

APPENDIX H

Comments/Responses During Final ToR Review

Table 1. Government Review Team Comment Summary Table

Proposal: Teston Road Area Transportation Improvements – Terms of Reference

Proponent: Regional Municipality of York

| Submitter | Summary of Comments | Proponent’s Response | Status |
|--|---|---|---|
| Provincial Agencies | | | |
| Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNR) | <p><u>General</u></p> <p>The Term of Reference (ToR) does not include any analysis of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP) and the policies contained therein that may have implications on this EA.</p> <p>The ORMCP is an ecologically-based plan which provides land use and resource management direction for land and water for areas within the Moraine. The unopened road allowance for Teston Road is located within an area designated as <i>Natural Core</i> in the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP). This land use designation represents the highest level of policy constraint in the ORMCP. The study area includes a large, mature significant woodland, earth and life science Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI), provincially significant wetlands and unevaluated wetlands. These features would meet the definition of <i>Key Natural Heritage Features</i> under the ORMCP and are afforded a high level of policy protection.</p> <p>Please note the following excerpt from Section 41 of the ORMCP dealing with transportation, infrastructure and utilities:</p> <p><i>(2) An application for the development of infrastructure in or</i></p> | <p><u>Previous Response</u></p> <p><i>An analysis cannot be completed at this time as the preferred alternative is unknown. This will be completed in the IEA. It has been noted in section 4.3 (p.20, 5th paragraph) that parts of the study area are subject to the ORMCP and it is noted several times throughout the ToR that Federal, Provincial, Conservation Authority and Municipal legislation, plans, policies, guidelines, consideration and planning objectives must be used during the IEA.</i></p> <p><i>As per August 17, 2018 meeting and August 30, 2018 teleconference the following changes to the</i></p> | <p>Have added the sentence (p. 20, 5th paragraph, before last sentence) “<i>The Provincial Policy Statement (2014) contains policies that protect Ontario’s natural heritage and water resources.</i>”</p> |

| Submitter | Summary of Comments | Proponent's Response | Status |
|-----------|---|--|--------|
| | <p><i>on land in a Natural Linkage Area shall not be approved unless,</i></p> <p><i>(a) the need for the project has been demonstrated and there is no reasonable alternative; and</i></p> <p><i>(b) the applicant demonstrates that the following requirements will be satisfied, to the extent that is possible while also meeting all applicable safety standards:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. The area of construction disturbance will be kept to a minimum.</i> <i>2. Right of way widths will be kept to the minimum that is consistent with,</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>i. meeting other objectives such as stormwater management and erosion and sediment control, and</i> <i>ii. locating as much infrastructure uses within a single corridor as possible.</i> <i>3. The project will allow for wildlife movement.</i> <i>4. Lighting will be focused downwards and away from Natural Core Areas.</i> <i>5. The planning, design and construction practices adopted will keep any adverse effects on the ecological integrity of the Plan Area to a minimum.</i> | <p><i>ToR have been made:</i></p> <p><i>Section 4.2.1, p. 20, 5th paragraph have added "The Provincial Policy Statement (2014) contains policies that protect Ontario's natural heritage and water resources." And added the following text to the last sentence "and should any alternative be within the ORMCP a full analysis of the proposal shall be completed against all applicable policies in the ORMCP."</i></p> <p><i>Section 5.2, p. 37 deleted the first and third bullet points and replaced with a paragraph below the bulleted list that states "The project team will also adhere to all relevant Federal, Provincial, Conservation Authority and Municipal legislation, plans, policies, and guidelines including the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (2017), the Greenbelt Plan (2017), Provincial Policy Statement (2014), and Growth Plan for</i></p> | |

| Submitter | Summary of Comments | Proponent's Response | Status |
|-----------|--|---|--------|
| | <p>...</p> <p><i>(3) An application for the development of infrastructure in or on land in a Natural Core Area shall not be approved unless the applicant demonstrates that,</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>(a) the requirements of subsection (2) have been met;</i> <i>(b) the project does not include and will not in the future require a highway interchange or a transit or railway station in a Natural Core Area; and</i> <i>(c) the project is located as close to the edge of the Natural Core Area as possible.</i> <p><i>(4) Except as permitted in subsection (5), with respect to land in a key natural heritage feature or a key hydrologic feature, the development of new infrastructure and the upgrading or extension of existing infrastructure, including the opening of a road within an unopened road allowance, is prohibited.</i></p> <p><i>(5) Infrastructure may be permitted to cross a key natural heritage feature or a key hydrologic feature if the applicant demonstrates that,</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>(a) the need for the project has been demonstrated and there is no reasonable alternative;</i> <i>(b) the planning, design and construction practices adopted will keep any adverse effects on the ecological integrity of the Plan Area to a minimum;</i> | <p><i>the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017)."</i></p> <p><i>Section 6.3, p. 42 the following bullet point was added:</i></p> <p><i>"Adhere to all relevant Federal, Provincial, Conservation Authority and Municipal legislation, plans, policies, and guidelines including the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (2017), the Greenbelt Plan (2017), Provincial Policy Statement (2014), and Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017);"</i></p> | |

| Submitter | Summary of Comments | Proponent's Response | Status |
|-----------|---|----------------------|--------|
| | <p><i>(c) the design practices adopted will maintain, and where possible improve or restore, key ecological and recreational linkages, including the trail system referred to in section 39;</i></p> <p><i>(d) the landscape design will be adapted to the circumstances of the site and use native plant species as much as possible, especially along rights of way; and</i></p> <p><i>(e) the long-term landscape management approaches adopted will maintain, and where possible improve or restore, the health, diversity, size and connectivity of the key natural heritage feature or a key hydrologic feature.</i></p> <p><i>(6) Service and utility trenches for infrastructure shall be planned, designed and constructed so as to keep disruption of the natural groundwater flow to a minimum.</i></p> <p>MNRF staff notes that the infrastructure policies in the ORMCP address both siting/route selection as well as construction design considerations. Section 41 requires the applicant to demonstrate “there is no reasonable alternative” when crossing a key natural heritage feature. Further, the policies specifically address unopened road allowances. It should also be noted that the subject area is located within an area designated as a Landform Conservation Area as defined in the ORMCP. Based on the foregoing, the ToR should include a full analysis of the proposal against all applicable policies in the ORMCP.</p> | | |

| Submitter | Summary of Comments | Proponent's Response | Status |
|---|---|--|-------------------|
| Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) | <p><u>General</u></p> <p>MNRF should be contacted to determine if there is any additional inventory work required within the study area (e.g., Feature delineation). Further, MNRF would appreciate the opportunity to undertake a site visit(s) to better inform our review to the proposal.</p> | The ToR commits to consulting with agencies during the IEA. | No Change to ToR |
| Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) | <p><u>General</u></p> <p>MNRF would appreciate an opportunity to meet with the proponent to review proposed inventory work related to species-at-risk to ensure it is consistent with requirements of the Endangered Species Act (ESA).</p> | Agreed, this commitment for the IEA is noted in Section 4.2.3, page 30. | No Change to ToR |
| Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) | <p><u>Section 4</u></p> <p>Page 27, second paragraph - mentions "These forest and wetland habitats can be expected to be sensitive to encroachment, however, current land use practices have likely already had impacts to ecological features. In addition, the current land use practices have already fragmented these features on the landscape". MNRF staff are of the opinion that the study area contains a number of very high quality natural heritage features and demonstrates a high degree of ecological function. The study area is located in a major core area of the southern Oak Ridges Moraine.</p> | Deleted the following wording "..., however, current land use practices have likely already had impacts to ecological features. In addition, the current land use practices have already fragmented these features on the landscape" | ToR revised |
| Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) | <p><u>Section 4</u></p> <p>Table 4-1 Potential Environmental Effects – Should also specifically mention: permanent affects such as lighting, increased traffic, increased noise and changes to fish and</p> | Lighting effects can be added Natural Environment under Table 4-1. Noise and wildlife passage is already addressed in Table 4-1. As | Updated Table 4-1 |

| Submitter | Summary of Comments | Proponent's Response | Status |
|--|---|--|------------------|
| | wildlife passage. | the one of the objectives of the study is to provide additional transportation capacity, traffic should be reduced not increased. | |
| Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNR) | <p><u>Section 5</u></p> <p>Given the policy direction in section 41 of the ORMCP around the development of infrastructure on the Moraine, evaluation methods should give substantially more weight to natural heritage considerations than typical weighting exercises that seek to “balance” economic, social and environmental considerations.</p> | <p>The evaluation methodology proposed in Section 5 notes that “additional evaluation methodologies may be utilized to ensure that the nature and magnitude of potential effects (of significant community and/or environmental value) are identified and mitigated.”</p> <p>The proposed reasoned argument method allows for the relative significance of the effects to be considered thus providing a clear traceable decision making supported by stakeholder input to ensure that issues, concerns and the magnitude of potential effects are identified and mitigated.</p> | No Change to ToR |
| Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNR) | <p><u>Section 6</u></p> <p>Section 6.3 should include specific reference to the ORMCP policies as a guiding principle for consideration in the considerations to generate alternatives.</p> | Agreed, where the alternative is within the ORMC Plan area. See revisions made per the General comment above. | ToR Revised |

| Submitter | Summary of Comments | Proponent's Response | Status |
|--|--|---|--|
| Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNR) | <p><u>Section 6</u></p> <p>The ORMCP also provides guides on design considerations for infrastructure that should also be acknowledged in the Terms of Reference (e.g., mitigating lighting, wildlife passage, enhancing ecological integrity). These will need to be incorporated into the development of alternative methods.</p> | <p>We are not predisposing that infrastructure is going to be built in the ORM at this time. It doesn't really fit in Section 6 (too specific). Will be applied as applicable during the IEA.</p> <p>Section 6.5, p.47, second paragraph does note that <i>"Approval requirements, mitigation or compensation measures and enhancement opportunities will be addressed with agencies, conservation authorities, municipalities, Indigenous Communities and other stakeholders at this study stage."</i></p> | <p>Added to second bullet point in Section 6.3 (e.g. "Consider relevant government policies and plans including the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (2017), the Greenbelt Plan (2017), Provincial Policy Statement (2014), Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017))</p> |
| Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNR) | <p><u>Section 7</u></p> <p>Terms of Reference Commitments and Monitoring should incorporate requirements established in Section 41 of the ORMCP. These include requirements to improve or restore ecological linkages using native plants, adopt long-term landscape management approaches, etc.</p> | <p>This is too specific for this section. Section 7 is consistent with the MECP Code of Practice for Preparing and Reviewing ToRs Requirements The ToR Acknowledges that part of the study area is subject to the requirements of Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (2017) (refer to Sections 4.2.1, 4.2.3, Figure 4-3, Appendix</p> | <p>No Change to ToR</p> |

| Submitter | Summary of Comments | Proponent's Response | Status |
|--|---|---|-------------------------|
| Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNR) | <p><u>Section 11</u></p> <p>Given the number of species at risk, it is likely that the undertaking will require one of more authorizations pursuant to the Endangered Species Act (ESA). MNR recommends the consulting team contact ministry staff to address potential ESA requirements early on in the EA process to ensure these approval processes are harmonized to the extent possible.</p> | <p>A).</p> <p>The ToR commits to consulting with agencies during the IEA.</p> | <p>No Change to ToR</p> |
| Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) Source Protection Programs Branch | <p>The Teston Road project occurs in the Toronto and Region Source Protection Area and is therefore subject to the CTC Source Protection Plan. In mapping the area on the Source Protection Information Atlas, it was found that the study area intersects HVAs as well as wellhead protection areas for water quantity (WHPA-Q) with a moderate stress level, as identified as per the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>Within the WHPA-Q, any future water takings that remove water from the aquifer without returning it to the same aquifer, as well as activities that reduce groundwater recharge, would be a significant drinking water and subject to the water quantity policies included in the CTC Source Protection Plan. Within areas defined as HVAs, any moderate and low threat policies included in the Source Protection Plan apply. The proponent should contact the source protection authority for assistance with determining which policies apply and how they may need to be addressed through the undertaking.</p> <p>The Terms of Reference for the Teston Road project does mention source protection in a number of areas and also identifies the intent to consider potential impacts on surface</p> | <p>To be addressed during the IEA stage.</p> | <p>No Change to ToR</p> |

| Submitter | Summary of Comments | Proponent's Response | Status |
|---|---|---|------------------|
| | <p>and groundwater in general. The proponent should also consult with the municipality's water and wastewater department as well as the source protection authority, as there could be plans to establish <i>new</i> or make changes to existing municipal residential drinking water projects that would result in new or changing vulnerable areas that would need to be considered.</p> <p>Furthermore, any private or non-municipal drinking water systems should be identified and considered during the undertaking as well. Evaluation of impacts to these sources of water is appropriate, including assessing whether any of the activities undertaken during construction or operation of any final preferred solution(s) could impact sources of drinking water. Including a discussion of any potential impact on other sources of drinking water and proposed mitigation measures in the Environmental Assessment report is recommended. The source protection authority can provide proponents with assistance in determining whether an activity associated with the construction or operation of the project may be considered a drinking water threat as per the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.</p> | | |
| Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) Central Region | <p><u>General</u></p> <p>There is no specific commitment to undertake a hydrogeological study – this should be committed to.</p> | Groundwater is a proposed evaluation factor for Alternative Methods as noted in Tables 6-1 and 6-2 and Appendix A, therefore a Hydrogeological study will be undertaken. As noted in Section 4.2.3, detailed natural environmental investigations will be | No Change to ToR |

| Submitter | Summary of Comments | Proponent's Response | Status |
|---|--|--|------------------|
| | | undertaken and the scope of these investigations will be developed prior to initiation of the IEA and will be based on discussions with the regulatory agencies. Also, as noted in Section 6.4.1 the necessary technical studies will be undertaken to assess the potential effects. | |
| Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) Central Region | <p><u>General</u></p> <p>There is no specific commitment to prepare a stormwater management strategy/report for the preferred alternative – this should be committed to.</p> | Depending on the preferred alternative selected during the IEA, a stormwater management strategy/report will be prepared as appropriate. | No change to ToR |
| Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) Central Region | <p><u>Section 2.1</u></p> <p>The sentence following the third paragraph is missing text, as it states "shows the designated urban areas within York Region from the TMP" and should state "Figure 2-2 shows the designated urban areas within York Region from the TMP."</p> | Agreed, ToR revised to state "Figure 2-2 shows the designated urban areas within York Region from the TMP." | ToR Revised |
| Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) Central Region | <p><u>Section 4.2.1.</u></p> <p>In response to our draft ToR comments, the proponent responded that a statement was added indicating that the IEA is to reference the PPS (2014) policies and it is to describe how the project is consistent with these policies. This statement was not added to the final ToR.</p> | Agreed. Statement has been added to Section 4.2.1. | ToR Revised |

| Submitter | Summary of Comments | Proponent's Response | Status |
|---|--|---|------------------|
| Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) Central Region | <p><u>Section 4.2.3.</u></p> <p>There is no discussion of the existing groundwater environment. A description of the existing groundwater environment should be included in the IEA.</p> | <p>Groundwater is a proposed evaluation factor for Alternative Methods as noted in Tables 6-1 and 6-2 and Appendix A, therefore a Hydrogeological study will be undertaken. As noted in Section 4.2.3, detailed natural environmental investigations will be undertaken and the scope of these investigations will be developed prior to initiation of the IEA and will be based on discussions with the regulatory agencies. Also, as noted in Section 6.4.1 the necessary technical studies will be undertaken to assess the potential effects.</p> | No Change to ToR |
| Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) Central Region | <p><u>Section 4.3</u></p> <p>We note that a review of the existing source water protection conditions and any impacts shall be reviewed and documented during the IEA. In order to determine if this project is occurring within a vulnerable area, proponents can use this mapping tool: http://www.applications.ene.gov.on.ca/swp/en/index.php. The mapping tool will also provide a link to the appropriate source protection plan in order to identify what policies may be applicable in the vulnerable area. For further information on the</p> | <p>Agree, this will need to be completed during the IEA.</p> | No Change to ToR |

| Submitter | Summary of Comments | Proponent's Response | Status |
|--|---|--|----------------------------|
| | <p>maps or source protection plan policies which may relate to their project, we advise that the proponent must contact the appropriate source protection authority. The contact for this project is Jennifer Stephens at jstephens@trca.on.ca or (416) 661-6600 x5568. The results of that consultation should be documented within the IEA and all correspondence should be included in the consultation record.</p> | | |
| <p>Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) Central Region</p> | <p><u>Appendices</u></p> <p>Under Appendix A, 1.3 Groundwater, Data Source: It is unclear what is meant by "Groundwater studies funded by the MOECC". Please explain.</p> | <p>This general reference has been deleted as it is a duplication of what is specifically listed below in the same section of the table.</p> | <p>ToR Revised</p> |
| <p>Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) Client Services and Permissions Branch</p> | <p><i>Comment: June 13, 2018:</i> Issues were raised during the meetings and teleconference between the proponent and the Indigenous communities that are not summarized in the main body of the ToR (e.g., Section 9) or in the Consultation Record, except for in Appendix G – Agency Meeting Minutes, which is not a logical place for the reader to find these comments. It is the expectation of this reviewer that key issues raised by Indigenous communities be summarized in the main body of the ToR and that the Consultation Record clearly identify all issues raised by Indigenous communities and how they are addressed or resolved (how have comments informed the ToR? e.g., were any sub-factors, criteria, rationale or data sources for the evaluation of alternative methods added, revised or removed because of Indigenous input?). It should also be noted that the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation is in the meeting minutes for the July 11, 2017 meeting; but this is not reflected</p> | <p><i>Response to June 13 Comment:</i> Agreed. Include summary of consultation with Indigenous Communities only.</p> <p><i>Response to Sept 13 Comment on Final Amended ToR:</i> A summary of all the concerns noted by the Indigenous Communities (including those comments/concerns noted in meetings) have been added to Section 9 of the ToR with our response</p> | <p>Amended ToR Revised</p> |

| Submitter | Summary of Comments | Proponent's Response | Status |
|-----------|---|---|----------------------------|
| | <p>in the summary of Indigenous community engagement in the Consultation Record.</p> <p>Comment on Final Amended ToR (Sept. 13, 2018):</p> <p>It is acknowledged that York Region added some additional information in Section 9 of the ToR. As noted opposite, it is the expectation of this reviewer that key issues raised by Indigenous communities be summarized in the main body of the ToR (e.g., Section 9), with an indication of how they have informed the ToR. Few issues were raised, but not all key issues are summarized in Section 9, and it is not clear how comments from Indigenous communities are reflected in the ToR. For example, the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation raised concerns that the project will go through an ANSI and about impacts from increased traffic. This is not reflected in Section 9 of the ToR, or in the main body of the Consultation Record (which does have a summary of comments provided on the ToR, but does not include these concerns).</p> <p>York Region updated the summary of summary of Indigenous community engagement in the Consultation Record with the July 11, 2017 meeting with Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation.</p> | <p>and/or how this concern has been addressed in the ToR.</p> | |
| | <p>Comment: June 13, 2018:</p> <p>The Consultation Record (Indigenous Communities Engagement) states that "A summary of the comments provided during the preparation of the draft ToR... are included in Appendix C". Comments from Mississaugas of the New Credit and Mississaugas of Scugog Island FN are in Appendix B. Comments from Huron-Wendat are in Appendix C, and incorrectly under "Agency/Interested Persons".</p> <p>Comment on Final Amended ToR (Sept. 13, 2018):</p> | <p>Response to June 13 Comment:</p> <p>Agreed. Include summary of consultation with Indigenous Communities only.</p> <p>Response to Sept 13 Comment on Final Amended ToR:</p> <p>Comments from Huron-</p> | <p>Amended ToR Revised</p> |

| Submitter | Summary of Comments | Proponent's Response | Status |
|-----------|---|--|---------------------|
| | Previous comment not addressed. | Wendat have been moved to Appendix B. | |
| | <p>Comment: June 13, 2018: There is no evidence that Indigenous communities reviewed and/or submitted comments on the draft ToR. It is the expectation of this reviewer that proponents follow-up with Indigenous communities to confirm that they received the draft ToR and to see if they have any comments. In the absence of comments from communities, evidence of any follow-up attempts with communities should be included in the Consultation Record.</p> <p>Comment on Final Amended ToR (Sept. 13, 2018): Text has been added to Section 9. However, it is not clear why details were added about the circulation of the Stage 1 archaeological assessment rather than the draft ToR. And, as per above, it is not clear what issues, questions or concerns were raised about the ToR and how they are addressed in the ToR (and/or through the EA). Lastly, the last four bullets of section 9 could be interpreted as though the communities followed-up and York Region did not respond – revisions are recommended.</p> | <p>Response to June 13 Comment: Agreed. Include summary of consultation with Indigenous Communities only.</p> <p>Response to Sept 13 Comment on Final Amended ToR: During our meetings with the Indigenous Communities, one of the major concerns they had were with the Archaeological Assessment and thus the details of the circulation of the Stage 1 Archaeological Report were also included in Section 9. We have revised Section 9 to more clearly communicate this.</p> | Amended ToR Revised |
| | <p>Comment: June 13, 2018: Please clarify what is meant by Williams Treaty First Nation (throughout ToR and Consultation Record)? Is this Karry Sandy-McKenzie, Williams Treaties First Nations Process Coordinator?</p> <p>Comment on Final Amended ToR (Sept. 13, 2018): Previous comment not addressed.</p> | <p>Response to June 13 Comment: Agreed. Include summary of consultation with Indigenous Communities only.</p> <p>Response to Sept 13 Comment on Final Amended ToR: We have revised "Treaty" to</p> | Amended ToR Revised |

| Submitter | Summary of Comments | Proponent's Response | Status |
|--|---|--|---|
| | | "Treaties" and "Nation" to "Nations" | |
| Local Agencies | | | |
| City of Toronto | Comments were provided and addressed however, they are not all recorded in the consultation records. | Agency correspondence can be found in the Appendices of the Consultation Record (Appendix A, B, C and G). | Consultation Record Revised to include text from June 6, 2017 letter from the City of Toronto. |
| Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) | <p><u>General</u></p> <p>While TRCA staff acknowledges that many ecosystem functions are already included the factors/criteria for the alternatives assessment and alternative methods assessment, TRCA staff strongly encourages York Region to consider a much more comprehensive assessment of ecosystem functions that captures site to landscape level functions, and quantifies functions to a greater extent than in a Schedule C Municipal Engineer's Class EA, taking into account exceptional circumstances at this location (e.g. s41 Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP) requirements). A more comprehensive assessment of functions will support a stronger, more defensible assessment of alternative methods, alternative designs, and mitigation measures for the preferred design. Should the connection across the unopened road allowance proceed to design alternatives, meeting TRCA's policies, especially regarding maintaining ecological and hydrological functions, not exacerbating existing natural</p> | <p>This undertaking is being carried out as an Individual Environmental Assessment under the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act and is therefore following a more detailed and rigorous process than a Class Environmental Assessment process such as the referenced Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process. Consideration of ecosystem functions in the assessment can be discussed with TRCA at the outset of the IEA.</p> <p>Added in section 6.4.1 the</p> | <p>Added in section 6.4.1 the following statement</p> <p><i>"Consideration of other factors such as Ecosystems Services could be considered as appropriate"</i></p> |

| Submitter | Summary of Comments | Proponent's Response | Status |
|---|---|--|------------------|
| | <p>hazards (including slopes), and meeting TRCA's stormwater management criteria, will require extensive and innovative designs that would be supported by a detailed assessment of ecosystem functions. Additional statements in the TOR supporting the need to assess ecosystem functions comprehensively at various scales, and quantified where possible, should be sufficient (e.g. s4.7, s5.2, s6.3 & s6.4.1).</p> | <p>following statement <i>"Consideration of other factors such as Ecosystems Services could be considered as appropriate"</i></p> | |
| <p>Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA)</p> | <p><u>General</u></p> <p>Please consider supplementing the analysis of ecosystem functions with an assessment of ecosystem services (ES). An ecosystem services assessment will provide a more integrated assessment of socio-ecological systems with a focus on human well-being, and be a more effective way to frame and communicate the environmental impacts. The Ecosystem Services Toolkit, 2017, created by the Canadian Councils of Resources Ministers, is a useful guide that has a section on incorporating an assessment of ES into the impact assessment process. The guide can be accessed through publications.gc.ca. The guideline suggests that the ES assessment may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of the extent, condition and trends in ecosystem services in the study area • Socio-cultural and economic values of ecosystem services benefits (valuation) • The interactions among ES • The relationships among ES, drivers of change and the provision of ES benefits • Alternative future scenarios of ES and human well-being resulting from possible management interventions (page 6) | <p>See response above</p> | <p>See above</p> |

| Submitter | Summary of Comments | Proponent's Response | Status |
|--|---|---|------------------|
| | <p>Valuation should be used selectively where it is not cost prohibitive and can be undertaken with robustness, objectivity and with sound and defensible methodology. TRCA staff note that based on the current state of science it is not appropriate to assign a value to the majority of ecosystem services; rather most ecosystem services should be qualitatively assessed.</p> <p>TRCA staff has expertise in ES assessment techniques and are available to assist in the revisions to the Terms of Reference and in the preparation of the RFP to ensure that the ES assessment is scoped to be sufficiently robust, while flexible enough to accommodate the variety of approaches to this rapidly evolving science.</p> | | |
| Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) | <p><u>Section 4.6, Figure 4-6</u> Please note that all of the wetlands on Block 27 have now been evaluated by the MNRF and most of the wetlands within the North Maple Park have been evaluated. The referenced ponds within the North Maple Park have now been identified as PSWs. Please contact MNRF for updates to the Block 27 planning area and the landfill site area.</p> | MNRF have been contacted and they have provided available data at the time of data collection. The Data collection dates have been noted in the ToR and it is recognized that during the IEA data collection, background review and site investigations will be required. | No change to ToR |
| Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) | <p><u>Section 4.6</u> The second paragraph states "These forest and wetland habitats can be expected to be sensitive to encroachment; however, current land use practices have likely already had impacts to ecological functions of these features. In addition, the current land use practices have already fragmented these features on the landscape." Please note that close to all of the wetland features on the Block 27 site have been identified as</p> | The second paragraph has been revised to delete the following wording...", however, <i>current land use practices have likely already had impacts to ecological functions of these features. In addition, the current land</i> | ToR Revised |

| Submitter | Summary of Comments | Proponent's Response | Status |
|---|--|---|-------------------------|
| | <p>PSWs by the MNRF. The City of Vaughan has also identified a number of Significant Woodlands as well as Key Natural Heritage Features within the Block 27 lands. Given the significance of these features, they are protected individually and are to be considered together as a more comprehensive and connected natural heritage system through the Secondary Plan and Block Plan process.</p> | <p><i>use practices have already fragmented these features on the landscape."</i></p> | |
| <p>Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA)</p> | <p>Figure 4-6 Please update Figure 4-6 to include: PSWs, and Significant Woodlands (Vaughan). Please note that the Natural Heritage System (TRCA) is very difficult to discern in the figure; please change the legend to better showcase the system. If needed please provide two figures to reflect requested layers.</p> | <p>Figure 4-7 (previously 4-6 in draft ToR) has been updated.</p> | <p>No change to ToR</p> |
| <p>Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA)</p> | <p>Table 6-1 and 6-2</p> <p>The first two bullets under Natural Environment are incomplete. TRCA staff suggests the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape form and function, including wildlife passage and the genetic connectivity of plants • Aquatic ecosystem form and function, including flora, fauna & habitat • Terrestrial ecosystem form and function, including flora, fauna & habitat <p>Wetlands could be a separate category or included in one of the above. Furthermore, each bullet should also evaluate alterations to system resiliency especially to chronic or acute stressors exacerbated by climate change.</p> <p>TRCA staff recommends the inclusion of landform as a separate sub-factor in table 6-2.</p> | <p>See previous response – Form and Function wording is specific to the TRCA. Recognize that during the IEA TRCA will encourage the use of “form and function”.</p> | <p>No change to ToR</p> |

Table 2. Public Comment Summary Table

Proposal: Teston Road Area Transportation Improvements – Terms of Reference
Proponent: Regional Municipality of York

| Submitter | Summary of Comments | Response |
|---|--|---|
| Sarah Bhagrath | Would like Teston Road to be extended from Dufferin to Keele Street in order to free up traffic on Major Mackenzie Drive and thus create a smoother drive across the city. | Comment noted. |
| Michael Iacovelli York Region Cycling Coalition Ambassador | <p>The York Region Cycling Coalition, with thousands of active members, strongly supports the enhancement of east-west connectivity through the extension of Teston Road between Keele Street and Dufferin Street. East-west connectivity is a big problem in York Region. Adding active transportation infrastructure through this area in the form of dedicated bicycle lanes and pedestrian walkways and extending it between Highway 400 and Bathurst would be advantageous to the local and extended York Region community.</p> <p>York Region's Active Transportation Network is designed to provide alternative methods of getting around in the Region, getting motor vehicles off congested roads. Cycling facilities added to an enhanced and extended Teston Road will fill gaps in the bike lane and active transportation network, and have the further benefit of making cycling and walking much safer in the Region.</p> <p>The cost of any cycling and pedestrian facilities is minimal compared to the cost of any eventual roadway. We strongly encourage and support the contemplation of active transportation in this study.</p> | Active Transportation facilities may be considered as appropriate during the IEA. |
| Tony Komljanec | The Teston Road project is welcome news. | Comment noted. |

Table 3. Indigenous Communities Comment Summary Table

Proposal: Teston Road Area Transportation Improvements – Terms of Reference

Proponent: Regional Municipality of York

| Aboriginal Communities | Summary of Comments | Proponent's Response | Status |
|---|---|---|------------------|
| Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation | <p>Phone call with Fawn Sault on July 5, 2018 to follow-up if the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation had any comments. Fawn Sault provided the comments listed below over the phone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that the project will go through an ANSI • Impacts to the protected area from increased growth and traffic in the area • Meetings are required for consultation | <p>The ToR has noted that the study area includes an ANSI and is within the ORCMP, potential impacts to these will be considered during the review of alternatives. The ToR commits to consulting with the Indigenous Communities during the IEA.</p> | No Change to ToR |
| Huron-Wendat Nation | <p>Maxime Picard sent an email on June 6, 2018 to the ministry that the Huron-Wendat Nation has great interest in the project as the study area contains numerous Huron archaeological sites and want to be involved in every</p> | <p>Noted. The ToR commits to consulting with the Indigenous Communities during the IEA.</p> <p>The Indigenous Communities were extensively consulted with during the development of</p> | No Change to ToR |

| Aboriginal Communities | Summary of Comments | Proponent's Response | Status |
|---|---|---|-------------------------|
| | <p>aspect of the project that is touching the heritage and archaeology. The ministry did not receive any additional comments from the Huron-Wendat Nation.</p> | <p>the Stage 1 Archaeology Assessment.</p> | |
| <p>Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation</p> | <p>Phone call with Dave Mowat on July 5, 2018 to follow-up if the Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation had any comments. Dave Mowat expressed that the Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation are interested in the project and will provide comments. To date the ministry has not received any additional comments from the Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation.</p> | <p>Noted. The ToR commits to consulting with the Indigenous Communities during the IEA.</p> | <p>No Change to ToR</p> |