

**ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT ACT SECTION 7.1
NOTICE OF COMPLETION OF MINISTRY REVIEW**

**AN INVITATION TO COMMENT ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
FOR THE PROPOSED
HIGHWAY 7 CORRIDOR VAUGHAN NORTH-SOUTH LINK PUBLIC TRANSIT
IMPROVEMENTS**

An environmental assessment (EA) was submitted to the Ministry of the Environment by the Regional Municipality of York for the construction and implementation of a 41 km two-lane, median transitway on the preferred alignments in the Highway 7 corridor between Highway 50 and the Markham By-Pass. The proposed undertaking consists of a 41 km two-lane median transitway on the preferred alignment (see map below) generally in the Highway 7 Corridor between Highway 50 and the Markham By-Pass through the City of Vaughan, Town of Richmond Hill, and Town of Markham. The proposed undertaking also includes a median transitway in the Vaughan North-South Link between Highway 7 and York University, with eventual replacement of this transitway by an extension of the Spadina Subway from Steeles Avenue at York University to Highway 7. The proposed transitway will be designed to accommodate both Bus and Light Rail Transit vehicle technologies. There are short sections of transit operation in mixed traffic through constrained sections of right-of-way and existing underpasses of major north-south arterial roads such as Bathurst Street and Bayview Avenue. The proposed undertaking includes stations generally located at major intersections and a proposed road widening along Highway 7 between Woodbine Avenue and Sciberras Road. The Region is requesting EAA approval to design, construct and implement the proposed undertaking. The Ministry of the Environment has prepared a Review of the EA for review and comment by the public, agencies and aboriginal peoples. The Review does not make a decision on the EA. This decision is made by the Minister of the Environment following the five week comment period and the consideration of all submissions.

You can submit comments on the undertaking, the environmental assessment, and the ministry Review. You may also request that the Minister refer the application to a hearing by the Environmental Review Tribunal. If you request a hearing you must state in your submission, whether you are requesting a hearing on the whole application or on only specified matters related to the application.

HOW TO GET THE INFORMATION YOU NEED

You can inspect the EA and the ministry Review during normal business hours at the following locations:

	Location	Address	Phone Number
1.	Ministry of the Environment, Environmental Assessment & Approvals Branch	2 St. Clair Avenue West, Floor 12A Toronto, ON M4V 1L5	(416) 314-8001
2.	Ministry of the Environment, Central Region Office	5775 Yonge Street, 8th Floor North York, ON M2M 4J1	(416) 326-6700
3.	Regional Municipality of York, Office of the Regional Clerk	17250 Yonge Street, 4th Floor Newmarket, ON L3Y 6Z1	1-(877) 464-9675 ext. 1320
4.	Town of Richmond Hill, Office of the Town Clerk	225 East Beaver Creek Road Richmond Hill, ON L4B 3P4	(905) 771-8800
5.	Town of Markham, Office of the Town Clerk	101 Town Centre Boulevard Markham, ON L3R 9W3	(905) 475-4744
6.	City of Vaughan, Office of the City Clerk	2141 Major Mackenzie Drive Vaughan, ON L6A 1T1	(905) 832-8504
7.	Ansley Grove Library	350 Ansley Grove Road Woodbridge, ON L4L 5C9	(905) 856-6551
8.	Richmond Hill Central Library, Adult Reference Desk	1 Atkinson Street Richmond Hill, ON L4C 0H5	(905) 884-9288
9.	Unionville Library	15 Library Lane Unionville, ON L3R 5C4	(905) 513-7977

Please ensure your written comments are received by: August 25, 2006.


SEND WRITTEN COMMENTS TO:

James O'Mara, Director
 Environmental Assessment & Approvals Branch
 Ministry of the Environment
 2 St. Clair Avenue West, Floor 12A
 Toronto, Ontario M4V 1L5
 Attention: Edward Naval, Project Officer
 Highway 7 Corridor Vaughn North-South Link Public Transit Improvements
 Phone: (416) 314-8433 or 1-800-461-6290
 Fax: (416) 314-8452

BE SURE TO EXPRESS YOUR VIEWS

If you make a submission or request a hearing before the above date, you will be notified of any decisions about this environmental assessment. Otherwise, the undertaking may proceed without further notice to you.

If no submissions or requests for a hearing are received, the undertaking may be approved with no further public notice. This will allow the undertaking to proceed.



Director
Environmental Assessment & Approvals Branch
Ministry of the Environment

Under the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* and the *Environmental Assessment Act*, unless otherwise stated in the submission, any personal information such as name, address, telephone number and property location included in all submissions become part of the public record files for this matter and can be released, if requested, to any person.

REVIEW UNDER THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT ACT

**REVIEW OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
HIGHWAY 7 CORRIDOR VAUGHAN NORTH
SOUTH LINK PUBLIC TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS**

Submitted by:

The Regional Municipality of York

EA File No. EA 02-06-02

*Review prepared pursuant to subsection 7(1) of the
Environmental Assessment Act, R.S.O. 1990
Province of Ontario by the Ontario Ministry of the Environment
Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch*

May 30, 2006

RECEIVED

FOR MORE INFORMATION JUL 12 2006

MINISTRY OF THE ENVIRONMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT & APPROVALS BRANCH

Public Record Locations

The public record for this environmental assessment can be reviewed during normal business hours at the following ministry office:

Ministry of the Environment
Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch
Floor 12A, 2 St. Clair Avenue West
Toronto, Ontario
Voice: (416) 314-8001/1-800-461-6290
Fax: (416) 314-8452

The Review and Notice of Completion are also available at the following locations:

Location	Address	Phone Number
1. Ministry of the Environment, Environmental Assessment & Approvals Branch	2 St. Clair Avenue West, Floor 12A Toronto, ON M4V 1L5	(416) 314-8001
2. Ministry of the Environment, Central Region Office	5775 Yonge Street, 8th Floor North York, ON M2M 4J1	(416) 326-6700
3. Regional Municipality of York, Office of the Regional Clerk	17250 Yonge Street, 4th Floor Newmarket, ON L3Y 6Z1	1-(877) 464-9675 ext. 1320
4. Town of Richmond Hill, Office of the Town Clerk	225 East Beaver Creek Road Richmond Hill, ON L4B 3P4	(905) 771-8800
5. Town of Markham, Office of the Town Clerk	101 Town Centre Boulevard Markham, ON L3R 9W3	(905) 475-4744
6. City of Vaughan, Office of the Proponent Clerk	2141 Major Mackenzie Drive Vaughan, ON L6A 1T1	(905) 832-8504
7. Ansley Grove Library	350 Ansley Grove Road Woodbridge, ON L4L 5C9	(905) 856-6551
8. Richmond Hill Central Library, Adult Reference Desk	1 Atkinson Street Richmond Hill, ON L4C 0H5	(905) 884-9288
9. Unionville Library	15 Library Lane Unionville, ON L3R 5C4	(905) 513-7977

MAKING A SUBMISSION?

A five-week public review period will follow publication of this Review. During this time, any interested parties can make submissions about the proposed undertaking, the environmental assessment or this Review. Should you wish to make a submission, please send it to:

Mr. James O'Mara, Director
Ministry of the Environment
Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch
2 St. Clair Avenue West, Floor 12A
Toronto, Ontario M4V 1L5
Fax: (416) 314-8452

**Re: Highway 7 Corridor Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements
Attention: Edward Naval, Project Officer**

Under the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* and the *Environmental Assessment Act*, unless otherwise stated in the submission, any personal information such as name, address, telephone number and property location included in all submissions become part of the public record files for this matter and can be released if requested.

PREFACE

This Review has been prepared by staff of the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch of the Ministry of the Environment in cooperation with federal, provincial and municipal government agencies.

The Review evaluates the Highway 7 Corridor Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Report (EA) submitted by the Regional Municipality of York, based on the commitments made in the approved Terms of Reference prepared under the *Environmental Assessment Act*. The Review assists the Minister of the Environment in making a decision about whether the EA should be approved, approved with conditions or refused, or if matters should be referred to mediation or to the Environmental Review Tribunal for a decision about whether to approve the proposed undertaking.

This Review is subject to the provisions of Ontario Regulation 616/98 which sets out a deadline for the completion of this document. The Review was completed, pursuant to subsection 7(3) of the EAA, on July 7, 2006. This paragraph and the giving of the Notice of Completion is the notice required by subsection 7(3) of the EAA.

Before a decision is made about this EA, any person has the right to submit to the Minister comments about the proposed undertaking, the EA and this Review. Any person also has the right, subject to the discretion of the Minister, to request a hearing on all or part of the EA.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.0	THE EA REVIEW PROCESS.....	1
1.1	Terms of Reference.....	1
1.2	Environmental Assessment.....	1
1.3	The Ministry Review	1
1.4	Next Steps	2
2.0	PREFERRED UNDERTAKING.....	3
2.1	Background.....	3
2.2	Description of the Preferred Undertaking.....	3
2.3	Modifying the Preferred Undertaking.....	4
2.5	Other Approval Requirements	5
3.0	THE MINISTRY REVIEW	6
3.1	Required Components of the EAA	6
3.2	Anticipated Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures.....	7
3.3	Consultation with the Public and Stakeholders	8
3.4	Consultation with First Nations	9
3.5	Summary of Government Team Comments	9
3.6	Summary of Public Submissions	14
4.0	CONCLUSION/RECOMMENDATIONS	14
4.1	Proposed Conditions of Approval.....	15
4.2	Potential Amendment to the Undertaking.....	19

LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 1: Transitway Alignment and Station Location
Figure 2: York Region Public Transit EA

LIST OF TABLES

- Table 1: Summary of Government Review Team Submissions
Table 2: Summary of Public Submissions

1.0 THE EA REVIEW PROCESS

Generally, the EA process is a two-stage application to the Minister of the Environment for approval of a proposed undertaking. The first stage requires the proponents to prepare and submit a ToR to the Ministry of the Environment for review and approval. Once approved by the Minister, the proponent can proceed to the second stage and prepare an EA document.

The EA must be completed in accordance with the ToR and with the EAA. Approval under the EAA is required prior to the proponent proceeding with a proposed undertaking or receiving any subsequent approvals. The Minister is required to take into consideration comments from government, affected stakeholders and the public prior to making a decision on the EA.

1.1 Terms of Reference

The first step in the EA process is for the proponent to prepare and receive approval for a ToR. The ToR is the work plan for how the EA will be prepared. In June 2004, the Minister approved the Proponent's ToR, which identified how the Proponent is to, among other things, assess alternatives and their environmental effects and consult with the public during the development of their EA.

1.2 Environmental Assessment

On September 2, 2005, the Proponent submitted its EA to the ministry for review and approval. The public and government review period of the EA ended on October 26, 2005. During this review period, the EA was reviewed by a Government Review Team (GRT), which included federal, provincial and municipal agencies. The role of the GRT is to ensure that the data and the conclusions in the EA are valid, based on their agencies' mandates. The public and First Nations also had the opportunity to review the EA concurrently and submit comments to the ministry.

On December 13, 2005, the Proponent requested that the ministry postpone the publication of the Review to provide them sufficient opportunity to address comments received from the government review team and report back to the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch (EAAB).

On May 8, 2006, the Proponent submitted to EAAB, its responses to comments received from the government review team and supplemental information to address issues about the preferred subway alignment.

1.3 The Ministry Review

The MOE is required by the EAA to complete a ministry Review of the EA. The purpose of this Review is to determine whether or not the EA was prepared in accordance with the commitments outlined in the ToR and whether or not the EA contains sufficient information about the anticipated environmental effects to allow a decision to be made by the Minister.

The Review will assist the Minister in making a decision about the EA and the proposed undertaking, which will be made following the public review period of the Review. The decision about the EA is made by the Minister, subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

A Notice of Completion of Review was published and the Review is now made available for a five-week public comment period. During this period, members of the public and the GRT can comment on the ministry's conclusions, and can request that the Minister refer the EA to the Environmental Review Tribunal for a hearing if they believe that their concerns have not been addressed.

1.4 Next Steps

A five week public inspection period follows the publication of the Review. During this time, all interested parties can make submissions about the proposed undertaking, the EA and/or the Review. A Public Notice will be published in the local newspaper indicating that the Review was completed and available for viewing from July 21 to August 25, 2006. Copies of the Review have been placed in the same locations where the EA was available. Copies were also distributed to all GRT members, private citizens and aboriginal communities who expressed concerns about the EA during the first review period.

At the end of the five week review period, MOE staff will make a recommendation to the Minister concerning whether the EA meets the requirements of the ToR and the EAA. The Review contributes to a number of documents that the Minister of the Environment must consider when making a decision about the proposed EA. The Minister must also consider the purpose of the EAA, the public comments submitted during the review periods, and other matters the Minister may consider relevant.

The Minister will make one of the following decisions:

- Give approval to proceed with the undertaking;
- Give approval to proceed with the undertaking subject to conditions;
- Refuse to give approval to proceed with the undertaking;
- Refer either a part of or the entire EA to mediation; or
- Refer either a part of or the entire EA to the Environmental Review Tribunal for a decision.

2.0 PREFERRED UNDERTAKING

2.1 Background

The Proponent's approved Official Plan (OP) sets out land use planning policies to accommodate the doubling of its population by 2021. The OP identifies the need for an early and significant increase in transit use if the population projections and employment growth are to be realized in a sustainable fashion. To reverse the current trends of declining transit use and achieve the targeted 33% increase in transit use, the OP recommended that high priority be given to investment in rapid transit infrastructure.

In 2002, the Proponent approved a Transportation Master Plan (TMP) which confirmed the need to develop a balanced transportation system by establishing a rapid transit system. The recommended rapid transit system focused on the Yonge Street and Highway 7 corridors, including a link from the Vaughan Corporate Centre (VCC) to the Spadina Subway and a connection from the Markham Centre to the Sheppard Subway (see Figure 2).

Also, in 2002, the Proponent completed the *Highway 7 Need and Justification Study* (NJS). The NJS examined the growing transportation demands in the Highway 7 Corridor associated with the York Region's projected population growth. The results of this study were consistent with the findings of the provincial "Places to Grow Strategy" prepared by the Ministry of Public Infrastructure and Renewal. The VCC, located within the proposed VNSL Corridor, is one of the four key pivotal emerging mixed-use town centers in York Region. The ability to deliver a robust and vibrant new downtown, as envisioned by York Region, is dependant on the delivery of a robust rapid transit network to the heart of the VCC.

2.2 Description of the Preferred Undertaking

Chapter 9 of the EA describes the proposed undertaking and the associated system elements. Figure 1 outlines the location of the transitway and station locations. The proposed undertaking will provide surface rapid transit improvements to the year 2021. The rapid transit system includes:

- A 41 km two-lane median transitway on the preferred alignment (see Figure 1), generally in the Highway 7 Corridor between Highway 50 and the Markham By-Pass, through the City of Vaughan, Town of Richmond Hill, and Town of Markham;
- Stations including appropriate amenities located at arterial or major collector east-west roads in 46 locations, and;
- A median transitway in the Vaughan North-South Link between Highway 7 and York University, with eventual replacement of this transitway by an extension of the Spadina Subway from Steeles Avenue at York University to Highway 7.

The proposed transitways will be designed to accommodate both Bus and Light Rapid Transit vehicle technologies. There are short sections of transit operation in mixed traffic through constrained sections of right-of-way and existing underpasses of major north-south arterial roads such as Bathurst Street and Bayview Avenue. The proposed undertaking also includes a proposed road widening along Highway 7 between Woodbine Avenue and Sciberras Road.

The City of Toronto (City) is currently undertaking an Individual EA to extend the Spadina Subway to York University. York Region's acquisition of the terminal site on Steeles Avenue is identified in this EA as a key opportunity in the decision to carry out the EA at this time. For this reason, alignment alternatives for an eventual conversion of the Vaughan North-South Link connection between York University and the Vaughan Corporate Centre to subway technology will have to be compatible with the Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) extension. The City and TTC have recognized the VCC as a significant contributor to the corridor transportation need. The ability to extend subway technology into York Region is quoted within the Toronto/TTC EA as an advantage of the preferred undertaking in discussion of the effects of the undertaking and its alternatives on the environment.

The City of Toronto and the TTC have committed to work cooperatively with the City of Vaughan and York Region to optimize transit-supportive development in the vicinity of the station.

2.3 Modifying the Preferred Undertaking

During the detailed design phase, it may not be feasible to implement the undertaking as described in the EA. If the Proponent decides to change any of the features of the undertaking, the Proponent must contact MOE to determine what, if any, EA approvals are required.

The Proponent proposes to use the amending procedure outlined in Section 11.5 of the EA to deal with any unforeseen changes to the undertaking. The amending procedure distinguishes between minor and major changes of the undertaking. A minor change will not alter the expected net impacts associated with the undertaking, and may include changes to lighting, landscaping, median width, and speed limit along the roadway. The Region will be responsible to ensure that all relevant issues associated with minor changes are addressed.

A major change includes a significant modification to the undertaking or a change in the environmental setting of the undertaking. A major change will require the Proponent to prepare an amendment to the EA and submit it to MOE for approval.

Three conditions of approval are proposed to confirm the amending procedures. The first condition of approval outlines the proposed amending procedures and outlines the Proponent's commitments to handle minor and major amendments to the undertaking.

Highway 7 Corridor Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements

This condition also outlines that major amendments are considered to be new undertaking under section 12 of the EAA and require full EAA approval. The Proponent understands that should a major amendment to the undertaking be required, that a ToR and EA must be submitted to the ministry for review and approval.

The second condition of approval that is linked to the amending procedures requires the Proponent to submit an annual compliance report to the ministry for approval. The annual compliance report will be put on the public record and requires the proponent to outline how the commitments of the EA and conditions of approval have been met. The Proponent will have to document information about minor and major amendments in the annual compliance report.

The third condition of approval pertains to the preferred subway design of the EA. The EA determined a preferred subway alignment with the option of amending, where necessary, the portion south of Highway 407 to tie into the approved TTC station and tail track alignment at the York Region transit terminal site on Steeles Avenue. The location of the TTC station at Steeles Avenue will be determined once the Toronto/TTC EA for the Spadina Subway Extension to Steeles has been completed. A condition of approval has been proposed that will require the Proponent to follow a public process to determine the optimum location for the alignment of the subway undertaking. The process will be documented in a report and submitted for approval to the Minister. The Proponent shall not proceed with the construction the subway undertaking unless the Minister, having considered the report, any public comments regarding the report and the public interest, approves its construction.

The ministry is satisfied that the Region's approach to deal with modifications to the preferred undertaking, and the above noted conditions, if imposed, will ensure that any changes to the undertaking are appropriately dealt with.

2.4 Other Approval Requirements

Section 12 of the EA outlines additional approvals required to design and construct the proposed undertaking. These approvals include:

- Municipal Building Permits for the Maintenance Facility;
- Toronto and Region Conservation Authority permits;
- Federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) authorization
- Ministry of the Environment's Section 53, *Ontario Water Resources Act* approval for the proposed storm sewers and stormwater management facilities;
- Ministry of the Environment's *Environmental Protection Act* approvals if required;
- Permits under the *Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act* approval; and
- Any Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources approvals.

The above list is not all inclusive and other approvals may be required as the project proceeds.

The Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency did not identify a requirement for a federal environmental assessment. If the Proponent receives federal funding, this will trigger the requirements for a federal EA under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*.

3.0 THE MINISTRY REVIEW

Ministry staff and the GRT have evaluated the EA to determine whether it meets the requirements of the EAA. It is not the purpose of this Review to decide whether the EA should be approved under the EAA. The Review is to determine if the EA met the requirements of the ToR and to determine if the information contained in the EA supports its recommendations and conclusions in the selection of the preferred undertaking. The Review is used to assist the Minister in making a decision on the EA.

3.1 Required Components of the EAA

The EAA requires a proponent to follow an approved ToR when completing an EA. The approved ToR required the proponents to, among other things, assess alternatives and their environmental effects, and consult with the public during the development of their EA.

The EAA also requires a proponent to document:

- the purpose of the undertaking;
- the description of and rationale for the undertaking;
- a description of all aspects of the environment;
- consideration of a reasonable range of alternatives;
- an evaluation of the advantages and disadvantages to the environment;
- a description of environmental effects;
- a description of measures to prevent, change, mitigate or remedy environmental effects; and,
- whether interested parties have been consulted during the preparation of the EA.

Section 1.2.2 of the EA describes the purpose of the proposed undertaking. The purpose can be summarized as:

- Providing improved public transit infrastructure and service in York Region's network's primary east west corridor and western north-south corridor capable of producing significant increases in transit ridership both within the corridor and across the network and regional boundary. This objective will be supported by interconnection with other corridors and Greater Toronto Area transit systems such as GO Transit and the (TTC); and,

Highway 7 Corridor Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements

- Integrating public transit facilities in a manner that improves and enriches streetscapes with new amenities by using a holistic urban design approach to support the Region's goals for higher density mixed-use transit-oriented development along the corridor in accordance with approved official plans.

The proposed undertaking addresses these objectives and, if approved, will allow for the construction of a transitway that will meet the Proponent's strategic goals for providing an efficient long-term rapid transit system in a cost-effective, non-disruptive manner. Section 3.1 of the EA provides an evaluation of a reasonable range of alternatives to the undertaking. The alternatives assessed in the EA included:

- Do Nothing;
- Current Commitments Strategy Including Priority Transit and Transportation Demand Management;
- Road Expansion Strategy;
- Enhanced Richmond Hill Commuter Rail and Inter-regional Bus Service Strategy; and,
- York Region Rapid Transit Corridor Initiatives Strategy.

Section 5.0 of the EA describes the alternative methods of carrying out the undertaking. The objectives and criteria used to generate routes, station locations, and transit technology options are also discussed.

3.2 Anticipated Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

The ToR requires that the EA identify the environmental effects of the undertaking and describe how the effects will be mitigated. The assessment of environmental effects are presented in Chapter 6 of the EA and are based on baseline data. The detailed analysis is included in the EA Appendices. Tables 10.4-1 to 10.4-4 and Table 11.3-1 describe the environmental effects, their level of significance and proposed mitigation measures. The anticipated environmental effects after mitigation measures include:

Property Requirements:

Not available at this time

Vegetation Removal:

- 0.1 ha from Segment A
- 1.23 ha from Segment B
- 0.6 ha from Segment C
- 0.86 ha from Segment D

A total 2.801 ha of vegetation will be removed from the Study Area.

Proposed Mitigation Measures Include:

- Built-in attributes and design modifications;
- Landscaping treatment, including construction of pervious surfaces where practical;
- On-site environmental inspector;
- Construction and operations monitoring;
- Ridership monitoring;
- Environmental effects monitoring; and
- Additional public consultation.

Section 11.4 of the EA commits the Proponent to prepare a Compliance Monitoring Program (CMP). A condition of approval is proposed that requires the Proponent to prepare the CMP to identify when and how the commitments in the EA will be addressed and monitored for compliance.

3.3 Consultation with the Public and Stakeholders

A comprehensive consultation plan was developed during the ToR and implemented during the development of the EA.

The plan for public consultation offered the public a wide range of methods for involvement in the EA process. These included:

- Several public notices that were published to introduce the study to the public, to invite interested members of the public to be placed on the mailing list, and to provide any preliminary concerns;
- Public Consultation Centers (PCC) were held at four key stages during the study. At each point, PCCs were held in three locations that provided geographic coverage along the proposed 45 km transit route. Using the format of an Open House, the PCC allowed the public to keep up-to-date on the proposed design alternatives and recommendations;
- A York Region Rapid Transit Website providing ongoing opportunity for the public to acquire information about the project, obtain contact information for the Region's planning team, and provide comments; and
- Current updates on the Region's general Website that included information on all aspects of the three ongoing Rapid Transit EAs in the Region, as well as information pertaining to other related rapid transit initiatives.

A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was organized to facilitate communication between the Project Team and relevant agencies. During the EA process, the TAC met on seven occasions. The TAC was comprised of senior staff from the following agencies:

- York Region;
- Town of Markham;
- Town of Richmond Hill;
- City of Vaughan;
- City of Toronto;

Highway 7 Corridor Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements

- TTC;
- Go Transit;
- Ministry of Natural Resources;
- Ministry of Transportation;
- Toronto Regional Conservation Authority; and,
- Ministry of Culture.

Section 14 of the Environmental Assessment details the public consultation carried out during the preparation of the EA.

3.4 Consultation with First Nations

Section 14.2 of the EA outlines how the Proponent consulted with aboriginal groups. The EA was circulated to Ontario Secretariat for Aboriginal Affairs (OSAA) and Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) as part of the GRT. OSAA indicated that there does not appear to be any land claims in the vicinity of the project and INAC noted that the Study Area is located within the Toronto Purchase specific claim which involves the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation.

As a result of comments submitted by OSAA and INAC, on September 2, 2005, the MOE circulated the EA to the following aboriginal groups:

- Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation;
- Curve Lake First Nation;
- Alderville First Nation;
- Beausoleil First Nation;
- Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation;
- Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation;
- Hiawatha First Nation;
- Six Nations of the Grand River;
- Algonquins of Pikwakanagan First Nation;
- Chippewas of Mnjikaning (Rama) First Nation; and,
- Moose Deer Point First Nation.

To date there have been no objections from aboriginal groups with respect to the EA. The Proponent has committed to continue to consult with First Nations based on their identified interest/concerns and specific request for additional involvement.

3.5 Summary of Government Team Comments

The GRT members that participated in the formal review of the EA include the following:

Federal Agencies:

- Environment Canada;
- Department of Fisheries and Oceans;
- Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency;
- Health Canada;
- Transport Canada;
- Indian and Northern Affairs Canada;
- Canadian Pacific Rail; and
- Canadian National Rail.

Provincial Agencies:

- Ministry of the Environment;
- Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal
- Ministry of Transportation;
- Ministry of Culture;
- Ontario Realty Corporation;
- Ontario Secretariat for Aboriginal Affairs;
- Ontario Growth Secretariat;
- GO Transit;
- Ministry of Natural Resources;
- Ministry of Citizenship;
- Ministry of Culture;
- Ministry of Tourism and Recreation;
- Hydro One;
- Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs; and
- Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

Municipal Agencies:

- Town of Markham;
- Town of Richmond Hill;
- City of Vaughan;
- Toronto and Region Conservation Authority;
- City of Toronto/Toronto Transit Commission;
- Regional Municipality of Durham; and
- Region of Peel

3.5.1 Federal Agencies

The Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (CEAA) did not identify any federal triggers and indicated that no federal EA was required at this time. CEAA did identify that if federal funding is received for the project, a federal EA would be required. To date no Federal funding has been received for the project.

Highway 7 Corridor Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements

With the exception of Health Canada, federal agencies, including Environment Canada, Transport Canada, and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, did not identify concerns with the EA. Some federal approvals for the undertaking will need to be obtained.

Health Canada provided comments on the potential health impacts of the undertaking. They also recommended that contingency plans to manage effects on drinking water wells would need to be developed. The Proponent has responded to Health Canada's comments through a commitment to develop a contingency plan to address potential effects to water wells during detail design of the undertaking. This commitment is documented in Table 11.3-1 of the EA Report.

3.5.2 Provincial Agencies

Ministry of the Environment (MOE)

The ministry's technical review team provided comments on how the EA addressed surface and groundwater water resources, air quality, noise, dust, soil contamination and environmental planning. The ministry identified concerns with how the air quality and noise impact assessments were undertaken and presented in the EA.

Noise Impacts

The ministry's comments on the noise impact assessment are summarized in Table 1. Generally, the reviewer identified inconsistencies with the use and interpretation of data and modelling errors that will unlikely change any overall effects but should be noted.

Some clarification is required for the Stamson calculations with respect to ground surface type, daytime and nighttime receiver heights, nighttime receiver source distances, percent traffic split of provincial roadways, and the designation of buses. The annual average daily traffic was inconsistently reported in Appendix K.

All inconsistencies and modeling errors were later resolved in the supplementary information package. With this added information, the MOE is satisfied with the EA Report.

Water Resources

It was noted that although environmental effects may be temporary or short term, they should not be disregarded as "insignificant". Any dewatering activities, involving an excess of 50,000L/day, will require an MOE Permit To Take Water. MOE should be the primary consultant in the event of any groundwater issues.

Air Quality Analysis

MOE technical staff raised numerous concerns with the Proponent's air quality assessment. The concerns were raised during the draft EA stage and during the review of

the Proponent's previous transit EAs. The Proponent made efforts to resolve these issues after the draft EA stage; however, MOE requires additional work to be carried out. The outstanding issues include:

- the level of detail in the EA report;
- the parameters used in the air quality impact assessment;
- the development of the vehicle emission data;
- the dispersion modelling; and,
- the mitigation measures proposed.

The Proponent has responded to the air quality issues raised by MOE and provided supplemental information that clarified the details of the air impact assessment. The EA Report combined with the technical appendices is a legally binding document if the EA is approved. The Proponent is not required to duplicate the information found in the appendices and reproduce it in the body of the EA Report. The Region has provided additional information that clarifies the air dispersion modelling methodology.

The final three concerns, including the parameters used in the air impact assessment, the vehicle emission data and mitigation measures, can be addressed by the Proponent by performing additional analysis for air parameter Particulate Matter 2.5 (PM_{2.5}). The Proponent has committed to completing this analysis.

MOE technical staff are satisfied that their issues concerning air impacts have been addressed by the Proponent. The Proponent's commitment to complete an analysis for PM_{2.5} will resolve the final air quality issue. MOE will review the PM_{2.5} analysis once it has been completed to determine that the right level of mitigation measures are in place. MOE is satisfied that the air quality issues will be resolved.

Ontario Realty Corporation (ORC)

Negative impacts to ORC managed lands should be avoided. It was requested that alignment through lands at the Highway 407/Warden Avenue area be reconsidered. The ORC Class Environmental Assessment should be referred to in order to determine whether the undertaking will trigger ORC involvement.

Ontario Secretariat for Aboriginal Affairs

OSAA recommends that York Region continue to contact relevant aboriginal groups and make follow up contact with identified First Nations and aboriginal organizations. As a result of comments received by OSAA, the Proponent and MOE consulted with several aboriginal groups as outlined in section 3.4 of this document.

Ministry of Transportation

MTO commented on the draft EA and noted that the references in the EA to relationship between the GO Transit BRT project and 407 Transitway were confusing. The

Highway 7 Corridor Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements

Proponent responded to MTO's concerns and MTO were satisfied that their comments were addressed in the final report. MTO is satisfied with the EA.

3.5.3 Municipal Agencies

The Town of Markham

York Region needs to work with the Town of Markham during the detailed design phase to protect sufficient right-of-way along Town Centre Boulevard. It was also recommended that further consultation with the IBM Corporation will be required to secure the remaining right-of-way. The Proponent has committed to continue to work with the Town of Markham and local municipalities during the detailed design and implementation of the undertaking.

The City of Vaughan

The City of Vaughan requested that York Region proceed with the amendment to the subway extension component of the EA at first opportunity once the TTC EA is approved. The City's ultimate preference for the VCC is not reflected in the EA plan. Vaughan should work closely with York Region during the detailed design phase so that the land use studies that are currently being undertaken are considered. The Proponent has committed to continue to work with the City of Vaughn during the detailed design and implementation of the undertaking.

City of Toronto/Toronto Transit Commission

The City of Toronto and TTC suggest that an addendum to the EA, reflecting the preferred alignment to Steeles West Station, is required to address their concerns. The addendum would have to be completed prior to the City of Toronto and TTC considering a further extension of the Spadina Subway for approval through the City's and TTC's planning and approval processes.

Once the Toronto/TTC EA for the Spadina Subway Extension to Steeles has been completed and the location of the TTC station at Steeles Avenue has been determined, a condition of approval has been proposed that will require the Proponent to follow a public process to determine the optimum location for the alignment of the subway undertaking at Steeles Avenue.

Region of Peel

The current EA should more thoroughly consider the need to move automobile and truck traffic safely and efficiently. A balanced alternative should be investigated. The pedestrian environment is not adequately addressed at the boundary of Peel Region. Coordinating transit improvements in the Highway 7 Corridor with the City of Brampton and the Region of Peel is essential. The region commented that passengers travelling between York and Peel should be able to seamlessly travel between regions without

jurisdictional problems and with single fare integration between transit systems. The change in the existing Highway 7 alignment should be discussed with MTO and Peel Region before proceeding further.

The Proponent has committed to consult with the Region of Peel and MTO during detailed design. The Proponent will also work closely with the Region of Peel to integrate any future Highway 7 transit improvements west of Highway 50 with this undertaking.

3.6 Summary of Public Submissions

In response to the EA Notice of Submission, the ministry received five submissions from the public. A summary of each public comment and the Proponent's response is included in Table 2. Copies of the public submissions are also available in the ministry's public record file.

Submitters identified concerns with the impacts the transitway will have on the social/cultural environments and quality of life in their communities. Submitters also identified concerns with the infrastructural changes, and that the undertaking does not address the need for a safe, continuous passage for pedestrians and non-motorized vehicles.

Specific comments regarding the implementation of the undertaking will be carried over and considered during detailed design. The Proponent have committed to working with local municipalities during detailed design and implementation.

Conclusion

The ministry's review concludes that the EA complies with the requirements of the ToR. Alternatives and alternative methods to the undertaking were assessed and evaluated to arrive at the preferred alternative. The EA assessed the potential environmental impacts of the alternatives and proposed undertaking and provides sufficient mitigation and monitoring measures to ensure that the potential negative environmental effects will be minimized. The ministry is satisfied that the proponent complied with the consultation requirements of the EAA, and that the EA adequately outlines the appropriate level of analysis for establishing the need for the facility.

4.0 CONCLUSION

This Review concludes that the Proponent has prepared the EA in accordance with the requirements of the EAA, and has provided sufficient information to enable a decision to be made about the application to proceed with the undertaking. There are several outstanding issues and concerns that can be addressed through proposed Conditions of Approval.

4.1 Proposed Conditions of EA Approval

It is proposed that the following conditions be applied, if the undertaking is approved. As part of the final public review period, the ministry invites comments on the EA, the Review, the proposed conditions and/or the undertaking.

DEFINITIONS

“**Proponent**” refers to the Regional Municipality of York.

“**MOE**” refers to the Ontario Ministry of the Environment.

“**EAAB**” refers to the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch of the Ministry of the Environment.

“**Director**” refers to the Director of the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch.

“**Regional Director**” refers to the Director of the Ministry of the Environment’s Central Regional Office.

“**EA**” refers to the document titled “Highway 7 Corridor Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Report”, dated August, 2005, and Appendices Volume 1 and 2 dated August, 2005, and the responses from the Regional Municipality of York dated November 15, 2005 and May 5, 2006.

GENERAL CONDITIONS

1. The Proponent shall comply with all the provisions of the EA submitted to the MOE which are hereby incorporated by reference except as provided in these conditions and as provided in any other approvals or permits that may be issued.
2. These proposed conditions do not prevent more restrictive conditions being imposed under other statutes.

PUBLIC RECORD

3. Where a document is required for the Public Record, it shall be provided to the Director for filing with the Public Record maintained for this undertaking. Additional copies of such documents will be provided by the Proponent for public access at:

- (a) The Regional Director’s Office;
- (b) The Clerk’s offices of the Regional Municipality of York;

- (c) The Town of Richmond Hill;
 - (d) The Town of Markham; and
 - (e) The City of Vaughan;
 - (f) Richmond Hill Central Library;
 - (g) Unionville Library; and
 - (h) Ansely Grove Library.
- (i) These documents may also be provided through other means as considered appropriate by the Proponent.

COMPLIANCE MONITORING

4. i) The Proponent shall prepare and submit to the Director for review and placement on the Public Record an Environmental Assessment Compliance Monitoring Program (Program). 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 consultation, additional studies and work to be carried out, and for all other commitments made during the preparation of the EA and the subsequent review of the EA.
- ii) The Program is to describe what actions are required to address the commitments and how compliance of these actions can be verified. The Program should specifically include, but not be limited to, the additional commitments outlined in:
- Tables 10.4-1 to 10.4-4 and Tables 11.3-1 to 11.4-2 in the EA, and Proponent's letter and attachments dated November 15, 2005;
 - The Proponent's commitment to undertake a Stage II Archaeological Assessment and any subsequent Archaeological Assessments that may be required. The Proponent is to consult with affected stakeholders on their findings and obtain any necessary approvals prior to proceeding with construction; and
 - The Proponent's commitment to undertake and consult on a Streetscape Plan for the Highway 7 Corridor.
- iii) The Proponent must provide a copy of the Program to those agencies, affected stakeholders and/or members of the public who expressed an interest in the activity being addressed or being involved in the subsequent work.
- iv) The Program must contain an implementation schedule of when and how compliance can be verified. The Program shall be submitted no later than one year prior to the commencement of construction. A statement must

Highway 7 Corridor Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements

accompany the Program when submitted to the Director indicating that the Program is intended to fulfill this condition. The Program, as it may be amended by the Director, must be carried out by the Proponent.

5. The Proponent shall prepare an Annual Compliance Report (ACR) which describes compliance with the conditions of approval set out in this Notice and which describes the results of the Proponent's Monitoring Program. The first reporting period shall be for one year from the date of this approval. Each subsequent reporting period shall be for a period of one year from the anniversary date of this approval. The Proponent shall submit to the Directors of the EAAB and Central Region, for placement on the Public Record, a copy of the ACR within 90 days of the anniversary date of this approval. 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 its final submission.
6. The Proponent shall retain at its office copies of the ACRs for each reporting year and any associated documentation of compliance monitoring activities. The Proponent shall make the documentation available to the MOE or its designate upon request in a timely manner when so requested by the MOE during an on-site inspection or audit, in response to a pollution incident report, or when information concerning compliance is requested by the MOE.

TRANSIT TECHNOLOGY

7. The Proponent shall prepare and submit to the City of Toronto and the Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) the results of their Ridership Monitoring Program (Ridership Program) as committed to in section 5.2.2.3 of the EA. The Proponent shall prepare a Technology Conversion Plan (TCP) that identifies when and if conversion from a Bus Rapid Transit System (BRT) to a Light Rail Transit (LRT) facility will occur. If conversion is to occur prior to 2021, the TCP shall provide an implementation schedule. The Ridership Program and TCP shall be placed on the Public Record file at the EAAB and the MOE's Central Regional Office.
8. A copy of the Ridership Program and TCP shall be provided to the City of Toronto, GO Transit, the Ministry of Transportation, the Towns of Markham and Richmond Hill and the City of Vaughan.

COMPLAINTS PROTOCOL

9. 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 Regional Director for placement on the Public Record.

AMENDING THE UNDERTAKING

10. (a) Except as prescribed in clause (b) of this condition, in the event that there is a minor change to the design of the undertaking which does not affect the expected net impacts 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 11.5.
 - (b) In the event that the Proponent determines that an 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 *Environmental Assessment Act*.

11. (i) The Proponent shall follow a public process to determine the optimum location for the alignment of the subway undertaking south of Highway 407 required to tie into the Toronto Transit Commissions station and tail track alignment at the York Region transit terminal site on Steeles Avenue. This process, at a minimum, shall include:
 - (a) A description of the local existing built and natural environment through which the alignment must pass to achieve the tie-in. Sensitive natural features and constraints on the design, such as the Black Creek and groundwater conditions, will be identified and documented in detail.
 - (b) An analysis and evaluation of subway horizontal and vertical alignment options, both above and below ground, through the approximately 800 metre tie-in zone. The evaluation will use the methodology adopted for the EA, measuring the alternatives against the primary objectives and goals and highlighting the advantages and disadvantages of each option.
 - (c) Identification of a preferred location for the future Highway 407 Station on the subway alignment and accommodation of surface facilities associated with this station to achieve intermodal transfer.
 - (d) Finalization of the preferred functional design for the Highway 7 terminal station and associated surface facilities based on the City of Vaughan's current Vaughan Corporate Centre planning and including relocation of the surface rapid transit station on Highway 7 at Jane Street.
 - (e) Assessment of the effects of construction of the alignment works and operation of subway service on the environment and description of proposed mitigation and monitoring measures.
 - (f) Assessment of the effects of construction and operation of Highway 407 and Highway 7 station facilities on the surrounding environment.

Highway 7 Corridor Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements

- (g) Meetings with a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to obtain input and acceptance of recommendations by the key stakeholders. The composition of the TAC will be confined to municipal representatives from Vaughan only, given that the supplementary work relates only to the Vaughan North-South Link.
 - (h) Public consultation opportunity to obtain comment on the evaluation of alternatives and the recommended preferred design.
 - (i) Preparation and submission, for approval by the MOE of a report documenting the findings of the study and commitments to mitigation and monitoring of any adverse environmental effects.
 - (j) Responses to public, stakeholder and government review team comments during review of the supplemental work.
- ii) The Proponent shall submit to the Minister a Subway Alignment Selection Report that identifies the optimum location for the alignment of the subway undertaking south of Highway 407. The Report shall summarize the public process carried out by the Proponent for the selection of the final location of the subway alignment and it shall document the assessment carried out, the consultation undertaken with the public and agencies and the commitments made by the Proponent in regard to the selection of the final location.
 - iii) The Proponent shall place the Report, within 30 days of its completion on the Public Record for a minimum 30 day period.
 - iv) The Proponent shall not proceed with the construction the subway undertaking unless the Minister, having considered the Report, any public comments regarding the Report and the public interest, approves its construction.

4.2 Next Steps

A five week review period follows the publication of this Review. During this time, any interested party can make submissions about the proposed undertaking, the environmental assessment or this Review.

Pursuant to section 9 of the EAA, the Review contributes to a number of documents that the Minister of the Environment must consider when making a decision about the proposed Highway 7 Corridor Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA. In making the decision the Minister must also consider the purpose of the EAA, the public comments submitted during the review periods, and other matters the Minister may consider relevant. The Minister will make one of the following decisions:

- Give approval to proceed with the undertaking;
- Give approval to proceed with the undertaking subject to conditions;
- Refuse to give approval to proceed with the undertaking;
- Refer either a part of or the entire EA to mediation; or
- Refer either a part of or the entire EA to the Environmental Review Tribunal for a decision.

HIGHWAY 7 CORRIDOR VAUGHAN NORTH-SOUTH LINK TRANSITWAY




Figure 1

YORK REGION PUBLIC TRANSIT EAs




Figure 2

Table 1. Government Review Team Comment Summary Table

Proposal: Highway 7 Corridor & Vaughan North-South-Link Public Transit Improvements
Proponent: The Regional Municipality of York

Submitter	Date Received	Issue/comment	Proponent's Response	Status
Provincial Agencies Ministry of the Environment – Air, Pesticides, and Environmental Planning - Technical Support	October 19, 2005	a) Section 8.3.2- Requested Clarification on the selection of the preferred route. b) Section 8.3.4.2- Requested clarification on the methodology used in the ranking and selection of various alignment options. c) Section 8.3.5.2 – Inconsistency between the text in this section and the accompanying table. d) Section 12.5 – Requested that a consistent level of environmental impact analysis be undertaken for the entire subway alignment e) Monitoring – Supportive of the proposed monitoring program, including the requirement for an independent Environmental Compliance Manager. Requested that Annual Monitoring Reports also be required.	a) The preferred alternative is a combination of Alternative B1 and continuation of the partially-segregated Phase 1 Keele St. service. This combination has the highest potential to attract ridership to both major destinations. b) The alternative methods of crossing the Hwy 404 interchange were not considered a comparison of alignments within a segment of the route, but an evaluation of the advantages and disadvantages of local design solutions to achieve a segregated right-of-way through the existing interchange. c) The highlighting in Table 8.3.6 of the EA report was inadvertently placed in the incorrect column. As stated in the text, the Civic Mall easement is the preferred option. d) The EA amendment will assess the effects of subway construction and operation of any components developed in more detail than in this EA between Hwy 407 and the limit of the TTC EA undertaking at Steeles Ave. e) Comment noted for consideration during development of the detailed Monitoring Program as noted in Section 11.4.1 of the EA report.	a) The Ministry of the Environment (MOE) is satisfied with the response. b) The MOE is satisfied with the response. c) The MOE is satisfied with the response. d) The MOE is satisfied with the response. e) N/A

Submitter	Date Received	Issue/comment	Proponent's Response	Status
Ministry of the Environment – Air Quality	October 19, 2005	<p>a) The details on the air quality (AQ) impacts have not been included in the body of the EA report. Any evaluation of AQ impacts of a project such as this should constitute the primary focus of the EA report, with respect to AQ. Referring the reader to the Senes AQ Assessment detracts from the stand-alone nature of the EA report.</p> <p>b) Technical Support (TS) feels that the adjustments made by York Region and Senes to include PM_{2.5} are inadequate and continues to recommend that PM_{2.5} be fully incorporated into all aspects of the AQ Impact Assessment.</p> <p>c) Inconsistency between the evaluation of alternatives noted in Section 8 of the EA report and the preliminary screening of alternatives dealt with in Section 3 of the Senes Report.</p> <p>d) TS would identify such efforts as tree planting as a factor in such mitigation and requests that they be considered by York Region and the appropriate revisions reflected in Table 10.4-3.</p> <p>e) The major difficulty that TS has with the conclusion on future PM₁₀ concentrations is that it does not include consideration of Table 3.2, the existing base case pollutant concentration estimates. For York Region to then conclude that the focus should be only on 2021 is misleading.</p> <p>f) The reference for the statement in the above is data noted as being available in Tables 4.3 and 4.4 of the Senes Report, when in fact it should be Tables 3.3 and 3.4.</p>	<p>a) The results of the AQ assessment are summarized in Chapter 10 (Table 10.4-3) of the EA report consistent with the summary of other potential environmental effects. The EA document references Appendix L which provides the detailed AQ assessment. The Proponent does not believe that a revision to the EA document is warranted.</p> <p>b) The Proponent has committed to do the additional PM_{2.5} analysis for the Highway 7 EA as requested. It will be submitted before the end of the MOE Review period. The sub-consultant (Senes) has been notified.</p> <p>c) The assessment of the effects of route segment alternatives on air quality did not provide any different result in the selection of the preferred alternatives from that shown in Section 8 of the EA report.</p> <p>d) It is acknowledged that tree planting provides an additional built-in positive effect on air quality. Tree planting will be considered further in the development in the detailed streetscape plan.</p> <p>e) The increase in PM (2001-2021) without the project is due solely to an increase in traffic volume. 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.</p> <p>f) Comment noted. Table 10.4-3 of the EA report should refer to Tables 3.3 and 3.4 of the Senes AQ report, and not Tables 4.3 and 4.4.</p>	<p>a) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>b) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>c) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>d) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>e) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>f) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>

Submitter	Date Received	Issue/comment	Proponent's Response	Status
Ministry of the Environment – Water Resources	October 12, 2005	<p>g) There are concerns associated with the stated level of monitoring in Table 10.4-3. Clarification is required to assess the extent of monitoring associated with construction activities.</p> <p>h) The Overall Assessment as noted in Section 8 of the Senes report and quoted in the EA report needs further review to substantiate that they are compatible with changes to the bodies of the reports, as may occur in terms of addressing the comments provided by TS and noted in the memo. The same is true of the Executive Summaries</p>	<p>g) Table 10.4-3 of the EA report was intended to indicate that no specific monitoring program beyond that normally required by the construction contract conditions is recommended. The Region will enforce the requirements of the standard contract conditions as described in Section 11.4.1 of the EA report.</p> <p>h) There are no changes proposed to the main EA report to address comments provided by TS. Clarification will be provided as appropriate.</p>	<p>g) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>h) N/A</p>
		<p>a) With reference to Section 10.1: Assessment Methodology, an effect that is temporary or short term in duration may be considered significant as the release of suspended solids to a watercourse can potentially cause a permanent loss of critical or productive aquatic habitat.</p> <p>b) Identified that approvals under section 53 of the <i>Ontario Water Resources Act</i> (OWRA) would be required for new and expanded storm sewers and end of pipe stormwater management facilities, prior to construction. Permit to take water must also be obtained under OWRA for dewatering in excess of 50,000L/day.</p> <p>c) Proponent must deal directly with the MOE for any groundwater issues encountered during construction. MOE would like to be involved in the detailed design and construction phase of the project.</p>	<p>a) Comment noted. As described in Section 10.1 of the EA report, the definition of significant effect includes a permanent loss of critical or productive aquatic habitat, regardless of the duration of the original net effect that precipitates the permanent effect.</p> <p>b) The Region will obtain all necessary permits under the OWRA prior to proceeding with construction. Section 11.2.1 of the EA also identifies subsequent approvals required during the detailed design of the undertaking.</p> <p>c) The MOE will be consulted during detailed design.</p>	<p>a) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>b) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>c) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>

Submitter	Date Received	Issue/comment	Proponent's Response	Status
Ministry of the Environment – Air and Noise Unit	October 24, 2005	<p>a) The majority of the calculations in Appendix K are based on absorptive ground surfaces. Based on drawings submitted with the proposal, it is the Air and Noise Unit's opinion that ground absorption was used incorrectly in the assessment of the roadway.</p> <p>b) The receiver heights used in the assessment of the receptors are not consistent with Section 5.5.4 of the MOE's publication ornament. The proponent should revise the subject calculations accordingly or clarify why this approach is used.</p> <p>c) Daytime source receiver distances should not equal nighttime source receiver distances. In the majority of cases the two distances differ by 3m. The proponent is asked to clarify why their approach was used in Appendix K</p> <p>d) The recommended day-night traffic volume ratios are 85%-15% for provincial roads. Clarification is required as to why the appropriate traffic split was not used.</p> <p>e) As the MOE's publication ornament classifies buses as medium trucks, the percentage of medium trucks should not be the same in Appendices K-E.</p>	<p>a) In all cases where noise monitoring was conducted the intermediate surface was covered by grass and therefore it was determined that an absorptive designation was appropriate. This approach is justified by ORNAMENT Technical Document (MOE 1989). In light of the MOE comment, the noise modeling was revised using a reflective ground surface. The predicted sound levels were found to be still within the range of the measured results in most instances.</p> <p>b) The actual height of the microphone of the noise monitoring equipment was used for a direct comparison with the traffic passby at each specific receptor location. However, for predicting future noise impact the noise modeling was carried out using 1.5 m for outdoor living area and 4.5 m for a 2nd story window.</p> <p>c) The shorter of the two horizontal distances was conservatively used for both daytime and nighttime. The nighttime receptor distances used in the revised model have been changed to reflect the 3 m difference.</p> <p>d) The 90%-10% day-night traffic volume ratio used in the modeling was derived from traffic count data and adopted as an appropriate representation of conditions on Highway 7 in the study area.</p> <p>e) The added bus transit traffic was treated as a separate source from the regular traffic. Also, the traffic volume of bus transit was not included in the AADT volume for the regular traffic. Hence the percentage of medium trucks is the same.</p>	<p>a) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>b) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>c) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>d) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>e) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>

Submitter	Date Received	Issue/comment	Proponent's Response	Status
Ministry of the Environment - EA Project Coordination	November 10, 2005	<p>f) Inconsistency between Section 5.2 of Appendix K and the AADT in Appendix K-E.</p> <p>g) Some of the distances in the assessment of the proposal are not correct. See Figure 9.7 of the EA Report. Also, the same concerns can be said of the assessment of the proposed LRT.</p> <p>h) The preferred assessment would see the dedicated bus lanes and the LRT, defined as separate segments in Stamson. This approach would simplify the Proponent's assessment and our review of the undertaking.</p> <p>i) Clarification is required for the reference value applied in Section 6.1 of Appendix K. A detailed sample calculation should be included to aid in the reader's comprehension.</p> <p>a) Requested clarification on the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA) approval process.</p>	<p>f) The AADT figure for the "with BRT" scenario represents general traffic only and does not include the BRT vehicles themselves. The modeling projects a minor reduction in auto vehicle use after BRT implementation however the overall person-capacity of the roadway is increased by the carrying capacity of the BRT service.</p> <p>g) The distances have been revised to reflect those shown in the figures in Chapter 9 of the EA report.</p> <p>h) The recommended assessment methodology as suggested by the MOE was used in the study submitted. The bus transit and LRT were treated as a separate segment in the Stamson modeling.</p> <p>i) This issue had been previously responded to and discussed with Mr. Denton Miller of the MOE Noise Unit in June 2005.</p> <p>a) CEAA did not identify a requirement for a federal environmental assessment. If the proponent receives federal funding, this will trigger the requirements for a federal EA under the <i>Canadian Environmental Assessment Act</i>.</p>	<p>f) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>g) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>h) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>i) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>a) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>

Submitter	Date Received	Issue/comment	Proponent's Response	Status
		<p>b) More information is requested on the evaluation methodology of Chapter 8, particularly the ranking of the preferred alternative found in Table 8.3-5.</p> <p>c) Table 8.3-6 highlights Enterprise Dr as the preferred option, while the text identifies Civic Corridor as the preferred option. Qualitative rankings are provided in Table 8.3-6 indicating fair, good but no rationale is provided on what this means in the weighing of the criteria.</p> <p>d) Table 8.3-7 provides check marks with no rationale on what these mean. Please provide further clarification on how these local alignment options were assessed and evaluated</p>	<p>b) Generally, these options were evaluated using the major objectives adopted for the primary route alternatives analysis. In some cases more specific local factors were used to compare options. Table 8.3-5 presents the basis for the evaluation of the options by listing the key attributes of each option in terms of the goals and primary objectives adopted for evaluation of the larger route segments along the corridor. The outcome of this process was identifying options C3-3 and C3-4. The relative merits of these two options were discussed in the text supporting the evaluation table in Section 8.1.5.1.</p> <p>c) In Table 8.3-6, the Enterprise Drive option was inadvertently highlighted as the "Technically Preferred Option". The qualitative rankings shown against each indicator were assessed collectively with implicit weighting and found to support the conclusion in the text that the Civic Mall Option best met the objectives for improved transit service through the planned Markham Centre.</p> <p>d) Each check mark in Table 8.3-7 indicates the alignment alternative that is preferred in terms of the individual planning criteria noted in the table. For some criteria, both options were considered to be equally responsive and thus both were checked. Again, these responses were assessed collectively leading to the recommendation of the northern alignment stated in the text.</p>	<p>b) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>c) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>d) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>

Submitter	Date Received	Issue/comment	Proponent's Response	Status
Ontario Secretariat for Aboriginal Affairs (OSSA)	October 6, 2005	<p>e) Section 8.3.4.2 is seeking approval for both C-B1 and C-B2. The preferred option is identified as C-B1. Any proposed changes to the preferred option would be considered an amendment to the undertaking.</p>	<p>e) The preferred strategy, Option C-B1, is to avoid environmental impacts and significant capital costs by operating the rapid transit in mixed traffic through the existing underpass on Hwy 7. The Region is seeking approval of Option C-B2, as the preferred ultimate solution for phased implementation if Option C-B1 becomes unreliable. Option C-B2 will be the Region's preferred ultimate option when it is required to traverse the Hwy 404 interchange without congestion delays.</p>	<p>e) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>
		<p>f) The York Region and Richmond Hill intermodal stations are discussed as part of the undertaking on Page 9-2. These stations are not part of the EA approval and should not be discussed as part of the described undertaking.</p>	<p>f) Comment noted. These terminals were mentioned as examples of associated facilities in the context of inter-connectivity with other modes.</p>	<p>f) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>
		<p>g) Requested further information on the evaluation methodology outlined in Chapter 8. Requested that the missing information in Table 10.4-2 also be provided.</p>	<p>g) The issues identified as significant are those concerning intersection levels of service analyzed as near or at capacity. The anticipated traffic volumes with or without the undertaking are such that monitoring will not lead to any further mitigation options. A completed page 10-9 of Table 10.4-2 from the EA report is provided as supplementary information.</p>	<p>g) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>
		<p>h) Without the conclusions of the City's Spadina Subway Extension EA Study, it is difficult to determine whether or not the protection of Alignment A-1 would be feasible and should be considered as part of this EA approval. EAAB would like the opportunity to meet with the Region and the City to discuss this component of the EA.</p>	<p>h) Chapter 12 of the Region's EA describes the rationale for selecting Alignment A-1 to access the VCC and identifies the potential zone where A-1 may have to be modified to link with the range of alignments being considered by the City's EA. The Region has submitted a supplementary information package to address issues raised regarding the eventual subway technology for the Vaughan North-South Link.</p>	<p>h) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>
		<p>a) OSAA recommends that the Proponent continue to contact and follow-up with relevant first Nations and aboriginal groups. It is also recommended that the MOE contact their legal branch to determine legal obligations for consultations with aboriginals.</p>	<p>a) Comment noted.</p>	<p>a) N/A</p>

Submitter	Date Received	Issue/comment	Proponent's Response	Status
Ministry of Transportation (MTO)	October 28, 2005	a) Identified that comments provided on the draft EA were addressed in final report. MTO satisfied with EA.	a) Comment Noted	a) N/A
Federal Agencies Health Canada	October 25, 2005	<p>a) Contingency plan for managing effects to drinking water wells needs to be developed as part of the EA.</p> <p>b) Construction noise should be included in EA.</p> <p>c) Ozone must be included in the EA to fully protect human health. Section 4.2 of Appendix L should provide the reference for formaldehyde and odour</p>	<p>a) Table 11.3-1 (I.D.#4), commits to preparing a contingency plan to address potential effects to water wells during detailed design of the undertaking. Identification of wells and municipal drinking water intakes will be undertaken during detailed design.</p> <p>b) Table 11.4-1 commits the proponent to monitor noise generated by construction activities to ensure compliance with Municipal By-Laws.</p> <p>c) Table 10.4-3, identifies that there is a net positive effect on all air pollutants assessed related to the proposed undertaking. Senes to provide additional detailed response.</p>	<p>a) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>b) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>c) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>
Local Agencies City of Vaughan	October 25, 2005	<p>a) City supports the approval of EA. Requests that the Region of York proceeds with the amendment to the subway extension component of EA at first opportunity once City of Toronto's EA is approved.</p> <p>b) City requests that the Region of York work with them during the detailed design phase for the transitway to take into account the results of the city's urban land use and design studies currently underway, including, but not limited to, the "Design Concept for Avenue 7 including Rapid Transit through the Vaughan Corporate Centre" report.</p>	<p>a) Figure 12-4 and as described in Section 12.5 of the EA, identifies that the final alignment for the protection of the underground right-of-way from Hwy 407 to Steeles Ave will be determined following completion of the Toronto/TTC EA Study (Spadina Subway Extension from Downsview Station to Steeles Ave).</p> <p>b) The Region is committed to working with the City of Vaughan during detailed design to develop a detailed streetscape plan that incorporates the recommendations from their urban land use and design studies where feasible.</p>	<p>a) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>b) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>

Submitter	Date Received	Issue/comment	Proponent's Response	Status
		<p>c) Impacts on traffic operations and urban design should be considered.</p> <p>d) The plan shown in the EA for the Corporate Centre does not reflect the City's ultimate preference as illustrated in the report to Committee of the Whole on Oct 11, 2005.</p> <p>e) There is minimal information available on the facility identified as a terminal in the "VCC Transit Square Concept", Section 12, of the EA report.</p>	<p>c) The Region is committed to monitoring traffic operations after implementation of the undertaking. In addition, a detailed traffic management plan will be developed prior to commencing construction.</p> <p>d) Section 9.1.1 of the EA identifies a conceptual Streetscape Plan was developed as part of the EA and provides the basis for the detailed streetscape design. The Region commits to working with the local municipalities to incorporate streetscape elements recommended through other studies where feasible.</p> <p>e) The intention in showing a concept for the surface intermodal facilities is to identify the need for an efficient means of transferring passengers from feeder bus services to the rapid transit service. It is not intended to be a detailed design. The location of the typical concept was based on the recommendations of the draft report on the City of Vaughan's study of streetscaping for the VCC.</p>	<p>c) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>d) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>e) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>
		<p>f) The City recommends a prohibition on left turns in and out from driveways and minor roads due to the transit way, restricting right turns on red lights from side streets, and addressing conflicts between U-turns and right turn movements onto Hwy 7 from side streets.</p> <p>g) Issues of pedestrian crossings and potential traffic infiltration need also be addressed.</p>	<p>f) Detailed comment noted. The Region will consult with the local municipalities during development of the detailed Traffic Management Plan (as described in Section 11.2.2.1 of the EA report).</p> <p>g) The Region will consult with the local municipalities during development of the detailed Traffic Management Plan. Also, traffic operations will be monitored after implementation to address issues/concerns such as infiltration.</p>	<p>f) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>g) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>

Submitter	Date Received	Issue/comment	Proponent's Response	Status
		<p>h) The City fully supports the ultimate conversion to subway technology presented in the EA. To overcome the uncertainty of alignment between Steeles Ave. and Hwy 407, the Region recommends additional studies when the preferred designs for the inter-related facilities have received EA approval.</p>	<p>h) Detailed comment noted. As noted on Figure 12-4 and described in Section 12.5 of the EA report, the final alignment of the subway from Hwy 407 to Steeles Ave will be determined following completion of the Toronto/TTC EA Study (Spadina Subway Extension from Downsview Station to Steeles Ave).</p>	<p>h) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>
Town of Markham	January 4, 2006	<p>a) Recommendations include that Council endorse the Environmental Study Report for the Hwy 7 rapid transit project, and that staff continue to work with the Region and YRTP staff to finalize the design for the rapid transit facility.</p> <p>b) Staff has worked with the proponents for the Liberty development to secure sufficient right of way (ROW) along Town Centre Blvd for the rapid transit proposal. Further ROW consultation will be required with IBM.</p>	<p>a) The Region will continue to work with local municipalities including the Town of Markham during detailed design and implementation of the undertaking.</p> <p>b) The Region will work with the local municipalities to secure the required ROW.</p>	<p>a) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>b) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>
City of Toronto	November 2, 2005 and December 6, 2005	<p>a) The EA report recommends that in order to follow through on a subway extension, an amendment (or addendum) to the EA will be completed. This amendment would use the approved alignment from the TTC/City EA as a starting point to develop and assess alternative design concepts for the subway extension. Chapter 12 of the EA report contains a description of the components of the amendment report.</p> <p>b) Both the Hwy 7 EA and the Spadina Subway Extension EA had a TAC with staff representatives from York Region, City of Vaughan, YRT, City of Toronto and TTC.</p> <p>c) The preferred alignment was identified through the TTC/City EA study process and was evaluated by the TAC during the summer of 2005. This alignment is not consistent with the preferred alignment A-1 shown in the Hwy 7 EA.</p>	<p>Throughout the Region's EA Study process, York Region, TTC and City of Toronto staff have participated in a reciprocal manner on the respective Technical Advisory Committees (TAC) for the Spadina Subway Extension. The confirmation of subway alignment recommended in prior studies relating to property protection for the VCC and the identification of the extent and scope of the tie-in alignment to be addressed in the addendum resulted from close collaboration with TTC staff and their consultant.</p> <p>This consultation has ensured that the alignment for the portion of the subway extension north of Hwy 407, for which approval is sought in the Region's EA is compatible with all alignment options from which the TTC/City of Toronto EA's preferred alignment will be selected. Also, the discussions and exchange of information form the basis of the description of components that are required to be addressed in the proposed addendum for the portion south of Highway 407 where the tie-in to the TTC's preferred alignment would be achieved.</p>	<p>a) - f) The MOE is content with the level of coordination between the Proponent, the City of Toronto, and the TTC and is satisfied with the response. In addition, a condition of approval has been proposed that will require the Proponent to follow a public process to determine the optimum location for the alignment of the subway undertaking at Steeles Avenue.</p>

Submitter	Date Received	Issue/comment	Proponent's Response	Status
		<p>d) The draft Hwy 7 EA was circulated for review in April 2005. At that time the TTC/City Spadina Subway Extension EA study was finalizing the selection of a preferred route, which was shown at public meetings in May 2005. The City's review of the draft EA, noting no substantial comments, was based on their understanding that the component of the study dealing with the subway would be updated to reflect current work from the TTC/City study prior to York Region submitting its final EA report. In particular that Chapter 12 would be reworked to reflect the TTC/City EA work.</p> <p>e) The evaluation of alignment options relies almost entirely on alignments generated based on the 1993 TTC EA for the subway extension. While the recommended A-1 alignment is similar to one of the alignments evaluated in the more recent TTC/City EA, it is not the preferred alignment that has been put forward to Toronto City Council for approval. The preferred alignment from the TTC/City EA was not evaluated in the Hwy 7 EA, even though that alignment was identified prior to the Region finalizing its EA report in August 2005.</p> <p>f) The City of Toronto and TTC suggest that an addendum to the Hwy 7 EA, reflecting the preferred alignment to Steeles West Station, would be an appropriate venue to address the concerns that they have.</p>	<p>A revised Figure 12-4 is included in the supplementary information regarding the Vaughan North-South Link and includes the preferred alignment identified in the TTC Spadina Extension EA (The preferred TTC EA alignment had not been confirmed at the time the Region's Hwy 7 and VNSL EA was being completed for formal submission).</p>	

Submitter	Date Received	Issue/comment	Proponent's Response	Status
Region of Peel	November 4, 2005	<p>a) Current EA should take into consideration the need to move automobile and truck traffic safely and efficiently. A balanced alternative should be investigated further.</p> <p>b) Local public transit along Hwy 7 (Regional Rd 107) in Peel Region is operated by the City of Brampton. Therefore it is important to coordinate transit improvements in close partnership with the City of Brampton and Peel Region.</p> <p>c) The EA does not indicate why a station at Highway 50 is not included.</p> <p>d) Highway 7 existing alignment shift between Highway 50 and Highway 27 should be discussed with Peel Region and MTO before proceeding further.</p> <p>e) To ensure that there will be good connectivity between Peel and York Regions, the EA study area (page 2-1) should include areas west of Hwy 50 along Hwy 7 in Peel</p> <p>f) It is essential to coordinate transit improvements to the Highway 7 corridor closely with the City of Brampton and Peel Region. Passengers traveling between York and Peel should be able to seamlessly travel between regions without any jurisdictional problems and with single fare integration between all transit systems in Peel, York, Toronto and other parts of the GTA.</p>	<p>a) Chapter 3 of the EA identifies a wide range of alternatives to public transit improvements, including a multi-modal approach to address travel demand and goods movement to 2031.</p> <p>b) The Region of Peel has been included in the Technical Advisory Committee and the Government Review Team for this formal EA submission. York Region will work with Peel to integrate any future Hwy 7 transit improvements west of Hwy 50 with the York Region undertaking defined in this EA.</p> <p>c) As noted in Figures 9-1 and 9-2, a transit stop has been proposed at Hwy 50 which is the planned terminus of rapid transit service as defined through this EA. Should rapid transit service be planned west of Hwy 50, York Region will work with Peel Region to integrate services appropriately.</p> <p>d) MTO will be consulted during detailed design as it relates to any work within their jurisdiction, including widening of Highway 7 over Highway 427.</p> <p>e) The study area for this EA extends from Hwy 50 to the York/Durham boundary. Should Peel Region or Brampton choose to define transit improvements west of Hwy 50, York Region will work with the neighbouring jurisdiction to integrate services accordingly.</p> <p>f) The Region proposes to work closely with the Region of Peel to coordinate the design of the integration of transit services between border municipalities. This EA assessed the environmental effects of the transit way. Fare integration is beyond the scope of the study.</p>	<p>a) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>b) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>c) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>d) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>e) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>f) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>

Submitter	Date Received	Issue/comment	Proponent's Response	Status
Regional Municipality of Durham	November 8, 2005	<p>g) Pedestrian environment is not adequately addressed at the boundary of Peel Region.</p> <p>h) The description of route alternatives provided on Page E-5 needs to be further discussed with Peel Region and the City of Brampton.</p>	<p>g) As shown on Figure 9-2, sidewalks are planned for both sides of Hwy 7 as far west as the York/Peel boundary (Highway 50). Also, Table 10.4-2 identifies the Built-In Positive Attributes of the undertaking, such as a design transitway to facilitate safe pedestrian crossings with median refuge.</p> <p>h) Chapter 5 of the EA report includes route alternatives for Segment A and includes the consideration of 6 different routes. See Table 5.1-1 and Table 5.3-1.</p>	<p>g) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>h) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>
Regional Municipality of Durham	November 8, 2005	<p>a) Supportive of changes in the final EA report.</p> <p>b) The EA should be amended so that the station location identified in Figure 9-81 may be moved further east to the Seaton Community to provide a connection to the Durham Region transit services.</p> <p>c) The Hwy 407 Transitway is significant from an inter-regional point of view. As such, rapid transit service on Hwy 7 should be treated and designed to complement, rather than compete with, future Hwy 407 Transitway services.</p>	<p>a) Comment noted</p> <p>b) Comment noted. York Region Transit will work with Durham Region Transit to ensure coordinated service at the boundary between the two jurisdictions.</p> <p>c) The undertaking is a key component of the York Region Rapid Transit Plan, which focuses on intra-regional urban rapid transit, with connections to inter-regional services and other neighbouring rapid transit.</p>	<p>a) N/A</p> <p>b) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>c) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA)	December 7, 2005	<p>a) TRCA recognizes that the Preferred Design requires a new crossing of the Rouge River. Staff met on site with York Region and Rouge Park representatives to discuss the implications of this crossing on November 18, 2005. Further to this meeting TRCA has no objection to the proposed crossing.</p> <p>b) Table 8.3-9 should be revised in order to clearly distinguish this alternative as preferable to the others, particularly as it will have the greatest negative impact on the natural environment.</p>	<p>a) TRCA agreement in principle to the proposed Rouge River crossing is noted.</p> <p>b) A revised Table 8.3-9 is included in the attached supplemental information to TRCA. The table is revised to include more of the detailed information as presented in Table 8.3-5 and wording as summarized in the text of section 8.3.5.1 that better distinguishes the preferred alignment alternative.</p>	<p>a) N/A</p> <p>b) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>

Submitter	Date Received	Issue/comment	Proponent's Response	Status
		<p>c) TRCA is advising that any future crossings of the Rouge River and its tributaries in this area are of significant concern and that no new crossings be permitted.</p> <p>d) TRCA requests that York Region commit to restoring the surrounding valley land and floodplain, in conjunction with the conservation authority, as part of a compensation plan to address the impacts associated with this new crossing. This process would include the acquisition of the flood plain property west of Warden Avenue and south of Cedarland Drive for this purpose. Notwithstanding the above, additional compensation may be required when this project moves to detailed design.</p> <p>e) The sentence in the third paragraph on page E-7 that ends "... to preserve the aquatic habitat" should be revised to read "... to preserve the aquatic and terrestrial habitat".</p> <p>f) It should be noted on Page 9-16 that the minimum crossing opening for Local Alignment C3-4 to satisfy geomorphic requirements is expected to be approximately 80 to 120 metres, and may be greater depending on site conditions. Additionally, the conceptual crossing structure profile and dimensions should be removed from Fig 9-60 to ensure that the EA is not misinterpreted to read that a 30 metre crossing may be permitted.</p>	<p>c) Comment noted for future Environmental Assessment or Planning Act applications in this area.</p> <p>d) The Region will work with TRCA to develop a compensation plan during detailed design that satisfies the agencies requirements.</p> <p>e) Comment noted.</p> <p>f) Section 9.1.5 (27) indicates that a meander belt analysis and a 100 year erosion limit will be determined during preliminary and detailed design to determine the sizing of the bridge span for the planned Rouge River crossing. Figure 9-60 also indicates that the sizing of the structure will be determined during the design phase. A revised figure 9-60 is attached and has been revised to delete the reference to a 30 metre structure span.</p>	<p>c) N/A</p> <p>d) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>e) N/A</p> <p>f) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>

Submitter	Date Received	Issue/comment	Proponent's Response	Status
		<p>g) Table 8.2-1 has been revised to include an indicator under Objective C4 for "extent of channel realignment", but not for impacts to restriction of channel plan form as per previous comments. Staff considers the extension of existing watercourse crossings to be potentially detrimental to physical processes in the watercourse, as this will impede natural plan form migration by confining additional channel length in structures that are of insufficient width to allow full meander bend development and evolution. Table 8.2-1 and 10.4-3 should be revised so that this issue is reflected in the evaluation.</p> <p>h) The number of new and widened watercourse crossings associated with each alternative route should be included in Table 8.3-2, as per evaluation tables in other sections.</p> <p>i) The transitway station on Fig 9-60 should be removed from the Rouge Valley corridor and regional floodplain. The note provided does not sufficiently indicate that the station location must be outside the valley corridor and floodplain.</p>	<p>g) The indicator "extent of channel realignment" has been considered a measure of any additional restriction of channel plan form due to the channel having to be re-aligned locally at existing crossings to follow the increment of increase in length of existing crossing structures. The Proponent agrees that the textual assessment of effects preceding Table 10.4-3 should include recognition that the extension of existing crossings with insufficient width to allow full meander development will introduce a moderately significant effect on natural plan form migration at existing crossing entrances and exits. This will be addressed further during the TRCA permit approval stage</p> <p>h) The three alternatives for Segment B East have the following new/widened watercourse crossings: <u>Alternative B4</u> – No new or widened crossings required. <u>Alternative B5</u> – New crossings include: Westminster Creek east of Dufferin Street; West Don River east of Dufferin Street, west of Bathurst Street and Widened structures at Hwy 7 over East Don River. <u>Alternative B6</u> – No new crossings or widened crossings required. With the inadvertent omission of listing the watercourse crossings from Table 8.3-2 in the EA report, the selection of Alternative B6 as the Technically Preferred Alternative does not change.</p> <p>i) During detailed design, the Region will refine the station location and design solution to meet TRCA requirements for protection of the valley corridor and flood plain based on a detailed survey of site conditions.</p>	<p>g) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>h) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>i) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>

Submitter	Date Received	Issue/comment	Proponent's Response	Status
		<p>j) The Stormwater Management Preliminary Assessment provided in Appendix G is not sufficient to confirm that an effective stormwater management system for the transitway can be provided. The appendix should be revised to address stormwater management for all sections of transitway that will be serviced by each measure. Also, deferring the fulfillment of treatment of this objective to large scale initiatives for urban stormwater retrofit is not acceptable. The Proponent should demonstrate that stormwater measures for the transitway can be provided that will provide a net improvement in water quality in the receiving watercourses.</p> <p>k) Suitable information has not been provided to confirm that impacts to terrestrial passage at stream crossings will be "insignificant", after mitigation, as indicated on Table 10.4-3 under objective C2. In the absence of additional information, the level of significance after mitigation for this item should be ranked as at least "moderately significant".</p> <p>l) The monitoring frequency in Table 11.4-1 for "effect of construction on water quality and quantity in watercourses" should be revised to indicate that monitoring should occur after every major storm event. The monitoring frequency in Table 11.4-1 for "effect of construction on water quality and quantity in watercourses" should be revised to indicate that monitoring should occur after every major storm event.</p>	<p>j) The Proponent will commit to working with the TRCA during preliminary and detailed design to ensure that the stormwater management plan provides a net improvement in water quality of the receiving watercourse. Opportunities to include treatment for this undertaking with broader infrastructure initiatives will be reviewed during the design phase. The proponent agrees that deferring the fulfillment of treatment of this objective is not acceptable. Additional information regarding the Stormwater Management Preliminary Assessment is included as supplementary information with this response to TRCA.</p> <p>k) As suggested by TRCA, the level of significance after mitigation can be considered to be moderate in the absence of additional information to be provided during the design and permit approval phase of the project.</p> <p>l) Comment noted and will be carried forward to the design and construction phase of the project.</p>	<p>j) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>k) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>l) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>

Submitter	Date Received	Issue/comment	Proponent's Response	Status
		<p>m) The discussion of water quality and quantity monitoring in Table 11.4-2 is not satisfactory as the monitoring methods and frequency are not appropriate for the monitoring purposes. It is recommended that separate monitoring items be developed for sediment accumulation, stormwater management facilities, transit operations, and impacts of snow and ice removal.</p> <p>n) At the detailed design stage, TRCA ecology staff will review all culvert/bridge modifications, and will require that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Any potential impacts are mitigated whenever possible; b) Effective sediment and erosion controls are provided; and c) There will be a net benefit to the aquatic and floodplain system. <p>Please note that it is possible that additional watercourses may be identified during detailed design stage, and that a TRCA permit and review under Fisheries Act may apply.</p> <p>o) Note that the tributary at station 541+300 (approx.) is being relocated to the east. Please contact Leslie Piercey for more information.</p> <p>p) Impacts to groundwater resources will need to be addressed in greater detail. Studies will be required to identify quantities, durations and zones of influence associated with aquifer depressurization or dewatering, along with other environmental impacts that may be anticipated. Areas of concern have been identified within the EA report, however, groundwater resources and the features dependent on them will need to be identified and protected throughout the entire corridor during the detailed design phase.</p>	<p>m) The Region will develop a detailed monitoring program covering all aspects noted during detailed design in consultation with TRCA. All required measurements, specifically to assess the effect of the transitway insertion, will be included in the monitoring program.</p> <p>n) Comment noted to be carried forward to the detailed design phase (as noted in section 11.2.1, the requirement for TRCA permits are identified as part of post-EA approval activities).</p> <p>o) Comment noted to be carried forward to the detailed design phase.</p> <p>p) Comment noted. The impacts on groundwater resources and the features affected by them, throughout the entire Highway 7 Corridor, will be identified during the detailed design phase when the extent of any dewatering is known. Mitigation plans will be developed to provide the necessary protection for natural heritage features and groundwater related resources in consultation with TRCA and other appropriate authorities.</p>	<p>m) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>n) N/A</p> <p>o) N/A</p> <p>p) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>

Submitter	Date Received	Issue/comment	Proponent's Response	Status
		q) Please note that the area identified for the Vaughan North-South Link is an area of shallow or upward groundwater movement. This is an issue that will need to be addressed by TRCA's hydrogeologist at the detailed design phase.	q) Comment noted. TRCA's hydrogeologist will be contacted during the detailed design phase.	q) N/A

Table 2. Public Comment Summary Table

Proposal: Highway 7 Corridor & Vaughan North-South-Link Public Transit Improvements
Proponent: The Regional Municipality of York

Submitter	Date Received	Issue/comment	Proponent's Response	Status
Private Citizen # 1		<p>a) Section 6.1.1.5 – To the locations of the additional terminals add the following: Promenade: <i>Southwest</i> of Bathurst and Centre; Vaughan Mills; <i>Southwest</i> of Jane and Rutherford; and York University: <i>Southwest</i> of Keele and Steeles.</p> <p>b) Section 6.1.2.5 - Add to the Bathurst St Station "for Hwy 7 West" or future GO Transitway.</p> <p>c) Yonge and Centre Station was omitted. Was the level unacceptable?</p> <p>d) Where are the ratios of traffic at Laidlaw Blvd?</p> <p>e) Section 6.1.2.6 – Add "High traffic volume on Beverly Glen" and "There is a threat of neighbourhood traffic infiltration" to the Wiltshire Neighbourhood.</p> <p>f) Section 6.3.3.1 – Under the City of Vaughan, note that Thornhill is divided in half at Yonge St between Vaughan and Markham, not Vaughan and Richmond Hill. Note that Thornhill is not in Richmond Hill as it is entirely below Hwy 7.</p>	<p>a) Comment noted.</p> <p>b) Comment noted.</p> <p>c) Both Yonge St and Centre St are included in the listings of level of service in Section 6.1.2.5 of the EA report.</p> <p>d) Existing traffic at the Laidlaw Blvd. intersection is operating at an acceptable level hence it does not appear in the listing of intersections at or near unacceptable levels of service.</p> <p>e) Comment noted</p> <p>f) Inadvertent error acknowledged. Reference to Richmond Hill is incorrect.</p>	<p>a) The Ministry of the Environment (MOE) is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>b) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>c) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>d) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>e) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>f) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>

Submitter	Date Received	Issue/comment	Proponent's Response	Status
		<p>g) Section 6.3.3.2 – Add the future areas at Bathurst and Centre/Promenade.</p> <p>h) Section 6.4.1.1 – Under Thomhill (Yonge St and Centre St), add that Yonge and Centre is an epicentre.</p> <p>i) Section 7.2 – Add "Proximity to development and origin-destination node/traffic generators".</p> <p>j) Section 7.3 – Add "intrusion into land uses" and "Public comfort stations/commercial land uses nearby".</p> <p>k) Figures 8.3-7, 8.3-9 and 8.3-10 – Add transit station at Bathurst and Hwy 7 West (Connection to GO/407 Transitway).</p> <p>l) Page 8.3.20 – The best choice for Hospital Complex is midpoint in the area, and therefore is most accessible.</p> <p>m) Table 8.3-2 – Why was B6 chosen when B-3 has 11 most responsive and B5 and B6 have only 8 criteriae?</p> <p>n) Table 8.3-2 – Why was B6 chosen when B-4 has 3 least responsive and B4 and B6 have no criteriae?</p> <p>o) Page 9.1 – GO stations in Woodbridge near Hwy 7 and Islington in Kleinberg are not shown in the plan.</p> <p>p) Figure 9-25 - One bus terminal is shown on the North side, but two terminals are shown on the Spadina Extension EA plan.</p>	<p>g) Comment noted.</p> <p>h) Comment noted</p> <p>i) Comment noted</p> <p>j) Comment noted</p> <p>k) Comment noted. Potential station at Bathurst St and Hwy 7 identified in Section 8.3.3 of the EA report</p> <p>l) Comment noted.</p> <p>m) B3 is an alternative to B1 and B2 and does not correspond with the section of route containing B6.</p> <p>n) B6 was assessed as having greater potential for the development of transit supportive land uses with convenient access to the stations while having no adverse effects that could not be mitigated.</p> <p>o) Stations on potential future GO services are not shown in the figure.</p> <p>p) The figure shows only the Region-owned land designated for future transit terminal use. Any additional terminal facilities required are part of the undertaking for the Spadina Subway Extension EA.</p>	<p>g) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>h) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>i) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>j) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>k) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>l) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>m) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>n) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>o) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>p) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>

Submitter	Date Received	Issue/comment	Proponent's Response	Status
		<p>q) Add one terminal on the south side of Steeles Ave (i.e. permanent for TTC routes S. of Steeles Ave).</p> <p>r) Figure 9-35 - Add a second gap on Centre St to adequately serve retailers or some stores will die.</p> <p>s) The station site west of Promenade loop is on a slope and could pose stopping problems.</p> <p>t) The right turn lane should be extended south of Centre St to the condo building entrance for flow.</p> <p>u) Figure 9-36 - Add a one to two lane northbound road versus three lanes shown in both directions on future plans</p> <p>v) Note the northbound station north of Atkinson poses a problem for the retail strip plaza vehicle access.</p> <p>w) Note the southbound station south of Atkinson poses a problem for school and community centre access.</p> <p>x) Section 12 - A1 Station Site: Better choice as it is under Steeles; lesser capital cost as no expropriation needed nor use of vacant land; better service to York University and has least effect on future development; and central location allows access to all terminals. Disadvantage of higher noise and vibration.</p>	<p>q) Terminals on the south side of Steeles Ave are not part of the undertaking for this EA but may be included in the City of Toronto/TTC's Spadina Subway extension EA.</p> <p>r) As shown in Figure 9-35 of the EA report, a full movement intersection (signalized) has been shown conceptually providing access to the lands north of Centre St between Vaughan Blvd and New Westminster Dr.</p> <p>s) A station at the location shown will meet design standards.</p> <p>t) The extent of turning lanes will be determined after further analysis of needs during the detailed design phase.</p> <p>u) Bathurst St will retain the existing two lanes in each direction, with the additional lanes being dedicated to rapid transit.</p> <p>v) Access to the plaza on the east side of Bathurst St will be possible by making a U-turn SB at the Atkinson Ave intersection followed by a right-turn into the plaza, or a left turn into Atkinson Ave and a second left-turn into the southern entrance to the plaza.</p> <p>w) Access to the community centre and school will be possible through the signalized intersection at New Westminster Dr.</p> <p>x) Comment noted.</p>	<p>q) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>r) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>s) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>t) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>u) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>v) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>w) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>x) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>

Submitter	Date Received	Issue/comment	Proponent's Response	Status
		<p>y) Page 12-4 – Add "Possible 2nd bus terminal" on the north side. Note that non-TTC routes can be accommodated by one terminal until Spadina is extended north.</p> <p>z) In general, the EA omits reference to other potential east-west or north-south arterial corridors for rapid transit in future in south York Region.</p>	<p>y) Overall terminal requirements at the Steeles Ave subway station are being defined by the Spadina Subway Extension EA. The station site will be addressed as part of the Spadina EA.</p> <p>z) The modeling of future rapid transit ridership has assumed enhanced transit service on parallel arterial routes in both the east-west and north-south directions.</p>	<p>y) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>z) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>
Private Citizen # 2		<p>a) Analysis being undertaken is defective in that it fails to recognize and implement the policies set out in City of Vaughan OPA 672. In particular, policies numbered 8 and 9 in that OPA.</p>	<p>a) As shown on Figure 9-35 of the EA report, a full movement intersection (signalized) has been shown conceptually providing access to the lands north of Centre St between Vaughan Blvd and New Westminster Dr. As noted on Figure 9-35, the final location of the full movement intersection will be determined during detailed design and in consultation with affected property owners.</p>	<p>a) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>
Private Citizen # 3		<p>a) The entire length of the proposed transitway should include the accommodation of additional space along the transitway corridor for safe and continuous passage of non-motorized vehicles. A pathway along the transit route could significantly reduce both the traffic congestion along the corridor as well as the emissions that would otherwise have resulted from elimination of the use of an additional vehicle on the road. "Continuous" meaning the pathway should not be broken along any section because of incompleteness or obstruction (such as highway bridges), and should allow the passage of small/light vehicles without the users of such a path having to resort to simultaneous use of the same roadway as heavy vehicles.</p>	<p>a) Detailed comment noted and will be carried forward for consideration during development of the detailed streetscape plan (Section 9.1.1 of the EA report describes the conceptual streetscape plan). As identified on Figures 9.1-2 to 9.1-10, a 2.0 m sidewalk is proposed along each side of the transitway/road corridor for pedestrians. As shown on Figures 13.9-3 to 13.9-5, a 3.0 m bicycle path is proposed from Warden Ave to east of Sciberras Rd and has been developed in consultation with the local municipality. The local municipality has jurisdiction over bike paths. At the time of detailed streetscape design, York Region will continue to work with local municipalities to incorporate additional streetscape facilities and bicycle access to stations where feasible.</p>	<p>a) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>

Submitter	Date Received	Issue/comment	Proponent's Response	Status
Private Citizen # 4		<p>a) Mr. Puddy mailed letters concerning the meetings at Markville on September 19, 2003 and September 17, 2004 and had no replies. He went to the Markham Town Centre to review the EA report and did not see his letter of September 19, 2003, although his letter of September 17, 2004 was recorded. The following are his comments on the EA report:</p> <p>b) The transit lane should be in the curb lanes with the transit stops at the far side of the traffic control intersections.</p> <p>c) The transit lanes should run straight along the corridor with a subway or overpass at the GO crossing and not detoured up and down to the GO station where the trains operate approximately two hours each direction on working days.</p> <p>d) The raised transit lanes will separate the corridor into a north and south side of the community requiring at each traffic control intersection numerous traffic light functions such as through, right, left and U-turns.</p>	<p>a) It appears that the Rapid Transit Program Office inadvertently omitted to acknowledge receipt of Mr. Puddy's letters and respond to the comments contained in them. However, the comments were taken into consideration in evaluating alternatives and developing the preferred design for the undertaking. The responses below indicate how his comments were addressed in the EA report.</p> <p>b) Curb side transit lanes were considered in the EA report (refer to Section 5.4.1, Alternative Locations within a Road r.o.w.). Table 5.4-1 provides an evaluation of the alternative locations for the transit lanes, with a median transitway identified as the preferred location. The typical station layout includes far side stops at intersections with traffic and pedestrian control signals (refer to Figure 7.3-1).</p> <p>c) Alternative routes and alignments were considered and evaluated in the EA (refer to Section 5.3.1, Analysis and Evaluation of Alternative Technology/Route Combinations and Section 8.3, Development of Segment Alignment Alternatives). In addition to inter-connectivity with GO Rail services, the routing selected serves the planned mixed-use Markham Centre where significant transit-supportive development is planned.</p> <p>d) As noted in Section 9.1.1 of the EA, a streetscape concept has been developed in consultation with local municipalities to be a catalyst for transit-oriented development and attract transit ridership by creating a pedestrian friendly environment. The effect on traffic operations was considered in the evaluation of options to locate a transitway in a roadway (refer to Table 5.4-1) and the analysis of traffic conditions during operation of the transit service (refer to Chapter 10). In addition, traffic operations will be monitored during rapid transit operations as noted in Table 11.4-2.</p>	<p>a) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>b) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>c) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>d) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>

Submitter	Date Received	Issue/comment	Proponent's Response	Status
		<p>e) Comments b through d show concerns associated with increased gridlock, pollution, safety, and will affect the community environment (surroundings).</p> <p><i>Comments from PCC#4, September 17, 2004</i></p> <p>f) Mr. Puddy spoke to a representative of Lynton Erskine at the Markville Mall presentation on September 17, 2004. He does not believe the present plan will enhance the quality of life in the Hwy 7 Corridor.</p> <p>g) The transit lanes should be in the curb lane of Hwy 7 corridor with stops at the far side of intersections.</p> <p>h) The level crossing on Hwy 7 in Unionville should have an underpass allowing safe passage for GO trains and Hwy 7 traffic which was done at Finch Ave, west of Leslie St.</p> <p>i) The transit line in the middle of Hwy 7 corridor with its left and U-turns at intersections are not safe and convenient for pedestrians or vehicles, contributing to gridlock and pollution. The transit line should not be detoured off the Hwy 7 corridor to the GO station for four trains each way on working days.</p> <p>j) The primary purpose of what used to be a provincial highway was for the movement of goods, people and services and should be the main function of this arterial road serving a commercial area.</p>	<p>e) Environmental criteria for assessing the effects of the undertaking on congestion, pollution and safety are included in Section 10.4 - Analysis of Environmental Effects and Mitigation, of the EA report.</p> <p>f) Protecting and enhancing the social environment in the corridor was a key objective in the development of the undertaking (refer to Chapter 1 and Chapter 10, Table 10.4-2).</p> <p>g) Curb side transit lanes were considered in the EA report (refer to Section 5.4.1, Alternative Locations within a Road r.o.w.). Table 5.4-1 provides an evaluation of the alternative locations for the transit lanes, with a median transitway identified as the preferred location. The typical station layout includes far side stops at intersections with traffic and pedestrian control signals (refer to Figure 7.3-1).</p> <p>h) Comment noted. Refer to Figure 9-63 of the EA report which shows a proposed underpass for the transitway crossing of the GO Stouffville line.</p> <p>i) Refer to responses c and d above.</p> <p>j) The purpose of the undertaking is presented in Section 1.2.2 of the EA report. The existing Social Environment is described in Section 6.3 and includes a wide range of adjacent land uses.</p>	<p>e) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>f) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>g) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>h) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>i) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>j) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>

Submitter	Date Received	Issue/comment	Proponent's Response	Status
		<p><i>Comments from PCC#3, September 19, 2003</i></p> <p>k) The preferred plan for Hwy 7 corridor is similar to the Spadina Ave transit in Toronto and Mr. Puddy does not consider that the Toronto system meets any of our criteria for the proposed plan.</p> <p>l) Mr. Puddy suggests that the preferred plan for all purposes would be better located in either the hydro or 407 corridors.</p> <p>m) The rapid transit line in the centre of the Hwy 7 corridor would not contribute to the safety and convenience of pedestrians or other users.</p> <p>n) The transit line should be built in the curb lanes and an underpass built at the Hwy 7 corridor and the GO level crossing which would allow passengers to transfer to the GO trains and provide a safe Hwy 7 corridor by eliminating a level crossing.</p>	<p>k) Comment noted. Analysis and Evaluation of Alternatives to the Undertaking is provided in Chapter 3 of the EA report.</p> <p>l) Alternative alignments (including Hwy 407 and sections of hydro corridors) were considered in the EA (refer to Section 5.1).</p> <p>m) Alternative alignments (including Hwy 407 and sections of hydro corridors) were considered in the EA (refer to Section 5.1, Rapid Transit Corridors).</p> <p>n) Alternative alignments (including Hwy 407 and sections of hydro corridors) were considered in the EA (refer to Section 5.1, Rapid Transit Corridors).</p>	<p>k) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>l) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>m) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>n) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>
Private Citizen # 5		<p>a) Ms. Boxen welcomes the Region's decision to improve transit but is concerned about the Region's inability to address land use planning.</p>	<p>a) Approval of site plan development is a local municipal jurisdiction and subject to the Ontario Planning Act, as well as conformance with land use as provided in the York Region Official Plan. The Region is also undertaking a Centres and Corridors Study to facilitate development of both the Regional Centres and Corridors with more intensive development supporting transit ridership (the Region's planning initiatives are briefly described in Section 12.1.1 of the EA report).</p>	<p>a) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>

Submitter	Date Received	Issue/comment	Proponent's Response	Status
		<p>b) The evaluation and comments provided are based on the following principles: 1) Efficient use of resources, existing infrastructure, land, energy, and most direct route to service the most people and destinations, with least environmental impacts; 2) Promotes health, reduces air, water and soil pollution by reducing the use and need for private vehicles, and promotes walking and cycling; 3) Other environmental concerns – Decreases the need for paved and other impervious surfaces and reduces flood potential. Increases vegetation to reduce runoff, provide shade, filter pollutants, and absorb CO2. reduces greenhouse gas emissions and moderated the effects of climate change; 4) Promotes community health – stops and terminals are located near centres of activity. Accessible to all residents in geographical sense and to those with physical handicaps. Inclusive of residents regardless of age and economical status; and 5) Convenience.</p> <p>c) Ms. Boxen presumes that the study does not include the impacts of the construction of the additional lanes on Hwy 407 in the central portion that are exempt from environmental assessment. These impacts should be added to those calculated for any added lanes to Hwy 7.</p> <p>d) The world has changed since the study commenced. Gas prices have gone from cheap to a point where people are actively looking for other means of transportation such as walking and cycling, as well as transit.</p> <p>e) Scientists have predicted that weather extremes and severity would increase with increased greenhouse gases and climate change.</p>	<p>b) Comment noted. Many of the factors noted here have been included throughout the EA (Chapter 5 - Alternative Methods of Improving Public Transit, Chapter 7 – Planning and Design Parameters, Chapter 8 – Development and Selection of Preferred Design, and Chapter 10 – Assessment of the Undertaking).</p> <p>c) The widening of Hwy 407 is not included as part of the proposed undertaking and not under the jurisdiction of York Region.</p> <p>d) Comment noted. The undertaking will have a positive effect on improving mobility as noted in Table 10.4-1 of the EA report.</p> <p>e) Comment noted. As noted in Table 10.4-3 of the EA report, the recommended undertaking will have a net positive effect on local and Regional Air Quality.</p>	<p>b) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>c) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>d) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>e) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>

Submitter	Date Received	Issue/comment	Proponent's Response	Status
		<p>f) If we are to implement infrastructure changes to accommodate rapid transit, they must be taken from existing paved surfaces or be in the form of rail. In August there was local flooding in basements in Thornhill and North York. Finch Avenue near Jane Street was washed out at Black Creek. Look again at the calculated impacts of increased river crossings and determine if they are realistic in view of what happened in August.</p> <p><i>Road Capacity</i></p> <p>g) Four lanes of road at capacity is not a signal to add additional lanes of road. Rather they are an indicator for increasing road efficiency by adding more public transit, separated bike lanes and sheltered sidewalks. This is the point at which travel demand is high enough to support these alternative modes of transportation and opportunity to reduce car dependency. Time, not distance, determines how far we go. If travel distances double, traffic volumes double. The above principles are achieved by focusing on people, not cars and to move people and goods, not cars and trucks.</p> <p><i>Infrastructure</i></p> <p>h) First build infrastructure that promotes convenience and safety for pedestrians and cyclists. Provide covered, separated bikeways and sidewalks along major arteries to allow the option of walking and cycling for commuting and doing errands. Provide covered bike lockers for bicycle storage near transit stations and bike racks on transit.</p>	<p>f) Comment noted. As noted in Table 11.3-1 (I.D. #5.1) of the EA report, the Proponent will develop a detailed storm water management plan during the detailed design phase of the proposed undertaking.</p> <p>g) Comment noted. The recommended undertaking is predominately transit related infrastructure (as described in Chapters 9 and 12 of the EA report). Proposed road widening from Lunar Crescent (east of Woodbine Ave) to east of Sciberras Rd is presented in Chapter 13 of the EA report. The Region's Transportation Master Plan (June 2002) includes a multi-modal strategy for dealing with travel demand in York Region to 2031, including significant planned transit infrastructure as well as road improvements.</p> <p>h) Safety and convenient access/mobility were important criteria used in the development of the undertaking (see Tables 10.4-2 and 10.4-4 of the EA report). Figures 9.1-2 to 9.1-10 present typical cross-sections for the transitway that include pedestrian sidewalks on each side of the r.o.w. A conceptual streetscape plan is described in Section 9.1.1 – Transitway Elements. During the development of a detailed streetscape plan and transit station design, specific features such as bicycle storage will be considered.</p>	<p>f) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>g) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>h) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>

Submitter	Date Received	Issue/comment	Proponent's Response	Status
		<p><i>Land Use and Development</i></p> <p>i) Reducing of car use and dependency is achieved by land use that promotes walking and cycling. Change the streetscape first. Compact, mixed-use development reduces car needs. Researchers are examining the connection between community design, physical exercise and transit use, and are finding that pedestrian friendly environments promote walking and the use of transit.</p> <p><i>Conclusion</i></p> <p>j) Expensive infrastructure for rapid transit is unnecessary to get people out of cars and onto buses. For example, the Yonge GO Bus has been well used for decades. When high demand transit is established, then concentrate on rapid transit with its own r.o.w. Transit is well used when there is connectivity to the surrounding community. Unless it is a subway, transit on its own r.o.w. is isolating. With people now actively looking for options to driving, it is an opportune time to present residents with a convenient system of public transit.</p> <p><i>Recommendation</i></p> <p>k) It is imperative that we reduce pollution and car use in the GTA for health and safety of our children and grandchildren. Along Hwy 7, add continuous sidewalks and separated, covered bike paths, street-facing buildings with bike racks, litter receptacles, shade trees and benches. The wide lanes encourage speeding. Take the room for the bike lanes from the existing roadways. Place a treed median down the centre of Hwy 7. Implement changes with little disruption of the environment as possible. Examine Portland Oregon's rapid transit system.</p>	<p>i) As described in Section 9.1.1 – Transitway Elements, a streetscape plan has been developed for the transitway that would be a catalyst for transit-oriented development and attract transit ridership. In addition, as described in Section 12.1.1, York Region is undertaking a number of land use planning initiatives to facilitate development of both the Regional Centres and Corridors with more intensive development supporting transit ridership.</p> <p>j) The analysis and evaluation of Alternatives to the Undertaking is presented in Chapter 3 of the EA report and includes consideration of local transit service improvements and GO Transit improvements. York Region Rapid Transit Corridor Initiatives was selected as the preferred alternative as described in Table 3.2-1 of the EA report.</p> <p>k) Chapter 1 of the EA report sets out the fundamental objectives of the undertaking which encompass many of the recommendations of Ms Boxen. As described in Chapter 9, the recommended undertaking includes a streetscape plan that will attract transit ridership within a pedestrian friendly corridor. As noted in Table 10.4-3, the recommended undertaking will have a net positive effect on local and Regional Air Quality. The expected environmental effects and mitigation are identified in Tables 10.4-1 to 10.4-4 in the EA report.</p>	<p>i) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>j) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p> <p>k) The MOE is satisfied with the response.</p>