basis & Criteria Report, Update to Dec 2009 Final Version, Final Draft, November 2011 (ID#8035)  <u>Arborist Report and Tree Preservation Plan (Y2015-035)</u>	Yes	EF (2010)	ACR: 2010: After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did change the review. The revised description indicates that the preliminary design is the beginning of the process of meeting the commitment and that compliance will be completed and shown during detailed design. ACR: 2012 Although additional references added, the preservation of trees will be specified in the streetscape plan.  <u>2015 ACR: Evidence found to support the assertion regarding tree preservation plan. This item is closed.</u>

Appendix 3 Action for comments received from the Public on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2014	Review Results	Notes
			f) We are concerned about potential additional light pollution at night since we have bedrooms that back on to the project.	f) Existing Yonge Street is an urban road and is currently illuminated. The proposed undertaking does not include additional illumination.		f) [2010] Status – <b>Complete</b> - pedestrian and road illumination standards will be further developed in the detailed design phase. Mitigation of off-street lighting will be considered during detail design where appropriate.  The design of the current phases of the project utilizes IES Type III full-cutoff fixtures with flat glass lenses so that there will be no light will be emitted above the horizontal plane of the fixture.  <b>The Yonge Street Corridor Lighting Detail Report – 60% (Y2015-036) confirms the use of full Type III cut-off fixtures in the detail design.</b>	Y2 - Highway 7 to 19th Avenue Preliminary Engineering Design Basis & Criteria Report Final June 2012 (ID# 8695)  Highway 7 Rapidway, Segment H3 – Yonge St to Kennedy Rd*, Preliminary Engineering Design Basis & Criteria Report, Update to Dec 2009 Final Version, Final Draft, November 2011 (ID#8035)  <b>Lighting Detail Report (Y2015-036)</b>	Yes	EF 2012  EF (2015) All items closed	ACR 2010 After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.  <b>ACR 2012</b> The evidence (ID#8035) supports the assertion regarding 4. Fixture shall have cut-off optics and IES Type III distribution and that preliminary design does begin the process of meeting the commitment and will completed in detail design.  ACR 2015: The evidence provided supports the assertion that cut-off fixtures. This item is closed
			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 our regular bus service.	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).		g) Status – No action required		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
	Mr. David Bradshaw	6	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.	a) Comment noted.	York Region	a) Does not apply to segment Y2		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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.	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.		b) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.

Appendix 3 Action for comments received from the Public on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review (MMM)		
								Review 2014	Review Results	Notes
			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 closer to the commercial properties on the west side of Yonge Street to reduce the impacts on our residential area.	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. The optimum location for the transitway and adjacent traffic lanes will be developed during the detailed design phase, recognizing the land uses on each side of Yonge Street.		c) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.
			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 closest 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.	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.		d) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		No	Closed	After the Oct-10 review, text in the following column was modified in order to improve the ACR / address MOE comments: Status and Description.... The text modifications did not change the review.