

14. PUBLIC AND AGENCY INVOLVEMENT

There are five features that are key to the successful planning under the Environmental Assessment Act. The five features that are described in the “Interim Guidelines on Environmental Assessment Planning and Approval, Ministry of Environment, 1989” are:

- Consultation with affected parties;
- Consideration of reasonable alternatives;
- Consideration of all aspects of the environment (i.e., natural, social, economic, cultural and technical);
- Systematic evaluation of net environmental effects; and
- Clear and complete documentation of the planning process.

The consultation process developed for this study contributes to the achievement of each of these key features. As such an extensive public involvement program was followed during the EA. The study was organized so that interested parties were:

- Informed throughout the study by the use of various communication channels and techniques;
- Involved throughout the study period and as well notified of appropriate milestones;
- Provided access to current information in an efficient manner;
- Provided sufficient time to respond to question and data request; and
- Encouraged to participate in an issue identification and resolution process.



The program ensured that concerns and issues were brought forward early and addressed appropriately in the course of the study. In addition, **Public Consultation Centres** were organized on several occasions for the general public to review and comment on the findings and progress of the study. These were advertised in local newspapers and mail-drop notices. A mailing list, carried over from the ToR preparation, was also maintained and updated during the course of the study.

When appropriate, meetings with specific interest groups were held to deal with localized issues and many formal meetings and presentations were organized with various stakeholders within the Study Area. As well, information regarding the status of the EA Study was available on the Region's website throughout the study.

Since the preparation of the ToR, most of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members have continued their involvement in the EA, although some members have decided not to participate since the limits of the EA Study was set outside of their jurisdiction. Others, even though representing agencies that were outside the reduced study limits, remained on the TAC as York Region still intends to introduce transit priority measures north of the current study limits (i.e., From 19th Avenue to Davis Drive in Newmarket) within their jurisdiction.

Participating technical agencies have continued to be involved during the EA Study and were actively involved in scoping the issues, developing and assessing alternative alignments, and developing mitigating measures for unavoidable impacts. Consultation with agencies was held through formal TAC meetings, site visits, workshops and correspondence.

The public, including the general public, communities, interest groups and property owners (residential/business/other) were offered several opportunities to review the study findings and provide input.

The public had four formal opportunities to participate in the EA Study through Public Consultation Centres (PCCs). In addition, representatives of key interest groups, community associations, business areas and heritage groups have been consulted through workshops, meetings and correspondence.

Technical Advisory Committee and Technical Agencies

A Technical Advisory Committee was organized to facilitate the line of communication between the Project Team and relevant agencies, thereby ensuring a seamless integration of Rapid Transit into the Region. TAC representatives were given the opportunity at all critical milestones to express any concerns their agencies may have with regards to the project. In addition, member's input was sought at various stages throughout the

study and their suggestions and comments integrated into the scope of work. Given the nature of the study, the location of the Study Area, the range of issues and the potential for a high level of community interest and concern, the TAC was comprised of senior staff from the following agencies:

- York Region (including York Region Transit);
- Town of Markham;
- Town of Richmond Hill;
- City of Vaughan;
- City of Toronto;
- TTC;
- GO Transit;
- Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR);
- Ministry of Transportation (MTO);
- Toronto Regional Conservation Authority (TRCA); and
- Ministry of Culture.

The Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch (EAAB) of the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) was asked to participate on the TAC but indicated that it was not their usual policy to participate in TAC meetings. Consequently, separate meetings were held with the MOE - EAAB to keep them informed of the study status and request comments. Meetings with MOE were also held to obtain input on noise and air quality protocols and methodologies.

Also, contact was initially established with CEAA to present the overall York Region Transit study on a program wide basis and to describe the three corridors through which implementation of the transit strategy was going to be undertaken. At this meeting a review of the application of the Federal Environmental Assessment procedures, and requirements and procedures for the screening procedures of “Triggers” under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act was conducted. Finally CEAA was contacted at the final stages of the preparation of the EA to plan for the review of the Report.

During the EA phase, the TAC met on seven occasions. Three of these meetings were held immediately prior to Public Consultation Centres to present to TAC members the material for the upcoming PCCs and obtain their feedback. The four other meetings were held to:

- inform the TAC of the evaluation methodology of the alternatives and seek input from them;
- present the preferred alternative and summarize the rationale for preferring the Highway 7 route; and
- review the draft EA Report and obtain final feedback on the Report prior to submission to MOE.

Copies of the Minutes of the Meetings can be found in **Appendix N**.

Technical Agencies

Key technical agencies were asked to provide input through participation on the TAC. In addition, those technical agencies with a potential interest in the study, including provincial, municipal, and federal agencies, were contacted at key points during the study and requested to provide technical input and to comment on the study findings.

The technical agencies that were contacted included the following (those shown with an asterisk (*) were also on the TAC):

❖ Ministry of Environment Environmental Assessment and Approval Branch Central Region	❖ Ministry of Natural Resources Aurora District* South Central Region
	❖ Ministry of the Solicitor General - OPP
❖ Ministry of Culture Heritage Operations Regional Services Branch	❖ Ministry of Transportation Urban Planning Office Transportation Planning Branch
❖ Ministry of Education York Region District School Board York Region Separate School Board CSD Centre Sud-Ouest CBD Catholique Centre Sud	❖ Ontario Realty Corporation ❖ York Regional Fire Coordinator ❖ York Region Police Chief ❖ CN North America ❖ GO Transit*
❖ Ministry of Health	❖ Rouge Park
❖ York Regional Health Unit	❖ Environment Canada
❖ Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing Office of the Greater Toronto Area Central Municipal services Office	❖ Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency – Ontario Region

The Government Review Team (GRT) for the EA was given an opportunity to provide comments on the Draft EA report. A summary of these comments and the responses to each are included in **Appendix Q**.

14.1 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM

For the purpose of the Highway 7 EA, the public included the general public, community groups, interest groups and property owners. Input from the public was obtained in a variety of ways including:

Public Notices – Several public notices 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 comments. Notices were placed in local newspapers, including the *Markham Economist & Sun*, the *Vaughan Citizen*, and the *Richmond Hill Liberal*, before each *Public Consultation Centre* (the local newspapers cover all households in the Study Area and are a standard avenue for the Region to publish notices and information about these types of project). In addition, for the third PCC, announcements and information material were mailed and delivered to interest groups and community associations to all addresses along the proposed rapid transit corridor.

Public Consultation Centres (PCCs) – PCCs were held at four key stages during the study, including a final PCC after approval of the revised unscoped EA Terms of Reference. At each point, PCCs were held in three locations that provided geographic coverage along the 45 km Highway 7 rapid transit corridor. A fourth PCC location was held during the third and fourth rounds of consultation to accommodate local interest groups.

Project Website – The dedicated York Region Rapid Transit Website (www.yorkinmotion.com and subsequently www.vivayork.com) provided ongoing opportunity for the public to acquire information about the project, contact the Region and the Consortium team, and provide comments.

Region’s Website – During the length of the study, current and updated information about the project was available on the Region’s website (<http://www.region.york.on.ca/Services/Transit/default+Public+Transit.htm>). The Website 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.

14.1.1 Public Consultation Centres

Public Consultation Centres were an important feedback instrument throughout the study duration. Using the format of an Open House, they allowed the public to keep up-to-date on the proposed design alternatives and recommendations for each main phase of the Project. During each PCC, the public was invited to review a detailed series of display boards, ask questions to team members and provide written and verbal comments. The full Public Consultation Centre reports are presented in **Appendix N**. The main highlights of each round of Meetings were as follows:

❖ **First round of Public Consultation Centres**

The purpose of the first PCC was to familiarize the public with the YRTP program, to provide the public with an opportunity to review and provide input regarding the collection of background data and to summarize the findings of the previously completed Need and Justification Study. This study included the analysis and evaluation of alternative transportation

solutions. In addition to other information, the three routes identified in the ToR were displayed and the public was asked to provide feedback on the relative opportunities/challenges that each of these routes would present as well as any specific concerns or preferences. The first round of Public Consultation Centres was held in three locations:

Where	When?
Markville Mall, Town of Markham	Thursday, February 6, 2003 (2:30 pm to 8:30 pm)
Hillcrest Mall, Town of Richmond Hill	Friday, February 7, 2003 (2:30 pm to 8:30 pm)
Woodbridge Community Centre, City of Vaughan	Wednesday, February 12, 2003 (2:30 pm to 8:30 pm)

It should be noted that the second location at the Hillcrest Mall was a joint PCC with the Yonge Street EA presenting its second PCC material.

The material on display consisted of presentation boards, YRTP information banners, a continuous slide presentation and project-specific fact sheets. Upon arrival, attendees were asked to sign a visitor “sign-in” sheet. Examples of the material presented are included in **Appendix N**.

A total of forty-four (44) people signed the visitor’s “sign-in” sheet at the February 6th PCC. Since the PCC was held in a shopping mall environment, it was more difficult to control the signing process. By actual count a total of 178 people reviewed some of the information available at the PCC. Of this total, 25% signed in and reviewed most of the information available, 66% reviewed most of the information available but did not sign in, and 34% reviewed the banner information located at the entry to the display area and the slide show which was visible from the entry to the display area but did not enter the display area or sign in.

A total of eight-four (84) people signed the “sign-in” sheet at the February 7th PCC. This was a joint presentation with the second PCC for the Yonge Street EA that attracted significant pass-by interest. It is conservatively estimated that there may have been at least 200 people who viewed some or all the display and pick-up hand-out material but did not sign in.

A total of seven (7) people signed the “sign-in” sheet at the February 12th Open House. Since there are no enclosed shopping malls in the Woodbridge area with areas for displays such as this, there was virtually no pass-by interest. As a result, those who came were all interested in learning more about the project.

A “Comment Sheet” box was available at all three venues for participants to submit their comments on the project and on the presentation material. In addition to numerous verbal comments, eighteen (18) written comment sheets were completed and submitted (see **Appendix N**). The overall response to the material presented at the PCC appeared to be very

supportive with the majority of participants supporting Rapid Transit along Highway 7 and in the Region. The most common comments/concerns expressed verbally by the participants at the first PCC were:

- Support for a Rapid Transit system along Highway 7;
- The opinion that reduced travelling times, passenger comfort, proximity to origin or destination, fare affordability and general safety were the most important factors to a successful RT system; and
- Concern that the approval and implementation will be delayed.

❖ **Second round of Public Consultation Centres**

The purpose of the second PCC was to review and provide input regarding the comparative assessment of the alternatives, the determination of the preferred undertaking, potential environmental effects, and proposed mitigating measures, and to obtain feedback on specific concerns or preferences. The second round of Public Consultation Centres was held:

Where	When?
Hillcrest Mall, Town of Richmond Hill	Thursday, April 24, 2003 (3:00 pm to 8:00 pm)
Chancellor Community Centre, Vaughan	Friday, April 25, 2003 (3:00 pm to 8:00 pm)
Markville Mall, Town of Markham	Saturday, April 26, 2003 (3:00 pm to 8:00 pm)

The material on display consisted of presentation boards, YRTP information banners, a continuous slide presentation and project-specific fact sheets. Upon arrival, attendees were asked to sign a visitor “sign-in” sheet. Examples of the material presented are included in **Appendix N**.

A total of forty-three (43) people signed the visitor’s “sign-in” sheet at the April 24th PCC, seventeen (17) people signed at the April 25th PCC and a total of sixty-four (64) people signed at the April 26th PCC. Based on previous documented experience at these or similar venues for this project, the total attendance at the three locations may have been in excess of 400.

A “Comment Sheet” box was available at all venues for participants to submit their comments on the project and on the presentation material. In addition to verbal comments, eight (8) written comment sheets were completed and submitted in the “Comment Sheet” box at the venue on Thursday, another three (3) comment sheets were submitted at Friday’s session and eight (8) comments were submitted on the Saturday session. The overall response to the material presented at the PCC appeared to be very supportive with the majority of participants supporting Rapid Transit along Highway 7 and in the Region in general.

The most frequent comments/concerns expressed by the participants at the second PCC were:

- The confirmation of a general support for a Rapid Transit system along Highway 7;
- The confirmation from the first PCC that fast travelling speeds, passenger comfort, overall convenience, fare affordability and general safety were the most important factors to a successful RT system; and
- Suggestions that more parking (Park-and-Ride facilities) should be provided around main intersections in the vicinity of the transitway stations.

❖ **Third round of Public Consultation Centres**

The purpose of this third PCC was to present to the public the preferred route for a median transitway and describe its main characteristics as the recommended undertaking. The third round of Public Consultation Centres was held:

Where	When?
Hillcrest Mall, Town of Richmond Hill	Thursday, September 18, 2003 (3:00 pm to 8:00 pm)
Markville Mall, Town of Markham	Friday, September 19, 2003 (3:00 pm to 8:00 pm)
The Promenade, Thornhill	Saturday, September 20, 2003 (3:00 pm to 8:00 pm)
Rosemount Community Centre	Tuesday, September 23, 2003 (6:00 pm to 9:00 pm)

The material on display consisted of presentation boards, YRTP information banners, a continuous slide presentation and project-specific fact sheets explaining the reasons for retaining the Highway 7 alignment and a general description of the transitway. The Region of York also used the opportunity offered by this PCC to present a series of Planning Policy boards that were in support of transit related development within the corridor. Upon arrival, attendees were asked to sign a visitor “sign-in” sheet. **Appendix N** contains the record of the material presented.

A total of 176 people signed the “sign-in” sheet at all four PCCs. Given the “mall” type of environment for three of the four meetings, it was difficult to insure that all the visitors would sign in. However, based on the number of information sheets that were taken by the public, it is estimated that in excess of 400 visitors actually consulted the exhibits on those days. A total of forty-seven (47) people signed the visitor’s “sign-in” sheet at Thursday’s meeting, six-five (65) signed-in at Friday’s PCC, fifty-three (53) signed-in at Saturday’s meeting and eleven (11) on the Tuesday evening meeting.

As it was the case during the first two rounds of PCCs, a “Comment Sheet” box was available at all four venues for participants to submit their comments on the project. In addition to verbal comments, twenty-seven (27) written comment sheets were completed and submitted. The questionnaire, asked four questions to the public. The most frequent

comments/concerns expressed by the participants at this third round of Public Consultation Centres were:

- The retained main option along Highway 7 and the recommended route alternatives along the corridor were supported by a majority of the participants;
- Because this third round of PCCs dealt with a more specific alignment for the transitway, several landowners or area residents were concerned with potential land acquisition on their property or of the property where their building is located; and
- Several area residents expressed concerns that the transitway would increase local traffic within and along the Highway 7 Corridor.

❖ **Final round of Public Consultation Centres**

A final series of PCCs was convened after the July 2004 approval of the revised ToR for the EA study. These PCCs, held on the dates below provided an opportunity for the public to review the findings of all steps in the EA process including an overview of the findings of the analysis of both alternatives to the undertaking (alternative transportation solutions) and alternative methods of carrying out the undertaking (routes and technologies). It should be noted that it was a joint PCC with the Yonge Street EA. The fourth location was held to focus on a community that may be affected by the Highway 7 Road Widening component of the EA.

Where	When?
Promenade Mall, City of Vaughan	Thursday, Sept 9, 2004 (from 3:00 pm to 9:00 pm)
Hillcrest Mall, Town of Richmond Hill	Saturday, Sept 11, 2004 (from 12:30 pm to 6:00 pm)
Markville Mall, Town of Markham	Friday, Sept. 17, 2004 (from 3:00 pm to 9:00 pm)
Markham Civic Centre, Town of Markham (to focus on the community that may be affected by the Highway 7 Road Widening component)	Thursday, October 28, 2004 (from 4:00pm to 9:00pm)

Again, the material on display consisted of presentation boards, YRTP information banners, a continuous slide presentation and project-specific fact sheets explaining the components of the Highway 7 as well as Yonge Street transitway designs and the environmental benefits of rapid transit service. In addition, copies of the detailed transitway alignment plan and profile drawings shown in **Chapter 9** were available for review by attendees.

Attendance at these PCCs exceeded 200, with 110 participants signing-in. Attendees included both those who were familiar with the project from previous PCCs and members of the public who were unaware of the project proposals. Some of the former attended to confirm that mitigation

discussed at prior meetings was being incorporated in the recommended design. Representative comments made by attendees included the following:

- Rapid transit in the form of a Yonge Subway extension or light rail service to Richmond Hill should be pursued;
- Reduce volume of traffic on roads by providing a fast, frequent service with convenient stations;
- Consider visual impact of transit facilities on the streetscape, respect natural features, minimize impacts and avoid a “barrier effect” between adjacent communities;
- Include attractive public spaces to encourage pedestrians and transit use;
- Provide convenient links to other existing transit services and routes such as GO Rail;
- Rapid transit is a good idea and much needed;
- Consider placing transit in the curb lanes with far side stops to make access safer and more convenient for pedestrians;
- The present frequency of GO service does not warrant a diversion from Highway 7 to the Unionville GO Station;
- Benchmark the top 10 European cities with similar demographics and climate to optimize the York Region package; and
- Concerns that the widening component should have been extended to Kennedy Road addressing the railway level-crossing with an underpass.

❖ Record of Public Consultation Centres

The record of the Public Consultation Centres described above is included in **Appendix N** and contains copies of comments received from the general public and examples of responses by the Region.

14.1.2 Facts Sheets

Over twenty (20) different Facts Sheets were prepared as part of the YRTP’s larger communications program. The Facts Sheets presented information on a wide range of topics including specific information about the Consortium, the proposed technologies, as well as more general information relating to the environmental, transportation and economic benefits of the Plan. The facts sheets produced during the project covered topics such as follows:

- What is Rapid Transit?;
- What is York Region’s Rapid Transit Plan?;
- Bring Rapid Transit to York Region: A Three-Phase Approach;
- Sustainability and Smart Growth;
- Mobility and Connectivity;

- Industry and Economy;
- Technology and Innovation;
- Integrated Family of Services Increases Convenience of Public Transit;
- Rapid Transit Corridors will Link Four Urban Centres within York Region;
- The Environmental Assessment Process;
- York Region’s Rapid Transit Plan Technical Advisory Committee;
- York Region and York Consortium;
- Rapid Transit is Key to Smart Growth;
- Transportation Benefits of York Region’s Rapid Transit Plan;
- Environmental Benefits of York Region’s Rapid Transit Plan;
- Financial and Economic Benefits of York Region’s Rapid Transit Plan;
- Innovation and Technology Benefits of York Region’s Rapid Transit Plan;
- York Region is the Fastest Growing Municipality in the Greater Toronto Area;
- Transportation Gridlock Threatens Quality of Life;
- York Region’s Rapid Transit Plan Improves Inter-Regional Connections;
- Measuring the Effectiveness of York Region’s Rapid Transit Plan; and
- Quick Start will Speed Implementation of York Region’s Rapid Transit Plan.

Other specific Facts Sheets, tailored to each of the Public Consultation Centres, were also produced during the length of the study.

14.1.3 York Rapid Transit Program Website

A comprehensive Website was created for the purpose of informing the public on the project progress. This Website, www.yorkinmotion.com has now been replaced by the www.vivayork.com site which contains a link to a summary of the material presented on the original site. Under the general heading of *Creating Transit for Tomorrow...Today*, the original site offered an extensive list of topics to consult under a number of headings, including:

- An explanation of the **Quick Start Project** which will introduce new service improvements, roadways modifications, stations, vehicles and amenities that work together to bring rapid transit to York Region in the short term.
- A description of the **Improvements** that will be brought about by the transitway project through an explanation of the *Planning and Environmental Assessment process*, the *Family of services* that will be offered, the *Proposed routes*, the *Expected benefits* and the *Timing* for implementation of the various components of the project.
- A general section introducing the basic **Planning** considerations and documents supporting the Rapid Transit Program in York Region.

Among those, a brief presentation of the Smart Growth approach with relevant links to the Ontario Smart Growth website, a section introducing and linking to the York Region’s Transportation Master Plan and current information pertaining to the EA processes for the proposed three main rapid transit corridors (Highway 7 and Vaughan North-South Link Transitway EA Study Markham North-South Link Transitway EA Study, Yonge Street Transitway EA Study).

- A section on all **Engineering** considerations including preliminary design, detailed design and construction general schedules. This section was designed to be easily accessible to the general public.
- An important section on **Getting Involved** inviting the public and community/interest groups to regularly consult *Public meeting notices*, *request presentations* or *book a speaker* in the context of the project.
- A general description of the **Public-Private Partnership** that was developed to create the *York Consortium*.
- A **What’s News** section providing links and excerpts of recent headlines and Press releases pertaining to the project.
- A **Library** of Planning reports and other relevant documentation that could assist the public in better understanding the project and assessing its effect on the community.
- A **Talk to us** link provided visitors to the site a method to offer comments, request information and add their names to a master mailing list.

14.2 STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION

First Nations Consultation

The Ontario Secretariat for Aboriginal Affairs (OSAA) received a copy of the Draft EA as part of the Government Review Team for this study. Following a review of the Draft EA, OSAA noted that there does not appear to be any land claims in the vicinity of the project. In addition, OSAA noted that the EA may be of interest to the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation and recommended that contact be made with them.

OSAA recommended that contact be made with organizations that represent a number of First Nations to inquire whether there are any First Nations who may be interested in the project and wish to provide comments. The two organizations identified by OSAA are the Association

of Iroquois and Allied Indians, and the Anishinabek Region/Union of Ontario Indians. The Association of Iroquois Indians recommended contacting the Six Nations of the Grand River. The First Nations that encompass the southeast region within the Anishinabek Region/Union of Ontario Indians were contacted to see if they have a potential interest in the study. These First Nations include Alderville First Nation, Beausoleil First Nation, Algonquins of Pikwakanagan First Nation, Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation, Curve Lake First Nation, Mississauga's of Scugog Island First Nation and Moose Deer Point First Nation.

OSAA also suggested that Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) be contacted since the Government of Canada sometimes receives claims that Ontario does not. Three different branches of INAC were contacted, namely the Comprehensive Claims, Specific Claims and Litigation Management and Resolution Branches. Study Area maps were provided for review and information on any First Nations that may have an interest in the EA was requested.

The Comprehensive Claims Branch of INAC noted that there are currently no comprehensive claims within the Study Area.

The Specific Claims Branch of INAC noted that the Study Area is located within the area delineated by the Toronto Purchase specific claim which involves the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation.

The Litigation Management and Resolution Branch of INAC noted a case involving the 1923 Williams Treaties which is currently in litigation. The First Nations involved as part of these Treaties and that may have an interest in the EA are the following: Alderville First Nation, Beausoleil First Nation, Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nations, Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation, Chippewas of Mnjikaning First Nation, Hiawatha First Nation and Curve Lake First Nation. Some of the First Nations that fall within the 1923 William Treaties are part of the Anishinabek Region/Union of Ontario Indians organization.

The First Nations listed above have been contacted to determine their interest in this EA, if any. The status of this contact is listed in **Table 14.2-1**.

Other Stakeholder Consultations

During the course of the EA, the study team consulted with several owners of property, either developed or in the process of being developed, along the routes under study. These consultations took the form of meetings, exchange of draft options analysis material and attendance at presentations. Examples of project locations where these consultations were conducted included:

**Table 14.2-1
First Nations Contacted**

First Nation	Response to Contact
1. Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation	Would like to receive a copy of the EA.
2. Curve Lake First Nation	Do not require a copy of the EA. A notice of submission will be sent.
3. Alderville First Nation	Would like to receive a copy of the EA.
4. Beausoleil First Nation	Would like to receive a copy of the EA.
5. Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation	Do not require a copy of the EA. A notice of submission will be sent.
6. Mississauga's of Scugog Island First Nation	Would like to receive a copy of the EA.
7. Hiawatha First Nation	Do not require a copy of the EA. A notice of submission will be sent.
8. Six Nations of the Grand River	Would like to receive a copy of the EA.
9. Algonquins of Pikwakanagan First Nation	Do not require a copy of the EA. A notice of submission will be sent.
10. Chippewas of Mnjikaning (Rama) First Nation	Response not available. A notice of submission will be sent.
11. Moose Deer Point First Nation	Response not available. A notice of submission will be sent.

- The link between Highway 7 and Markham Town Centre involving assessment of alignments on either Warden Avenue or South Town Centre Boulevard and the IBM property.
- The alignment along Centre Street in Vaughan for consideration of access to adjacent commercial property.
- Bathurst Street and Centre Street to provide intersection requirements to developers of adjacent vacant land.
- The alignment along Highway 7 between Rodick Road and Warden Avenue for discussion of right-of-way requirements and access locations with developers of adjacent property.
- Markham East for consideration of alignment options and right-of-way requirements in Cornell.
- Markham Town Centre for evaluation of alignment options and right-of-way requirements across the GO Stouffville Line and through the planned Town Centre development.
- Jane Street in front of the Beechwood Cemetery to address cemetery access issues.
- Highway 7 at Highway 404 to identify effects of transitway options on the proposed Seneca College campus.

General Presentations

The Region's general communications program included making presentations to a wide variety of stakeholders, opinion makers and community groups. While the EA Study was not usually the focus of these presentations, it was included as a key element of the overall rapid transit initiative in most of the presentations. Among the groups that received a presentation during the EA consultation period were:

- Local Boards of Trade;
- Canadian Urban Transit Association;
- Federal GTA Caucus;
- GO Transit;
- Toronto Strategic Transportation Planning Committee;
- Regional Council and all 3 local municipal Councils;
- Transportation committees of local municipalities
- Study teams for concurrent land use and streetscaping studies in Vaughan (Steeles Avenue and VCC) and Markham (Highway 7)
- MPs and MPPs;
- MP Town Hall meeting;
- Major land owners and developers;
- Large employers in the corridor;
- York University representatives;
- Markham-Stouffville Hospital representatives; and
- The Cornell community.

14.3 MUNICIPAL APPROVALS

At important decision points in the study, formal presentations were made to the Steering Committee and Regional Council to summarize the assessment of alternatives, the recommended designs and major recommendations of the study, including the final submission of this report. These presentations were also made to councils and committees of the City of Vaughan, the Town of Markham and Town of Richmond Hill.