

APPENDIX C
CONSULTATION DURING THE PRE-SUBMISSION REVIEW OF
THE TOR

Note: Comments are reproduced verbatim including typos and/or grammatical errors

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
Agency / Indigenous Communities / Interested Persons						
Draft IEA ToR Review						
Indigenous Communities Correspondence						
1.	Picard	Maxime	Nation Huronne-Wendat 255 Place Chef-Michel-Laveau Wendake, QC, G0A 4V0	Feb. 26, 2018/ EM	<p>Hi John,</p> <p>Thanks for your letter and update on the Teston Road IEA Project.</p> <p>As York Region is already aware our concerns toward this project are mainly on archaeology and the protection of our heritage.</p> <p>We would like to insist again to stay engaged and updated on the archaeological aspect of this project.</p> <p>As the study area contains a high huron-wendat heritage potential we ask for a huron-wendat monitor being present for all the archaeological fieldwork of this project</p> <p>So at this point we have no other precise comments on the document you provided us.</p> <p>Best regards, Maxime Picard</p> <hr/> <p><u>Follow up email received March 22, 2018:</u></p> <p>Hi John,</p> <p>As the archaeology for Teston Road IEA has started, the Huron-Wendat Nation would like to initiate the discussion for the Action Plan between our Nation and the Region.</p> <p>At this point, ARA expects us to provide some comments on the Draft Stage 1.</p> <p>Before doing so, it is important for us that we agree on a framework on how to proceed for the consultation of our Nation.</p>	<p><u>Response provided March 22, 2018:</u></p> <p>Hi Maxime</p> <p>We are currently at the Terms of Reference (ToR) stage of the Teston Rd IEA. We have to receive approval from MOECC on the ToR before we can proceed to the IEA phase. The Stage 2 field work will be done during the IEA phase and it is expected sometime in 2019 pending approval of the ToR. We will be in touch with you before we proceed to the IEA, to understand your requirements for the field work. There is no further archaeological work being done at the ToR phase.</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>Praveen John, P.Eng. Sr. Project Manager, Engineering</p>

Note: Comments are reproduced verbatim including typos and/or grammatical errors

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>We will provide you with a draft Action Plan for comments in the next few days.</p> <p>Best regards,</p> <p>Maxime Picard</p>	
Agency Correspondence						
2.	Wajmer	Nicole	Fisheries Protection Biologist Fisheries and Oceans Canada	Feb. 23, 2018/ EM	<p>Dear Mr. Ahmed,</p> <p>The <i>Fisheries Act</i> requires that projects avoid causing serious harm to fish unless authorized by the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans Canada. This applies to work being conducted in or near waterbodies that support fish that are part of, or that support a commercial, recreational or Aboriginal fishery. Following the measures to avoid harm will help you comply with the <i>Act</i>.</p> <p>We request that you visit our website at www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/pnw-ppe/index-eng.html and undertake a Self-Assessment to determine if DFO needs to review your project.</p> <p>If your project IS NOT in one of the listed waterbody types, and its activities ARE NOT listed, nor does it meet the associated criteria (if applicable), you may submit a Request for Review to DFO before proceeding further.</p> <p>If you are UNSURE about whether your project requires DFO review, you can seek support from a qualified environmental professional familiar with measures to avoid impacts to fish and fish habitat (www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/pnw-ppe/env-pro-eng.html).</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Nicole Wajmer</p> <p>Fisheries Protection Biologist</p> <p>Fisheries and Oceans Canada</p>	

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
3.	Lye	Alex	<p>Infrastructure Ontario Environmental Specialist Tel: 416-326-0483 Alex.Lye@infrastructureontario.ca</p>	Feb. 26, 2018/ EM	<p>Hello Mr. Praveen: Do you know if this project requires provincially-owned land, or if the project area is adjacent to provincially-owned land? Regards Alex Lye Environmental Specialist Infrastructure Ontario Tel: 416-326-0483</p>	<p><u>Response from Praveen John (York Region), March 6, 2018:</u> Hi Alex The project is currently at the Terms of Reference (ToR) stage. The corridor and the alignment will be identified and evaluated during the Individual Environmental Assessment (IEA) study, which will follow the approval of the ToR by MOECC. At this point we have not identified the land requirements. We will keep all the stakeholders informed during the development and selection of the alternatives during the IEA process. Regards Praveen John, P.Eng. Sr. Project Manager, Engineering</p>
4.	Floyd	Laurel	<p>Executive Assistant to Duane E. Aubie, P.Eng., Vice President & COO York Major Holdings Inc. Eagles Nest Golf Club Inc. Turnberry Golf Club Inc. 10,000 Dufferin Street, PO Box 403, Maple, ON L6A 1S3 t 905.653.2001 f 905.417.0525 c 416.300.3965</p>	Mar. 08, 2018/ EM	<p>Good afternoon Neil, Just a quick question, how do I go about signing up Duane E. Aubie (daubie@yorkmajorholdings.com) to ensure he receives notifications and updates on the Individual Environmental Assessment (IEA) Terms of Reference - Teston Road (City of Vaughan)? Kindly advise. Laurel Floyd Executive Assistant to Duane E. Aubie, P.Eng., Vice President & COO</p>	<p><u>Response from Neil Ahmed (WSP), March 13, 2018:</u> Thanks for your enquiry. We will add Duane to our mailing list as per request below. Regards, Neil Ahmed, P. Eng. Senior Project Manager, Transportation Planning</p>

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
5.	Hatcher	Laura	<p>MTCS Heritage Planner Heritage Program Programs and Services Branch Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport 401 Bay Street Suite 1700 Toronto ON M7A 0A7 Tel. 416.314.3108 email: laura.e.hatcher@ontario.ca</p>	Apr. 05, 2018/ EM	<p>Dear Mr. Ahmed and Mr. John,</p> <p>Thank you for sharing the Draft Terms of Reference for the above mentioned project with the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport. Please find attached a table with our comments on the ToR.</p> <p>Please let me know if you have any questions or would like to discuss our comments.</p> <p>Sincerely, Laura</p> <p>*Comments attached in PDF*</p>	
6.	Roias	Marta	<p>City of Vaughan 905-832-8585, ext. 8026 marta.roias@vaughan.ca Infrastructure Planning and Corporate Asset Management 2141 Major Mackenzie Dr., Vaughan, ON L6A 1T1</p>	Apr. 05, 2018/ EM	<p>Greetings,</p> <p>On behalf of City of Vaughan staff, please see attached tabled comments.</p> <p>Regards, Marta Roias, RPP</p>	
7.	Haley	Kevin	<p>Environmental Health Specialist kevin.haley@york.ca</p>	Apr. 05, 2018/ EM	<p>Hi Praveen,</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity for providing comments on the draft TOR for the Teston Road IEA.</p> <p>York Region Public Health is pleased to see that air quality and climate change impacts will be considered as part of the IEA. For</p>	<p>Email from Praveen John, March 15, 2018:</p> <p>Hi Kevin</p> <p>As discussed attached is a copy of the Draft terms of Reference document for your review and comment. We are expecting the comments back by April</p>

Note: Comments are reproduced verbatim including typos and/or grammatical errors

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
			<p>The Regional Municipality of York</p> <p>17250 Yonge St, Newmarket, ON L3Y 6Z1</p>		<p>example, Section 4.7 of TOR identifies Types of Potential Environmental Effects:</p> <p>-Climate change and cumulative effects will be integrated into the assessment of alternatives. Extreme weather and rainfall will be assessed as part of the assessment.</p> <p>-Air quality impacts; greenhouse gas emissions associated with climate change; short-term construction related effects (i.e. dust, noise, fumes etc.) as well as source water impacts will be assessed.</p> <p>It is also great to see that the TOR includes criteria relating to air quality in their comparisons of alternatives as noted on page 36 (Table 5-1: Proposed Factors and Criteria for Assessing Alternatives To the Undertaking).</p> <p>York Region Public Health is also supportive of including improved livability and health as part of the principles for transportation planning when developing the specific alternatives to consider as noted on page 32.</p> <p>We added specific comments on the Appendix to the Teston Road TOR table that you sent to us (see attached).</p> <p>York Region Public Health is requesting to be included in Teston Road IEA email distribution list. Please add Asim Qasim asim.qasim@york.ca and Kevin Haley kevin.haley@york.ca to the email distribution list.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Kevin</p>	<p>5th, Thursday. If you need more details on the project please let me know. There also more information at the project website under Teston Rd IEA</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>Praveen</p>

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
8.	Smith	Scott	<p>TRCA</p> <p>5 Shoreham Drive, Toronto, ON, M3N 1S4</p> <p>416-661-6600 ext. 5758 ssmith@trca.on.ca</p>	Apr. 06, 2018/ EM	<p>Praveen,</p> <p>Please find attached our comment table from our review of the draft Terms of Reference for Teston Road. The first comment is being drafted now - hopefully I'll have it ready prior to our meeting Wednesday. The final letter may take another week as it is being sent up to our CAO for review; however, I don't anticipate any changes to the table attached, only the cover letter. Also, as discussed, many of our comments are recommendations to strengthen the clarity and cohesiveness of the document; as such we'll discuss them Wednesday, but I'll defer action on them to yourself and your project team. We'll only request written responses where I've noted there is TRCA policy in support.</p> <p>thank you, Scott Smith</p>	
9.	Mulcahy	Lynda	<p>City of Toronto</p>	Apr. 12, 2018/ EM	<p>Praveen, please find attached the city of Toronto's comments for the revised TOR.</p> <p>Our original comments letter is also included.</p> <p>Pls confirm receipt of these comments-</p> <p>Thanks Lynda</p> <p><u>June 6, 2017, Letter Comments Summary:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City of Toronto firmly opposes any selected alternative that impacts the Keele Valley Landfill (KVL). • Would require amendment to the Certificate of Approval (CofA) or relocation of KVL infrastructure. • The study area, as shown in the notice of commencement and posted to the York Region website, implies a direct (straight-line) connection between Keele Street and Dufferin Street. This suggests that only one alignment for the proposed Teston Road connection is being considered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted, comment to be carried forward to IEA. • Noted. • The study area has since been expanded to encompass a much larger area.

Note: Comments are reproduced verbatim including typos and/or grammatical errors

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important that the EA should include an assessment of alternative alignments for the Teston Road connection. The study area should reflect these alternatives. • The presentation materials that York Region provided at a meeting held on March 20, 2017 at KVL implies a straight-line alignment for Teston Road. This may create a bias from the onset regarding the preferred alignment or alternative for transportation improvement in the area. • A York Region easement is present along the north end of the KVL, separating the KVL and the Vaughan Landfill. • There is Extensive infrastructure in this area which is used to control groundwater impacts from the Vaughan Landfill. This infrastructure could be impacted if the proposed straight alignment is implemented. The infrastructure includes purge wells, observation wells, manholes containing flow meters, plumbing and associated buried electrical services as well as a forcemain. • City of Toronto is currently monitoring and maintaining the KVL. Toronto is required to operate a purge well system that controls contaminated ground water plume from the Vaughan Landfill, located immediately north of the Teston Road easement. • The Teston Road Purge Well System includes thirteen purge wells located in the area, eleven are operational. • Note that purge wells are in constant operation and are predicted to be needed for decades. • The accessible area in the vicinity of the Teston Road easement, where the subject infrastructure is located is 'tight' as it is located in a narrow valley between the slopes of the KVL and Vaughan Landfill. • Toronto is concerned about the requirement to amend the KVL CofA, to accommodate the proposed project. Amendment of the CofA would take significant time and effort and Ministry concerns, or new requirements, cannot be entirely anticipated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed, the study area has been expanded. • Agreed, the study area has been expanded. • Agreed. • Noted, this will be a consideration during the IEA. • Noted. • Noted. • Noted. • Noted, this will be a consideration in the IEA.

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Toronto also has concerns about possible changes to operational or compliance triggers with the CofA. A previous EA for the general purpose of considering a connection of Teston Road between Keele Street and Dufferin Street was conducted in 2003. The Ministry recommended status quo be maintained due to concerns by the Ministry and the Toronto Region Conservation Authority. The concerns/issues identified at that time should be fully revisited and addressed in the current EA. Toronto understands that York Region is in the “information gathering” stage and appreciates being identified as a key stakeholder and intended to participate fully in the EA process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted, this will be a consideration in the IEA. Agreed, this is the purpose of the IEA. Agreed. The City of Toronto will be considered a key stakeholder during the IEA.
10.	Cameron	Anne	<p>MOECC 135 St. Clair Avenue West 1st Floor Toronto ON M4V 1P5 T: 416-314-1181 F: 416-314-8452</p>	Apr. 17, 2018/ EM	<p>Hi Rhonda,</p> <p>Please find attached the ministry’s review of the draft Terms of Reference.</p> <p>Attached are the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Environmental Assessment Services Section (EASS) Memo - EASS Comment Table - Central Region Comment Table - Air Quality Comment Table - District Engineer Comment Table - <p>I am awaiting comments from our Noise Team however I wanted to get you these other comments so that you can start reviewing them. I will forward the comments from the Noise Team asap.</p> <p>Please let me know if you have any questions and I appreciate your patience on this matter.</p> <p>All the best,</p> <p>Anne Cameron Project Officer</p>	

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
11.	Strong	Steven	<p>Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry</p> <p>50 Bloomington Road, 4th Floor, Aurora, ON L4G 0L8</p> <p>905-713-7366</p> <p>steven.strong@ontario.ca</p>	Mar. 14. 2018/ EM	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to review the draft Terms of Reference for the proposed extension of Teston Road between Bathurst Street and Keele Street. Please find attached comments from staff at the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry. There are three main themes staff would recommend need to be strengthened in the Terms of Reference:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP) has policies that address the development of infrastructure on the Oak Ridges Moraine. There has been no analysis of this proposal in the context of those policies, especially those policies in section 41. 2) The study area in question has been presented as an environment that has been impacted by urbanization. MNR staff are of the opinion that the study area contains some very significant natural heritage features and the quality of these features has been understated. 3) Given the significance of the Oak Ridges Moraine and the direction of provincial policy for development of infrastructure on the moraine, an assessment of social, economic and environmental considerations should add additional weighting to environmental considerations, given the policies contained in the ORMCP. <p>It should also be noted that other authorizations and approvals will be required for this undertaking. Authorizations will likely be required pursuant to the Endangered Species Act. It is possible that approvals may also be required pursuant to the Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act (e.g., removal of water control structures, if any) and the Public Lands Act (e.g., if works are required in proximity to the beds of navigable waters). It is recommended that a meeting occur with MNR staff to determine if any additional approvals are required.</p>	

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>Please find attached our comment template for consideration. If you have any questions on the foregoing, please feel free to contact me directly.</p> <p>Steve</p>	
12.	Brown	Andrea	<p>MOECC York Durham District, Ministry of the Environment & Climate Change</p>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> P. 21, <i>Keele Valley Landfill Site (KVLS) is subject to MOECC guidelines for land use in 30m of the fill area</i> – there are numerous (70+) waste, air, stormwater approvals and amendments that supersede the general guidelines and apply to the larger area of the waste site, primary, secondary buffer, and lands where easements/agreements exist relating to landfill related monitoring, mitigation or contingency measures. At a minimum, the approvals, and closure plan set out the required leachate and landfill gas mitigation and monitoring requirements more specifically than the D-4 guideline <i>Section 4.3</i> provides very little description of the KVLS and the reference to the Maple Valley Plan presumes that plan would be implemented within the period of the TOR project (noting that plan will have to address the approvals requirements referenced above) <i>Section 4.5, Built Environment and Table 6-2: Summary of Evaluation Factors and Sub-Factors for Alternative Methods</i>, are silent on the significant landfill infrastructure present at the 3 waste sites (leachate, gas collection, stormwater, caps, liners etc.). While Groundwater includes existing landfills as a sub-factor, there is no corresponding surface water sub-factor, and factor 2.6, contaminated property and waste management includes no sub-factors relating to engineering, approval or other considerations (I note there's at least one brownfield in the area in addition to the 3 waste sites) P. 27 – it is unclear how or why the TOR has assumed KVLS closure in 2002 with ongoing maintenance, monitoring and controls have resulted in <i>grassland/old field habitat</i> creation in relation to potential species at risk 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Changed the reference to approvals and closure report rather than MOECC D-4 guide. The detailed description of the landfill will be provided in more detailed contaminant studies during the IEA. Sub-factors added. Refers to the Vaughan Disposal Site, clarified this. We did not have access to the KVLS so we cannot comment on the site conditions. Closure report was requested and never received thus has not been referenced These specific references will be used during the IEA. This information will come from landfill reports, which are to be reviewed during the IEA. Additional text added.

Note: Comments are reproduced verbatim including typos and/or grammatical errors

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>5. <i>Section 12 – references</i> do not include the KVLS Closure Plan or approvals (although landfill reports are broadly referenced in 1.3 in relation to groundwater data sources) – the closure plan is included under land use</p> <p>6. <i>References</i> - No data sources are identified for contaminant concerns (O.Reg 153 RSC Registry, ministry files, ERIS might be appropriate)</p> <p>7. <i>References</i> – existing landfills refers to the D series guidelines and site approvals and monitoring and reports should be considered</p> <p><i>Appendix A, 2.6</i> – studies are proposed to consider road salt effects and in addition to the project as a source of potential contamination, the project as a preferential pathway, or new conduit for contamination and landfill gas should also be considered.</p> <p>In general, while the TOR is a very high level and broad overview to the proposed approach to the project, I am concerned that there is no preliminary recognition that KVLS is the largest municipal landfill in Canada with significant infrastructure and long- term management requirements, and there is a similarly complex and rigorous approvals framework associated with the site – which would also be a consideration.</p>	<p>The ToR is intended to be a very high level document, comprehensive background review will occur during the IEA. Will add some additional text on KVLS. As noted above, while we had requested the Landfill Closure Report, the report was not provided and thus the information on the KVLS at this ToR stage is limited.</p>
					<p>1) Noise Limits shall comply with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Publication NPC-115, “Construction Equipment” b. Publication NPC-118, “Motorized Conveyances” c. Publication NPC-300, “Environmental Noise Guideline, Stationary and Transportation Sources – Approval and Planning Publication NPC”, August 2013; and d. All applicable regional, municipal and MTO guidelines with respect to noise. <p>2) Noise Report shall be prepared in accordance with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Publication NPC-233, "Information to be Submitted for Approval of Stationary Sources of Sound", October 1995 as amended; and b. "Basic Comprehensive Certificates of Approval (Air), User Guide, Appendix A - Supporting Information for an 	<p>Listed under “Rationale” column in item 2.3 (Noise Sensitive Areas) in Appendix A.</p>

Note: Comments are reproduced verbatim including typos and/or grammatical errors

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>Acoustic Assessment Report or Vibration Assessment Report Required by a Basic Comprehensive CofA" prepared by the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch, Version 2.1, March 2011.</p> <p>3) Vibration Limits: shall comply with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Publication NPC-207, "Impulse Vibration in Residential Buildings", November 1983; b. Publication NPC-119, "Blasting"; and c. All applicable regional, municipal and MTO guidelines with respect to vibration. <p>4) Vibration Reports: shall be prepared in accordance with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Publication NPC-233, "Information to be Submitted for Approval of Stationary Sources of Sound", October, 1995 as amended; and b. "Basic Comprehensive Certificates of Approval (Air), User Guide, Appendix A - Supporting Information for an Acoustic Assessment Report or Vibration Assessment Report Required by a Basic Comprehensive CofA" prepared by the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch, Version 2.1, March 2011. <p>Please note that MOECC publication LU-131 has been superseded by NPC-300.</p>	
13.			MOECC - Air Quality Comments on Draft ToR		<p>The following comments pertain only to the potential local ambient air quality impacts of the proposed new roadway on the environment and nearby sensitive receptors. However, the IEA should ensure that all potential impacts during construction and operation of the preferred alternative be assessed. Since the study area contains the former Keele Valley Landfill, the Vaughan Waste Disposal site and the Disposal Services Landfill, it is our position that York Region conduct baseline ambient monitoring and ambient monitoring during construction activities for methane and other contaminants of concern to ensure that activities do not impact nearby current and future sensitive receptors. This commitment should be included in the ToR.</p>	<p>At this stage, a preferred alternative has not been chosen. These commitments will be included in a future IEA as appropriate. As per Chapter 8.5, MOECC will continue to be consulted during the IEA.</p>

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>Section 2.2, page 10: Please explain why the weekday morning peak hour traffic conditions were used to assess existing and future traffic conditions. Typically the weekday afternoon peak hour traffic is more congested than in the morning.</p>	<p>Agree, the demand may be higher during afternoon peak hour. The current York Region's travel demand model is developed only for the morning peak hour. Therefore, the analysis was conducted for the morning peak hour.</p> <p>During the IEA, if the Travel Demand Model may be available for both the morning and afternoon peak hour then analysis could be conducted for both peak hours.</p>
					<p>Table 5-1, page 36; Table 6-1, page 40; Table 6-2, page 42: Please clarify why Table 5-1, Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 include local and regional air quality under the socio-economic environment heading, while Table 4-1 includes air quality under the natural environmental features heading.</p>	<p>Tables revised.</p>
					<p>Appendices: Further discussion with the MOECC regarding the level of AQIA will be required once the preferred alternative has been determined. Please include under the "Data Source" column for 2.7 the following text: "Agency Consultation (MOECC)".</p>	<p>Added.</p>
14.			MOECC – Planning/Regional EA Coordinator		<p>Section 2.2/Page 10: Re: "York Region's Travel Demand Forecasting model (YRTDF model, EMME based) was used to evaluate future traffic conditions and assess the 'Need and Justification' for the proposed Undertaking." -Space need between "and" "assess" -Delete the double period</p>	<p>Revision made.</p>
					<p>2.2/10: Re: "Additionally, York Region's travel demand model considers future growth in Active Transportation and Transit Modal shares within the Region. The proposed Kirby GO Station on the Barrie line, to be located at the southwest corner of Kirby Road and Keele Street intersection, falls within the study area." This paragraph should be clarified. What exactly is considered in the model; is it just the proposed Kirby GO station? The paragraph does not explicitly state this.</p>	<p>Noted. The York Region's travel demand model provides forecast for the 2041 conditions for the proposed land use in the GTA.</p> <p>This model also assumes all other planned/proposed road network improvements in the extended study area. York Region's travel demand model considers future growth in Active Transportation and Transit Modal shares within the Region.</p> <p>The proposed Kirby GO Station on the Barrie line, to be located at the southwest corner of Kirby Road and Keele Street intersection, falls within the study area. Based on the review of the recent version of the model used for the travel demand analysis for this study, we understand the model was not</p>

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
						considering any trips to/from the Kirby GO Station.
					2.2/10: Is there currently an environmental assessment underway for the proposed Kirby GO station? No information is provided on the level of assessment completed for this assumption, even though that information is provided for the other assumptions (the planned road improvements).	This EA is underway. Kirby GO station assessment has been clarified (see response above).
					4.3/18: Parts of the study area are subject to the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (2017), the Greenbelt Plan (2017) and Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017). Please include a commitment that the IEA will reference applicable policies of the plans and describe how the proposed project adheres to the applicable policies.	Added.
					4.3/18: The Provincial Policy Statement (2014) contains policies that protect Ontario's natural heritage and water resources. Please include a commitment that the IEA will reference applicable policies and describe how this proposed project is consistent with these policies.	Added that the IEA is to reference these policies and it's to describe how the project is consistent with these policies.
					4.3/19: Re: "Areas to the north of Teston Road are primarily made up of the Natural Heritage System and Protected Countryside consisting of rural and open space lands as part of the Oak Ridges Moraine, shown in Figure 4-2 ." This sentence is confusing. Also, there should be a better description of the study area in terms of the land designations under the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (2017), as a significant amount of the study area contains lands designated under the Plan. Please revise this section for clarity and also include a more detailed description of land use in the context of the ORMCP.	Added a separate ORM figure and addressed.
					4.3/19: This section should also discuss that the project is subject to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017) and the Greenbelt Plan (2017).	Added.
					4.3/21: Re: "These guidelines state that no land use change may take place within 30 meters of a fill area to protect the integrity of	The wording was revised in Section 4.3, as per the MOECC's suggestion.

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>the clay liner of the Keele Valley Landfill site and that there should be mitigation measures for gas and leachate surrounding a fill area (MOECC, D-4 Land Use On or Near Landfills and Dumps, Section 5.2)."</p> <p>MOECC D-4 guideline, section 5.2 does not make the statement above. Section 5.2.2 of the D-4 guideline states for non-operating sites: "Where technical controls for leachate, or leachate and has are required surrounding a fill area, no land use [change] may take place within 30 metres of its perimeter. Please revise this section to include accurate information.</p>	
					<p>4.3/21: Please provide a more detailed description of the two landfill sites. This detailed discussion may be more appropriate under section 4.5. (Note that the two sentences provided under section 4.5 about the Keele Valley landfill site are not sufficient).</p>	<p>We agree that description of these two landfill sites is brief, as detailed information regarding these two landfills was not available at the time of the TOR preparation. The intent of the TOR is to provide the framework for completion of more detailed investigations. Detailed investigations will provide landfill details.</p> <p>The landfill information was presented in Section 4.3 of the TOR, as "landfills" are part of evaluation of the factor "Contaminated Property and Waste Management", which fits within the Socio-Economic Environment evaluation factor.</p>
					<p>4.3/21: There is no discussion on other potential or known contaminated sites/properties beyond the landfill sites. Please include this.</p>	<p>A contamination overview study (COS), which typically evaluates the presence of potential or known contaminated sites/properties in the project area, has not been completed at this time. This report is preliminary in nature and sets up the framework / Terms of Reference for completion of further detailed contaminant investigations.</p> <p>The text has been added in the report, to acknowledge that there may be some other contaminant sites in the project area.</p>
					<p>4.4 and 4.5/25: How is the proponent defining "Built Environment"? It is unclear what this section is supposed to be describing.</p>	<p>Refers to Built Heritage Environment – revised for clarity.</p>
					<p>4.4 and 4.5/25: The discussion of historic mapping and cultural heritage resources should be moved to section 4.4.</p>	<p>Revised.</p>
					<p>4.2/18 and 4.7/30: The proponent should be more specific about detailing exactly what "further environmental investigations" and "environmental work" will be undertaken during the IEA to</p>	<p>Refer to Appendix A and work plans will be developed for agency review as part of the IEA. Added reference to Appendix A on p. 28 and what it contains.</p>

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					inventory the existing environment. At present the only hard commitment made regarding further work is on page 28: "As part of the IEA, detailed natural environmental investigations will be undertaken." What other environmental investigations and work is the proponent committed to undertaking during the IEA? It is not clear. Please describe.	
					5.2 (Table 5-1)/36: Under Social/Economic Environment please include the following criteria: -Landfills and Hazardous Waste Sites -Provincial / Federal / Municipal Land Use Planning Policies/Goals/Objectives	Added.
					6.4/4.2: The study area contains lands that are designated as "Highly Vulnerable Aquifers" under the local source protection plan. As such, Table 6-2 should include "Highly Vulnerable Aquifers" as a sub-factor.	Added.
					Appendix A, 2.2, PDF page 73 – The correct reference year for the Provincial Policy Statement is 2014, not 2015.	Revised.
					A coordinated review of Ontario's four land use plans (Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, Greenbelt Plan, Oak Ridges Moraine Plan and Niagara Escarpment Plan) began in 2015. The updated plans were released in May 2017. As the new provincial plans are now in effect as of July 1, 2017, all planning matters including those associated with the environmental assessment process must conform to the new 2017 plans. Please ensure that all references to these Plans are for the 2017 plans.	Reviewed and confirmed 2017 date.
15.			MOECC - EASS		Need to include a page that lists all of the acronyms used throughout the document.	Added
					Ensure that a commitment that the EA will discuss net effects (those remaining after mitigation) and that the EA will evaluate the advantages and disadvantages to the environment of the proposed undertaking and the alternatives methods based on net effects, is highlighted in the document.	This is noted in several locations in the ToR document (Section 4.6, 5.2, 6.4 and 6.4.1)
					Ensure that cumulative effects are incorporated into the assessment of alternatives throughout the assessment process.	Added more text to this effect.
					Section 2.1/p6: When and why was the section of Teston Road that crossed over the	Added Hurricane Hazel information.

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>East Don River washed away? Include this information in the background.</p> <hr/> <p>2.1/p7: The ministry requires more rationale for why the boundaries of the study area were established.</p> <hr/> <p>2.2/p10: Detailed traffic analysis has been conducted, presented and reported as required by the ministry.</p> <hr/> <p>2.2/p10: Consider including a figure that shows the planned/proposed network improvements identified in the Transportation Master Plan and as detailed in the Draft ToR as part of Scenario B.</p> <hr/> <p>2.2/p10: The first sentence of the third paragraph, "Additionally, York Region's travel...", seems to relate and provide context to the last paragraph on the page which talks about volume to capacity ratios. Consider rearranging these paragraphs.</p> <hr/> <p>2.2/11: The paragraph beginning with "With the currently planned..." has extra commas and the word "improvement" should be plural.</p> <hr/> <p>Section 3/p14: Would be beneficial to clarify what "transportation improvements" means to the proponent. This is related to the traffic analysis and we would like further information as to what "improvements" looks like for this.</p> <hr/> <p>Section 4.1/p16 Detail was provided for why the study area was chosen, however pre-Draft ToR and the current draft ToR do not provide enough detail for why the study area is sufficient. The Ministry is concerned that the study area is too narrow in scope and limits the alternatives or options that would be feasible for the proponents to study.</p> <hr/> <p>4.3/p19: Page 19 contains a spelling error; "rid sharing" should be corrected.</p> <hr/> <p>Discrepancy on page 19 which uses 'm' for metre, but later spells out metre and kilometres on page 21.</p> <hr/> <p>4.3/p21: In the first paragraph on the page, when Area of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI) Maple Uplands are mentioned, please reference Figure 4-6 which provides an image of where the ANSI is located.</p>	<p>Rationale is provided in Section 4.1.</p> <hr/> <p>Noted.</p> <hr/> <p>Added map from TMP showing 2041 proposed road network.</p> <hr/> <p>Paragraph rearranged.</p> <hr/> <p>Revised.</p> <hr/> <p>Will review and revise.</p> <hr/> <p>Study are started out from what was defined during the Class EA. Can be expanded if needed during IEA. Refer to section 4.1 Preliminary Study Area.</p> <hr/> <p>Revised.</p> <hr/> <p>Revised</p>

Note: Comments are reproduced verbatim including typos and/or grammatical errors

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>4.6/p27: Scientific name of the Redside Dace (<i>Clinostomus elongates</i>) was not included in the list of species.</p> <p>4.7/p30: The ministry suggests that extreme weather such as one in 500 year storm is considered in order to address climate change. This is to ensure that the frequency of storm events is appropriately assessed for current and future scenarios (which is greater than the one in 100 year storm event) and the mitigation measures proposed are adequate.</p> <p>4.7/p31: In Table 4-1, please consider including more positive effects. Also, cumulative impacts and the influence of nearby landfills should also be included.</p> <p>Noise should be considered under the category of Socio-economic.</p> <p>Section 5: Ensure consistency within this section (including titles) in regards to using the capitalization of "Alternatives To" rather than "Alternatives to". The use of "Alternatives To" is the correct form.</p> <p>p34: The first sentence in the second paragraph under the Evaluation Method heading is missing the word "be" – "...and the public should be consulted early in the IEA study".</p> <p>Section 6.4/p41: "Net effects, or the effects on the environment that remain after standard mitigation measures have been applied, will be identified". It would be beneficial to also note that it will be considered as required under the EAA to ensure that the statement is clear.</p> <p>Section 7.1/p45: The section states that the IEA Report will include a list of all commitments made during the Terms of Reference process. A commitment should be made in the Terms of Reference that a table will be included in the IEA to list all commitments and where those commitments can be found in the IEA Report.</p> <p>7.2/p45: Include a statement about Adaptive Management. Something along the lines of "The monitoring program will include adaptive environmental management strategies which will allow for the early identification of undesirable environmental effects and the development and implementation of an intervention strategy aimed at addressing such effects before they become problems".</p>	<p>Revised</p> <p>Currently, we are not aware of any available data or model for a 500 year storm event. The current practice in Ontario is a 100 year storm event, the available data is for Regional storm event, which is higher than a 100 year storm. If sufficient data is available at the time of the IEA, a larger storm event can be used for evaluation (this is noted in the text of the ToR document).</p> <p>More positive effects added. Cumulative effects will be considered as part of the IEA, consistent with Section 4.3.</p> <p>Revised.</p> <p>Revised.</p> <p>Revised.</p> <p>Revised.</p> <p>Revised and added.</p>

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>Section 8: Businesses and Utilities should be included in the consultation plan.</p> <hr/> <p>8.2: Will a Stakeholder Committee be formed? If so, this should be included.</p> <hr/> <p>8.3: It should be stated that all Notices (Notice of Commencement, etc.) will be sent to all identified Indigenous Communities and it should clearly state by what means (i.e. mail, email, etc.)</p> <hr/> <p>8.5/p50: It would be beneficial to include additional details as to what will be included in the executive summary as noted in the Ministry's July 4, 2017 comments under Ontario Regulation 334 Requirements.</p> <hr/> <p>Section 9: Please provide a brief summary of the consultation that has occurred for the ToR stage. For example, "During the ToR, the following consultation mechanisms were used: Notice of Commencement published in local newspapers; formation of a Stakeholder Committee; formation of a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC); direct agency engagement; development of a webpage and e-newsletter; Public Information Centres; etc.</p> <p>Also include a brief summary of Indigenous consultation undertaken to date</p> <hr/> <p>Section 11/p53: Be more specific as to what approvals may be required. As an example, next to the bullet point for Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change, you could include the following approvals – Permit To Take Water, Environmental Compliance Approval, etc.</p>	<p>Added.</p> <hr/> <p>Added wording that Stakeholder Groups can be formed as needed during the IEA.</p> <hr/> <p>Added (mail out)</p> <hr/> <p>Added.</p> <hr/> <p>Added</p> <hr/> <p>Deferred to the IEA process – since the preferred alternative is unknown at this time it is hard to determine what permits may be required.</p>
16.			TRCA		<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</p>	<p>Applicable during the IEA and TRCA will be consulted with during that time. Preferred alternative has not been determined.</p>

Note: Comments are reproduced verbatim including typos and/or grammatical errors

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>unopened road allowance proceed to design alternatives, meeting TRCA’s policies, especially regarding maintaining ecological and hydrological functions, not exacerbating existing natural 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> <hr/> <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.</p> <p>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>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>	

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>Climate change has been insufficiently considered and inappropriately isolated in the document as a separate environmental effect (table 4-1) or criterion (table 5-1). Climate change is a multi-faceted challenge that has potential impacts on a wide variety of criteria. See table 3 in the MOECC’s guideline: considering climate change in the environmental assessment process (MOECC’s Guideline). Table 3 lists examples of climatic variables or stressors exacerbated by climate change through alterations to their frequency, severity or duration that have effects on a variety of project components.</p> <p>The draft Terms of Reference (TOR) does not follow MOECC’s Guideline. It is strongly recommended that this guideline be followed both because it supports various provincial policy directions, and because the MOECC could be more strictly enforcing this document through the IEA process. Here is a summary of areas for integrating climate change, as supported by the MOECC Guideline:</p> <p>Section 4 – Add a sub-section summarizing various chronic and acute stressors whose frequency, severity or duration could be altered by climate change and that effect components of the environment (social, economic and natural). A summary of such stressors is provided in MOECC’s guideline in section 4. Summarize the greenhouse gas sinks and sources in the study area.</p> <p>Section 4.7 – various alternatives to the undertaken could impact carbon sink or sources, or could impact the resiliency of various socio-economic and natural systems to chronic and acute stressors potentially exacerbated by climate change. The introductory text and table 4-1 should both integrate this language into the types of environmental effects. The introductory text to section 5 and table 5-1, and the introductory text to section 6 and table 6-1 should reflect a similar approach.</p> <p>The MOECC Guidelines are clear that the project must demonstrate how climate change impacts have been incorporated into project planning (see section 3 of the MOECC climate change guideline under “business-as-usual vs. climate-focused approaches”). This analysis could conclude section 6.4.</p> <hr/> <p>The various guiding principles, factors and criteria seem disjointed. It is not clear how they relate to each other.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table 4-1 lists potential environmental effects, categorized under socio-economic, cultural, and natural. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Added a sub-section in chapter 4 on Climate Change. Climate change has been added to the list of things that should be considered in the evaluation in section 52 (this list is also referred to in Section 6.4). Greenhouse gas sinks and sources in the study will be reviewed and determined during the IEA. Removed Climate Change as a factor in table 4-1.

Note: Comments are reproduced verbatim including typos and/or grammatical errors

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5 – lists 6 guiding principles for developing the alternatives to the undertaking Table 5-1 provides criteria organized under 5 factors for assessing alternatives to the undertaking. As compared to table 4-1 land use, economic, and transportation have been separated from social/economic. Section 6.1 lists four “types of inputs” to guide the generation of the study limits. Section 6.3 – starts with 6 principles to guide the generation of alternative methods. It is not clear why these principles are different from the 6 principles for the generation of alternatives to the undertaking. Table 6-1 lists features and considerations organized under 4 components that are described as technical considerations during the generation of alternative methods. It is not clear why the categorization has changed as compared to table 5-1, and components here differ from the factors in table 5-1. The last sentence states that “specific objectives or guiding principles for each of the above components/considerations will be developed during the IEA in consultation with stakeholders.” The first part of 6.3 lists guiding principles for some of the components in table 6-1. The relationship between the first list of guiding principles, the detailed components and features in table 6-1, and the commitment to develop specific objectives and guiding principles is not clear. Table 6-2 lists factors and sub-factors under 4 categories for the evaluation of alternative methods. The 4 categories used don’t match the components in table 6-1, the Criteria in table 5-1 or the potential environmental effects in table 4-1. It’s not clear why the terminology has changed to factors and sub-factors and how these relate to the factors in prior tables. <p>The terminology and the categorization/organization should flow between the tables and lists above. It should be clear to the reader why terminology or categorization/organization changes. A glossary of terms could be helpful.</p> <hr/> <p>The Regional Municipality of York has undertaken great work in advancing the concept of context sensitive design, and integrates this into their EAs. TRCA strongly supports context sensitive design as a framework for designing infrastructure adjacent to the natural heritage system. There are no references to context sensitive design in the TOR. Please consider some references to context sensitive design.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Different stages and levels of detail, therefore intentional. Tables have been revised and updated for consistency. <hr/> <p>Added.</p>

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>Section 1/p1: In the first paragraph there is a reference to the IEA needing to accommodate a “range of transportation solutions”, but the first paragraph does not state that there is a transportation problem. TRCA staff suggests adding a general purpose statement to the first paragraph.</p> <hr/> <p>S1: Please consider providing a sentence indicating that an IEA is being conducted rather than a municipal Class EA as a commitment from the previous Municipal Class EA study for the widening and reconstruction of Teston Road between Pine Valley Drive and Bathurst Street.</p> <hr/> <p>S1/p2: The first sentence of the last paragraph is vague in its description of the purpose of a TOR. Please provide a more clear description for the objectives of the Terms of Reference. For example, TRCA staff suggests stating that the purpose of the Terms of Reference is to set out in detail the requirements for the preparation of the IEA.</p> <hr/> <p>S2.1/p6: In the first paragraph the meaning of the phrase “fully urbanized road network” is not clear in the context of a transformation in Vaughan from being auto oriented.</p> <hr/> <p>S2.1/p6: In the fifth paragraph, revise the first sentence to “...over the East Don River during Hurricane Hazel resulted in...”</p> <hr/> <p>S2.1/p7: The fourth paragraph ends with “Should Kirby Road be added to the Regional Road network, improvements could include widening to 4 lanes and a connection between Dufferin Street and Bathurst Street.” There is an EA underway exploring options for a 4 lane connection between Dufferin Street and Bathurst Street. The EA is being undertaken under Schedule C of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment, with Rizmy Holdings and the City of Vaughan as co-proponents. It is the understanding of TRCA staff that Kirby Road may be added to the Regional Road network after the conclusion of the EA.</p> <hr/> <p>S2.2: The Need and Justification section should end with a clear problem statement and clear opportunity statement to support the purpose in the next section.</p> <hr/> <p>S2.3: The purpose of the undertaking is stated as “improving the efficiency, safety and continuity of the transportation network within the</p>	<p>Addressed throughout Section 2.</p> <hr/> <p>This is explained in section 2.1 (Background)</p> <hr/> <p>The description of the ToR has been expanded – the wording has been taken from the MOECC’s Code of Practice for Preparing a Terms of Reference.</p> <hr/> <p>Added some examples.</p> <hr/> <p>Added.</p> <hr/> <p>As per section 2.2, p. 10 we have considered that the 4 lanes and the connection as part of the future network; if the connection along Kirby doesn’t go in east-west congestion will be increased.</p> <hr/> <p>Additional text has been added.</p> <hr/> <p>At the study commencement the project was identified as “Teston Road IEA ToR between Keele and Bathurst Street”. Subsequently the study area was expanded. The project team felt that changing the study name could cause confusion.</p>

Note: Comments are reproduced verbatim including typos and/or grammatical errors

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>study area” with “the specific need forany proposed undertaking(s)...determined during the initial phases of the IEA study.” However, the introductory paragraph in section 1 states that the IEA is for Teston Road between Keele Street and Bathurst Street while providing a larger study area to “allow for a range of alternatives to be reviewed during the IEA.” The two sections do not provide clarity as to the relationship between the implied primary study area of Teston Road between Keele Street and Bathurst Street and the broader study area. This is an approach similar to an MCEA where a master plan has already identified the preferred alternative. Section 1 appears to support that the decision has already been made to undertake a transportation solution on Teston Road between Keele Street and Bathurst Street with an analysis of alternatives in the broader study area to reconfirm this approach. Section 2.3 appears to contradict this with stating a broad purpose as applies to the larger study area. TRCA staff recommends these sections be clarified.</p> <hr/> <p>Section 4.3/p19: The report indicates that “The portion south of Teston Road is predominantly urban”. This statement is misleading. Please note that as depicted in Figures 4.2 and 4.6 of this report that a vast and extensive natural heritage system is coincident with a large extent of the existing southern boundary of Teston Road eg: natural Core Area of the ORM, Significant Woodlands, Significant Valley lands, including the Terrestrial Natural Heritage System, Interior Forest, and numerous watercourse crossings.</p> <hr/> <p>S4.3/Figure 4-2: The figure is very busy and only covers a few of the Oak Ridges Moraine Plan planning zones. TRCA staff recommends a separate figure be added clearly showing the boundary of the Oak Ridges Moraine Plan and the planning zones.</p> <hr/> <p>S4.6: Please note that there are regulatory floodplains associated with various tributaries across the study area. Please either add a figure showing the regulatory floodplains in the study area or add text noting the regulatory floodplain, as appropriate.</p> <hr/> <p>S4.6/p27 & Figure 4-6: 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>	<p>Wording revised.</p> <hr/> <p>Added a separate ORMCP figure</p> <hr/> <p>Regulatory floodplains will be addressed in the IEA. As per our April 11, 2018 meeting added some text regarding the flood plains (no need to include in mapping).</p> <hr/> <p>MNRF has not provided this information when the information requests were made. Will include dates when the desktop study was completed.</p>

Note: Comments are reproduced verbatim including typos and/or grammatical errors

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>S4.6/p27: 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 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 pulled together into a more comprehensive and connected natural heritage system through the Secondary Plan and Block Plan process.</p> <hr/> <p>S4.6/p27: The fourth paragraph states “The current habitat classification and extent for these regulated areas is unknown”. Please note the DFO is working collaboratively with the MNRF in terms of the up-listing of RSD and as such the RSD regulated areas are known.</p> <hr/> <p>S4.6/p28: The section states that “Species at risk potential within the agricultural lands and isolated pockets of woodland are likely limited to birds, bats and the Butternut tree.” Please also include fish (Redside dace). Amphibians and reptiles are also likely candidates as are species of regional concern in TRCA’s jurisdiction (L1 to L3 ranked species). Further assessments and discussions with MNRF are required on this matter.</p> <hr/> <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> <hr/> <p>S4.7: The first paragraph notes “The most current rainfall intensity-duration-frequency (IDF) curves for drainage include consideration of climate will be used.” The meaning of the sentence is not clear. IDF curves are based on past data, and do not incorporate anticipated future alterations to IDF curves as a result of climate change.</p> <hr/> <p>S4.7: In the first paragraph, revise to “Current practice is to review the regional storm event, which is greater than the 100 year storm event in the study area.”</p> <hr/> <p>S4.7: In the fourth paragraph, please clarify how you differentiate</p>	<p>Noted. Current information subsequent to this ToR will be gathered at the IEA stage.</p> <hr/> <p>This sentence is just referring to the potential SAR present in the woodlands and agricultural lands – RSD as a potential SAR is noted early in this section when discussing the East Don River.</p> <hr/> <p>All available PSW and woodlands information that were provided at the time have been included – further information will be gathered during the IEA (including detailed field investigations). The figure has been split into two figures for clarity.</p> <hr/> <p>Wording revised. The MTO curves include consideration of climate change, Region’s do not – most conservative curves will be used.</p> <hr/> <p>Revised</p> <hr/> <p>Removed “avoid”.</p>

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>“avoid” and “prevent”.</p> <hr/> <p>S4.7: The environmental effects in table 4-1 are both positive and negative. Therefore, consider adding to the main objective supporting positive environmental effects. Otherwise table 4-1 should be reworded to be only negative effects.</p> <hr/> <p>S4.7/Table 4-1: Under “Socio-Economic” is “improved air quality”. It may be more accurate to specify improved local and regional air quality as the geographic extent of impacts from alterations to the local road network is limited.</p> <hr/> <p>S4.7: Under the second bullet, note that the concern is with any alteration to water quality, not just reduction. Consider revising to “...and/or alteration to quantity.”</p> <hr/> <p>S4.7: The third, fourth and sixth bullets are confusing as the terms overlap. 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> <hr/> <p>S4.7: The seventh bullet is regarding air quality impacts and greenhouse gas emissions. Note that the tailpipe emissions associated with local air quality impacts are different than those that are associated with climate change. Also, their impacts and associated mitigation are at different geographic scales - air quality has more local impacts, while greenhouse gases emissions have global impacts. Finally, climate change has impacts to socio-economic systems as well. Consider separating air quality and climate change, and consider adding a separate bullet for greenhouse gas emissions under “socio-economic” (note that effects on climate change are under social/economic environment in table 5-1).</p> <hr/> <p>Section 5: The phrase “reducing ecological impacts” is ambiguous. The point is stronger and clearer with just “protecting and sustaining the natural</p>	<p>Both positive and negative effects were included in this table at the request of MOECC.</p> <hr/> <p>Added wording.</p> <hr/> <p>Added wording.</p> <hr/> <p>This categorization and wording is very specific to the TRCA, this document needs to include wording to satisfy all reviewing agencies and the public. Wording has been revised.</p> <hr/> <p>Reviewed and revised to two separate bullets and remove reference to climate change</p> <hr/> <p>To be reviewed.</p>

Note: Comments are reproduced verbatim including typos and/or grammatical errors

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>and build environment". Consider deleting "and reducing ecological impacts".</p> <hr/> <p>S5.1: Often when road widenings are proposed along with new active transportation facilities, the additional active transportation facilities are relied upon strongly to support the sustainability improvements of a widening alternative. Active transportation improvements can be made along existing corridors, and an active transportation connection can be made across the unopened road allowance at far less cost and with far less impact on the ecological form and function as compared to a new road crossing. Please consider separating active transportation as a separate alternative to the undertaking.</p> <hr/> <p>S5.2/p33: The first bullet point is very general. TRCA staff are concerned that TRCA policy (the Living City Policies), regulation (Ontario Regulation 166/06) and guidelines (especially the Stormwater Management Criteria, Wetland Water Balance, and Crossings Guideline) may be overlooked, but are importance in the evaluation of alternatives to the undertaking. TRCA staff suggests that either the first bullet be expanded a bit such as to "Federal, Provincial, Conservation Authority, and Municipal legislation, plans...". Alternatively, a separate bullet could be added specific to TRCA such as "TRCA Policy and Guidelines (e.g. Living City Policies, Crossing Guidelines). Please note that the outcome of this IEA may require a permit from TRCA and that TRCA has a Board approved crossing guideline documenting the requirements for bridge crossings which may significantly affect the cost of the Alternatives.</p> <hr/> <p>Table 5-1: The criteria are understood to be translations of environmental effects into measurable criteria. However, it is not clear why the effects in table 4-1 are more detailed than the criteria in table 5-1. TRCA staff recommends that the relationship between table 5-1 and table 4-1 be clearly stated. Consider making the criteria in table 5-1 at least as detailed as the impacts listed in table 4-1.</p> <hr/> <p>Table 5-1: TRCA staff notes that the category "socio-economic" has been expanded in table 5-1 to social/economic, land use, economy and transportation. Furthermore, the criteria under the category Transportation are far more detailed and specific than those listed under Natural Environment. Lastly, several categories contain criterion that will have economic metrics. While no criteria weighting has been discussed, there could be the perception of a weighting or bias in favour of socio-economic criteria relative to the natural environment based on the categorization, the relative level of detail of the criteria</p>	<p>Active transportation is an opportunity as part of this project, but is not an initiative on its own.</p> <hr/> <p>Revised (i.e. expanded "Government).</p> <hr/> <p>Tables have been revised.</p> <hr/> <p>Tables have been revised.</p>

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>between categories, and the number of criteria between categories that could have economic metrics.</p> <hr/> <p>Table 5-1: 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. Furthermore, each bullet should also evaluate alterations to system resiliency especially to chronic or acute stressors exacerbated by climate change.</p> <hr/> <p>Table 5-1: Land use appears under the factor Social/Economic and is its own separate factor. This appears to be a duplication.</p> <hr/> <p>Table 5-1: It is not clear what “resources” refers to. There does not appear to be a clear environmental effect in table 4-1 to match.</p> <hr/> <p>Table 5-1: For the eighth bullet under Transportation the phrase “more balanced transportation system” is ambiguous. Please consider a more specific description of the desired transportation system.</p> <hr/> <p>Section 6.2: TRCA staff appreciates the need to stage data collection as the study area is refined and saving the most detailed field studies for when the preferred alternative method is identified. However, one of the alternative methods and the most likely preferred alternative based on the Vaughan TMP, the draft North Vaughan and New Communities TMP, and the York Region TMP is a new road connection across the unopened road allowance of Teston Road. This section of the valley is highly sensitive and complex and should be studied over several seasons. TRCA staff has been in conversation with York Region staff about undertaking this multi-season monitoring. Please note. No revisions necessary.</p> <hr/> <p>S6.4.1: The last sentence is that “all stakeholders will be provided with the opportunity to review and provide comments on the factors, criteria and measures used to identify a preferred Alternative Method(s).” Staff</p>	<p>This categorization and wording is very specific to the TRCA, this document needs to include wording to satisfy all reviewing agencies and the public. Wording has been revised.</p> <hr/> <p>Tables have been revised.</p> <hr/> <p>Tables have been revised.</p> <hr/> <p>Addressed.</p> <hr/> <p>Comment Noted.</p> <hr/> <p>Revised text for clarity.</p>

Note: Comments are reproduced verbatim including typos and/or grammatical errors

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>notes that no measures have been provided in table 6-1 or Appendix A. It would be preferable for the measures (metrics, indicators) be developed now and refined during the EA. Otherwise TRCA staff recommend that it be clearly stated that the development of indicators (metrics, indicators) has been deferred to the EA.</p> <hr/> <p>Table 6-1 & 6-2: Climate change is listed under the Social/Economic environment component, but is absent from the other components. TRCA staff note that as requested in earlier comments, air quality and climate change be either listed under each features/components, or the analysis otherwise framed that climate change will be considered for each criteria.</p> <hr/> <p>Table 6-1 and 6-2: 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> <hr/> <p>Table 6-1 and 6-2: Provincial/Federal and Municipal policies/goals and objectives should be in each component. Add Conservation Authority to the list under Natural Environment</p> <hr/> <p>Table 6-2: Add "flowing artesian conditions" as a sub-factor of 1.3: Groundwater.</p> <hr/> <p>S8.2.4: Note that TRCA staff expects to be consulted as per the Service Level Agreement, which involves additional milestones than those listed. No revisions required.</p> <hr/> <p>Section 12: In October 2017 the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change released their guideline: Considering climate change in the environmental assessment process. This guideline is noticeably absent from the list of references. The document is very clear that it is to be used for Individual EAs. Given the growing emphasis on the consideration of climate change from all levels of government and from the public, TRCA staff strongly recommends that this guideline be</p>	<p>Tables have been revised.</p> <hr/> <p>This categorization and wording is very specific to the TRCA, this document needs to include wording to satisfy all reviewing agencies and the public. Wording has been revised.</p> <hr/> <p>Added text.</p> <hr/> <p>Added.</p> <hr/> <p>Comment noted.</p> <hr/> <p>Added MOECC Guideline to references.</p>

Note: Comments are reproduced verbatim including typos and/or grammatical errors

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>reviewed, the principles incorporated into the Terms of Reference, and that it be listed in the References.</p> <hr/> <p>Appendices: 1.2: Under Data Source for Wetlands, add TRCA Wetland Water Balance Risk Evaluation (2017)</p> <hr/> <p>1.3: Groundwater: add “flowing artesian conditions” as a sub-factor because there is a potential for geotechnical instability and permanent dewatering especially with a new structure across the unopened road allowance.</p> <hr/> <p>1.3: Please add the Oak Ridges Water Program as a data source for all groundwater sub-factors.</p> <hr/> <p>1.4: Under data source, replace “fill line regulation” with “development, interference with wetlands and alterations to shorelines and watercourses Regulation”</p> <hr/> <p>1.4.2: Please add to the sub-factors or criteria, as appropriate, erosion control and thermal mitigation, referencing TRCA’s Stormwater Management Criteria document.</p> <hr/> <p>2.7: This is the only factor that explicitly discusses climate change. The criteria relate only to the GHG emissions associated with operation of the alternative method. A more robust consideration of climate change in the TOR, as per the MOECC’s guidelines, will result in a more complete and defensible EA. For example, the MOECC guidelines clearly states that evaluation criteria should include impacts on carbon sinks. A new road crossing could result in significant losses to vegetation carbon sinks, especially large trees. This loss could be quantified to support compensation. Consideration of GHG contributions should be expanded to a life-cycle carbon assessment, including GHG emissions from materials extraction and processing, transportation to the site for construction and operation, and project maintenance and operation.</p>	<p>Added</p> <hr/> <p>Added</p> <hr/> <p>Added</p> <hr/> <p>Added</p> <hr/> <p>Added</p> <hr/> <p>Climate Change removed as a factor.</p>
17.			City of Toronto		<p>Toronto wishes to reiterate its previous comments on the EA as described on page 2 and 3 of a June 6, 2017 letter sent to Praveen John, P.Eng. of the York Region Transportation Services Department. A copy of the June 6, 2017 letter is attached. These comments apply and should be part of the comments record for this revised TOR.</p> <hr/> <p>Section 4.3/p21: The KVL is a “closed” landfill, not a “former” landfill</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <hr/> <p>Revised.</p>

Note: Comments are reproduced verbatim including typos and/or grammatical errors

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					4.3/p22: Replaced “old” with “other”	Revised
					4.5/p26: The KVL is a “closed” landfill, not a “former” landfill	Revised
					4.7/p31:Disturbance/alteration to existing utilities [ADD] “and engineered landfill controls”	Revised
					Table 5-1/p. 36: Social/Economic Environment: Add point: “- regulatory requirements for the perpetual care and control of closed landfills”	Revised
					Table 6-1/p.40: Social/Economic Env., Landfills and Hazardous Waste Sites. Toronto wishes to clarify that the Keele Valley landfill (and others in the area) are not Hazardous Waste Sites. Unless there are other hazardous waste sites to be considered, it is suggested that “Hazardous Waste Sites” be deleted or clarified to specify what sites are referred to.	The description “hazardous” was removed from the text.
					Table 6-2/p.42: 2.1 – Land Use: Add point: “- landfills under Provincial regulations and ECA requirements”	Added to item 2.6.1
					S8.1/p.47: Prior to the issuance of the draft EA report, Toronto requests to be copied on all technical studies that comment on potential impacts to the Keele Valley Landfill, and the opportunity to provide written comments.	Noted.
					S1.3: Change “former” landfills, to “closed” landfills. [reword] ... and the Vaughan Landfill to the north with known groundwater contamination and landfill gas issues, and the Keele Valley Landfill to the south, and the associated existing and potential future engineered landfill controls.	Revised
					S1.3: Large Volume Wells. The landfill purge wells systems are comprised of a series of purge wells with a combined water taking that should be considered as a Large Volume Well.	This information was added in the “Data Source” column of Section 1.3 “Groundwater” (Appendix A).
					S2.1: [ADD] “- landfills under Provincial regulations and ECA requirements”.	Added in section 2.6.1
					S2.6: There are potential impacts to existing landfill infrastructure (i.e., road salts [ADD] liners, monitoring/purge wells, landfill gas systems) and to space requirements for potential future landfill engineering controls if deemed necessary or required by MOECC. The City of	The comment was noted. Relevant information was added in Section 2.6 of the Terms of Reference.

Note: Comments are reproduced verbatim including typos and/or grammatical errors

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					Toronto must comply with existing regulatory requirements for the Keele Valley landfill; any change to the undeveloped portion of the Teston Road road allowance could significantly affect the City's ability to comply with the Environmental Compliance Approval for the site. The City has ongoing, intensive operational requirements for the site, which will continue for decades in the future. Operation of the Teston Road purge well system has been, and will continue to be, a significant method for groundwater plume management in the area.	
18.			City of Vaughan		<p>P2, Paragraph 3: This paragraph states that the proponents are required to examine two types of alternatives to an Undertaking. Please clarify why only two types of alternatives to an Undertaking will be examined. There may be a need to examine more than two through the process.</p> <hr/> <p>P2, Paragraph 4: Add "municipal" after public, and before agency input. Municipalities should not be grouped with public and agency.</p> <hr/> <p>Section 2/General: Approach to this section as drafted does not more holistically integrate information with respect to land use - at the "study/ project level". (i.e. recent and new planned communities, employment areas, etc....) S2/General: Section in general should include more fulsome background information and decision milestones/ history that include links to YR Reports and minutes on transportation network infrastructure improvements in the Preliminary Study Area including previous 2003 EA.</p> <p>There is no mention of York Region's Mid-York East and West Transportation Improvements Feasibility and Preliminary Engineering Study August 2012.</p> <hr/> <p>General/p6 and 7 6 2.1: General comment - section should include information on dates. (when was interchange with Highway 400 constructed /opened? when was washout of the crossing structure over the East Don River? when was the previous Municipal Class EA completed? when did York Region commit to completing an IEA for section of Teston Road - information on decision history, etc....)</p> <hr/> <p>P6: TOR refers to a historical connection on Teston Road over the East Don River, but does not provide a date. It would be more accurate to state the year the crossing structure washed out, and the length of time the corridor has been impassable at this point, including the extensive gravel and landfill operations over the past 50+ years.</p>	<p>Revised. There are only two types of Alternatives: "Alternatives To" and "Alternative Methods" under these two types there would be multiple alternatives examined. Chapter 5 details what "Alternatives To" are and Chapter 6 details what "Alternative Methods" are.</p> <hr/> <p>Added</p> <hr/> <p>Comment noted. The background information and existing conditions in the ToR are not meant to be a comprehensive review of the study area (this will be completed during the IEA); but are meant to provide the reader with general idea of the existing conditions when the ToR desktop study was completed (i.e Spring 2017). The requirement to provide final detailed description in the IEA has been noted in multiple locations in the ToR.</p> <hr/> <p>Dates added.</p> <hr/> <p>Added some background info. Oct.1954.</p>

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>P7: More fulsome information YRTMP on study area planned network information including Road Network. http://www.york.ca/wps/wcm/connect/yorkpublic/e0746dc9-8bb9-447b-a706-7f8d6513b29d/2016+TMP+Maps+16+to+19.pdf?MOD=AJPERES</p> <hr/> <p>P7/Paragraph 4: Comments/question on extract paragraph</p> <p>The TMP (clarify which TMP this is referring to?) identifies Kirby Road (add from Highway 27 to Bathurst Street) as a potential candidate to be added to the Regional Road network. Should Kirby Road be added to the Regional Road network, improvements could include widening to 4 lanes and a connection between Dufferin Street and Bathurst Street.</p> <p>The foregoing statement would otherwise suggest that that planned improvements to Kirby Road would only be constructed should Kirby Road be uploaded to the Region. The wording should be revised to clearly state that “Successive City and Regional Transportation Master Plans including Vaughan’s TMP 2013 and York Region’s TMP 2016 identified the need to improve Kirby Road including widening to 4 lanes and a connection of the missing link between Dufferin Street and Bathurst Street.”</p>	<p>Added the planned road network for 2041 from the YR TMP.</p> <hr/> <p>Text revised</p>
					<p>P8 and 9, Figures 2-2 and 2-3: Not clear why this section only includes information on the 10-year Cycling Network and not plans for other networks Road, Transit... from the YRTMP 2016</p> <p>See comment above.</p>	<p>Added the planned road network for 2041 from the YR TMP.</p>
					<p>P10/S2.2: The existing Maple GO Station is also situated the study area.</p>	<p>The Maple GO is an existing station. This section has listed the planned/proposed network improvements.</p>
					<p>P10-12/S2.2: It is not clear whether the analysis presented as sourced to the YRTMP 2016 approved June 2016 , has been updated - following the announcement on GTA West February 9, 2018 https://news.ontario.ca/mto/en/2018/02/ontario-not-moving-forward-with-highway-for-gta-west-corridor.html</p> <p>More specifically, the Region’s model used for the Region’s TMP 2016 assumed GTA West corridor would be in place. Accordingly, the model being used would need to remove GTA West transportation corridor from travel demand forecasting, analysis and evaluation etc.... I It is noted that travel demand forecasting and analysis from more</p>	<p>Analysis will be completed during the IEA.</p>

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>recent City's North Vaughan and New Communities Transportation Master Plan concludes that the GTA West corridor does have significant impact on the demand on E-W corridors.</p> <hr/> <p>P15/Figure 3-1: While the study includes a note on duration 2 to 3 years, the timeline with key decision points is not clear.</p> <hr/> <p>P13: Advise if undertaking will identify active transportation network (holistic approach). It appears to read as just a transportation network (i.e. roads?)</p> <hr/> <p>Section 4.3/P21: Add reference to the Vaughan Super Trail to second paragraph as a connected city wide system.</p> <p>The Vaughan Super Trail is an initiative to create a world-class, identifiable trail that connects a variety of off-road pathways and on-road pedestrian and cycling systems. A key goal of the Vaughan Super Trail is to link communities and people with local nature, cultural heritage, communities and special destinations throughout the City of Vaughan. Within the study area, The Vaughan Super Trail alignment includes connections through Block 27 along the Trans Canada Pipeline, connecting the proposed Kirby Station and associated mobility hub area, through NMRP and includes the Bartley Smith Greenway trails.</p> <p>The concept was presented to Finance, Administration and Audit Committee as part of the Cycling and Pedestrian Advisory Task Force. The Vaughan Super Trail was included as one of the recommendations presented in the task force Findings Report dated April 3, 2017.</p> <p>The proposed multi-use recreational trail network in the 2018 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bicycle Master Plan Update (work in progress) identifies the Vaughan Super Trail as a key priority.</p> <p>Details of proposed Vaughan Super Trail presented to City of Vaughan Council can be found: https://www.vaughan.ca/council/minutes_agendas/AgendaItems/Finance0403_17_8.pdf</p> <p>Make reference to the City of Vaughan 2007 Pedestrian and Bicycle Master plan noting that a 2018 update is in progress.</p> <hr/> <p>P22/S4.3: North Maple Regional Park Expansion</p>	<p>Timelines are subject to change and thus will not be included in the ToR.</p> <hr/> <p>Opportunity to add AT will be considered during the IEA.</p> <hr/> <p>Comment noted. The background information and existing conditions in the ToR are not meant to be a comprehensive review of the study area (this will be completed during the IEA); but are meant to provide the reader with general idea of the existing conditions when the ToR desktop study was completed (i.e Spring 2017). The requirement to provide final detailed description in the IEA has been noted in multiple locations in the ToR.</p> <hr/> <p>Comment noted. The background information and existing conditions in the ToR</p>

Note: Comments are reproduced verbatim including typos and/or grammatical errors

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>The expansion of the North Maple Regional Park (NMRP) is currently under review by the City through a due diligence master plan process that could see lands consisting of the Keele Landfill and surround open space forming part of a larger regional park system.</p> <p>A recent unsolicited proposal from Golf Canada presents an expanded vision for a nationally significant public sports, recreation and cultural venue within the NMRP and adjacent open space lands. The site is being considered as a preferred location for an integrated public park and golf course, which would become the permanent home to the national sporting organization and the prestigious Canadian Open.</p> <p>The expanded site is approximately 364 hectares (900 acres) of publicly owned park and open space property – which comprises the NMRP parkland of 81 hectares (200 acres) and the former Vaughan Township and Keele Valley landfill sites.</p> <p>Its vision for the NMRP site includes development of an expanded destination park with year-round recreational, cultural and multi-sport facilities, including a public golf course and club house and a Golf Canada Village that would-be home to the organization’s headquarters and the Canadian Golf Hall of Fame.</p> <p>The City is currently undertaking a comprehensive due diligence assessment as a first step to determining the true value and viability of Golf Canada’s proposal and will provide the City with a clearer understanding of these lands and how to fully realize their promise to build a lasting legacy of social, cultural and economic benefits for Vaughan residents.</p> <p>Furthermore, through this initiative consultation with the City of Toronto in underway with respect to the status of the Keel Landfill and potential access.</p> <p>Additional information can be found under Item 1, Report No. 15, of the Committee of the Whole (Working Session) on April 10, 2017, which was adopted without amendment by the Council of the City of Vaughan on April 19, 2017.</p> <p>https://www.vaughan.ca/council/minutes_agendas/AgendaItems/CW(WS)0410_17_1.pdf</p>	<p>are not meant to be a comprehensive review of the study area (this will be completed during the IEA); but are meant to provide the reader with general idea of the existing conditions when the ToR desktop study was completed (i.e Spring 2017). The requirement to provide final detailed description in the IEA has been noted in multiple locations in the ToR.</p>
					<p>P22/S4.3: NMRP Phase 1 Note that Phase 1 of the NMRP works are underway and will be ready for public use by summer of 2018. Phase 1 will include two senior</p>	<p>To be reviewed during IEA</p>

Note: Comments are reproduced verbatim including typos and/or grammatical errors

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>soccer fields, associated ancillary facilities, change rooms, and opening up trails within NMRP for public access.</p> <hr/> <p>P21/Figure 4-3: Show proposed new trails including the Vaughan Super Trail – refer to 2007 Ped and Bicycle Master Plan. Identify Maple Valley Plan limits.</p> <hr/> <p>P23/Figure 4-4: Show extent of North Maple Regional Map 900 acres expansion.</p> <hr/> <p>P31/Table 4-1: Part of Socio Economic Potential Environmental Effects: Disruption to or limiting the implementation of a continuous major recreational trail network</p> <hr/> <p>P16: Remove the text, “which are currently underutilized in a very developed part of the GTA”, from Section 4.1.</p> <hr/> <p>P18: Have a consistent format for reference to the Vaughan Official Plan as follows: Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (VOP 2010) Volume 1, Section 1.1</p> <hr/> <p>P19/Paragraph 8: Section 4.3 provides detailed Regional context but it does not provide the same level of detail for the City of Vaughan. Refer to Chapter 2, Managing Growth.</p> <p>Replace references to City of Vaughan Official Plan as “Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (VOP 2010)”</p> <p>Replace reference to Section 2.1.1 as “Section 2.1, Planning for Growth)</p> <hr/> <p>P19/Paragraph 10: This section should reference the City’s of Vaughan’s Natural Heritage Network, as per Schedule 2 of the VOP 2010.</p> <p>Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan Area should be referenced correctly. Correct other subsequent sections.</p> <p>Study area also includes lands that are within the Greenbelt Plan Area. Figure 4-2 should be updated to show Greenbelt Plan Area boundary.</p> <p>Suggest including wording to identify the study area to be contained within the City of Vaughan’s Urban Area boundary as per Schedule 1 A.</p>	<p>To be reviewed during IEA</p> <hr/> <p>To be reviewed during IEA</p> <hr/> <p>Added</p> <hr/> <p>Revised.</p> <hr/> <p>Revised.</p> <hr/> <p>Further details will be included in the IEA. References replaced.</p> <hr/> <p>Added figure that has only ORM and Greenbelt areas.</p>

Note: Comments are reproduced verbatim including typos and/or grammatical errors

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>P20: Figure 4-2 Identify where the lands use schedule is from (i.e. VOP 2010 Schedule 13?)</p> <hr/> <p>P21: Reference is made to OPA 535. Reference should also be made to the applicable VOP 2010 policies.</p> <hr/> <p>P23: Reference is made to site specific plans, identify these plans by number (i.e. VOP 2010 Volume 2 Section XX)</p> <hr/> <p>P22: Below are comments in reference to sections under “Areas Subject to Secondary Plans”:</p> <p>Future Employment Area: In addition to prestige employment lands the Secondary Plan also includes general employment & mixed use commercial lands. Refer to complete land use designations in Schedule C of the 11.4 Highway 400 North Employment Lands Secondary Plan. Also add: The Secondary Plan was approved by the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) on November 21,2011.</p> <p>In reference to “New Community Area – Block 27”</p> <p>The first sentence does not reference the Block 27 boundaries accurately, consider rewording to “The Block 27 Area, seen in Figure 4.4 is bounded by Teston Road to the south, Kirby Road to the north, Jane Street to the east and Keele Street to the west and is proposed for... “</p> <p>Reference to ‘rural’ lands should be reconsidered. Schedule 13 Land Use, of VOP 2010 references the lands as “New Community Areas” “Natural Areas” “Agricultural” with a small portion of the lands at the northeast corner of Teston Road and Jane Street as “Rural”.</p> <hr/> <p>P24: The City requests changes to the following text.</p> <p>Subject lands located at 1600 Teston Road are currently being reviewed as a development application pursuant to the Planning Act developed, and are divided into two areas subject to the Core Features policies and Enhancement Areas policies, as described in Section 3.2.3, Volume 1 of the Official Plan.</p> <hr/> <p>P27/ S4.6: This section should reference the City of Vaughan’s Natural Heritage Network Study. Refer to link below for study information. http://www.vaughan.ca/projects/policy_planning_projects/natural_heritage/Pages/default.aspx</p>	<p>Added.</p> <hr/> <p>All applicable policies will be reviewed and included in the IEA.</p> <hr/> <p>Added.</p> <hr/> <p>Changes made.</p> <hr/> <p>Revised</p> <hr/> <p>Comment noted. The background information and existing conditions in the ToR are not meant to be a comprehensive review of the study area (this will be completed during the IEA); but are meant to provide the reader with general idea of the existing conditions when the ToR desktop study was completed (i.e Spring 2017). The requirement to provide final detailed description in the IEA has been</p>

Note: Comments are reproduced verbatim including typos and/or grammatical errors

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>Figure 4-6 Natural Environment Overview should be updated to include the City's NHN as per Schedule 2 of VOP 2010. There should also be reference to the policies in Chapter 3 of the VOP 2010, as it provides language on protection and management of these features.</p> <p>Reference to Block 27 as "rural land" may be confusing. Consider changing it to "existing rural land uses".</p> <hr/> <p>P16/S4.1: Consistent with comments above – include information on dates for traceability. York Region committed to completing an IEA for the section of Teston Road between Keele Street and Dufferin Street during a previous Municipal Class EA Study in– include date.</p> <p>Clarify - The study area includes an area beyond the Teston Road Corridor (what area beyond is this referencing, what are the limits of the Teston Road Corridor?) which was previously reviewed in the 2003 Municipal Class EA</p> <hr/> <p>P17/S4.1: Figure 4.1 Preliminary Study Area – map/illustrate information described/documented on Page 16.</p> <hr/> <p>Section 5/P33: Versus reference to Municipal Policy (e.g. approved Official Plans) identify the Official Plans by name</p> <hr/> <p>P36: Same comment identify municipal plans specifically</p> <hr/> <p>P36: Table 5-1. Please make the following changes. "The degree to which the proposed transportation system modification impacts natural features, species of conservation concern, and species at risk, such as:</p> <hr/> <p>P37/Table 5-1: Suggested criteria under Transportation factor – should consider leverage investment in right-of-way Teston Road infrastructure and interchange with Highway 400</p> <hr/> <p>Section 6/General: The Terms of Reference should give special consideration to impacts to the existing infrastructure of the three closed landfill sites located in the study area. Essential water and gas monitoring and control equipment straddle the current Teston Road right of way between Keele and Dufferin.</p> <p>The infrastructure includes purge wells, observation wells, manholes containing flow meters, plumbing and buried electrical service, as well</p>	<p>noted in multiple locations in the ToR.</p> <hr/> <p>Date added and revised.</p> <hr/> <p>Refer to other figures within ToR.</p> <hr/> <p>All municipal policies and plans applicable to this project will be captured in the IEA.</p> <hr/> <p>Revised</p> <hr/> <p>Criteria will be reviewed in detail during the IEA stage.</p> <hr/> <p>Comment noted.</p>

Note: Comments are reproduced verbatim including typos and/or grammatical errors

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>as a force main all operated by City of Toronto to the east, and a perimeter landfill gas collection and flaring system operated by City of Vaughan on the western extent of the site. The Vaughan landfill gas control system consists of a network of twenty-seven landfill gas extraction wells connected by buried header piping to two blowers running in parallel, with aboveground piping under pressure to an enclosed flare. North of the Teston Road right of way there are also eleven groundwater monitoring wells located east of the East Don River, used to track potential leachate impacts on groundwater quality on the eastern portion of the Site.</p> <p>As these closed landfills operate under Certificate of Approvals from the MOECC, any changes to access or infrastructure will likely increase costs and required oversight measures.</p> <hr/> <p>P42/S6.4: Update Table 6-2 Summary of Evaluation Factors and Sub-Factors for Alternative Methods Section 1.2 with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provincially Significant Wetlands - Significant Woodlands - ANSI and ESA - Significant Wildlife Habitat <hr/> <p>P44/S6.5, Paragraph 2: Add “municipalities” after agencies</p> <hr/> <p>P40/Table 6-1: Change reference to local parks to simply state Parks. I would recommend that the parkland typologies in VOP 2010, section 7.3 be used when noting parkland.</p> <hr/> <p>P43/Table 6-2: Under section 2.2.6 Consider reframing as Community and Recreational Facilities/Institutions</p> <hr/> <p>Section 8/P46, Paragraph 4: The terms “stakeholder” as it relates to Vaughan requires clarification. Municipalities do not identify as stakeholders but as approval authorities. This section should be updated to differentiate between the different public interest groups. Also, it is suggested that the Indigenous communities also not be referred to as stakeholders.</p> <hr/> <p>P47/S8.2.2: This section should include the supporting Figure 3-1 with information clarifying the study process for stages of consultation/ mandatory points of contact, key milestones/decision points etc.... under the consultation program.</p> <hr/> <p>P49/S8.4: As related to previous comment - this section needs to more clearly articulate and expand on how the consultation program will be</p>	<p>These are already listed in the Table in Appendix A under criteria.</p> <hr/> <p>Added.</p> <hr/> <p>Removed local.</p> <hr/> <p>Added.</p> <hr/> <p>Addressed.</p> <hr/> <p>ToR only provides an overview of the Consultation plan – these details will be initiated in the IEA.</p>

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>engaging and the role of the City of Vaughan.</p> <hr/> <p>Section 11: This section references the agency but not the specific Acts. Suggest adding this detail, as per the Fisheries Act Approval (Federal Government), see suggestions below. Also, include legislation/regulations that are applicable to the project.</p> <p>Environment Canada</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fisheries Act - Species at Risk Act - Migratory Birds Convention Act <p>Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Endangered Species Act <p>MOECC</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clean Water Act <p>Add "TransCanada Pipeline Inc."</p> <hr/> <p>Section 12: The following references should be added.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. City of Vaughan Natural Heritage Network, 2014 2. Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, 2017 3. Greenbelt Plan, 2017 4. Growth Plan, 2017 5. Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 <hr/> <p>P54: The following should be referenced in the document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City of Vaughan 2013 Active Together Master Plan noting that a 2018 update is in progress to be finalized in Q2 2018. <p>City of Vaughan 2007 Pedestrian and Bicycle Master plan noting that a 2018 update is in progress.</p> <hr/> <p>Appendices:</p> <p>2.1.3 – Rename Vaughan Official Plan to Vaughan Official Plan 2010</p> <p>2.4.2 – Under Data source identify specifically the applicable official plans</p> <p>2.4.4 – add 2010 after City of Vaughan Official Plan</p> <p>Appendix A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Update ORMCP and PPS with proper years, as they have been updated. - Update Provincial and Federal Agencies names as they have 	<p>All applicable Acts/Regulations will be determined during the IEA once the full undertaking and alternatives are determined.</p> <hr/> <p>References used for during the preparation of the ToR will be listed.</p> <hr/> <p>Document not finalized.</p> <hr/> <p>Revised Too specific for the ToR Revised</p> <hr/> <p>Revised, factors and criteria will be further addressed in the IEA.</p>

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>changed, for instance there is no longer a Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs, it is now called Ministry of Indigenous Relations and Reconciliation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regarding Woodlands, include under "Criteria" woodlands that meet the definition of woodlands in the Regional Official Plan and VOP 2010. <hr/> <p>Appendix A – Data Source column, 1.4 (Factor), 1.4.2 (sub-factor):</p> <p>The last bullet should read..."MOECC Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual (2003) and the final version of MOECC's Low Impact Development Stormwater Management Design guideline.</p> <p>MOECC anticipates the final version of the document to be released in 2018. Thus, well within the IEA project timeline.</p> <hr/> <p>Page 84 item 2.2 under rationale: Speak to the future plans and feasibility of park expansion.</p> <hr/> <p>Page 77 item 2.4.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All reference to Active Together Master Plan should be "Active Together Master Plan (2013) or its successor - noting that a 2018 update is in progress to be finalized in Q2 2018. <p>City of Vaughan 2007 Pedestrian and Bicycle Master plan noting that a 2018 update is in progress.</p> <hr/> <p>Page 84 item 4.2.2 – Reference should be made to limiting barriers to the connectivity of future planned trails.</p>	<p>Revised.</p> <hr/> <p>Parks are included in the rationale</p> <hr/> <p>The most current data source will be used during the IEA process.</p> <hr/> <p>Wording added.</p>
19.			MNRF		<p>General:</p> <p>A) The Term of Reference (ToR) provides an overview of various regional and municipal planning initiatives related to the proposed under taking. It does not, however, 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</p>	

Note: Comments are reproduced verbatim including typos and/or grammatical errors

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>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 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>...</p>	

Note: Comments are reproduced verbatim including typos and/or grammatical errors

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<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> <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> <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> <i>(e) the long-term landscape management approaches adopted will maintain, and where possible improve or</i> 	

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p><i>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> <p>B) 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> <p>C) 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>	<p>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 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.</p> <p>B) As noted in Chapter 8 of the ToR MNRF will be continued to be consulted during the IEA. Noted, a site visit can be completed during the IEA.</p> <p>C) No “inventory” work has been completed during this ToR stage – detailed inventory work (including field investigations) will be completed during the IEA. There will be regular meetings with MNRF during the IEA.</p>
					<p>Section 4:</p> <p>A) 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. The forests and swamps of this area are part of large forested tract of about 300 hectares, is one</p>	<p>Noted</p>

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>of the 12 largest blocks of forests on the Oak Ridges Moraine and largest forest in the City of Vaughan.</p> <p>B) Table 4-1 Potential Environmental Effects – Should also specifically mention: permanent affects such as lighting, increased traffic, increased noise and changes to fish and wildlife passage.</p> <hr/> <p>Section 5:</p> <p>A) 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> <hr/> <p>Section 6:</p> <p>A) Section 6.3 should include specific reference to the ORMCP policies as a guiding principle for consideration in the considerations to generate alternatives.</p> <p>B) 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> <hr/> <p>Section 7:</p> <p>A) 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> <hr/> <p>A) 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). MNRF 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>Weighting of criteria will be determined during the IEA when alternatives have been established.</p> <hr/> <p>Section 6.3 identifies high level principles to be applied in the generation of alternatives, policies and plans will support these principles.</p> <hr/> <p>Commitments and monitoring will be considered during the IEA as appropriate.</p> <hr/> <p>Noted.</p>

Note: Comments are reproduced verbatim including typos and/or grammatical errors

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
			MTCS		<p>General: In Ontario, cultural heritage is generally described in three main categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archaeological resources; • Built heritage resources, including bridges and monuments; and, • Cultural heritage landscapes. <p>This terminology is reinforced in provincial policy, including the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014. We encourage the proponent to use terminology consistent with this in its ToR and the IEA documentation.</p> <p>Furthermore, we note that while cultural heritage landscapes are considered briefly in section 6 and in the appendices, they do not appear to be discussed in earlier sections of the report. The IEA should identify and consider any cultural heritage landscapes in the “description of the environment” and “environmental effects.”</p> <hr/> <p>In 2010, the City of Vaughan retained ASI to undertake a cultural heritage landscape inventory and policy study to support their Official Plan review. We are bringing it to your attention as it may be of assistance with this IEA.</p> <p>www.vaughan.ca/services/business/heritage_preservation/General%20Documents/Cultural%20Heritage%20Landscape%20Inventory%20and%20Policy%20Study%20March%202010.pdf</p> <hr/> <p>S4/ 4.4 and 4.5: These sections identify that there are a number of archaeological sites, areas of archaeological potential, as well as built heritage properties in the study area. A preliminary baseline review for built heritage resources was completed as part of the ToR, but more information will be necessary in order to understand the cultural heritage resources in the area as well as understand project impacts on those resources.</p>	<p>Revised</p> <hr/> <p>Comment noted.</p> <hr/> <p>A desktop Built Heritage study was completed for the ToR, further studies will be completed during the IEA.</p> <p>A Stage 1 Archaeology Study has been completed for part of the study area, further studies to be completed as required as part of the IEA (the Stage 1 Archaeology Study is not included as part of the ToR, but was completed as a separate document).</p>

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>It appears that the preliminary baseline inventory only screened for cultural heritage resources that have already been identified on inventories or registers. We note that while some cultural heritage resources may have already been formally identified, others may be identified through screening and evaluation during the EA process. We recommend that the MTCS Criteria for Evaluating Potential for Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes or another screening should be completed to help determine whether this EA project may impact cultural heritage resources.</p> <p>The Built Environment section should clearly identify what further studies will be undertaken as part of the IEA in order to identify any known or potential cultural heritage resources and possible impacts on these resources. MTCS recommends that archaeological assessments as well as a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) are undertaken for this project. The following is a sample table of contents for a HIA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • description of study area • overview of cultural heritage and environmental assessment legislation as it relates to this project • name of the proponent • brief description of the proposed project 2. Historical background of the property or study area <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • settlement of surrounding area, association with prominent persons, land use activity, ownership pattern 3. Statement(s) of cultural heritage value or interest 4. Full description and purpose of proposed activity 5. Description of the anticipated impacts of proposed activity on heritage attributes that support the cultural heritage resource’s cultural heritage value or interest 6. Description and evaluation of development alternatives and mitigation or avoidance measures in response to impacts 7. Summaries of engagement with Indigenous communities, stakeholders, the community and interested organizations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • who was engaged and how • how comments were incorporated into the recommended approach 	

Note: Comments are reproduced verbatim including typos and/or grammatical errors

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>8. Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preferred conservation measures • if other site alteration or development approaches are not appropriate, explanation of why • if there is going to be an impact on a resource, explanation of why the impact cannot be avoided • implementation decision making and to ensure that any necessary mitigation measures can be implemented for the project. <p>9. Appendices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • project personnel <hr/> <p>S4.5/P26: Resources numbers 5, 6, 7 appear to be within the study area, according to the area mapped in figure 4-5. Please clarify.</p> <hr/> <p>S4.7/P31: Under the Cultural effects heading, this list is repetitive, especially with regard to archaeological resources. The difference between the following is unclear:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alteration/ displacement of known and not yet known archaeological sites - Removal/ loss of cultural archaeological units - Disturbance to lands with significant archaeological potential <hr/> <p>S5.2/Table 5-1/P36: We suggest the following modifications (in bold) to this section: The degree to which the proposed transportation system modification impacts cultural features, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - properties of cultural heritage value, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • archaeological sites • built heritage resources • cultural heritage landscapes - archaeological and; - Indigenous sites <hr/> <p>S5.2: Evaluation of alternatives should be based on information in technical heritage studies, including Heritage Impact Assessment and archaeological assessment.</p> <hr/> <p>S6.3/P39:</p>	<p>Confirmed and clarified.</p> <hr/> <p>Revised</p> <hr/> <p>Revised</p> <hr/> <p>Noted.</p> <hr/>

Note: Comments are reproduced verbatim including typos and/or grammatical errors

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>It is recommended that minimizing impacts to cultural heritage resources is included as its own “guiding principle”. Not all cultural heritage resources are within urban/rural areas.</p> <hr/> <p>S6.3/Table 6- 1/P40: We suggest the following updates for consistency with current terminology and practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Historical, Archaeological sites, built heritage resources, and cultural heritage landscapes <p>Sites</p> <hr/> <p>S6.4/Table 6- 2/P43: For item 3.1 we note that cultural heritage resources are not limited to the sources listed, and may also be identified through technical heritage studies.</p> <p>For item 3.2.1 we suggest the term “pre-contact” rather than “pre-historic”.</p> <hr/> <p>S6.5: We note that the HIA and archaeological assessment should be used to inform the mitigation measures and concept design.</p> <hr/> <p>Appendices: Appendix A – comments made on items 3.1 and 3.2.1 apply to items 3.1 and 3.2.1 in this table as well.</p>	<p>Revised</p> <hr/> <p>Revised</p> <hr/> <p>Revised</p> <hr/> <p>Comment noted.</p> <hr/> <p>Revised</p>
20.			York Region Public Health		<p>Appendices: Re: Appendix A (pg 54) Summary of Evaluation and Criteria for Alternative Methods: Air Quality and Climate Change: Local and regional air quality impacts and greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>York Region Public is requesting further clarification regarding how qualitative comparisons will be made for alternatives for both local and regional air quality and for GHG's. We suggest the IEA process consider sensitive receptors such as schools, child care centres and long term care homes in their consideration of alternatives and part of their qualitative assessment. This aligns with section 3.2.6 of our York Region Official Plan policy: “that sensitive uses such as schools, daycares, and seniors facilities not be located near significant known air emissions sources such as controlled access provincial 400- series highways.”</p>	<p>Under criteria add consideration of sensitive receptors.</p> <p>Added “MOECC guidance documents” under data sources as well as Consultation with MOECC.</p>

Note: Comments are reproduced verbatim including typos and/or grammatical errors

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					<p>In addition, we are recommending that the TOR mention the relevant MTO/MOECC air quality and climate change EA guidance documents. For example,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MOECC Air Quality Impact Assessment Guidance for Schedule C Municipal Road Class EAs (see attachment) • MTO's Environmental Guide for Assessing and Mitigating the Air Quality Impacts and Greenhouse Gas Emissions of Provincial Transportation Projects http://www.raqsb.mto.gov.on.ca/techpubs/eps.nsf/0/24fe4bb174a2af7085257aa9006558f4/\$FILE/MTO%20Environmental%20Guide%20for%20Air%20Quality%20June%202012%20Final%20ACC.pdf • MOECC's Climate Change impacts when preparing an environmental assessment: https://www.ontario.ca/page/considering-climate-change-environmental-assessment-process 	
Public Correspondence						
21.	Trueman	Geoff	Geoff Trueman, P.Eng gmtrueman@outlook.com	Mar. 07, 2018/ EM	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>I commute from the Weston/Teston area in Woodbridge to Yonge/Elgin Mills daily for work. I take the detour up Keele to Kirby and back down Dufferin which adds at least 10-15 minutes to my commute each way. This link would save me up to half an hour of driving every day, and I cannot say enough good things about it.</p> <p>With Vaughan quickly expanding northward this should be a boon to commuters who wish to avoid the heavy rush-hour traffic on Major MacKenzie and Rutherford Roads.</p> <p>Thank you, Geoff Trueman, P.Eng</p>	<p><u>Response from Christine Morrison (York Region), March 8, 2018:</u></p> <p>Good afternoon Mr. Trueman,</p> <p>Thank you for your feedback regarding the Teston Road Individual Environmental Assessment Study. We appreciate you taking the time to share your experiences with travel in the area.</p> <p>Community input is an important part of this study and your comments have been shared with our project team and documented for the record.</p> <p>Please do not hesitate to contact me directly if you have any questions or require more information.</p> <p>Regards, Christine Morrison Communications and Community Engagement Specialist</p>

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
22.	Kallai	Noreen	Noreen Kallai 905-884-7427 noreenkallai@aol.com	Feb. 27, 2018/ EM	<p>I have quickly reviewed the proposed Terms of Reference for a proposal to extend Teston Road between Keele and Dufferin to Bathurst. By segmenting environmental assessments into small sections you miss the problems that are created in adjacent communities. As I previously commented, this assessment needs to consider not just the impact on the proposed area to Bathurst but further from Hwy 400 to 404 Hwy. Not all aspects of the environmental assessment will apply for this broader area but some, such as the air quality need to be considered, as air quality is not restricted to an area on a study map.</p> <p>The same applies to traffic movement. Extending Teston Road simply moves the congestion challenges on Major MacKenzie one concession road north. A big difference is that Major MacKenzie has a railway underpass so the traffic keeps flowing. Elgin Mills, with the same number of trains, has a level crossing. This difference can not be ignored because every time the crossing gates block traffic you have traffic gridlock in the Elgin Mills- Yonge to Bayview streets and side streets, with its associated car exhaust.</p> <p>I really hope that the persons involved in the assessment live in proximity to the geographic area or are prepared to invest sufficient time to become very familiar with the challenges of increasing congestion, particularly as the Yonge, Bernard, Elgin Mills Streets are slated for further housing intensification, construction of which is already underway. No extension of Teston should be considered before a railway over or underpass is constructed on Elgin Mills. Otherwise you will make a somewhat tolerable situation intolerable.</p> <p>Noreen Kallai 905-884-7427 noreenkallai@aol.com</p>	<p><u>Response from Christine Morrison (York Region), March 8, 2018:</u></p> <p>Good afternoon Ms. Kallai,</p> <p>Thank you for your feedback regarding the Teston Road Individual Environmental Assessment study.</p> <p>A study of York Region’s entire transportation network was carried out as part of the development of the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) 2016. The TMP also identifies the smaller segments to be considered, such as Teston Road between Keele Street and Dufferin Street, that are prioritized based on the transportation requirements. The Individual Environmental Assessment (IEA) being undertaken on Teston Road is a longer process when compared to a more typical Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process.</p> <p>The first step in the IEA process is the development of the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the IEA.</p> <p>The Terms of Reference for the Teston Road project identifies principles that will guide the Individual Environmental Assessment (IEA) study. The study area was developed based on consultation from the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change, stakeholders, regulatory agencies and feedback from the Public Open House held in April 2017.</p> <p>The processes for data collection, development and evaluation of the alternatives as well as the selection of the preferred alternative will be done as part of the IEA, are outlined in the ToR document.</p> <p>The construction of a grade separation to replace the level rail crossing on Elgin Mills Rd east of Yonge is included in our 10-Year Roads and Transit Capital Construction Program and will be built ahead of any improvements on Teston Road within the IEA study area</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>Christine Morrison Communications and Community Engagement Specialist</p>
					<p><u>Response received March 8, 2018:</u></p> <p>Thank you for your detailed response. Clearly I have not followed all the planning related to roads. It is reassuring that any Teston Road extension will not proceed ahead of a grade segregation at the Elgin Mills rail crossing.</p>	

Note: Comments are reproduced verbatim including typos and/or grammatical errors

Number	Last Name	First Name	Address	Comment Date/ Type	Comment Received	Action/ Response
					Noreen Kallai 905-884-7427 noreenkallai@aol.com	
23.	Di Vona	Matthew A.	Di Vona Law Professional Corporation 600-77 Bloor Street West Toronto, Ontario M5S 1M2 (416) 562-9729 matthew@divonala.com	Jan. 19, 2018/ EM	<p>What is the status of the IEA for the proposed Teston Road link between Keele and Bathurst?</p> <p>Please provide me with notice regarding the public consultation and any future consideration of this matter by the Region.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p> <p>Matthew A. Di Vona Di Vona Law Professional Corporation</p>	<p><u>Philip Brandon responded on April 13, 2018:</u></p> <p>Dear Mr. Di Vona,</p> <p>Thank you for your email and interest in the Teston Road – Keele Street to Bathurst Street project. We are in the process of preparing a Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Individual Environmental Assessment (IEA). The ToR is at the draft stage, and can be viewed on the project website at York.ca/TestonRoad. Upon reviewing and incorporating comments from stakeholders, we will prepare the final ToR and submit it to the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change for review and approval. Once the Terms of Reference for the project is approved, we will commence the Individual Environmental Assessment, which will be carried out in accordance with the approved Terms of Reference.</p> <p>The IEA study duration will be approximately 3-4 years, and will include multiple open houses to consult with the public.</p> <p>I will have you added to the project mailing list to keep you up to date on the project.</p> <p>Best Regards,</p> <p>Phil Brandon, P.Eng</p>