YONGE STREET CORRIDOR PUBLIC TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS FROM STEELES AVENUE TO 19TH AVENUE
SUMMARY LISTING OF EA COMPLIANCE DOCUMENTATION
FOR Y2 SEGMENT (from HIGHWAY 7 to 19th AVENUE)
Prepared: December 2018

This Annual Compliance Review has been prepared primarily by the Design Build Consortia, who are implementing the projects under Design-Build contract. Compliance items related to policy, landuse planning, operations and maintenance activities, etc. are reported by York Region. The Compliance Review is carried out by an independent Environmental Compliance Lead, on behalf of York Region's Environmental Compliance Manager. All non- closed items are the subject to compliance review. Occasionally, there are items with issues that could not be addressed within the time between the compliance review and submission date. These items are noted and steps to address the issue are indicated. These items will be reviewed in next year's submission.

Jamie Freeman & Jim Kroetsch, Jacobs	Steve Mota, Region of York
Environmental Compliance Lead	Environmental Compliance Manager

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 Y2

Compliance Review		
Column	**Results**	**Notes**
Status	Yes	**Status accepted:** the statement about the status of the item is accepted based on the reviewers understanding of the project.
	No	**Status not accepted**: the statement about the status of the item is not accepted based on the reviewers understanding of the project.
	UNC	**Unclear**: Further explanation requested regarding the status of the item.
Results	AC	**Accepted** means that items are reported as in-progress but have not reached a reportable milestone (i.e., there is no documents available). The statement on status is accepted based on the reviewers understanding of the project.
	EF	**Evidence Found** means that the evidence provided reasonably shows that a compliance action (i.e., something done to address a compliance item) has been undertaken.
	EFC	**Evidence Found of Change** means that the evidence provided reasonably shows that a compliance action has been undertaken but the action is a change from the compliance item.
	NSE	**Not Sufficient Evidence** means that the evidence provided although applicable to the compliance action, is not adequate to reasonably show that the compliance action has been undertaken, or that evidence is believed to be available
	ENF	**Evidence Not Found** means that evidence has either not been provided or that the evidence does not appear related to the compliance action.
	Closed (year)	No further action or review of the item is warranted. Either all condition / commitments for the item have been addressed and reviewed, or the item does not apply or requires no action.
Notes	Comments in regard to the compliance review for that year. In addition, the closed components of an item are tracked. For example, an item may have three distinct components, designated by [1], [2] and [3]. If only component [1] was completed in 2013, the column will include a statement that component [1] was closed in 2013. That statement will remain in each subsequent ACR report until all components (i.e., [2] and [3]) are closed. For information on items closed in previous years the reader is directed to the ACR for the year the item was closed.	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Glossary

AAQC – Ambient Air Quality Criteria
ACR – Annual Compliance Report
APEP – Air Pesticide and Environmental Planning
AQ – Air Quality
BHF – Built Heritage Features
BRT – Bus Rapid Transit
CBD – Commercial Business District
CEAA – Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency
CLU – Cultural Landscape Units
CMP – Compliance Monitoring Plan
DBCR – Design Basis and Criteria Report
DFO – Fisheries and Oceans Canada
EA – Environmental Assessment
EAAB – Environmental Assessment and Approvals Board/Branch
EPA – Environmental Protection Area
ERS – Emergency Response Service
HADD – Harmful Alteration, Disruption or Destruction
LRT – Light Rail Traffic
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 – North Bound
NPC – Noise Pollution Clearinghouse
NWPA – Navigable Waters Protection Act
OE – Owner's Engineer
OGS – Oil/Grit Separators
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
SB – South Bound
SPOHT – Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill
SWM – Storm Water Management
SWMP – Storm Water Management Pond
TCP – Technology Conversion Plan
TOR – Terms of Reference
TRCA – Toronto Regional Conservation Authority
TS – Technical Support
TSP – Transit Signal Priority
TTC – Toronto Transit Commission
VMS – Vehicle Management System
Y2DBCR – Y2 Design Based Criteria Report
YC or YC2002 - York Consortium 2002 (completed preliminary design)
YRRTC – York Region Rapid Transit Consortium
YRT – York Region Traffic
YRTP – York Region Transit Program

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		
					Status	Results	Notes
1	CMP Section 1.1 - "… Therefore implementation of the O&M facility will likely not proceed in the location identified in the EA. At this time, a detailed search for an alternative site for the O&M facility has not commenced. Progress on this issue will be reported in the ACR."	York Region	Status - Does not apply to segment Y2		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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		Yes	Closed (2015)	

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		
						Status	Results	Notes
3	1.1 General Conditions 1.2 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 - Completed 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 document. Refer to the sections as noted for details.		Yes	Closed (2016)	
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 - Completed Refer to Appendices 2 and 3 for agency specific comments related to this EA.		Yes	Closed (2005)	
5	1.3 These proposed conditions do not prevent more restrictive conditions being imposed under other statutes.	York Region	As applicable	Status – On-going Permits received are documented on an on-going basis. Will continue to monitor as implementation progresses. Expected to be closed at project completion	Permits, Licenses, Approvals and Authorizations Ledger, Rev.0 **September 2018 (ID Y2018-001)**	Yes	EF	It is accepted that it is not evident that no more restrictive conditions have been imposed directly against and superseding CMP items. However, it is possible that permit requirements may actually have more restrictive conditions. The evidence provided (ID Y2018-001) supports that these requirements are being tracked.
6	2.1 Public Record 2.2 Where a document is required for the Public Record, it shall be provided to the Director for filing	York Region	Design, Construction and Operation as specified	Status – On-going To be completed with the filing of the last ACR. [1] **The 2017 ACR was submitted to MOECC on December 20, 2017.** [1] Copies of the **2017** ACR were provided to	[1] **Correspondence acknowledging receipt of 2017 ACR to MOECC dated June 8, 2018 (ID Y2018-002)** [2] Correspondence transmitting	Yes	[1-3] EF	[1,3] The evidences provided [Y2018-002 and Y2018- 003] were found to support the assertion regarding conditions [1 and 3].

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		
						Status	Results	Notes
	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.			Markham, Vaughan, Richmond Hill and York Region and libraries [2]and posted online. [3]The CMP is posted on York Region's york.ca website.	2015 ACR to Clerks offices and libraries dated January 5, 2016 (ID# H2WE-2016-104 and H2WE-2016-105, respectively) 2016 ACR Letter to Clerks - Public Record **2017 ACR Letter to Clerks – Public Record (ID Y2018-011)** **[3] 2017 Annual Compliance Report (December 2017) (ID Y2018-003)** vivaNext website: http://www.vivanext.com/PDFs/EA/SouthYongeSt/ACR_YONGE-ENV-RPT-060-2017-NOV-21-Y2-EA-2017-ACR-FINAL.pdf			[2] Evidence for Correspondence transmitting the to the Clerks offices and libraries was provided.

7	3.1 3.2	Compliance Monitoring and Reporting 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	York Region	Design stage (Timing as specified in condition 3.1)	Status – Completed The date of the approval of the EA for the undertaking was April 19, 2006. The final CMP was submitted to the Acting Director, Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch on March 10, 2008 and approved on April 11, 2008.		Yes	Closed (2009)	.

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		
						Status	Results	Notes
	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.							
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.		Yes	Closed (2010)	
9	3.3 A statement must accompany the Program when submitted to the Director indicting 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.		Yes	Closed (2010)	
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	York Region	Design, Construction and Operation as specified	Status – On-going Conditions will be addressed with the submission of ACR's until all conditions are satisfied. **2018 ACR is currently being prepared and will be submitted to the MOECC in December 2018.**	**Letter of Acceptance from MOECC (ID Y2018-002)** **2017 Annual Compliance Report (December 2017) (ID Y2018-003)**	Yes	EF	The evidences provided [Y2018-002 and Y2017-003] were found to support the assertion regarding the assertion that the ACR was prepared and is being submitted annually.

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		
						Status	Results	Notes
	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.							
11	3.4 ii) The Proponent shall make the documentation available to the MOECC 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 MOECC.	York Region	Design, Construction and Operation as specified	Status – On-going Pending a request.		Yes	AC	It is accepted that there has not be a request.
12	4.1 Transit Technology 4.2 i) The Proponent shall prepare and submit to the City of Toronto and the TTC the results of their Ridership Monitoring Program (Ridership Program) as committed in Section 5.2.2.3 of the EA.	York Region	Prior to conversion from BRT to LRT technology as required	Status – Completed The potential future evolution from Bus Rapid Transit to higher capacity Light Rail Rapid Transit is not being planned at this time. York Region has updated its Transportation Master Plan (TMP), November 2016, including the timing of technology conversion from BRT to LRT. The TMP indicates that conversion to LRT will be beyond the 2041 horizon year of the TMP. For purposes of this ACR, we are suggesting that this item be closed as it will not be addressed within the time frame of ACR reporting.		Yes	Closed (2016)	
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	York Region	Prior to conversion from BRT to LRT technology as required	Status –Completed See Item 13 (condition 4.1.)		Yes	Closed (2015)	

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		
						Status	Results	Notes
	(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.							
14	4.1 iii) The Ridership Program and TCP shall be placed on the Public Record file at the EAAB and the MOECC's Central Regional Office.	York Region	Prior to conversion from BRT to LRT technology as required	Status – Completed See Item 13 (condition 4.1.)		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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 – Completed See Item 13 (condition 4.1.)		Yes	Closed (2015)	
16	5.1 Complaints Protocol 5.2 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 – Completed The Community Relations Protocol has been prepared by YRRTC and submitted to MOECC. Provided in 2016 to complete item.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
17	6.1 Consultation and Other Work Required 6.2 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 - Does Not Apply No watercourse alteration for Pomona Mills Creek is planned for Y2.		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Section 2.0 - Monitoring of Conditions of Approval								
c	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		
						Status	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	Status – [1, 2, 3, 5] Completed, **[4] On-going** [1] Stage II Archaeological Assessment completed in 2015 (Y2016-002). [2] Stage III Archaeological Assessment completed in 2016 (Y016-003). Stage III Archaeological Assessment Elgin Mills Burial Remains Recovery (Y2017-004) [4] Reports provided to Huron Wendat First Nation, awaiting comments. [3, 5] Letters of Acknowledgement from MTCS for Stage II (Y2016-004) and Stage III (Y2016-005) Archaeological Assessments. Stage III Elgin Mills Burial clearance letter from MTCS (Y2017-(Y2017-005)	[1] Stage II Archaeological Assessment (ID Y2016-002) [2] Stage III Archaeological Assessment (ID Y2016-003) (Y2017-004) [4] Correspondence to Huron Wendake First Nation dated November 21, 2016 and Program Update package (ID# Y2016-101) [3, 5] MTCS Letters (ID Y2016-004, and ID Y2016-005) (ID 2017-005)	Yes	[1-5] EF	Items [1 -3, 5] closed in 2016 and 2017. Item [4] on-going **Action: For 2019, provide update on sending information from the new Mills Burial report to the Huron Wendat First nations**
19	6.3 The Proponent will [1] undertake and [2] consult on a Streetscape Plan for the Yonge Street Corridor.	York Region	Design	Status - Completed [1] The 100pct Boulevard Streetscape Design Report for Y2.1 and Y2.2 has been submitted and accepted by the Owner. [Y2016-006; Y2016-007] [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.		Yes	Closed (2016)	
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. The community of Thornhill is located South of Highway 7, and is therefore not located in the Y2 segment		Yes	Closed (2015)	

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		
						Status	Results	Notes
21	7.1 Amending the Undertaking 7.2 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 – Completed Minor changes dealt with during preliminary design are described under item 81 below. Refer to Item 81		Yes	Closed (2016)	
22	7.1 ii) In the event that the Proponent determines that a major amendment to the approved undertaking as described in the EA is required, the amendment to the undertaking will be subject to section 12 of the EAA.	York Region	Design stage as necessary	Status – Completed Changes requiring a major amendment have not been identified during preliminary design. Refer to Item 82		Yes	Closed (2016)	

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		
					Status	Results	Notes
22-a	CMP Section 3.1: Roles of the Environmental Compliance Manager:	N/A	Status – No Action Required No compliance requirements		Yes	Closed (2016)	
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	Status – No Action Required No commitment or requirement, but description of internal processes		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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	Status – No Action Required No commitment or requirement, but description of internal processes		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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	Status – Completed Responsibilities are in the Design Build Agreement		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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	Status – Completed CMP commitments are in the Design Build Agreement.		Yes	Closed (2015)	

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		
					Status	Results	Notes
27	CMP Section 3.2.1 - Design Phase - The ECM will verify compliance and prepare/submit ACRs.	York Region	Status – On-going **The 2017 ACR was submitted to the MOECC on December 20, 2017.** **This report constitutes the 2018 ACR to be submitted in December 2018.**	**2017 Annual Compliance Report (December 2017) (ID Y2018-003)**	Yes	EF (2018)	The ACR reference provided are considered to be evidence of compliance.
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	Status – Completed CMP commitments are in the Design Build Agreement.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
29	CMP Section 3.2.2 - Construction Phase - The ECM will verify compliance and prepare/submit ACRs.	York Region	Status – On-going **The 2017 ACR was submitted to the MOECC in December 2017.** **This report constitutes the 2018 ACR to be submitted in December 2018.**	**2017 Annual Compliance Report (December 2017) (ID Y2018-003)**	Yes	EF	The ACR reference [Y2018-003] provided is considered to be evidence of ongoing compliance.
29-a	CMP Section 3.2.3 – Once construction is complete and rapid transit service operations commence on the project, York Region will assume responsibility for monitoring the effects of operations and maintenance in accordance with the CMP requirements.	York Region	Status – Future Work		Yes	AC	It is accepted that all operational monitoring is Future Work.

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		
					Status	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	Status – Completed A Traffic Analysis Report was prepared during Detailed Design which identifies opportunities to increase vehicle and pedestrian safety A Boulevard Civil Streetscape Design Report and Drawings were prepared in accordance with Preliminary Engineering drawings and H3 IFC drawings and contract specifications. Additionally, the Design-Build Agreement included a Road and Safety Review and Audit Plan which has been implemented as part of the detailed design. 100 pct. Streetscape Design Reports have been provided to replace 90 pct. reference provided in 2015.	Y2.1 100pct Streetscape Design Report, RapidLINK, Jan 2016 (ID Y2016-006) Y2.2 100pct Streetscape Design Report, RapidLINK, Dec 2015 (ID Y2016-007)	Yes	Closed (2015)	
31	CMP Section 4.1 - Application of design standards that permit future conversion to LRT technology; (2009 item number : 24)	York Region	Status - Completed RapidLINK is following the Preliminary Engineering Design so that when the future LRT is constructed it should only require minor corrections. Email with EA design compliance summary attached (Y2016-008).	Email with EA design compliance summary (ID Y2016-008)	Yes	Closed (2016)	
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	Status – Completed [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. [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.		Yes	Closed (2015)	

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		
					Status	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	Status – Completed A Traffic Analysis Report was prepared during Detailed Design. The purpose ofthis study was to provide a detailed analysis of traffic signal operations along the VivaNext Yonge Street rapidway segments during both construction staging and post-construction conditions. The file included in the 2015 ACR submission was mislabeled as 90%, it is the Final.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
34	CMP Section 4.1 - Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment; (2009 item number : 27)	York Region	Status – Completed Refer to Item 18.		Yes	Closed (2016)	Archaeological Assessment and correspondence have been provided as evidence.
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	Status – Completed [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)		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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	Status – [1,3] Completed, [2] On-going [1] Open Houses were conducted in May 2015. Presentation materials remain available online [1] Construction has commenced. Project construction related updates are posted online [2] Reports provided to Huron Wendat First Nation, awaiting comments.	[1] http://www.vivanext.com/yonge-streetrichmond-hill-newmarket-open-house/ [1] http://www.vivanext.com/ [2] Correspondence to Huron Wendake First Nation dated November 21, 2016 and Program Update package (ID# Y2016-101) This item is ongoing.	Yes	[1,3] AC [2] EF	Item [1]: Evidence provided support the open house in 2015. This item is closed. Item [2]: In addition to previous opportunities described in past ACRs, the evidence provided supports the assertion regarding opportunities for input for First Nations. This item remain open waiting for response for Huron Wendat First Nation. Item [3]: Closed in 2007.
37	CMP Section 4.1 - Inclusion of built-in attributes to	York Region	Status – Completed		Yes	Closed (2016)	

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		
					Status	Results	Notes
	mitigate adverse effects in design solutions; (2009 item number : 30)		Refer to Section 2 for general information on the ACR. Refer to Appendix 1 for all measures included as part of the design to mitigate adverse effects.				
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	Status – Completed A Drainage and Hydrology Report was prepared during Detailed Design. Section 6 of this report outlines the design strategy for Stormwater Quality Control, i.e. OGS units. Additionally, the Landscape and Streetscape Plan presents storm water mitigation measures such as permeable pavers as part of the continuity strip. During construction, the implementation of the Aquatic Resources Protection Plan and Surface Water Quality Monitoring Plan will lead to mitigation of impacts to surface water quality and aquatic resources. Final Drainage and Hydrology Report was added.	Drainage and Hydrology Design Report, RapidLINK, January 2016 (Y2016-028)	Yes	Closed (2015)	
39	CMP Section 4.1 - Procedures to obtain regulatory approvals and input from municipal departments. (2009 item number : 32)	York Region	Status - Completed 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.		Yes	Closed (2014)	
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	Status – Completed Responsibilities are in the agreement.	Design Build Agreement May 2013, Schedule 14, Part 100 (ID# Y2014-002)	Yes	Closed (2016)	.

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		
					Status	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 – No Action Required No commitment or requirement, but description of internal processes		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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 – No Action Required No commitment or requirement, but description of internal processes		Yes	Closed (2015)	
42-a	CMP Section 4.3 Compliance, by all agencies responsible for design and operation, with the procedures established to manage and monitor the effectiveness of design attributes and built-in measures in mitigating any adverse effects of operations and maintenance on the	N/A	Status – No Action Required No commitment or requirement, but description of internal processes		Yes	Closed (2016)	.

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		
					Status	Results	Notes
	natural and social environment; • Compliance, by all agencies responsible for safety and operation and maintenance, with the procedures established to manage and mitigate effects on the natural or social environment of accidents or incidents during operation and maintenance activities.						

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments-Table 5.1-Monitoring during design									
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	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review		
							Status	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	Status – Completed [1] A copy of the MTO Environmental Protection Requirements (EPRs) for Transportation Planning and Highway Design, Construction, Operation and Maintenance Document has been obtained MTO EPRs are addressed as follows: • Terrestrial Ecosystems and the Oak Ridges Moraine Component is addressed by the GEMP Terrestrial Resources Protection Plan • Fish and Fish Habitat and Water Resources are addressed by the GEMP Aquatic Resources Plan • Noise addressed by the GEMP Noise and Vibration Master Plan • Agriculture land use is not a component that is applicable to this project • Contaminated Property, Waste and Excess Materials Management is addressed by the GEMP Waste Management and Contamination Plan and Earth Management Plan; • Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes addressed by the GEMP Cultural Heritage Management Plan • Archaeological Resources addressed by the GEMP Archaeological Impact Management • Air addressed by the GEMP Air Quality and Dust Control. [2] MTO Best Management Practices Manual for Fisheries (June 2016) has been obtained (ID Y2016-017). BMPs outlined in this Manual are contained in the reports described above, as applicable (ID Y2016-010 to Y2016-016).	None required	MTO Environmental Protection Requirements for Transportation Planning and Highway Design, Construction, Operation and Maintenance (ID Y2016-009) GEMP Terrestrial Resources Protection Plan Rev.1 (ID Y2016-010) GEMP Aquatic Resources Plan Rev.2 (ID Y2016-011) GEMP Noise and Vibration Master Plan Rev.1 (ID Y2016-012) GEMP Waste Management and Contamination Plan and Earth Management Plan Rev.2 (ID Y2016-013) GEMP Cultural Heritage Management Plan Rev.0 (ID Y2016-014) GEMP Archaeological Impact Management Rev.0 (ID Y2016-015) GEMP Air Quality and Dust Control Rev.1 (ID Y2016-016) MTO Best Management Practices Manual for Fisheries (June 2016) (ID Y2016-017)	Yes	Closed (2016)	.

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments-Table 5.1-Monitoring during design									
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	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review		
							Status	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.	Does not apply		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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 – Completed 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)	None required		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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 as Pomona Mills Creek not in Y2	Does not apply		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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 as Pomona Mills Creek not in Y2	Does not apply		Yes	Closed (2015)	
48		EA Chapter 12, Table 12-1, Appendix E: CMP I.D. # 1.6 - Any proposed in-stream work and site-specific mitigation	York Region	Status – Completed Table 8 from the Natural Science Report includes the following mitigation measures applicable to Y2 [1]-Erosion and Sediment Control	Refer to monitoring during construction as outlined in Section 5b and Appendix 1 Tables		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments-Table 5.1-Monitoring during design									
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	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review		
							Status	Results	Notes
		measures carried out as outlined in Table 8 of the Natural Science Report (2009 item number : 38)		[2]-Level 1 Stormwater Treatment [3]-Revise cross-section to reduce footprint area [4]-Use headwalls, wingwalls, and guiderail to reduce length of culvert extension [5]-In water construction timing restriction [6]-Perform in-water works in the dry [7]-Match inverts of existing culverts Final Drainage and Hydrology Design Report added.					
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	Status – [1,2] Completed [1] Final Well inspection conducted in 2016. Invitations to have well inspection completed send December 2015. From letters, one respondent requested the well inspection to be conducted - 11283 Yonge St. Questionnaire and results are provided [2] Well decommissioning was completed in 2015 as per the Well Decommissioning Plan. Well decommissioning records were provided	None required		Yes	Closed (2016)	
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	Status – Completed A Drainage and Hydrology Report 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. Final Drainage and Hydrology Design Report added.	None required		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments-Table 5.1-Monitoring during design									
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	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review		
							Status	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	Status – Completed 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. These best practices are reflected in the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, Terrestrial Resources Protection Plan, and Aquatic Resources Protection Plan. The implementation of these plans is monitored using the Daily Environmental Inspection Checklists Daily Inspection checklists added to demonstrate implementation.	Monitor using the Daily Environmental Inspection Checklists		Yes	Closed (2015)	
52		EA Chapter 12, Table 12-1, Appendices E & M: CMP I.D. # 5.3 - Compliance with ORMCP Section 45(8), which prohibits new storm water management ponds in key natural heritage features or hydrologically sensitive features. (2009 item number : 42)	York Region	Status – Completed As per the Drainage and Hydrology Report, no new storm water management ponds are proposed for construction. Final Drainage and Hydrology Design Report added.	None required		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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	Status – Completed The Drainage and Hydrology Report indicates that the preliminary design for the EA was developed following the MOE Stormwater planning and Design Manual. The drainage design complies with the MOE water quality guideline of Enhanced Level (80% total suspended solids removal). Final Drainage and Hydrology Design Report added.	None required		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments-Table 5.1-Monitoring during design									
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	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review		
							Status	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 storm water management where applicable. (2009 item number : 44)	York Region	Status – Completed The Drainage and Hydrology Report (Y2016-028) 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. Final Drainage and Hydrology Design Report added.	None required		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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	Status – Completed A memo was prepared outlining VivaNext Yonge Street Rapidway Y2 - Compliance with the 1990 Rouge River Basin Strategy. It is noted that the final Drainage and Hydrology Report for the VivaNext Yonge Street Rapidway project meets the requirements of the Comprehensive Basin Management Strategy for the Rouge River Watershed (1990) to the best level achievable under the project constraints identified in the EA and the Final Drainage Study.	None Required		Yes	Closed (2016)	
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	Status – Completed A Drainage and Hydrology Report (Y2016-028) 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. Final Drainage and Hydrology Design Report added.	None required		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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.	Does not apply		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments-Table 5.1-Monitoring during design									
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	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review		
							Status	Results	Notes
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	Status – Completed An Erosion and Sediment Control Plan was prepared by RapidLINK as part of the detailed design.	Monitor using the Daily Environmental Inspection Checklists		Yes	Closed (2015)	
59	Groundwater	Proponent Response to Government Review Team Comments: CMP I.D. # 6 - The need for any dewatering and any additional analysis needed to determine if linkages exist between [1] dewatering and [2] local surface features and [3] any resulting mitigation requirements. Detailed geotechnical and hydrogeological studies addressing impacts (2009 item number : 49)	York Region	Status – Completed PTTWs have been obtained for Y2.1 and Y2.2. A Groundwater Management Plan was prepared by RapidLINK to outline the guidelines and procedures to ensure that groundwater is managed according to applicable legislation, municipal bylaws and industry Best Management Practices.	Monitor in accordance with PTTWs		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments-Table 5.1-Monitoring during design									
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	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review		
							Status	Results	Notes
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 – Completed A Waste Management and Contamination Plan (WMCP) was prepared as part of the Detailed Design. This plans outlines procedures to follow in the event that contaminated sites are identified after construction activities begin. Document updated to reflect final version of the Plan.	Compliance with the Waste Management and Contamination Plan (WMCP)		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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 – Vehicle maintenance and storage facilities do not apply to segment Y2.	Does not apply		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments-Table 5.1-Monitoring during design									
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	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review		
							Status	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	Status – Completed Strategic planning for parking needs for the Viva corridors commenced during the preliminary design phase as a separate study[1] The Urban Street Design Standards references parking guidelines for on-street parking based on the posted speed limit for the street.[2] On-street parking can help lower speeds, increase commercial activity and provides buffer between the roadway and the pedestrian realm Commuter Park & Ride Strategy developed and presented to Council.	None required		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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.	Does not apply		Yes	Closed (2015)	
64	Archaeological Resources	Proponent Response to Government Review Team Comments and Appendix J: CMP I.D. # 11 - Completion of a Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment and procedure for continued consultation with the Ministry of Culture. Records of consultation with First Nations. (2009 item number : 54)	York Region	Status – Completed Refer to Item 18.	None required		Yes	Closed (2016)	

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments-Table 5.1-Monitoring during design									
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	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review		
							Status	Results	Notes
65	Heritage Resources/ Cultural Landscape	EA Section 11.3.2, EA Chapter 12, Table 12-1 CMP I.D. # 12 - Continue to work with Thornhill Heritage Committee during the design phase with respect to the existing community settings. Relocation or burying of hydro lines where widening places lines unacceptably close to existing culturally sensitive areas. Consultation with municipal heritage planners, heritage committees and other local heritage stakeholders, specifically Markham Heritage regarding preservation of two built heritage features on Langstaff MSF site. Design solutions adopted for curb-side stations in Richmond Hill CBD to avoid adverse effects on cultural heritage buildings. (2009 item number : 55)	York Region	Status – Does not apply. Does not apply to segment Y2. No changes to existing curbside stops in the Richmond Hill CBD are proposed as part of this project.	Does not apply		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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.	Does not apply		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments-Table 5.1-Monitoring during design									
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	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review		
							Status	Results	Notes
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 – Completed According to the DBA, we are required to maintain access to driveways, including the ones to schools. [1, 2] The Traffic Management Plan Rev.3 was prepared and finalized during Detailed Design. (ID Y2016-021). Section 3 of the report discusses general Disruption Management Strategies that apply to schools. Section 4.5 speaks to Communication to Public and Notifications. [2] Traffic Staging Specifications were also developed for Construction (ID Y2016-022). The strategies and specifications ensure safe, uninterrupted access to schools affected by the works.	None required		Yes	Closed (2016)	
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	Status – Completed [1] 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 9 of the report provides analysis of posted speed limits. [2]. Section 5.2 of the above report provides analysis for pedestrian crossings. Pedestrian countdown lights are being used. File attached as 2015 evidence was labeled 90%, but opening the report reveals it as Final.	None required		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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.	Does not apply		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments-Table 5.1-Monitoring during design									
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	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review		
							Status	Results	Notes
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.	Does not apply		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Section 5.0b Actions Required to Address Commitments- Table 5-2- Monitoring during construction												
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)	Status	Results	Notes
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency								
ITEMS 71 to 79: Status – On-going. **Daily Environmental Inspection Checklist (ID Y2018-004)** 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. **ITEM 76: Status – On-Going. The measures outlined in the Noise and Vibration Management Plan (Y2018-005) meet the intent: "*Daily inspections will be undertaken by the QA / Environmental Administrators. The QA / Environmental Administrators will identify any issues of deficiencies or non-conformances in weekly inspection summaries. This would include reporting on any failure to ensure the following: Construction equipment is maintained in good working order and complies with MOE NPC-115 Construction Equipment guidelines. The QA / Environmental Administrators may ask to review vehicle and equipment maintenance logs; and Nuisance effect from noise on adjacent sensitive receptors are minimized."*** **ITEM 78: Status – On-Going. A Cultural Heritage Assessment Report was completed in January 2016 (Y2018-006). It includes the identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes and Built Resources and provides a description of the existing environment and conditions of the resources. Indirect impacts are identified as well as mitigation measures. Should any deterioration or damage be reported, protocols identified in the Cultural Heritage Management GEMP (Y2018-007) will be implemented.** ITEM 72: Status – Closed. Does not apply to Y2. **ITEM 80: [1] Status – On-going. Traffic monitoring is conducted on an on-going basis. Section 3.2.1 of the Traffic Management Plan indicates that "*RapidLINK's Traffic Control Persons will check the traffic control devices regularly to ensure that the traffic operations in the work zones are acceptable. Such personal engaged in traffic control will check the work sites carefully to make sure that traffic controls are continually updated to suit changing construction conditions due to work staging and progress, or if an immediate improvement to the traffic control is needed*". (Y2018-008). The site specific Traffic Plan (Y2018-009) illustrates the customized nature of planning and indicates that the Traffic Control Persons have been instructed in their duties (refer to Traffic Management Plan). (Y2018-012 and Y2018-013) show evidence that traffic congestion is discussed in meeting minutes.**												
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 change	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	CPG 9-Dec-17	Yes	EF (2018)	Provided evidence [Y2018-004] supports the assertion.
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	[1] On-site environmental inspection during in-water work. [2] 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 change	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	CPG 9-Dec-17	Yes	Closed (2017)	Item [1-2] These items were closed in 2017.

Section 5.0b Actions Required to Address Commitments- Table 5-2- Monitoring during construction												
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)	Status	Results	Notes
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency								
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 change	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	CPG 9-Dec-17	Yes	EF	Provided evidence [Y2018-004] supports the assertions.
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 change	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	CPG 9-Dec-17	Yes	EF	Provided evidence [Y2018-004] supports the assertions.
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 change planned	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	CPG 9-Dec-17	Yes	EF	Provided evidence [Y2018-004] supports the assertions.
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 change	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	CPG 9-Dec-17	Yes	EF	Evidence [Y2018-004] supports that noise monitoring is occurring. [2018-005] supports the assertion that Noise and Vibration Management Plan has been developed. This item to remain ongoing.
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 change	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	CPG 9-Dec-17	Yes	EF	Provided evidence [Y2018-004] supports the assertions.
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 change	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	CPG 9-Dec-17	Yes	EF	Item [Y2018-006] and [Y2018-007] supports the assertions.
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 change	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	CPG 9-Dec-17	Yes	EF	Provided evidence [Y2018-004] supports the assertions.

Section 5.0b Actions Required to Address Commitments- Table 5-2- Monitoring during construction												
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)			
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency						Status	Results	Notes
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 [1] and traffic patterns during operations.[2]	After temporary access works have been installed and during ongoing inspection of construction works.	No change	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	CPG 9-Dec-17	Yes	[1] EF [2] AC	Evidence provided [2018-008 and 2018-009, 2018-012, 2018-013] document that traffic congestion is taken into consideration during construction, discussed in meeting minutes and by following correct traffic control methods (i.e. Book 7) but did not provide evidence of monitoring of congestion levels during construction. **For 2019 ACR, provide evidence of monitoring of congestion levels during construction. This item is ongoing.** Item [2] closed in 2016 via ITEM 80-i.

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.3 Operations and Maintenance Monitoring										York Region's Notes		Compliance Review		
Construction and Compliance Monitoring					Specific information to be added by ECM with annual compliance reporting (for all cells in these columns).									
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency	Changes to Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Agency Responses and Dates	New Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Date of Permit Approval or Authorization	Record of Compliance (ECM Signature and Date)	Status and Description of how commitments have been addressed during Operations and Maintenance	Compliance Document Reference	Status	Results	Notes
80-a	Base low alterations	To ensure frequency, magnitude and duration of flow is not adversely affected by new impervious surfaces	Post-Construction inspection of storm water management facilities to evaluate their effectiveness. On-going maintenance	After significant storm events following completion of construction facilities	No change planned	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	CPG 9-Dec-17	Future Work		Yes	AC	Accepted that post construction monitoring is Future Work.
80-b	Fish habitat may be destructed or disturbed due to realignment of watercourse (Pomona Mills Creek at the proposed MSF]	To ensure a healthy fish habitat alter watercourse realignment	Monitor the newly altered fish habitat	Twice per year in spring and fall	Does not apply to Segment Y2	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	CPG 9-Dec-17	Does not apply to Segment Y2		Yes	Closed (2016)	
80-c	Fish habitat may be lost due to reflective storm water management facilities	To ensure that sediment accumulation in storm water management facilities is not causing a population decline.	Monitor degree of sediment accumulation in storm water management facilities.	Immediately after construction, alter major storm events and annually	No change planned	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	CPG 9-Dec-17	Future Work		Yes	AC	Accepted that post construction monitoring is Future Work.
80-d	Temperature increase due to clearing of riparian vegetation and storm water management practices	To ensure minimum change in temperature to aquatic habitat	Post-construction inspection of riparian plantings to confirm survival.	Twice per year in spring and fall	No change planned	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	CPG 9-Dec-17	Future Work		Yes	AC	Accepted that post construction monitoring is Future Work.

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.3 Operations and Maintenance Monitoring										York Region's Notes		Compliance Review		
Construction and Compliance Monitoring					Specific information to be added by ECM with annual compliance reporting (for all cells in these columns).									
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency	Changes to Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Agency Responses and Dates	New Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Date of Permit Approval or Authorization	Record of Compliance (ECM Signature and Date)	Status and Description of how commitments have been addressed during Operations and Maintenance	Compliance Document Reference	Status	Results	Notes
80-e	Effect of snow and ice removal on water quality in corridor watercourses	To confirm that water quality is not being adversely affected by transit way and vehicle maintenance activities	Monitor sediment accumulation in storm water management facilities	During major storm events up to five times per year	No change planned	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	CPG 9-Dec-17	Future Work		Yes	AC	Accepted that post construction monitoring is Future Work.
80-f	Noise generated by operation and maintenance activities	To ensure noise levels comply with municipal by-laws	Pass-by and idling measurements of levels produced by representative vehicles activities	Initially after revenue service is introduced in and in response to concerns or after any major increase in service frequency.	No change planned	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	CPG 9-Dec-17	Future Work		Yes	AC	Accepted that post construction monitoring is Future Work.
80-g	Effect of rapid transit operations on local air quality (pollutants, odour,)	To confirm that local air quality is not being adversely affected by transit vehicle activity at terminals/facilities	Regular inspection of measures and of transit vehicles exhaust emissions	Initially after facilities are placed into service and at five-year intervals during vehicle life.	No change planned	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	CPG 9-Dec-17	Future Work		Yes	AC	Accepted that post construction monitoring is Future Work.
80-h	Effect of rapid transit operations on GHGs emitted per commuting person-trips	To assess the effectiveness of improved public transit as a commuting choice in reducing GHG emissions in the corridor.	Ridership growth surveys and transit mode split data analysis to derive GHG emission reduction	Findings to be included in the annual Compliance Reports.	No change planned	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	CPG 9-Dec-17	Future Work		Yes	AC	Accepted that post construction monitoring is Future Work.

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.3 Operations and Maintenance Monitoring										York Region's Notes		Compliance Review		
Construction and Compliance Monitoring					Specific information to be added by ECM with annual compliance reporting (for all cells in these columns).									
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency	Changes to Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Agency Responses and Dates	New Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Date of Permit Approval or Authorization	Record of Compliance (ECM Signature and Date)	Status and Description of how commitments have been addressed during Operations and Maintenance	Compliance Document Reference	Status	Results	Notes
80-i	Effect of RT operation and intersection modifications on traffic infiltration through neighbourhood roads	To identify any increase in the use of neighbourhood roads by non-resident traffic as an alternative to left turn access restrictions	"Before and after" traffic volume observations on affected roadways to determine any change in infiltration levels	Before commencement of construction and six months after introduction of RT service	No change planned	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	CPG 9-Dec-17	Future Work		Yes	AC	Accepted that post construction monitoring is Future Work.
80-j	Increased mobility choice due to rapid transit service introduction and local transit connectivity	To verify the convenience of the inter-connection between rapid transit service and reconfigured local feeder service	Review of effectiveness of local service plans in terms of growth of transfers and response to customer requests/ complaints	After six months of RT service and annually thereafter	No change planned	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	CPG 9-Dec-17	Future Work		Yes	AC	Accepted that post construction monitoring is Future Work.
80-k	Effect of RT operations on public safety in the right-of-way and in station zones	To confirm the effectiveness of safety measures incorporated in the transit infrastructure design and pedestrian access facilities	Review of accident reports and statistics to establish whether cause is transit related	In response to specific incidents as required and in Annual Compliance Reports	No change planned	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	CPG 9-Dec-17	Future Work		Yes	AC	Accepted that post construction monitoring is Future Work.
80-l	Streetscaping, neighbourhood aesthetics and community vistas	To confirm that landscaping, station and transitway features continue to enhance the community environment in the corridor	Inspection of landscaping [1] by Region arborist and streetscaping features [2] by maintenance personnel	Twice annually or in response to specific complaints about plant health, graffiti, cleanliness	No change planned	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	CPG 9-Dec-17	Future Work		Yes	AC	Accepted that post construction monitoring is Future Work.

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.3 Operations and Maintenance Monitoring										York Region's Notes		Compliance Review		
Construction and Compliance Monitoring					Specific information to be added by ECM with annual compliance reporting (for all cells in these columns).									
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency	Changes to Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Agency Responses and Dates	New Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Date of Permit Approval or Authorization	Record of Compliance (ECM Signature and Date)	Status and Description of how commitments have been addressed during Operations and Maintenance	Compliance Document Reference	Status	Results	Notes
80-m	Provision of median crossing for Emergency Response Services vehicles	To ensure the operation of the ERS vehicles	Obtain feedback from ERS staff on performance of access provisions	Initially after completion of access [1] facilities and through regular consultation with the emergency services [2]	No change planned	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	CPG 9-Dec-17	Future Work		Yes	AC	Accepted that post construction monitoring is Future Work.
80-n	Utilization of Community Facilities	To confirm that rapid transit is increasing usage of facilities due to improved access	Obtain registration data from facilities served (up to three)	Review registration data annually for a period of 5 years after start-up	No change planned	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	CPG 9-Dec-17	Future Work		Yes	AC	Accepted that post construction monitoring is Future Work.
80-o	Change in existing land use patterns to transit oriented development may not be attainable or may be inappropriate	To confirm that municipal development approvals and zoning are realizing the benefit of improved transit and encouraging development compatible with existing neighbourhoods	Monitor re-development activity to control overall increase in and type of development density	Review municipal data on redevelopment/ development levels annually for a period of 10 years after start-up	No change planned	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	CPG 9-Dec-17	Future Work		Yes	AC	Accepted that post construction monitoring is Future Work.
80-p	Effect of an increase in business activity on the urban form	To determine whether business activity along the corridor increases and whether resulting intensification meets urban form objectives.	Monitor business activity, urban form and economic conditions in the corridor	Review building applications and permits and economic influences annually for 10	No change planned	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	CPG 9-Dec-17	Future Work		Yes	AC	Accepted that post construction monitoring is Future Work.

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.3 Operations and Maintenance Monitoring										York Region's Notes		Compliance Review		
Construction and Compliance Monitoring					Specific information to be added by ECM with annual compliance reporting (for all cells in these columns).									
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency	Changes to Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Agency Responses and Dates	New Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Date of Permit Approval or Authorization	Record of Compliance (ECM Signature and Date)	Status and Description of how commitments have been addressed during Operations and Maintenance	Compliance Document Reference	Status	Results	Notes
				years after start-up										

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**		
					Status	**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	Status – On-going A list of approved minor changes to-date has been logged - Change Control Log **[ID Y2018-010]**	**Change Control Log (ID Y2018-010)**	Yes	EF (2018)	The evidence [Y2018-010]) supports the assertions regarding minor changes being reported.
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 – Ongoing (if necessary). 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.		Yes	AC	It is accepted that there is no change.

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 Status	Compliance Review Results	Compliance Review 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.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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 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.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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 – Completed Open Houses were conducted in May 2015. Presentation materials remain available online		Yes	Closed (2016)	

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 Status	Compliance Review Results	Compliance Review Notes
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 – Completed YRRTC has 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. The Community Relations Protocol was prepared by YRRTC and submitted to MOECC (YR15-101) – added for 2016 to complete item	YR15-101 Complaints Protocol Letter to MOECC (26-Oct-2015)	Yes	Closed (2015)	
86-a	CMP Section 7.1.3 – York Region Transit consults on a regular basis with the public through Open Houses at which they provide information on planned system expansion and modifications and respond to questions and complaints concerning existing operations. These forums will provide the opportunity to inform the public of the results of monitoring of EA commitments as well as to obtain feedback from the public on the effectiveness of environmental mitigation measures incorporated into the design and operations of the undertaking.	York Region	Status – Completed Engagement on the 2016 Transportation Master Plan is an example of ongoing consultation on planned system expansion and modifications and respond to questions and complaints concerning existing operations. The Consultation and Engagement Summary Report describes the engagement.		Yes	Closed (2016)	
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	Status – Completed Refer to Item 18.		Yes	Closed (2016)	.

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**		
					Status	**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	Status – Completed Refer to Item 18.		Yes	Closed (2016)	
89	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, [1] particularly regarding works associated with any alteration of Pomona Mills Creek.[2] 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. [3] This could vary from sending notices to attending meetings. (2009 item number : 67)	York Region	Status – [1] Completed [2] Does not apply [1] See item 18 [2] Refer to Item 46 – Ponoma Mills Creek is not in Segment Y2		Yes	Closed (2016)	

Section 8.0 – Program Schedule					Compliance Review		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Status	Results	Notes
89-a	CMP Sec 8: The CMP will be conducted during the implementation of all segments of the Yonge Corridor EA Undertaking. Design of the initial segment between Steeles Avenue and Highway 7 commenced in July 2006 and will continue through 2007 and part of 2008. As noted earlier, construction of this segment is dependent on the availability of funding. Rapid transit operations using the facilities will commence immediately after testing and commissioning of the systems and facilities. CMP activities programmed for each phase will be carried out throughout the implementation of the project [1] and will continue during operations and maintenance until it can be verified that all commitments relating to operational effects have been met. [2] It is anticipated that a stable operating environment will be reached within three years of the commencement date by which time monitoring activities will have confirmed compliance and as such, will be no longer necessary.		Status: [1] Completed [2] Future Work [1] Refer to item 27. Mitigation measures required throughout implementation of the project are documented and reported on through the ACR process. [2] Refers to Operational monitoring		Yes	AC	Item [1]: Closed in 2016. Item [2] is post-construction monitoring and is future.

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		
					Status	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	Status – Completed. The final CMP was submitted to the Acting Director, Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch on March 10, 2008 and approved on April 11, 2008.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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	Status – Completed. The letter of submission includes a statement indicating that the CMP is intended to fulfill Condition 3 of the Conditions of Approval. Letter of approval notes that the CMP will be placed in the ministry's public record file.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
93	CMP Section 9.0 - The document will also be available for public information on the Proponent's website at www.vivayork.ca. (2009 item number : 71)	York Region	Status – Completed.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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.		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Section 10 – Annual Compliance Report					Compliance Review		
Item	**Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Status**	**Results**	**Notes**
94-a	CMP Sec 10: The ECM will prepare an Annual Compliance Report (ACR) which describes the results of the Compliance Monitoring Program during the year preceding the submission of each ACR. A copy of the ACR will be submitted to the Directors of the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch and Central Region for placement on the Public Record. The first ACR will be submitted in December 2008 with subsequent submissions in December of each year thereafter until the construction of the undertaking is complete and the rapid transit service has been operated for at least three years after the last construction segment completed	York Region	Status: On-going **The 2017 ACR was submitted to the MOECC in December 2017.** **This report constitutes the 2018 ACR to be submitted in December 2018.**	**2017 Letter of Acceptance from MOECC (ID Y2018-002)2016 Annual Compliance Report (December 2017) (ID Y2018-003)**	Yes	EF	Documents provided support that the ACR was submitted in 2017 and this report constitutes the 2018 ACR which will be submitted in December 2018 .

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		
					Status	Results	Notes
95	Ridership Monitoring Program: 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, and TTC, the Towns [City] of Markham and Richmond Hill and the City of Vaughan for review.(2009 item number : 73)	York Region	Status – Completed Refer to Item 12		Yes	Closed (2015)	
96	Technology Conversion Plan CMP Section 11.2 - A Technology Conversion Plan will be prepared to identify when and if conversion from a bus rapid transit (BRT) system to a Light Rail Transit (LRT) system will occur.(2009 item number : 74)	York Region	Status – Completed Refer to Item 13		Yes	Closed (2015)	
97	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)	York Region	Status – Completed Refer to Item 12		Yes	Closed (2016)	
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 MOECC'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 – Completed Refer to Item 14		Yes	Closed (2015)	

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**		
					Status	**Results**	**Notes**
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 – Completed Refer to Item 16.		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Appendix 1
Table 11-1
Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-1
Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective A - Mobility

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/ Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Monitoring: Compliance Review Status	Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE A: To improve mobility by providing a fast, convenient, reliable and efficient rapid transit service																		
A1 (a)	Maximize Inter-regional and local transit connectivity	Connections to inter-regional services and future gateways	✓		✓	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.		Yes	Closed (2010)	
(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 – Future 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.	http://www.york.ca/wps/portal/yorkhome/yorkregion/yr/councilandcommittee/agendasminutesandreports/yrt2017annualserviceplan/!ut/p/a0/04_Sj9CPykssy0xPLMnMz0vMAfGjzOI9Hd09PTy8Dbz8TSycDRwN_B29jMwtDCy8zfULsh0VAc66hOY!/#.WjKhBj6GMgw	Yes	ENF	Web reference provided does not work. **ACTION for 2019 ACR provide updated web link for documentation purposes.**
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.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
(b)																		

Appendix 1
Table 11-1
Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-1
Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective A - Mobility

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/ Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Potential Residual Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring: Responsible person / agency	Compliance Monitoring: Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Monitoring: Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review: Status	Compliance Review: Results	Compliance Review: Notes
OBJECTIVE A: To improve mobility by providing a fast, convenient, reliable and efficient rapid transit service																		
(c)		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.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
(d)		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.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
		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.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
(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 – Completed. 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.		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Appendix 1
Table 11-1
Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-1
Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective A - Mobility

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/ Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Compliance Monitoring: Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review: Status	Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE A: To improve mobility by providing a fast, convenient, reliable and efficient rapid transit service																		
(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[1]	York Region	Status – Closed Transition to LRT is a longer term initiative on the Y2 corridor – See item 12		Yes	Closed (2016)	
(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 – Closed [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 see Item 12 Vertical profile to be adjusted when implemented.		Yes	Closed (2016)	
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.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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.		Yes	AC	The revised description indicates that the meeting the commitments will be completed during operation phase.

Appendix 1
Table 11-1
Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-1
Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective A - Mobility

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/ Concerns	Project Phase[1]			Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures			Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring					
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation			Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review Status	Compliance Review Results	Compliance Review Notes
OBJECTIVE A: To improve mobility by providing a fast, convenient, reliable and efficient rapid transit service																		
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 landuse. Facilities designed with weather protection, direct barrier free access and attractive streetscapes within surrounding residential neighbourhoods.	Continued dependence on automobile if land use objectives not achieved	Greater emphasis on supportive land use	Positive effect	[2] Regular review of land use and new or infill development potential during detailed design phases for transitway and stations.	York Region	Status – [1] Completed. [2] Future Work [1] York Region has developed guidelines for assessing potential locations for new Viva stations. [2] No new development applications have been received for the corridor during the detailed design (design/build) phase. The Region will monitor applications.		Yes	[2] AC	[1] Closed in 2014. [2] Accepted that review of infill development is Future Work.

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

Appendix 1
Table 11-2
Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-2
Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective B - Social Environment

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/ Concerns	Project Phase[1]			Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures			Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation			Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Status	Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor																		
B1 (a)	Minimize adverse effects on and maximize benefits for communities in corridor	Potential displacement of community features		✓	✓	Entire Corridor	Potential displacement or loss of unique features.	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 and November 19 and 20, 2013.		Yes	Closed (2014)	
(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.		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Appendix 1
Table 11-2
Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-2
Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective B - Social Environment

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/ Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Potential Residual Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring: Responsible person / agency	Compliance Monitoring: Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Monitoring: Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review: Status	Compliance Review: Results	Compliance Review: Notes
OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor																		
(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 y 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.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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.		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Appendix 1
Table 11-2
Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-2
Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective B - Social Environment

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/ Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Potential Residual Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring: Responsible person / agency	Compliance Monitoring: Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Monitoring: Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review: Status	Compliance Review: Results	Compliance Review: Notes
OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor																		
(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 maneuvers 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] Completed, [2] Does not apply A Traffic Analysis Report was prepared during Detailed Design which identifies why "Right Turns on Red" prohibitions were not considered for Yonge Street. Monitoring is therefore, not required.		Yes	Closed (2016)	
(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.		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Appendix 1
Table 11-2
Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-2
Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective B - Social Environment

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/ Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Potential Residual Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring: Responsible person / agency	Compliance Monitoring: Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Monitoring: Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review: Status	Compliance Review: Results	Compliance Review: Notes
OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor																		
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 signalized intersections. Increased the number of signalized intersections on Yonge Street to provide direct access to side streets.	Infiltration may remain.	Traffic management measures or alternative access arrangement 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.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
b)		Potential for Traffic Infiltration			✓	Woodward Avenue/Grand view Avenue/Highland Park	Southbound left turns at the Highland Park, Woodward and Grandview intersections will be restricted in the preferred RT design. This additional restriction may divert traffic to Doncaster Avenue, Meadowview Avenue, Glen Cameron Road and Clarke Avenue, and ultimately to Henderson Avenue.	Traffic management measures such as turn restrictions could be implemented during detail design.	Infiltration may remain.	Traffic management measures or alternative access arrangements would be undertaken, as required.	Moderately Significant	Undertake "before" and "after" traffic volume observations on affected roadways to determine any changes in traffic infiltration levels. Traffic management measures such as turn restrictions, partial closures or traffic calming would be implemented, as required in consultation with City of Toronto.	York Region	Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
(c)																		

Appendix 1
Table 11-2
Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-2
Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective B - Social Environment

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/ Concerns	Project Phase[1]			Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures			Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring					
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation			Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review		
																Status	Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor																		
(d)																		

Appendix 1
Table 11-2
Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-2
Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective B - Social Environment

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/ Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Potential Residual Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring: Responsible person / agency	Compliance Monitoring: Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Monitoring: Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review: Status	Compliance Review: Results	Compliance Review: Notes
OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor																		
(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.		Yes	AC	Accepted that post-construction monitoring 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

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/ Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Potential Residual Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring: Responsible person / agency	Compliance Monitoring: Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Monitoring: Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review: Status	Compliance Review: Results	Compliance Review: Notes
OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor																		
(d)		NB/SB U-turn movements and the correspondin g g 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 – Completed 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. Refer to Item B2(b) 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). Monitoring is therefore not required.	[	Yes	Closed (2016)	

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				
							Proposed Mitigation Measures									Compliance Review		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/ Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Status	Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor																		
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 – Completed. 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. A Traffic Analysis Report (final provided) was prepared during Detailed Design which identifies Emergency and Heavy Vehicle Access Considerations for Yonge Street Consultation with ERS was completed during detail design as noted in the Emergency Response Services Meeting Minutes		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Appendix 1
Table 11-2
Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-2
Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective B - Social Environment

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/ Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Potential Residual Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring: Responsible person / agency	Compliance Monitoring: Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Monitoring: Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review: Status	Compliance Review: Results	Compliance Review: Notes
OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor																		
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.		Yes	AC	Accepted that post-construction audit measurements is Future Work.
(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.		Yes	AC	Accepted that post-construction audit measurements is Future Work.
(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.		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Appendix 1
Table 11-2
Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-2
Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective B - Social Environment

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/ Concerns	Project Phase[1]			Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures			Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation			Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Status	Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor																		
(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.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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 ed 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.		Yes	Closed (2015)	

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					
							Proposed Mitigation Measures									Compliance Review		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/ Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Status	Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor																		
(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 MOECC APEP-115 noise emission standards. [2] 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 circumstance	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 d.	York Region	Status–On-going The Noise and Vibration Management Plan demonstrates compliance to mitigate noise and vibration effects of construction, to be implemented during construction and monitored using the Daily Environmental Checklist Continued.	Noise and Vibration Management Plan (Y2015-009) **Daily Inspection Checklists (Y2018-004)**	Yes	[1-3] EF	[1-3] Evidence provided [Y2018-004] support assertions and that inspections are occurring during construction **See Item 76 for specifics of equipment monitoring**
B4 (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.		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Appendix 1
Table 11-2
Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-2
Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective B - Social Environment

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/ Concerns	Project Phase[1]			Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures			Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation			Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Status	Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor																		
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.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
(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 minimize 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.		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Appendix 1
Table 11-2
Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-2
Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective B - Social Environment

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/ Concerns	Project Phase[1]			Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures			Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation			Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Status	Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor																		
(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.		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Appendix 1
Table 11-2
Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-2
Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective B - Social Environment

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/ Concerns	Project Phase[1]			Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures			Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review		
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation			Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Status	Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor																		
B5 (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. If no potentially significant archaeological sites are identified during Stage 2, it will be recommended to the Ministry of Culture that the areas assessed be considered free of further archaeological concern.	Archaeological sites may be identified during the course of Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment.	Needs for further mitigation, possibly including Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment (test excavation) and Stage 4 Archaeological Assessment (further mitigative work, including mitigative excavation), must be determined following Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment, if archaeological resources are identified during survey.	Negligible for stage 1 Archaeological Assessment	No requirement for monitoring has been identified as a result of Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment. Monitoring may be required, depending on the results of Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment.	York Region	Status – Completed Refer to Item 18.		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Appendix 1
Table 11-2
Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-2
Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective B - Social Environment

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/ Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Potential Residual Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring: Responsible person / agency	Compliance Monitoring: Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Monitoring: Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review: Status	Compliance Review: Results	Compliance Review: Notes
OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor																		
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 – [1,2] Does not apply; [3] Completed [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] This is addressed with each site plan application on website.		Yes	Closed (2016)	
B6 (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] **Completed** [2] Future Work [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. Irrigation plans are included in the Boulevard IFC Drawings (Y2017-009) [2] Following the post-construction warranty period, York Region Forestry Services will	[1] TS 8 - Landscape and Streetscape Design Report (Y2015-033) [1] Y2.1 and Y2.2 IFC Drawings for Streetscape Design Tree Grate Details (Y2017-009)	Yes	[1] Closed (2017) [2] AC	Item [1]: This item is closed. Item [2] was deemed future work in 2015.

Appendix 1
Table 11-2
Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-2
Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective B - Social Environment

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/ Concerns	Project Phase[1]			Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures			Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring					
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation			Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review		
																Status	Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor																		
														monitor the health of landscaping.				

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

Appendix 1
Table 11-3
Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3
Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural Environment

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issue/ Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Potential Residual Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review: Status	Compliance Review: Results	Compliance Review: Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
C1 (a)	Minimize adverse effects on Aquatic Ecosystems	Fuel spills, due to accidents during construction refueling and accidents during operation, entering the watercourses.		✓	✓	Entire Corridor	Killing fish 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 – Completed Refueling and other spill-related mitigations are included in the Spill Prevention and Response Plan		Yes	Closed (2015)	
(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 – [2] Completed [1, 3] On-going [2] Sediment and erosion control mitigations are included in the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (Y2015-028). [1, 3] Item 1.2 Daily Environmental Checklist verifies fencing is available; Item 1.3 monitoring for evidence of sedimentation is conducted after rain events**. (Y201-004).**	**[1,3] Daily Environmental Checklist (Y2018-004)**	Yes	[1,3] EF	Item [2] closed in 2015. The documents provided [Y2018-004] support the assertion for items and that inspections are occurring and ongoing during construction [1, and 3].
(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, and storm water ponds. Opportunities to improve storm water 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.		Yes	AC	Accepted that post-construction monitoring is future work.

Appendix 1
Table 11-3
Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3
Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural Environment

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issue/ Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Potential Residual Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring: Responsible person / agency	Compliance Monitoring: Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Monitoring: Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review: Status	Compliance Review: Results	Compliance Review: Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
C1 (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 l inspection during in-water work [3] Post-construction monitoring of fish habitat conservation measures. [4]	York Region	Status – **[1,3] On-going; [2,4] Closed** An Aquatic Resources Protection Plan was prepared during Detailed Design which outlines agencies consulted [1], timing constraints for in-water construction [3], and in-water work timing restrictions. [1] Also refer to Item 45. [1] Permits, Licenses, Approvals and Authorizations Ledger demonstrates negotiations with TRCA for Y2.1 and Y2.2. (Y2017-001 **and Y2018-014)** [3] Aquatic Resources Protection GEMP has been updated (ID Y2017-007) and environmental inspection is documented using the **Daily Environmental Inspection Checklist (Y2018-004)**	Aquatic Resources Protection Plan (Y2017-007) **Daily Environmental Inspection Checklist (Y2018-004)** **VYONGE-ENV-PER-050-2018-JAN-12-Y2.2-TRCA Bernard Permit (Y2018-014)**	Yes	[1,3] EF [2,4] AC	Item [1]: ID [Y2017-007, Y2018-004 and Y2018-014] support the assertion that agencies were consulted. [Item [2,4]: Was closed in 2017 ACR. Item [3]: Documents reference [Y2017-007Y2018-004 and Y2018-014] support the assertion that water work plan was developed and ongoing.
(e)		Fish mortality		✓		All watercourses 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.	None expected.	None	Negligible	[6] On-site environmental l inspection during in-water work.	York Region	Status – [1, 2, 5] Completed; [3, 4, 6] On-going **[3, 4, 6] Daily Environmental Inspection (Y2018-004)**	**Daily Environmental Inspection Checklist (Y2018-004)**	Yes	EF [3, 4, 6]	Items [1, 2, 5]: Completed Items [3, 4, 6]: Evidence provided [Y2018-004] support the assertion.

Appendix 1
Table 11-3
Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3
Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural Environment

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issue/ Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Potential Residual Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring: Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review: Status	Compliance Review: Results	Compliance Review: Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
								[4] Capture fish trapped during dewatering of the work zone and safely release upstream. [5] Prohibit the entry of heavy equipment into the watercourse.										
C1 (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 l inspection during in-water work.	York Region	Status – [1,2,3] Completed; [4] Does not apply; [5] On-going [4] MSF at Langstaff Road at Don River Tributary 3 is not within Segment Y2. [5] Daily Environmental Inspection	**[5] Daily Environmental Inspection Checklist (Y2018-004)**	Yes	[4] AC [5] EF	Items [1, 2 and 3]: Closed in 2015. Item [4]: It is accepted that Trib. 3 does not apply and is closed. Item [5]: The document provided [Y2018-004] supports the assertion.
(g)		Base flow 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 – [1, 2] Completed; [3] Does not apply A Drainage and Hydrology Report (final provided) was prepared during Detailed Design which followed the recommendations of the preliminary engineering drainage study. No storm water management facilities to address quantity control are proposed, therefore [3] does not apply.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
C1 (h)	**Minimize adverse effects on**	Baseflow alterations –		✓	✓	Pomona Mills Creek	Fish habitat may be	▪ erosion and sedimentation control	▪ alteration of approximately 700 m2 of	None required	Positive	Monitor the newly altered fish habitat	York Region	Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Appendix 1
Table 11-3
Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3
Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural Environment

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issue/ Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Potential Residual Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring: Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review: Status	Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
	Aquatic Ecosystem MS (continued)	realignment of watercourse				at the proposed ed Maintenance and Storage Facility	destructed or disturbed.	▪ provide Level 1 storm water treatment for vehicle storage and maintenance facility ▪ convey existing flow through the site during construction of the new watercourse ▪ create new channel using natural channel design ▪ stabilize new channel prior to diversion ▪ capture and safely release stranded fish ▪ in-water construction timing restriction Negotiations will occur with regulatory agencies during detail design to address the proposed realignment and naturalization of this watercourse.	highly degraded fish habitat anticipated ▪ opportunity to create and enhance approximately y 900 m2 of fish habitat through channel realignment ▪ therefore, net gain of 200 m2 of fish habitat anticipated ▪ Opportunity to enhance this highly degraded watercourse through natural channel design.									
(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	York Region	Status – [1-3] Completed; [4-6] Future Work. [2] For water quantity impact the Final Drainage Study identifies that there is no impact on the Regional Flood Plain as long as the widened road is not raised. It does not identify any other flow control and storage requirements other than conveyance of increased flows, and it identifies that there is insufficient space and property provided for storm water management BMP's. Drainage and Hydrology Report for Section Y2 100% Design	Drainage and Hydrology Report for Section Y2 100% Design Report [Y2016-028] (See Section 6.2) Daily Environmental Inspection Checklists [Y2016-026 and Y2016-027] Memo: Y2.2 Rouge River Strategy Compliance (Y2016-020)	Yes	[4-6] AC	Items [1, 3]: Closed in 2015. Item [2]: Closed in 2016. Items [4-6] were deemed Future Work in 2015.

Appendix 1
Table 11-3
Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3
Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural Environment

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issue/ Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Compliance Monitoring: Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review: Status	Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
												riparian plantings to confirm survival.		Report [Y2016-028] (See Section 6.2). Refer also to the Memo indicating Y2.2 Rouge River Strategy Compliance (Y2016-020)				
(j)		Disturbance to rare, threatened or endangered species		✓	✓	East Don River	Redside dace resident approximately 2 km upstream of Yonge Street. None known to be resident within zone of influence of the project.	No species-specific mitigation required.	None expected	None required	Negligible	None required.	York Region	Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
C2 (a)	Minimize adverse effects on Terrestrial Ecosystems	Destruction/ Disturbance of wildlife habitat.		✓	✓	Entire corridor Rouge River Tributary 2	Construction of the transitway and associated facilities will result in the removal of vegetation and the wildlife habitat that it supports. Activities such as site grubbing, staging & stockpiling during construction could result in destruction or disturbance of migratory birds Extension of existing culvert	▪ [1] Minimize the area of vegetation removals to the extent possible. ▪ [2] Minimize grade changes to the extent possible. ▪ [3] Use close cut clearing and trimming to minimize the number of trees to be removed. ▪ [4] Delineate work zones using construction fencing/tree protection barrier. ▪ [5] Protect trees within the clear zone using guide rail, curbs, etc. to prevent removal.	Removal of 0.026 ha of cultural meadow vegetation community at the CN-Bala/GO Line and 0.013 ha of cultural meadow vegetation community at the hydro corridor south of Highway 407. Community has low habitat structure and diversity.	[6] Restore natural areas disturbed during construction with native vegetation, where feasible. [7] Replace ornamental vegetation as part of landscaping.	Negligible	[8] Post-construction inspection of vegetation plantings to confirm survival.	York Region	Status – [1-7] Complete, [8] Future Work The cultural meadow vegetation community at the CN Bala/GO line and hydro corridor south of Highway 407 is not within segment Y2. [8] Following the post-construction warranty period, York Region Forestry Services will monitor the health of landscaping. [1-5] Aquatic and Terrestrial mitigation measures are outlined in the Aquatic Resources Protection Plan and the Terrestrial Resources Protection Plan (Y2015-019 and Y2015-029)		Yes	[8] AC	Items [1-7]: Closed in 2015. Item [8] was deemed Future Work in 2015.

Appendix 1
Table 11-3
Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3
Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural Environment

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issue/ Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Potential Residual Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring: Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review: Status	Compliance Review: Results	Compliance Review: Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
							may have potential adverse effects on migratory birds.											
(b)		Wildlife mortality.		✓		Entire corridor	Removal of wildlife habitat may result in wildlife mortality.	▪ [1] Perform vegetation removals outside of wildlife breeding seasons (typically April 1 to July 31). ▪ [2] Perform bridge/culvert extension, repair and replacement outside of wildlife breeding seasons.	None expected	None required	Negligible	None required.	York Region	Status – On-going 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 **(Y2018-006).** The TRPP notes 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.*"	GEMP Terrestrial Resources Protection Plan (Y2015-029) **Daily Environmental Inspection Checklist (Y2018-004)**	Yes	[1,2] EF (2016)	The evidence provided [Y2018-004] supports the assertion for [1, 2]. document from previous year ACR was not provided [Y2015-029] but is not required for review.
(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	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 – Completed [1] No changes to culverts and bridges during detailed design, therefore wildlife passages are maintained. [2] Culvert extension size at Rouge River Tributary 2 was maintained in detailed design, as recommended by Preliminary Engineering. No specific mitigation for wildlife passage is proposed. (Y2015-037) [3] The MSF is not within segment Y2		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Appendix 1
Table 11-3
Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3
Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural Environment

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issue/ Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring: Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review: Status	Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
								passage at vehicle maintenance and storage facility through stream daylighting, realignment and restoration.										
C2 (d)	**Minimize adverse effects on Terrestrial Ecosystems (continued)**	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.	▪ Span bridges across the meander belt. ▪ Use oversized culverts to promote wildlife passage under the road. ▪ Stagger culvert inverts to create wet and dry culverts.	Transitway represents an incremental increase in road width compared to existing hazard to wildlife created by Yonge Street.	None required	Insignificant	None required.	None required	Status – Not Applicable to Y2.		Yes	Closed (2016)	
(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.		Yes	Closed (2016)	
(f)		Disturbance to vegetation through edge effects, drainage modifications and road salt.		✓	✓	Entire corridor	▪ Clearing of new forest edges may result in sunscald, windthrow, and invasion by exotic species. ▪ Ditching, grading and other drainage modifications may alter local soil	▪ [1] Minimize the area of vegetation removals to the extent possible. ▪ [2] Minimize grade changes and cut/fill requirements to the extent possible. ▪ [3] Use close cut clearing and trimming to minimize encroachment on remaining vegetation. ▪ [4] Delineate work zones using construction	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	Status – [1-4] Completed [5] Future Work 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. [1,2,4] Aquatic and Terrestrial mitigation measures are outlined in the Aquatic Resources Protection Plan and the Terrestrial Resources		Yes	[5] AC	Items [1-4]: Closed in 2015. Item [5]: It is accepted that this is Future Work.

Appendix 1
Table 11-3
Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3
Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural Environment

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issue/ Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Potential Residual Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring: Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review: Status	Compliance Review: Results	Compliance Review: Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
							moisture regimes. ▪ Road salt may result in vegetation mortality and dieback.	fencing/tree protection barrier. ▪ [5] Manage the application of road salt to the extent possible.						Protection Plan (Y2015-019 and Y2015-029) [3] Refer to Item C2(a) [5] Road salt management is operational				
(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.	▪ [1] Minimize the area of vegetation removals to the extent possible. ▪ [2] Minimize grade changes to the extent possible. ▪ [3] Use close cut clearing and trimming to minimize the number of trees to be removed. ▪ [4] Delineate work zones using construction fencing/tree protection barrier. ▪ [5] Protect trees within the clear zone using guide rail, curbs, etc. to prevent removal.	Trees may be removed by the transitway and its associated facilities.	None required	Insignificant	None required.	York Region	Status – Completed Aquatic and Terrestrial mitigation measures are outlined in the Aquatic Resources Protection Plan and the Terrestrial Resources Protection Plan (Y2015-019 and Y2015-029) Close cut trimming/clearing does not have any application in this project. However, the Arborist Report and Tree Preservation Plan (Y2015-035) outline other methods of minimizing the number of trees to be removed, including selection criteria. The Arborist Report and Tree Preservation Plan provides measures to protect trees (Y2015-035).		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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 (PM10, NOx, SO2, CO) when comparing 2021 forecasts with and without the proposed Rapid Transit (see Tables 4.3 and	None required	Positive Effect	None required	None required	Status – No action required.		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Appendix 1
Table 11-3
Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-3
Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective C – Natural Environment

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issue/ Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring: Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review: Status	Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
									4.4 of Appendix K, 1.6% decrease in PM10, 2.0% decrease in NOx, 1.9% decrease in SO2, and 3.0% decrease in CO)									
(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 CO2 forecast in 2021)	None required	Positive Effect	None required	None required	Status – No action required.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
(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 – Completed. 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. Document updated to final in 2016.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
(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.		Yes	Closed (2015)	

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] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Potential Residual Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review: Status	Compliance Review: Results	Compliance Review: Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
C4	Minimize adverse effects on corridor hydro-geological, geological and hydrological conditions	Increased pavement; decreased infiltration			✓	Entire corridor Proposed Maintenance & Storage Facility	Minor increase in quantity of surface runoff. Minor decrease in quantity of groundwater. Lower quality of surface water.	[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. [4] Storm water management controls (quality, quantity and erosion) will also be required for the construction of the proposed Maintenance & Storage Facility (MSF).	Minor increase in peak streamflows. Minor decrease in groundwater.	None practical	Negligible	None required	York Region	Status – Completed [4] The Maintenance and Storage Facility is not within segment Y2 [1 to 3] Refer to item 53		Yes	Closed (2015)	

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

Appendix 1
Table 11-4
Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-4
Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective D – Economic Environment

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issue/ Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring: Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review: Status	Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE D: To promote smart growth and economic development in the corridor																		
D1 (a)	Support Regional and Municipal Planning Policies and approved urban structure	Need for pedestrian-friendly streets and walkways for access to stations		✓	✓	Entire corridor	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 – [1-4] Completed, [5] Future Work [1 to 2] A Traffic Analysis Report was prepared during Detailed Design (Y2015-003) in accordance with the Preliminary Design. [3, 4] The 100pct contract drawings for Y2.1 and Y2.2 [Y2016-029 and Y2016-030] demonstrate consideration for safety and visibility for signage and platform edge treatment such as a planting zone between the road and sidewalk to discourage jaywalking and illegal access. Responses to the Road Safety Audit Report further illustrate these considerations [Y2016-031]	[1][2] Final Traffic Analysis Report, June 2015 (Y2015-003) 100pct Roadways (Y2.1 See Sheet 2149 for [4] and Sheets 2173-2179 for [3]) (Y2016-029) 100pct Roadways (Y2.2 See Sheet 2240 for [4] and Sheets 2261-2265 for [3]) (Y2016-030) Responses to Prestage Road Side Safety (See ID 1 & 2) (Y2016-031)	Yes	[1-4] EF [5] AC	Items [1 to 4]: Closed in 2016. Item [5] is accepted as future work.
		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 – On-going Development proposals are reviewed by York Region	https://www.yorklink.ca/citybuilding/#	Yes	AC	It is accepted that York Region is reviewing development activity via the Municipal Site Plan approval process. **ACTION: For 2019 ACR, provide documentation to support the development proposals are reviewed by York Region**

Appendix 1
Table 11-4
Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 11-4
Assessment of Environmental Effects for Objective D – Economic Environment

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issue/ Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring: Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review: Status	Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE D: To promote smart growth and economic development in the corridor																		
(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: ● Thornhill Heritage District is not in segment Y2. ● No changes to existing conditions are proposed in Richmond Hill historical district.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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 incorporates 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 [5] traffic patterns during operations.	York Region	Status – [1-3] Complete, **[4] Ongoing**, [5] Future Work [1-3] A Traffic Analysis Report was prepared during Detailed Design to identify potential traffic impacts and mitigations. Final provided. Additionally, Traffic Staging and Temporary Conditions Drawings include information on signage for detours [5] Monitoring of traffic after construction will be carried out by York Region Transportation Services following the commencement of operation. **[4] Ongoing - Refer to Item 80**	**Final** Traffic Analysis Report, RapidLINK, June 2015 (Y2015-003) Y2.2 Traffic Staging and Temp Conditions Dwgs (Y2015-038)	Yes	[4] EF	Items [1-3] closed in 2015. Item [4] (and ITEM 80) Evidence provided [2018-008 and 2018-009, 2018-012, 2018-013] support that traffic congestion is taken into consideration during construction, discussed in meeting minutes and by following correct traffic control methods (i.e. Book 7) but did not provide evidence of monitoring of congestion levels during construction. **For 2019 ACR, provide evidence of monitoring of congestion levels during construction. This item is ongoing** Item [5] is accepted as future work.
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	Intensification of underutilized sites along with the development of infill locations and any vacant land can be pursued under municipal planning guidelines for	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 Development proposals are reviewed by York Region and circulated to the Viva design team for review and comment.		Yes	AC	Item is accepted as 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

GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issue/ Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring: Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Compliance Review: Status	Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE D: To promote smart growth and economic development in the corridor																		
(b)							change in urban form.	transit-oriented development.										
		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 – On-going [1] The Complaints Protocol outlines procedures to address requests of affected businesses; [2] Traffic Analysis Report was prepared during Detailed Design (final provided), incorporates design solutions to minimize the number of businesses affected. Portable Variable Messaging Signage (PVMS) are examples of 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.	Final Traffic Analysis Report, RapidLINK, June 2015 (Y2015-003) (YR15-101) YRRTC to MOE re Complaints Protocol 26-Oct-2015.pdf Functions	Yes	[1] EF [3] AC	Item [1]: The Complaints Protocol outlines procedures to address requests of affected businesses. Item [2]: Closed in 2015. Item [3]: Accept that no actions need to address business loss concerns.
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 – [1,2] Completed, [3] Future Work [1 to 2] A Traffic Analysis Report (final provided) was prepared during Detailed Design [3] Monitoring of traffic after construction will be carried out by York Region Transportation Services following the commencement of operation.	Final Traffic Analysis Report, RapidLINK, June 2015 (Y2015-003)	Yes	[2] AC	Item [1,2]: Closed in 2015. Item [3]: It is accepted that post-construction monitoring is Future Work.
(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 – Completed Addressed in the Y2.2 Traffic Staging and Temp Conditions Drawings		Yes	Closed (2015)	

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

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the Government Review Team on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
								Compliance Review		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Status	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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		d) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the Government Review Team on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
								Compliance Review		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Status	Results	Notes
				interface with future 407 Transitway services.						
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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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 – Completed The final CMP was submitted to the Acting approved by MOE in April 11, 2008. This ACR constitutes an Annual review of mitigation and monitoring compliance.	EA Compliance Monitoring Plan March 10, 2008 (ID#3145) Letter of submission (ID#3144) Letter of approval (ID#3146)	Yes	Closed (2016)	

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the Government Review Team on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
								Compliance Review		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Status	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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			Lack of Detail in EA Report on AQ Impacts of the Project (Future Case) 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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			Focus of EA Report and Senes Report on PM Emissions e) Although TSP is discussed with respect to its role a 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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			f) PM2.5 is included in the existing conditions discussion but does not appear in the subsequent evaluation in the EA. TS wishes further explanation as to why PM2.5 was not included since it is a health based parameter. TS recommends that PM2.5 is included in all aspects of the AQ impact assessment.	f) The supplementary air quality memorandum addresses $PM_{2.5}$.		f) Status – No action required		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			Comparison of "Historical & Measured AQ Data" with MOE AAQC g) The averaging time used in Tables 6-23, 6-24 & 6-25 of the EA Report & in Tables 2.5, 2.6 & 2.7 of the Senes Report for the designated pollutants, do not in all cases, correspond with times over which applicable MOE Ambient AQ Criteria are actually averaged. i. Table 6-25 of EA Report is intended to be identical to Table 2.7 of the Senes Report & yet Table 6-25 for SO2, O3 & NOx has a 30-hr	g) i. The supplementary air quality memorandum includes updated Tables 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7. 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.		g) i. Status – No action required ii. Status – No action required		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the Government Review Team on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
								Compliance Review		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Status	Results	Notes
			standard whereas Table 2.7 has 30-day standards for the same parameters, yet the values depicted are identical in both cases. ii. For CO, the 8-hr value of 36,200 ug/ m3 & the 24-hr value of 15,700 ug/ m3 as listed in the Table 2.5 (Senes) & 6-23 (EA Report) are incorrect. It is the 1-hr value which should be 36,200 ug/ m3 & the 8-hr which should be 15,700 ug/m3. In Tables 2.6, 2.7 (Senes) & 6-24, 6-25 (EA Report) the 1-hr value of 36,200 ug/m3 is listed correctly, however, the 8-hr value of 15,700 ug/ m3 has been omitted. iii. For O3, the averaging time to be used in the comparison is the 1-hr value of 165 ug/m3 not a "calculated equivalent standard". iv. For NOx, both the 24-hr value of 200 ug/m3 & the 1-hr value of 400 ug/m3 should be listed & used in the comparison & it should be clear that using NOx as NO2 is a conservative assumption but is considered acceptable. (Note: NOx = NO + NO2) v. For SO2, O3 and NOx, the 30-day values as listed in Table 2.7 of the Senes Report are inappropriate and should not be included.	ii. The supplementary air quality memorandum includes updated Tables 2.5, and 2.6. iii. The supplementary air quality memorandum includes updated Tables 2.5, 2.6 and 2.8. iv. The supplementary air quality memorandum provides a response to this comment. v. The supplementary air quality memorandum includes an updated Table 2.8.		iii. Status – No action required iv. Status – No action required v. Status – No action required				
			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.	h) The supplementary air quality memorandum includes updated Tables 2.5, 2.6, 2.7 and 2.8.		h) Status – No action required		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			Development of Vehicle Emissions Data 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	k) The supplementary air quality memorandum includes an updated preamble to Table 3.1.		k) Status – No action required		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the Government Review Team on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
								Compliance Review		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Status	Results	Notes
			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.							
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			m) A ratio of CO/SO2 was used by TS as an alternate approach to substantiating some of the road link data in Tables 3.2 and 3.3. There are some discrepancies in the results (see Memo for details). As a follow-up to above comments, Senes should review the Existing Base Case data of Table 3.2 to confirm its accuracy.	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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			Dispersion Modelling/ Assessment of AQ 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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			Matching of Alt. Assessed in EA Report with Those in Senes' 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	p) The supplementary air quality memorandum provides a response to this comment.		p) Status – No action required		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the Government Review Team on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
								Compliance Review		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Status	Results	Notes
			any different results on selection of the preferred alternative from that shown in Section 8 of the EA report.							
			Identification of Mitigation Measures 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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			r) Table 11-3 under Proposed Mitigation Measures-Potential Residual Effects suggests an improvement (or decrease) in PM10 concentrations of some 1.6% when comparing 2021 (future) forecasts with and without the proposed rapid transit. The major difficulty TS has with this conclusion is that it does not include consideration of Table 3.2, the existing base case pollutant concentration estimates. It is of TS opinion to include consideration of the fact that PM10 emissions will increase markedly from the existing base case (2001) to the future base case (2021). As a result, there will be a 40% increase in PM10 initially and it will decrease 1.6% with inclusion of BRT. For York Region to then conclude that the focus should be only on 2021 is misleading and not something TS can easily agree to. At the very least TS feels that the change from 2001 to 2021 could be characterized in terms of BRT slowing the increase but it should include consideration of further mitigation based on the significant initial increase in PM10 concentrations.	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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			t) TS is of the opinion that the issue of PM2.5 concentrations also needs further review and as such, Table 11-3 should be modified to include consideration of PM2.5 as well as PM10.	t) There will be a net positive effect to the environment from PM2.5 and PM10, therefore no further mitigation is required.		t) Status – No action required		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			Monitoring of Construction PM Emission u) Table 11-3 of the EA Report includes comments on "Degradation of AQ during construction" which indicates that "some PM emissions locally" are expected but no "Monitoring" is recommended. This information raises some concern with TS about its compatibility with info provided in Sec. 12.4.1 of the EA Report ("Construction Monitoring"), which does indicate that "Monitoring" will be done in the form of regular inspections of dust & vehicular emissions control. Although TS is strongly in favour of the need to do such monitoring it is important that YR clarify	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.		u) Status – No action required		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the Government Review Team on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
								Compliance Review		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Status	Results	Notes
			what appears to be contrary statements in Table 11-3 that no "Monitoring" is recommended.							
			Senes Project Description v) The content of Sec. 1.1 of the Senes Report is confusing to the reader in light of the apparent focus of Senes' AQ Assessment on airborne dust/ PM emissions from roadways & vehicular traffic. Other than an implied reference in the outline of Phase 1 of YRTP, which Senes states is not assessed in this report, there is virtually no reference to vehicular traffic. Notwithstanding the focus of the Project on Public or Rapid Transit improvements, Senes must explain in this Section their role in the Project and how their description of work relates to the content of their assessment which clearly includes PM emissions from roadway/ vehicular traffic.	v) The supplementary air quality memorandum provides additional information.		v) Status – No action required		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			Executive Summaries 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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			Overall Assessment of AQ 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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			c) There are no outstanding groundwater issues.			c) Status – No action required.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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 No Action Required		Yes	Closed (2015)	
York Region District School Board	Ms. Jane Ross, Manager of	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	a) Comment noted and will be carried forward for consideration during detailed design and development of the	York Region	a) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the Government Review Team on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
								Compliance Review		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Status	Results	Notes
	Land Use Planning		Vaughan, and Thornhill Public School located at 7554 Yonge Street in Vaughan.	Monitoring Program as outlined in Chapter 12 of the EA report.						
			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.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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 storm water 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.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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.		b) Status – Completed Refer to Item 18.		Yes	Closed (2016)	
			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) Status – Completed No construction is required in the Richmond Hill historical district. Cultural Heritage Management Plan GEMP outlines mitigation measures and cultural heritage resources within the Rapidway area. (Y2016-014)	GEMP Cultural Heritage Management Plan (Y2016-014)	Yes	Closed (2016)	
Health Canada	Ms. Carolyn Dunn, Environmental Assessment Officer	6	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: i. Create an urban environment that permits an efficient management of traffic conflicts and is pedestrian friendly;	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. ii. Comment noted. The York Region Transportation and Works Department, Traffic Engineering and Safety Section	York Region	Status – Completed i. [2010] The Y2 preliminary design has incorporated pedestrian friendly guidelines – Section 3.15.2 of the Y2 DBCR. Pedestrian safety has been	Final Traffic Analysis Report (Y2015-003)	Yes	Closed (2015)	

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the Government Review Team on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
								Compliance Review		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Status	Results	Notes
			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; iii. Put in place a suitable police surveillance along the transitway; iv. Reduce the speed of the vehicles on the Yonge Street Corridor; v. Require the minimal distance between buses to be 150 m while they are circulating on the transitway; vi. Equip all of the intersection with numerical countdown pedestrian lights; 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; viii. Ensure that bus drivers have a good visibility (e.g. avoid packed buses); and	will be involved throughout the detailed design and implementation phase. iii. The Traffic Act is enforced on all local and Regional roads by York Region Police, including Yonge Street transitway corridor. iv. Speed limit reduction comment noted and will be carried forward for consideration during the detailed design phase. 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. vi. Comment noted and will be carried forward for consideration during the detailed design phase. vii. The proposed median will include periodic breaks to provide for emergency vehicle assess. Installation of a continuous fence along the median would severely impact the emergency vehicle access. viii. Existing transit driver training includes extensive consideration of safety issues.		considered during Y2 PE Design - e.g. Sections 3.14, 3.17.2, and 3.18 of the Y2 DBCR. ii. Refer to Item 30. iii. No action required iv. Refer to Item 68 v. No action required vi. Refer to Item 68 vii. No action required viii. No action required Final documents added in 2016.				
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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 – Completed Refer to Item 49.		Yes	Closed (2016)	

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the Government Review Team on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
								Compliance Review		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Status	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 Federal Contaminated Site Risk Assessment in Canada that are available through the Contaminated Site Division. These documents included *Guidance on Human Health Preliminary Quantitative Risk Assessment* and *Health Canada Toxicological Reference Values*.	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 – Completed 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.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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 *Draft National Guidelines for Environmental Assessment: Health Impacts of Noise* 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 – No Action Required		Yes	Closed (2016)	
			Section 6.6 Existing Air Quality and Criteria 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).	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.		f) Status – No action required.		Yes	Closed (2016)	
			g) Predict the cumulative air emissions (for construction and operation). These predictions should include a comparison to NAAQO and an estimate of possible exceedances.	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		g) Status – No Action Required		Yes	Closed (2016)	

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the Government Review Team on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
								Compliance Review		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Status	Results	Notes
				will be provided should CEAA approval be required in the future.						
			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 – Completed Refer to Item C3(c). Monitoring of effects of construction activities on air quality are tracked using the Daily Environmental Inspection Checklist		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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/NOx 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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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)		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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. 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 – Does not apply to segment Y2 (not located in the City of Vaughan)		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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).		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the Government Review Team on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
								Compliance Review		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Status	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).		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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 Coty 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).		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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).		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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).		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the Government Review Team on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
								Compliance Review		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Status	Results	Notes
			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).		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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. 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.	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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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 Proponent will commit to work with the Town [City] of Markham and the		b) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the Government Review Team on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
								Compliance Review		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Status	Results	Notes
			b) The Region and YRTP continue to work with Town staff to finalize the Thornhill Yonge Street Study and an implementation strategy.	Thornhill Heritage Committee through the detailed design process.						
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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)		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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 wider spread use of public transit.	a) Comment noted.	York Region	a) Status – No action required		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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.		Status – On-going Reports to be provided to Six Nations.	Correspondence to Huron Wendake First Nation dated November 21, 2016 and Program Update package (ID# Y2016-101)	Yes	AC	Update package sent 2016. However, reopened for new find. **Action For 2019, provide update on sending information from the new Mills Burial report to the Huron Wendat First nations**

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the Government Review Team on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
								Compliance Review		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Status	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).		Status Complete Refer to Item 45.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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.		a) Status – No action required		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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.		b) Status – No action required		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			Vehicle Technology Requirements south of Steeles 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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the Government Review Team on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
								Compliance Review		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Status	Results	Notes
			Strategy for Technology Conversion (pages 5-5, 5-6) 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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			GO Finch Terminal Requirements (page 5-6) 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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			Preferred Alignment south of Steeles Ave (Figure 10-1) 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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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	**Completed:** Refer to Items 10(c) and 18 for contacting first nations		Yes	Closed (2016)	
			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.		a) Status – No action required		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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	Status – Completed a) Refer to Item 38 b and c) Potential groundwater impacts are addressed in the Groundwater Management Plan		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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. b) The Preliminary Geotechnical Study Report prepared by Golder Associates (Appendix 2) states that groundwater control would be a	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		Status – Completed See above		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Appendix 2 Action for comments received from the Government Review Team on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
								Compliance Review		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Status	Results	Notes
			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.	as part of the design phase, will address any potential impacts to groundwater.						
			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.	c) This will be addressed as part of the detailed design phase/geotechnical investigation. Regulatory Agencies will be consulted during detailed design.		Status – Completed See above.		Yes	Closed (2015)	

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 Status	Compliance Review Results	Compliance Review 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)		Yes	Closed (2016)	
			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)		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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)		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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	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)		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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)		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	

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 Status	Compliance Review Results	Compliance Review Notes
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	

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 Status	Compliance Review Results	Compliance Review Notes
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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	p) Section 12.2.2 of the EA report provides an indication of the expected timeline for construction of the initial phase of		p) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Appendix 3 Action for comments received from the Public on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
								Compliance Review		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Status	Results	Notes
			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.	the facility and an indication of the period for its anticipated expansion to the ultimate configuration.						
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
	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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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	b) Comment noted.		b) Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		Yes	Closed (2015)	

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 Status	Compliance Review Results	Compliance Review Notes
			change was made about 5 years ago to avoid confusion with main arterial.							
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			i) What would be 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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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		Yes	Closed (2015)	
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	Status – Does not apply to segment Y2 (not located in Vaughan/Thornhill)		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			b) In the EA, the organization is referred to as The Society for the Preservation of Old Thornhill (SPOT) rather that the Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill (SPOHT).	b) Comment noted.		Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			c) The major street in the Thornhill (Markham) Heritage Conservation District is referred to as Colbourne Drive rather than Colborne Street.	c) Comment noted.		Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Appendix 3 Action for comments received from the Public on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
								Compliance Review		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Status	Results	Notes
			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.		Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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.		Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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.		Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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.		Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		Yes	Closed (2015)	
	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	Status – No action required		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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.		Status – No action required	[2010] Yonge Street Median Rapidway – Highway 7 to 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)	Yes	Closed (2015)	

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 Status	Compliance Review Results	Compliance Review Notes
			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.		Status – Does not apply to segment Y2		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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 everyday 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.[1] Emergency vehicle access has been provided across the median as discussed in Section 10.1.1 of the EA report[2] and developed in consultation with emergency responders.[3]		Status – [1] Future Work; [2, 3] Completed [1] Intersection traffic operations monitoring will commence after introduction of transit service in the Rapidways [2,3] 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 June 22, 2010.		Yes	[1] AC	Item [1]: was deemed Future Work in 2015. Item [2]: Closed in 2015. Item [3]: Closed in 2010.
			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.		Status – Completed 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.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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.		Status – Completed The Yonge Street Corridor Lighting Detail Report – (Y2015-036) confirms the use of full Type III cut-off fixtures in the detail design.		Yes	Closed (2015)	

Appendix 3 Action for comments received from the Public on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring					
								Compliance Review		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Status	Results	Notes
			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).		Status – No action required		Yes	Closed (2015)	
	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	Does not apply to segment Y2		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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.		Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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.		Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		Yes	Closed (2015)	
			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 close 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.		Status – Does not apply to segment Y2.		Yes	Closed (2015)	