Schedule ‘C’ Environmental Assessment for 16th Avenue between Yonge Street and Woodbine Avenue

Appendix D

Agency and Stakeholder Correspondence / Minutes
## 16th Avenue EA – Key Agency Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CN Rail</td>
<td>Michael Vallins</td>
<td>Public Works Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN Rail</td>
<td>Derek Basso</td>
<td>Public Works Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN Rail</td>
<td>Ryan Coward</td>
<td>Constable, CN Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Richmond Hill</td>
<td>Samson Wat</td>
<td>Transportation Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Markham</td>
<td>Peter Chan</td>
<td>Capital Works Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrolinx/ GO Transit</td>
<td>Trevor Anderson</td>
<td>Senior Manager, Rail Network Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry</td>
<td>Mark Heaton</td>
<td>Fish and Wildlife Biologist, Aurora District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry</td>
<td>Jeff Andersen</td>
<td>Management Biologist, Aurora District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks</td>
<td>Emilee O'Leary</td>
<td>Environmental Planner / Environmental Assessment Coordinator, Central Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Ministry of Transportation</td>
<td>Margaret Mikolajczak</td>
<td>Senior Project Manager, Corridor Management Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Ministry of Transportation</td>
<td>Raymond Ng</td>
<td>Senior Project Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto and Region Conservation Authority</td>
<td>Scott Smith</td>
<td>Planner II, Environmental Assessment Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto and Region Conservation Authority</td>
<td>Harsimrat Pruthi</td>
<td>Planner, Environmental Assessment Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Region Transit</td>
<td>Umaharan Sivarajah</td>
<td>Service Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Municipality of York</td>
<td>Paul Acquaah</td>
<td>Manager, Engineering (Capital Planning and Delivery Branch, Transportation Services Department)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Municipality of York</td>
<td>Yvonne Kaczor</td>
<td>Senior Active &amp; Sustainable Transportation Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Municipality of York</td>
<td>Angie Hutnick</td>
<td>Green Infrastructure Design Technologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Municipality of York</td>
<td>Jay McCague</td>
<td>Landscape Specialist, Streetscape Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Municipality of York</td>
<td>Gerard Sullivan</td>
<td>Environmental Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Municipality of York</td>
<td>James Szeto</td>
<td>Traffic Noise Abatement Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Municipality of York</td>
<td>Tina Wang</td>
<td>Traffic Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Municipality of York</td>
<td>Shu Zhu</td>
<td>Senior Project Manager, Capital Planning &amp; Delivery, Transportation Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Municipality of York</td>
<td>Carmen Hui</td>
<td>Program Manager, Streetscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Municipality of York</td>
<td>Duncan MacAskill</td>
<td>Manager, Development Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Municipality of York</td>
<td>Steve Mota</td>
<td>Program Manager, Transportation Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Municipality of York</td>
<td>Erion Poloska</td>
<td>District Manager, Southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Municipality of York</td>
<td>David Mhango</td>
<td>Manager, Development Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Municipality of York</td>
<td>Calvin Mollett</td>
<td>Program Manager, Development Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Municipality of York</td>
<td>Phil Harrison</td>
<td>Water Resources Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Municipality of York</td>
<td>James Lane</td>
<td>Program Manager, Green Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Municipality of York</td>
<td>Peter Sniulolis</td>
<td>Program Manager, District Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Municipality of York</td>
<td>Vi Bui</td>
<td>Program Manager, Transportation Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Municipality of York</td>
<td>Media Liya</td>
<td>Operations Technologist II, Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Municipality of York</td>
<td>John Soriano</td>
<td>Operations Technologist II, Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Municipality of York</td>
<td>Matthew Aylett</td>
<td>Coordinator, Utility Plans (Technologist III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Municipality of York</td>
<td>Beata Rancourt</td>
<td>Project Quality Control Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Municipality of York</td>
<td>Nelson Costa</td>
<td>Manager, Corridor Control and Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Municipality of York</td>
<td>Tammy Silverstone</td>
<td>Manager, System Sustainability Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Municipality of York</td>
<td>Paul Nause</td>
<td>Manager, Traffic Signal Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Municipality of York</td>
<td>Mike Fairbanks</td>
<td>Manager, Water Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Municipality of York</td>
<td>Adam Barkovitz</td>
<td>Program Manager, Urban Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Municipality of York</td>
<td>Pina Accardi</td>
<td>Manager, Environmental Project Management Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Municipality of York</td>
<td>Birju Shah</td>
<td>Capital Project Specialist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following summarizes meetings with individual agencies, stakeholders, property owners/residents, and other interested parties throughout the duration of the 16th Avenue Environmental Assessment Study. Key correspondence and meeting minutes are included in this appendix. Records of all correspondence and meetings are documented in the Region’s project file.

**York Region Stakeholders Meetings:**

- Highway 404 Alternatives Workshop: July 15, 2016
- Highway 404 and Median AT Facilities Meeting: September 22, 2016
- Alternative Designs Meeting: July 14, 2017
- Active Transportation and Streetscaping Meeting: August 14, 2017
- Highway 404 Traffic Meeting: October 3, 2018

**Ministry of Transportation (MTO) Meetings:**

- Coordination Meeting: January 22, 2016
- Coordination Meeting: September 29, 2016
- Coordination Meeting: January 9, 2017
- Coordination Call: July 13, 2017
- Coordination Meeting: July 18, 2017
- Coordination Meeting: August 17, 2017
- Coordination Meeting: March 22, 2018
- Coordination Meeting: April 20, 2018
- Coordination Meeting: May 1, 2018
- Coordination Call: June 27, 2018
- Coordination Meeting: July 23, 2018
- Coordination Meeting: July 30, 2018
- Coordination Meeting: August 13, 2018
- Coordination Meeting: September 10, 2018
- Coordination meeting: September 24, 2018
- MTO Executives Engineering Meeting: October 9, 2018
- Coordination Meeting: October 22, 2018
- Coordination Meeting: November 6, 2018
- Coordination Meeting: November 19, 2018

**Local Municipality Meetings:**

- **Town of Richmond Hill Meetings:**
  - Coordination Meeting: November 2, 2016
  - Coordination Meeting: January 13, 2017
  - Coordination Meeting: April 25, 2017
  - Coordination Meeting: July 13, 2017
  - Coordination Meeting: July 31, 2017
  - Coordination Meeting: May 25, 2018
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- Coordination Meeting: October 29, 2018

- City of Markham Meetings:
  - Coordination Meeting: November 11, 2016
  - Coordination Meeting: March 22, 2017
  - Coordination Meeting: July 28, 2017
  - Coordination Meeting: October 19, 2018

- City of Pickering Meetings:
  - Coordination Meeting: January 8, 2018

CN Rail Meetings:

- Coordination Meeting: January 27, 2017
- Coordination Meeting: September 15, 2017
- Coordination Meeting: October 17, 2018

Metrolinx Meetings:

- Coordination Meeting: November 9, 2016

Ministry of the Environment, Conservation, and Parks (MECP) Meetings:

- Coordination Meeting: July 18, 2016
- Coordination Meeting: March 31, 2017
- Coordination Meeting: December 11, 2017
- Coordination Meeting: June 28, 2018

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) Meetings:

- Coordination Meeting: October 25, 2016
- Coordination Meeting and Site Visit: June 15, 2017
- Coordination Meeting: September 19, 2017
- Coordination Meeting: May 23, 2018

Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) Meetings:

- Coordination Meeting: October 27, 2016
- Coordination Meeting: September 29, 2017
- Coordination Meeting: October 17, 2018

Parks Canada Meetings:

- Coordination Meeting: August 24, 2017

Alectra Meetings:

- Coordination Meeting: May 29, 2017
Property Owner Meetings:

- Property Owner Meeting: January 11, 2017
- Property Owner Meeting: January 20, 2017
- Property Owner Meeting: July 28, 2017
- Property Owner Meeting: October 17, 2017
- Property Owner Meeting: October 18, 2017
- Multiple Property Owner Meetings: October 25, 2017
- Multiple Property Owner Meetings: November 1, 2017
- Property Owner Meeting: November 8, 2017
- Property Owner Meeting: December 6, 2017
- Multiple Property Owner Meetings: March 9, 2018
- Property Owner Meeting: March 22, 2018
- Property Owner Meeting: April 4, 2018
- Property Owner Meeting: May 23, 2018
- Property Owner Meeting: October 22, 2018
Meeting Minutes

Project: 16th Avenue Environmental Assessments (EAs) from Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue and from Woodbine Avenue to York/Durham Line

Subject: MTO Meeting

Date: Thursday, August 17, 2017

Location: MTO Downsview Office

Attendees:
- Margaret Mikolajczak, MTO
- Rebecca Palys, MTO
- Aaron Janke, MTO
- Paul Acquaah, York Region
- Michelle Mascarenhas, York Region
- Tyrone Gan, HDR
- Veronica Restrepo, HDR

Regrets:
- Goran Nikolic, MTO
- Nina Vallvé, MTO
- Colin Wong, York Region
- Anson Wong, York Region

Minutes by: Veronica Restrepo, HDR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 16th Ave EA Update</td>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project Update/Background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o First round of Open Houses was held in November 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Next set of open houses being planned for Fall 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Environmental Study Report (ESR) filing anticipated in 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Updated recommended solutions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Limits of proposed widening have been updated and are consistent with the York Region (YR) Transportation Master Plan (TMP), as follows:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Yonge Street to McCowan Road: Widen to six lanes for Transit/High Occupancy Vehicles (HOV), Active Transportation (AT) improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• McCowan Road to Donald Cousens Parkway (DCP) – AT Improvements, no additional lanes required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DCP to York/Durham Line (YDL) – Paved shoulders, no additional lanes required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Median Active Transportation (AT) Facilities</td>
<td>Information and Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Median AT facility is an option proposed for 16th Avenue at the Highway 404 Interchange (IC) to offer more protection to pedestrians and cyclists as well as minimize conflicts with high speed vehicles at the highway interchange ramps.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 16th Avenue is a key AT corridor for all types of users. Heavy ramp volumes can result in conflicts and safety concerns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- YR is reviewing the Highway 7/Highway 400 IC Median AT pilot project and confirming the contact for that project to obtain more information. Aaron’s manager (Alice Munro) was involved in the Highway 7/Highway 400 pilot project review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- YR would like to confirm the process required for the Ministry’s approval of median AT facilities through the Highway 404/16th Ave interchange.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- MTO noted that the median AT was implemented in the Highway 7/Highway 400 project to avoid impact or replacement of the existing structure at that location. This is not the case for 16th Avenue as the structure will be either widened or replaced.
- The design alternatives to accommodate AT facilities through the interchange were discussed. **EA team to send plan drawings and cross-sections for all four alternatives to MTO (Aaron) for review.** These include the drawings for the Parclo AB (existing) and Parclo A4 configurations with boulevard and median AT facilities. **Post-meeting note: files were provided to MTO on October 2, 2017.**
- For the existing interchange configuration, it was noted that the conflict for the east-west AT crossing with northbound left-turn is still unresolved. Signal phasing could address this.
- **MTO (Margaret) to share comments from Ramone** (from the previous review of the 16th Avenue median AT option) with Aaron to facilitate his review. **MTO (Aaron) to review comments from the Highway 7/Highway 400 design.**
- MTO noted a concern that cyclists would not wait for two sets of lights to cross to the median. YR noted they are building infrastructure to accommodate cyclists of all ages and experience levels, not strictly cyclists that are comfortable riding anywhere.
- **MTO (Aaron) to confirm if MTO requires traffic forecasts from YR** for the 2041 16th Avenue EA horizon (for review by Goran’s group). MTO EA has forecasts for 2031 which will likely be sufficient.
- **EA team to send MTO (Aaron) the existing 16th Avenue profile.** **Post-meeting note: file was provided to MTO on October 2, 2017.**
- **MTO (Aaron) to provide a list of all the required documents for the median AT review.** A formal submission will then be made to MTO via Margaret. Nina (MTO) will be the lead in the review, with involvement from Aaron. **Post-meeting note: list of required files was received from Margaret and the files were provided to MTO on October 2, 2017.**
- The submission to MTO to include an overview of operations, pros and cons for the various options, bullnose geometry deficiencies, etc.
- The MTO review timelines are approximately 6-8 weeks. **MTO to provide feedback as soon as possible so that the Open House material can reflect the final preference.**
- If feedback is not received to incorporate final recommendation at the upcoming Open Houses, YR will show both the “traditional” boulevard AT facility and the median AT facility through the interchange and defer the final decision subject to MTO review. Another option is to show the “traditional” boulevard AT facilities with a note that it may change to median AT facilities.

### 3. Cross-Sections and Design Considerations

- YR’s “Towards Great Regional Streets” (TGRS) specifies 3.3 m through lanes. MTO noted they will not allow any flexibility on their standard for 3.5 m wide lanes. MTO standards should be followed

---

**Information and Discussion**

hdrinc.com  
100 York Boulevard, Suite 300, Richmond Hill, ON, CA L4B 1J8  
(289) 695-4600
within the Controlled Access Highway (CAH) limits for the interchange. The transition from 3.3 m to 3.5 m lanes should be beyond the CAH limit. **Tyrone to confirm if HDR has the CAH limits**, otherwise the CAH limits will be requested from MTO (Margaret). *Post-meeting note: CAH limits were provided by MTO*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross-section options:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Option 1, including cycle track and sidewalk on both sides, is no longer being recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Option 2 includes multi-use path (MUP) and sidewalk with 3.3 m through lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Option 3 includes MUP and sidewalk with 3.5 m through lanes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- It was noted that MUP winter maintenance through the interchange is not a major concern for YR, even if the AT facilities are at a different elevation compared to the road, as there is not much snow expected under the structure.
- The vertical height for the AT structure is approximately 1.5-2.0 m.
- Consideration should be given to the need for a westbound speed change lane. WSP is reviewing this need and MTO is currently leaning towards including the speed change lane in the design. The following was discussed:
  - o If only the taper is required, this may alter the structure designs, girders, etc., which would be reflected in the cost.
  - o 4th eastbound lane is currently shown on the 16th Ave design because of the existing structure’s opening size. However, if full replacement of the structure is needed, YR would only recommend a 6-lane cross-section.
  - o For staging, it should be confirmed whether 3 westbound lanes are sufficient.
  - o MTO requires YR commitment for WSP change order to proceed (YR requested clarification from MTO).

- MTO detailed design is currently based on Ministry standards (standard boulevard AT facilities)
- MTO noted that the existing vertical clearance of the structure is substandard and the bridge is currently being hit. If the structure is to be replaced, 16th Avenue would need to be lowered to achieve the standard clearance. If twinning, a split profile may be considered to achieve the standard clearance in the new structure.
- MTO requested that YR consider an interim design for the existing Parclo AB interchange configuration with boulevard AT facilities, and an ultimate design for the reconfigured Parclo A4 interchange configuration with median AT facilities.
- It was noted that the eastbound left-turn lane may need to be extended under the bridge.
4. **Additional Discussion Items**

- MTO is going to the public in November and will likely leave interchange recommendations open-ended. Combining the Open Houses for both the MTO and YR projects was discussed and ruled out. Instead, MTO will direct people to YR if questions regarding 16th Avenue arise at their Open House.
- YR/ MTO fees: **MTO (Rebecca) to provide a breakdown/ clarification for Paul to review with YR.**
- The following hard copy drawings have been left for MTO, all with cycle track/sidewalk AT facilities based on the October 31, 2016 design:
  - Parclo AB with boulevard AT facilities plotted July 17/17 (source file 278372-103C-12P04)
  - Parclo A4 with boulevard AT facilities plotted July 17/17 (source file 278372-10C-RP25)
  - Parclo AB with median AT facilities plotted July 17/17 (source file 278372-103C-RP08)
  - Parclo A4 with median AT facilities plotted July 17/17 (source file 278372-10C-RP267)

5. **Next Steps**

- EA team to send relevant draft Open House displays to MTO (Margaret) prior to Open House for review. **Post-meeting note:** *files were provided to MTO on September 28, 2017*
- Open Houses to be held in Fall 2017.

If there are any errors or omissions to these minutes please contact Veronica Restrepo within ten business days of the issuance of these minutes.
RESPONSE FORM

Regional Municipality of York
Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Studies
16th Avenue from Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue and
16th Avenue from Woodbine Avenue to York-Durham Line
Town of Richmond Hill and City of Markham

Contact Name: MARGARET MIKOLAJCZAK
Title: SENIOR PROJECT MANAGER
Agency / Organization: MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION
Address: 159 Sir William HEARST AVE. 7th Floor
Building D, TORONTO, ON Postal Code: M3N 0B7
Phone No.: 416-235-4269
Email address: margaret.mikolajczak@ontario.ca

Please note specific concerns and comments (use additional sheets if necessary):


Do you wish to be notified for continued involvement in the process?

☑ Yes, please continue to send me updates about the project

☐ No, I do not wish to be kept informed about the project. Please remove our organization from the project contact list.

Please return this form by **July 29, 2016** to:

Colin Wong, P.Eng.
Project Manager
The Regional Municipality of York
17250 Yonge Street
Newmarket, Ontario L3Y 3Z1
Email: colin.wong@york.ca
### Project: 16th Avenue Environmental Assessments from Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue and from Woodbine Avenue to York/Durham Line

### Subject: Town of Richmond Hill Meeting

### Date: Wednesday, November 2, 2016

### Location: 225 East Beaver Creek, Town of Richmond Hill Offices

### Attendees:
- Tracey Steele – Town of Richmond Hill
- Jeff Walters – Town of Richmond Hill
- Carrie Park – Town of Richmond Hill
- Lamyaa Salem – Town of Richmond Hill
- Samson Wat – Town of Richmond Hill
- Colin Wong – York Region
- Michelle Mascarenhas – York Region
- Tyrone Gan – HDR
- Veronica Restrepo – HDR

### Minutes by: Veronica Restrepo, HDR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Introduction and EA Study Overview</td>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ York Region (YR) provided a brief project introduction and summary of the work completed to date, including preliminary recommendations</td>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Two 16th Avenue EAs (Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue, in the Town of Richmond Hill and the City of Markham and Woodbine Avenue to York/Durham Line in the City of Markham) are being conducted concurrently, but documented separately</td>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ There are opportunities to improve all modes of transportation along the study corridor</td>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Key Features and Planned Development</td>
<td>RH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key features within the portion of the study area in the Town of Richmond Hill were discussed:</td>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Existing grade separation at the CN Richmond Hill GO Line east of Yonge Street</td>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ A land-use (mixed use) study is currently underway for the Yonge Street and 16th Avenue area, and will become a secondary plan as part of the KDA. This study includes the Yonge subway extension</td>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ The Town of Richmond Hill (RH) is planning to reconfigure the entrance to 16th Avenue Public School/David Dunlap Observatory (DDO) – RH (T. Steele) to send the DDO Master Plan to the EA team</td>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Significant number of driveways and frontage on 16th Avenue between the CN/GO rail crossing and Bayview Avenue</td>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ There are a number of watercourse crossings along the study corridor</td>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Headford/Beaver Creek business areas are a significant source of employment and goods movement and need improvement</td>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ The Buttonville redevelopment on the south east quadrant of 16th Avenue and Highway 404 as well as the Highway 404 interchange reconfiguration will have significant impact on the EA studies</td>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ The current majority of roadway users are in single occupancy vehicles, there is low transit and active transportation (AT) use (based on 2011 Transportation Tomorrow Survey data)</td>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ In the Region’s TMP the study corridor is designated as a frequent transit network (service every 15 minutes), currently there are significant transit delays from traffic congestion</td>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ The sidewalks are discontinuous and there is a lack of dedicated cycling facilities, cyclists often cycle on the sidewalk</td>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ The Urban Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP) along Yonge</td>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Street recommends sidewalk widths, locations of cycling facilities, etc. for that area. **RH to provide MESP recommendations for consideration in the EAs.** [Post-meeting note: the Urban MESP Class Environmental Assessment Master Plan, May 2014 document was provided]

- Two jug handles east of Yonge Street will be eliminated in the KDA
- As part of the Red Maple Development Application, funds have been secured to provide a pedestrian connection from Red Maple Road to 16th Avenue – **RH staff to provide sketch of future pedestrian connection to be considered as part of the EAs.**
- **Richmond Hill to confirm if this pedestrian connection has been approved in order to share with the public at the upcoming Open Houses.** This connection is identified as part of the conditions of approval for the development application.
- **YR’s transportation model considers future development to a 2041 horizon, accounts for KDA, RH/Langstaff Centre, etc.**

### 3. Alternative Solutions

- **Draft/preliminary recommended solution for the study corridor between Yonge Street and Highway 48 is to widen to six lanes for transit/HOV and provide continuous AT facilities**
- **16th Avenue EA recommended solution is consistent with the ultimate Carville recommendations (Rutherford/Carrville Road EA filed in March 2016)**
- It was confirmed that the recommended cross-section for 16th Avenue will not be similar to the existing Highway 7 configuration, as Highway 7 is designated as a Rapid Transit Corridor with dedicated bus rapid transit lanes, and 16th Avenue is designated as a Frequent Transit Network with a proposed solution for transit/HOV curb lanes.
- **RH inquired about the difference between traffic operations if the road is widened for transit/HOV, compared with a do-nothing approach (maintaining four existing general purpose lanes)**
  - The additional curb lanes would be shared by buses and high occupancy vehicles, so additional vehicular capacity would be provided
  - Buses would use curb lanes, so traffic in the four general purpose lanes should experience fewer delays as they do not have to stop behind buses at bus stops
- **16th Avenue timing of improvements (based on 2016 YR 10-year capital construction program):**
  - Leslie Street to Woodbine Avenue: Construction start in 2021
  - Yonge Street to Leslie Street: Construction start in 2023
- **Property requirements as part of the proposed design**
  - EA studies are currently in the alternative solutions phase and property requirements, including potential impacts to parks and adjacent properties, will be determined during a later phase
  - The YR Official Plan (OP) designates the right-of-way (ROW) along 16th Avenue from Yonge Street to 9th Line to be 43 m wide. As such, the KDA would be planned for a 43m ROW along 16th Avenue.
- **Between Leslie Street and Woodbine Avenue, two scenarios are possible**
  - If Buttonville Airport is not redeveloped, the existing interchange will be retained
  - If Buttonville Airport is redeveloped, the interchange will be reconfigured
- **YR is working with MTO for the 16th Avenue and Highway 404 Information Only**
### Interchange

Options have been developed to compare AT facilities in the boulevards and in the median

- For AT facilities in the traditional boulevard location, there are conflicts with vehicles at uncontrolled high-speed ramps
- AT facilities in the median are not traditional, but they eliminate conflicts between vehicles and cyclists/pedestrians at the ramps
- HDR to send draft design plans for the area around the Highway 404 interchange to RH, and RH active transportation staff to review and comment
- If MTO ramps are not reconfigured, design alternatives for AT in the boulevard and in the median could be developed with this condition

### 4. Next Steps

- **EA** is moving forward with approved numbers for Buttonville redevelopment as per the Region’s OP. Any changes will be reflected and the EA will be updated accordingly
- **RH to forward any known public issues/concerns** regarding this segment of 16th Avenue including:
  - Infiltration through Valleymede Drive to avoid Bayview Avenue
  - First round of public Open Houses is scheduled for late November

If there are any errors or omissions to these minutes, please contact Veronica Restrepo.
### 1. EA Study Update

- York Region (YR) provided a brief project update and summary of the work completed to date, including preliminary recommendations.
- Open Houses were held in November 2016.
- Next round of Open Houses is anticipated for the spring/summer of 2017, with EA filing in late 2017 or early 2018.
- Based on the 2016 10-year capital plan, this segment of 16th Ave is scheduled to start construction in 2023. [Post meeting note: Only the segment of 16th Avenue from Leslie Street to Woodbine Avenue is included in the 2018 10-year Roads and Transit Capital Construction Program.]

### 2. KDA Update

- The Town of Richmond Hill (RH) confirmed that there are no approved applications yet as part of the KDA study.
- The plan is still under internal RH review/discussions. The KDA draft study is being finalized, and the secondary plan is currently being developed.

### 3. Red Maple Pedestrian Connections

- Several residents have expressed concern regarding safety and lack of efficiency of pedestrian connections from Red Maple Road to 16th Avenue.
- RH is not aware of any safety incidents at this location; however some graffiti issues were noted.
- There has been no communication from CN regarding their position on this issue.
- This is an ongoing issue and there is political interest for its resolution (in particular from Councillor Godwin Chan).
- There is a proposed development (townhouses, with 2018 anticipated construction start) south of 16th Avenue, between the rail tracks and Red Maple Road. RH is looking for the developer to provide funding for a pedestrian connection in the area.
- As part of the original condo development, a crossing over the tracks was considered further south but was not implemented.
- Concerns related to pedestrian connections at this location include: need for a railing, illumination under the 16th Ave bridge, width of the existing platform, phasing (timelines for development vs. 16th Ave improvements).
- This is a safety and liability concern for both YR and RH. As an immediate risk mitigation action, signs should be posted. Wording could be something such as “Access to 16th Avenue via Red Maple Road”. YR and RH to coordinate and confirm who should install the signs. YR and RH to review operations at other similar locations for precedent and wording that could be used for the signs.

Potential pedestrian connection options were discussed:
- **Stairs:**
  - RH has no intention to provide access on the north side of 16th Ave; only stairs on the south side. However, this could result in increased j-walking across 16th Ave.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ave.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o The vision for the KDA is to have a park on the north side of 16th Ave, so it would make sense to have a pedestrian connection to the north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o The stairs in isolation may pose AODA concerns; however, there is an existing accessible connection (sidewalk to 16th Ave / Red Maple Road intersection). The stairs would be intended as an alternate connection to 16th Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o The developer is willing to add stairs to provide access to BRT on Yonge Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o A gap in the guiderail and a platform would be required for the stairs to connect to the 16th Ave sidewalk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Stair ownership needs to be confirmed. Would the local municipality own it? Or would there be an encroachment or maintenance agreement between YR and RH? <strong>YR to look into ownership, agreements, and requirements at Davis Drive stairs and at RH GO Station stairs (Major Mackenzie Drive).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o The 16th Ave bridge over the rail tracks will be widened to accommodate 6 lanes and active transportation facilities. This means that any pedestrian connection implemented as part of the development would either need to accommodate the 4 (existing) and 6 (future) lane designs for 16th Ave, or it would become throw-away work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o If the stairs are not constructed as part of the development, RH inquired regarding the possibility of including them in the 16th Ave EA (with funding from the developer or costs recovered through the KDA). If RH prepares a preliminary design for a pedestrian connection (stairs or other), this could be used as input to the 16th Ave EA. The EA commitments could state protection for a future pedestrian connection location. YR could then include the stairs as part of the 16th Ave detailed design with cost-sharing agreements with RH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o RH has standards for stairs within municipal road allowances; however, <strong>YR to confirm design and implementation parameters/requirements as well as agreements for maintenance and liability</strong>, for RH to consider in preliminary design, as this would be constructed within the YR ROW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o If stairs are proposed on the north side, no property requirements are anticipated (within YR property).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pedestrian underpass (tunnel under rail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Benefit: excavation for pedestrians is not as deep as for trains/vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Underpass could be a long term solution, providing a connection with the community as part of the KDA development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o If there is a potential GO station on the SW quadrant of the tracks, an underpass could connect to this station as a long term solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- At-grade signalized pedestrian crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Would eliminate the need for stairs and could be designed to be AODA compliant and accommodate cyclists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Needs to be discussed with CN. RH would also like to be invited to CN discussions. Metrolinx would also need to be involved in discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o <strong>HDR to look into high level costs for an at-grade signalized pedestrian crossing</strong> (Barry Russell or Dan Francey).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- High level cost estimates to be reviewed for all options. <strong>A separate cost-sharing discussion</strong> to be set up between YR and RH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>RH to obtain funding from the developer or recover through KDA</strong>, but implementation to be at a later date to avoid throw-away work once the 16th Ave bridge is widened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>RH and YR to follow up on signs to be posted as immediate risk mitigation action.</strong> RH will coordinate with YR (through Peter) regarding operations and who will be responsible for installing the signs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If there are any errors or omissions to these minutes, please contact HDR within ten business days of the issuance of these minutes.
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### Item 1. EA Study Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- York Region (YR) provided a brief project update and summary of the work completed to date, including preliminary recommendations.
- Recommended solutions for segment in the Town of Richmond Hill consists of widening to six lanes for Transit/HOV, Active Transportation (AT) improvements.
- Open Houses were held in November 2016.
- Next round of Open Houses is anticipated for the fall of 2017, with EA filing in 2018.
- Construction for this segment is anticipated to start in 2023 per the current York Region 10-year Roads and Transit Capital Construction program.

### Item 2. KDA Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- A draft secondary plan has been developed and is currently available for public input on the Town’s website; a Council public meeting is scheduled for May 10, 2017.
- Through the KDA plan, the intent is to convert the loop service roads into open space as part of a linear park, with a road under the bridge.
- The 16th Ave EA should continue to show the loop ramps, as they cannot be removed until the internal KDA road network is in place.
- RH suggested that the EA team could develop interim and ultimate designs, showing the loop ramps in their current configuration as well as in the ultimate KDA proposed location (further away from 16th Ave).
- Road connections at the existing loop ramp locations are shown on development approvals. **RH will provide information regarding the two development applications** at this location.
- RH intends for the Region’s 16th Ave EA to incorporate RH’s vision for the KDA.
- RH has met with landowners to discuss the Town’s vision for the KDA, and public comments regarding roads, height and density have been received. In general, there has been public support for the linear parks (based on consultation as part of the alternative development stage).
- Renderings showing where the linear park would be placed in relation to 16th Avenue are included as part of Appendix 1 of the draft secondary plan.
- The “planned TTC subway alignment” shown on the draft secondary plan figures is subject to future study. Lands are currently protected on the south side of 16th Ave, but not on the north side.
- Timing for implementation of the KDA depends on the individual development applications and their timing.
- RH would require YR’s support of the KDA plan, as the service (loop) roads are within YR’s right-of-way (ROW).
- Coordination of the KDA and 16th Ave EA will be required, in particular regarding...
### Meeting Minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - RH plans to go back to Council in July to obtain approval for adoption of the secondary plan. After RH Council approval, YR approval would be sought. It is unknown if an OMB process will be required.  
- YR clarified that the EA recommendations need to be based on approved plans, so it might be difficult to include the KDA vision in the EA designs and ESR if the KDA is not approved by then. It was suggested that a note can be added to the ESR to document the KDA status and considerations at the time of ESR filing, even if its vision is not included in the preliminary designs. |

### 3. Pedestrian Connections Across CN Rail

| - Several residents have expressed concern regarding safety and lack of efficiency of pedestrian connections from Red Maple Road to 16th Avenue, and across the CN rail tracks.  
- The CN rail crossing issue related to cyclists and pedestrians is corridor-wide, and not specific to 16th Ave  
- The potential for pedestrian/cyclist connections across the tracks as part of the KDA was discussed. The draft secondary plan identifies a potential bridge connection north of 16th Ave (at the observatory)  
- A potential GO station in the area could provide an opportunity for an AT bridge connection in the vicinity of 16th Ave; however, a GO station at this location is not currently in Metrolinx's latest plans. |

### 4. Constraints and Design Alternatives

| - Based on the currently approved development, six lanes are required to accommodate future traffic demand along 16th Avenue between Yonge Street and Markham Road/Highway 48  
- The EA team is developing options for the 16th Ave widening to six lanes, including widening the bridge over the CN rail tracks  
- 16th Ave widening will require either grading into the service (loop) roads or large retaining walls, so the EA team is considering a narrow cross-section footprint to minimize impacts  
- The EA team’s preference for AT facilities is to provide separate cycle track and sidewalk, but at constrained locations a multi-use path (MUP) will be provided on one or both sides  
- In general, the EA team is looking at design alternatives that avoid property acquisition for back yards or side yards  
- The property fabric currently shown on the presentation figures does not differentiate between YR and RH property. EA team will review and update the ROW widths accordingly.  
- Design options for each road segment were discussed  |

Yonge to Bayview:

- Provision of a two-way left-turn lane may not allow sufficient space for utilities within the existing ROW, and may not provide sufficient space for landscaping  
- Replacing the two-way left-turn lane with a raised median would restrict access to driveways and require U-turns, which the public is unlikely to support  
- RH is planning to reconfigure the entrance to 16th Avenue Public School/Elvis Stojko Arena/David Dunlap Observatory (DDO) – RH (T. Steele) to send the DDO Master Plan to the EA team. RH is open to discussions regarding the ROW limits on the north side of 16th Ave.  
- Regardless of the option, driveways would be shortened even if within YR’s ROW. The EA team will need to check if there are any houses close enough to the road that would not have an adequately long driveway as a result of the 16th Ave widening. |

Bayview to Leslie:

- Development east of Bayview on the south side is still under approval, which could
provide an opportunity to acquire additional ROW on the south side. **RH (G. Galanis to follow up with the planner).**
- No current development application on the south side east of Strathearn Ave (1053 16th Ave). Property acquisition at this location is likely required.

Leslie to Woodbine:
- The EA is proceeding on the basis that the existing interchange configuration will be maintained
- RH is supportive of the median AT facilities through the interchange
- The EA team is reviewing the potential to implement median AT facilities through the interchange with the existing interchange configuration, as there might be conflicts with left-turning vehicles and restricted space due to the left-turn lane under the bridge. It was suggested that the EA team consider partial median AT facilities for westbound travel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Other EA Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RH noted they have received complaints regarding noise for the segment between Bayview Avenue and Leslie Street. A noise study is being undertaken as part of the EA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HDR to provide population and employment figures used as part of the traffic analysis for the 16th Ave EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH to provide any additional comments on the material presented, for consideration in the development of alternative design concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDR to provide a copy of today's presentation to RH (S. Wat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The EA team will schedule another meeting with RH prior to Open House #2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If there are any errors or omissions to these minutes please contact Veronica Restrepo within ten business days of the issuance of these minutes.
Item | Action
--- | ---
1. **EA Study Update** | Information Only

- **Project Update/Background**
  - First round of Open Houses held in November 2016
  - Next set of open houses being planned for Fall 2017
  - Environmental Study Report (ESR) filing anticipated in 2018
- York Region (YR) provided a brief project update and summary of the work completed to date, including preliminary recommendations
- Recommended solutions for segment in the Town of Richmond Hill consists of widening to six lanes for Transit/HOV, Active Transportation (AT) improvements
- Limits of proposed widening (in the City of Markham study area) have been updated and are consistent with York Region’s Transportation Master Plan (TMP), as follows:
  - Yonge Street to McCowan Road: Widen to six lanes for Transit/High Occupancy Vehicles (HOV), Active Transportation (AT) improvements
  - McCowan Road to Donald Cousens Parkway (DCP) – AT Improvements, no additional lanes required
  - DCP to York/Durham Line (YDL) – Semi-rural cross-section with paved shoulders, no additional lanes required
- Construction for these segments is anticipated to start in 2021 (Leslie Street to Woodbine Avenue) and 2023 (Yonge Street to Leslie Street) per the current (2017) York Region 10-year Roads and Transit Capital Construction program. [Post meeting note: based on York Region’s 2018 10-year Roads and Transit Capital Construction program, construction for the Leslie Street to Woodbine Avenue segment is anticipated to start in 2021, and construction for the other segments is anticipated to start beyond 2028.]

2. **Key Development Area (KDA) Update** | Information and discussion

- For the existing access east of Yonge Street, Richmond Hill (RH) staff noted that the future access is proposed at the existing location south of 16th Avenue, but the access connection to the north is to be confirmed as the location and orientation may differ from the most recent KDA drawings (the proposed street pattern might be in a more north-south orientation, closer to 90). **Town of Richmond Hill to confirm the**
proposed street orientation and location of connections to 16th Avenue.

- Grading and intersection spacing would likely dictate where the new accesses could occur. The EA study team could identify the most easterly point feasible based on future 16th Avenue grading. Otherwise, SmartREIT (owner of the entire north-east quadrant of the KDA) would have to re-grade. **The study team will advise regarding the range of feasible locations for the intersection east of Yonge Street, on the north side of 16th Avenue.**

- Although RH staff suggested that full movements be permitted at the intersection east of Yonge Street, it was noted that a new signal at that location doesn’t provide sufficient spacing between signalized intersections. Therefore, it was confirmed that connections to 16th Avenue from the north and south should be protected for Right-In/Right-Out (RIRO) access only. RH supports moving forward with this approach.

- A secondary plan is anticipated to be released in September/October. However, SmartREIT plans to complete an additional transportation study which may not be ready for September.

- It is anticipated that the developer won’t have concrete plans before the 16th Avenue EA is filed, and perhaps even detailed design completed. The EA should include a **commitment for detailed design to confirm the developer’s status.**

- There is still protection for a future subway extension within the KDA plans but not above ground. The latest direction from Rapid Transit (YRRTC) identified that building above ground was allowed. HDR suggested that the Town revisit how deep the platform/concourse would need to be, so that building foundations and underground parking can be planned accordingly as to not preclude a future subway extension.

- The KDA plan protects for a future GO station in the south-west quadrant of CN Rail and 16th Avenue (south-east quadrant of the KDA).

- Town staff suggested it might be redundant to have cycle tracks on 16th Avenue as well as the KDA linear parks. It was clarified that these facilities meet different functions. Linear parks adjacent to 16th Avenue as part of the KDA won’t cross the CN Rail tracks. The proposed cycle tracks will connect the Carrville Road/16th Avenue cycling network.

3. Pedestrian Connections Across CN Rail

- The developer will implement stairs at the south-east quadrant of CN Rail and 16th Avenue (in the vicinity of Red Maple Road).

- RH staff requested that provisions for pedestrian connections at other quadrants also be considered. The EA team clarified that this is beyond the scope of the EA as this is a corridor-wide issue for the CN corridor, but the EA will not preclude this from being implemented by others.

- From a pedestrian connectivity perspective, it would be beneficial to include pedestrian connections in all quadrants. **A statement can be included into the Environmental Study Report (ESR) regarding the potential for future pedestrian connections to be reviewed in the future by the Town.**
4. David Dunlap Observatory (DDO) Master Plan

- RH clarified that the proposed driveway will not be designed to Town standards for roads, and it will likely be one lane in each direction. It will essentially serve as a connection between 16th Avenue and the DDO parking. RH noted that the driveway would be similar to the existing Richmond Green driveway.
- The Town’s goal is to improve the visibility of the park so that it stands out over the school.
- RH staff noted that the proposed driveway may not be at the existing driveway location.
- The eastbound left turns into the park should be maintained.
- The EA team inquired about a conceptual design for the entrance/gateway. RH staff noted that a feasibility study is currently underway, but discussions have not yet been started with the school. The timing of implementation for this would be after the 16th Avenue EA.
- **There will be a commitment documented in the ESR to work with the Town during detailed design to consider issues relating to the entrance based on the information available at the time.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information and discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. Design Considerations and General Recommendations and Discussion

### Active Transportation (AT) Facilities:

- The study team’s approach for active transportation is to provide overall network improvements. The current recommendations, subject to further review and consultation, consist of:
  - Off-street cycle track and sidewalk on both sides of the street between Yonge Street and Highway 404 interchange (RH segments)
  - Median AT facilities through the Highway 404 interchange
  - MUP on the north side and sidewalk on the south side between Highway 404 interchange and Warden Avenue
  - MUP on both sides between Warden Avenue and Kennedy Road, where the proposed York Downs development provides an opportunity to achieve a wider ROW and provide trail connections on both sides of 16th Avenue.
  - MUP on the north side and sidewalk on the south side between Kennedy Road and Donald Cousens Parkway

- For the RH segments, cycling facilities are proposed on both sides in the form of one-way cycle tracks to promote the safety of cyclists and prevent conflicts with driveways while providing a separate facility from pedestrians.
- RH staff noted there is more potential for pedestrian activity at fronting properties, and creating an attractive pedestrian environment encourages people to utilize active transportation facilities.
- RH staff inquired regarding existing cycle track/sidewalk combination facilities. 2nd concession and Highway 7 were noted as examples. **YR (Colin) will request photos for the facilities at Highway 7 and provide to RH.**
- On-road bike lanes are proposed for Yonge Street.
- If multi-use path (MUP) is to be implemented on one side only, it should be on the north side.
- Transition from Carrville cycle track/sidewalk to MUP/sidewalk could be at Yonge Street.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HDR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AT design options consist of (HDR to develop sample cross-section graphics based on Sta. 11+280): [Post-meeting note: the additional cross-section graphics were provided on August 1, 2017]

1. Cycle track and sidewalk on both sides, as currently proposed, with limited landscaping opportunities
2. MUP on the north side with trees adjacent to utility zone, and sidewalk on the south side. Space for utilities on the north side may be used for plantings to minimize the centreline shift to the south.
3. MUP on the north side, sidewalk on the south side, with trees to be planted on the south side between the sidewalk and property line.

- Kill strip (area adjacent to the road susceptible to salt spray) to be considered in the development of cross-sections.
- It was noted that York Region transportation staff would need to comment on these options.
- If MUP is only on one side from Yonge Street to Highway 404, the typical cross-section would change at the 404 interchange. MUP could be provided on the south (existing) bridge, but this would change YR’s requirements from MTO.

[Post meeting note: Recommendations for AT facilities have since been updated]

Maintenance concerns:
- It was confirmed that currently, in-boulevard facilities are maintained by the local municipality.
- Previous discussions with RH operations were undertaken during the Rutherford/Carrville Road EA, which included the possibility of only plowing the sidewalk, not the cycle track as part of the winter maintenance strategy.
- RH (Samson) to request comments from operations group for the 16th Ave EA and continue to maintain their involvement in the EA. Samson will highlight maintenance issues when material is circulated to operations staff.

Design elements:
- The proposed raised median is 1.5 metres wide. RH suggested that a narrower median be considered, however 1.5m is the minimum allowed by YR.
- The CN bridge widening will impact the existing retaining wall on Red Maple Road. A higher retaining wall will likely be implemented as part of the 16th Ave EA.
- Wider roadway platform would result in shortened driveways on the south side.
- RH staff are concerned about the lack of trees and landscaping opportunities with the proposed cross-sections. It was suggested to consider removing cycling facility on one side of the street in order to add more trees. It was confirmed that there will be no change to trees that currently exist within private properties.
- The Town has tried planting trees in private properties, but the owners have torn them down.
- Hydro lines present a constraint for tree plantings. There are currently above ground hydro utilities on the south side, so planting could be considered on the north side.
Development applications:
- RH noted the property at 1053 16th Avenue is currently up for sale and there are suggestions of a potential development at this location. Access won’t be directly from 16th Avenue.

Other items:
- The Town’s Official Plan identified a 23 m right-of-way (ROW) for Red Maple Road, and RH staff inquired regarding potential impacts from the 16th Ave EA. The intent of the EA is to keep Red Maple Road where it is (no proposed shift), and to build a higher retaining wall at the existing retaining wall location, therefore impacts to Red Maple Road are not anticipated.
- It was noted that Red Maple Road is within the Region’s property. **EA team to check the streetline survey to confirm how this property is identified.**
- YR and RH are unsure of the process for delineating this property.

### 6. Next Steps

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|  | **EA team to send presentation to RH** [Post-meeting note: the presentation slides were provided on August 1, 2017]  
RH to provide comments within two weeks, in particular related to the Town’s direction regarding AT facilities. RH to discuss at their upcoming meeting on Tuesday. [Post-meeting note: comments were provided in September 2017]  
The **design plans will be circulated to the Town** for review prior to the Open Houses. [Post-meeting note: draft designs were provided in October 2017] |
| HDR | RH | YR / HDR |

If there are any errors or omissions to these minutes please contact Veronica Restrepo within ten business days of the issuance of these minutes.
### 16th Avenue Environmental Assessment Study from Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue

**Project:** 16th Avenue Environmental Assessment Study from Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue

**Subject:** Town of Richmond Hill Meeting

**Date:** Monday, October 29, 2018

**Location:** Town of Richmond Hill (225 East Beaver Creek), 5th Floor – Main Boardroom

**Attendees:**
- Clement Chong – Town of Richmond Hill
- Sybelle von Kursell – Town of Richmond Hill
- Denis Beaulieu – Town of Richmond Hill
- Kyle Paterson – Town of Richmond Hill
- Samson Wat – Town of Richmond Hill
- Richard Hui – Town of Richmond Hill
- Colin Wong – York Region
- Nasir Aslam – York Region
- Claire Wang – York Region
- Tyrone Gan – HDR
- Veronica Restrepo – HDR

**Minutes by:** Veronica Restrepo, HDR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. EA Study Update</strong></td>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The project team provided a brief study update and summary of the proposed design and timelines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The recommendations for the segment between Yonge Street and Woodbine Avenue consist of widening from four to six lanes for Transit/HOV, a multi-use path (MUP) on the north side, and a sidewalk on the south side.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Study A (Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue) Environmental Study Report (ESR) will be filed in December 2018, and the ESR for Study B (Woodbine Avenue to York/Durham Line) will follow in 2019.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Per York Region's current (2018) Roads and Transit Capital Construction Program, construction of the proposed improvements between Leslie Street and Woodbine Avenue is scheduled to begin in 2021. The segment from Yonge Street to Leslie Street is not in the 2018 Plan, and as such construction for that segment is not anticipated to start before 2028. The plan undergoes annual review and is subject to change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Yonge Street and 16th Avenue Key Development Area (KDA) Update</strong></td>
<td>Information and Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Town staff confirmed that the KDA Plan is still in draft form. It is scheduled to be presented to Council after the 16th Avenue Study A ESR is filed.</td>
<td>HDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The KDA proposes reconfigurations to the road network in the vicinity of the CN rail crossing and the existing service roads. A north-south collector road is proposed on the west side of the rail tracks, under the CN bridge.</td>
<td>HDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If the service roads are removed, Town staff noted that the 16th Avenue improvements could be implemented with additional grading along slopes instead of a retaining wall adjacent to Red Maple Road. This can be confirmed during detailed design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The project team will provide cross-section at station 10+220 to illustrate the potential height of the retaining wall currently proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wording will be added to the ESR to discuss the KDA Plan and the need for further coordination during detailed design between York Region and the Town of Richmond Hill.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. 16th Avenue Bridge over CN Rail</strong></td>
<td>Information and Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The existing bridge is proposed to be widened on both sides to accommodate the 16th Avenue improvements, including road widening for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. 16th Avenue and Highway 404 Interchange

- The proposed design consists of a normalized interchange, which would replace the free-flow access to the loop ramps with signal-controlled right-turn movements to minimize cyclist/pedestrian conflicts with high speed vehicles at highway on-ramps
  - In the interim, normalization of the existing Parclo AB interchange would improve operations for all travel modes
  - For the ultimate Parclo A4 configuration, the Town of Richmond Hill side (west of Highway 404) will remain the same, but the City of Markham side (east of Highway 404) would be reconfigured
  - The proposed design doesn’t preclude future widening of the southbound off-ramp (at the west ramp terminal), should MTO choose to undertake that work in the future
- MTO is moving forward with construction of HOV lanes on Highway 404, north and south of 16th Avenue. Coordination with MTO regarding the design and construction of improvements at the 16th Avenue and Highway 404 Interchange is ongoing.
- The intent is for MTO to construct the proposed improvements for 16th Avenue, including active transportation facilities, within their construction limits (between the Highway 404 ramp terminals) as part of the MTO construction contract. York Region would then undertake the construction of 16th Avenue improvements east and west of the Highway 404 interchange.
- Town staff inquired regarding signage where the MUP terminates. This will be reviewed during detailed design.
- Construction staging will aim to minimize disruption to traffic along 16th Avenue
- 16th Avenue lanes in the vicinity of the Highway 404 interchange will be 3.5 metres wide per MTO requirements

### 5. Other Considerations and Discussion

- York Region confirmed that the 16th Avenue EA proposed improvements are based on approved plans, policies, and developments. Once approved, other proposed changes can be incorporated during detailed design.
- Town staff noted that Berwick Crescent may become a four legged intersection in the future. Coordination with the 16th Avenue improvements,
if required, would take place during detailed design.
- Access and internal circulation for the David Dunlop Observatory (DDO) should be coordinated with the 16th Avenue improvements during detailed design.
- The Lake to Lake trail (a separate project up to Major Mackenzie Drive or Elgin Mills Road) includes a gap in the MUP on the west side of Leslie Street, north of 16th Avenue. As part of the 16th Avenue improvements, York Region will provide an MUP connection for approximately 80 to 100 metres north of 16th Avenue to complete this gap in the active transportation network.
  - Town staff noted this MUP connection was being planned as part of a separate project; York Region to confirm.
- Town staff noted that the **HOV symbol southeast of the Mural Street intersection should be moved** by one lane. This will be corrected for the final design drawings in the 16th Avenue ESR.
- Town staff inquired regarding the size for daylight triangles. In general, these are 15 m by 15 m per York Region’s standards. It was noted that the Town has coordinated with York Region to implement smaller (10 m by 10 m) daylight triangles in the past for site specific locations, and the Town is aiming for this to become an official policy. It was noted that this is outside the scope of the 16th Avenue EA studies.
- Town staff noted that the fire department on the south side of 16th Avenue at Dewbourne Avenue would likely be interested in the EA recommendations. **Town staff will circulate EA material to the fire department, and provide any comments to the project team.**
- Town staff inquired about cost estimates for the proposed improvements, and whether property acquisition costs (if required) are considered. The project team confirmed that the cost estimates included in the ESR will exclude any property acquisition costs, but York Region’s overall capital cost allocation for the project based on the Region’s annual 10-year capital plan considers property acquisition costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Next Steps</th>
<th>Town</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town staff to provide comments on Study A draft ESR by November 14, 2018</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town staff indicated that they do not wish to be included in the circulation of the material related to the Study B ESR.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If there are any errors or omissions to these minutes please contact Veronica Restrepo within ten business days of the issuance of these minutes.
RESPONSE FORM

Regional Municipality of York
Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Studies
16th Avenue from Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue and
16th Avenue from Woodbine Avenue to York-Durham Line
Town of Richmond Hill and City of Markham

Contact Name: ________________________________
Samson Wat

Title: ________________________________
Traffic Analyst

Agency / Organization: ________________________________
Town of Richmond Hill

Address: ________________________________
225 East Beaver Creek Road, Richmond Hill, ON

Postal Code: ________________________________
L4B 3P4

Phone No.: ________________________________
905-771-8800

Email address: ________________________________
Samson.Wat@richmondhill.ca

Please note specific concerns and comments (use additional sheets if necessary):

Please be advised that the Town is in the process of developing a KDA secondary plan in the Yonge/16th area. This plan should take into consideration of this secondary plan.

Do you wish to be notified for continued involvement in the process?

☐ Yes, please continue to send me updates about the project

☐ No, I do not wish to be kept informed about the project. Please remove our organization from the project contact list.

Please return this form by July 29, 2016 to: Colin Wong, P.Eng.
Project Manager
The Regional Municipality of York
17250 Yonge Street
Newmarket, Ontario L3Y 3Z1
Email: colin.wong@york.ca
December 6, 2018

To:
Town of Richmond Hill

Dear Mr. Wat

Re: Response to Draft Environmental Study Report Comments
16th Avenue Study A (Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue)
Municipal Class Environmental Assessment – Schedule C Road Project
Regional Municipality of York

Thank you for your comments dated November 14 and November 26, 2018. We understand the Town of Richmond Hill staff reviewed the drafted Environmental Study Report (ESR) dated October 19, 2018 and associated technical studies available at this time.

Please see the attached table for the project team’s responses to the comments.

Regards,

Tyrone Gan
Consultant Project Manager, HDR

Cc: Colin Wong, York Region
Nasir Aslam, York Region
Veronica Restrepo, HDR
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Reviewer’s Department/Division</th>
<th>Drawing No./ Report page No.</th>
<th>Town Comments</th>
<th>Project Team’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Policy – PRS</td>
<td>Draft ESR – Page 18 (Section 2.2.1 - Yonge Street and 16th Avenue Key Development Area)</td>
<td>Although the Secondary Plan has not yet been approved, the EA should take into consideration and should not preclude the redevelopment of the area including the closure of the service loop and the creation of a linear park near the 16th Avenue bridge that will link potential trails to planned Urban Plazas and Parks located in the northwest and southeast quadrants. This proposed closure is anticipated to occur through the re-development process on lands north and south of 16th Avenue, wherein new streets will be provided to facilitate the same “ring-road” movement of vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians between the north and south quadrants below the bridge, while providing for more streets within the quadrants to permit frontage of new buildings.</td>
<td>Consideration of the KDA throughout the EA is documented in various sections of the ESR, including Section 2.2.1, which was updated to note that the recommendations of the 16th Ave EA should not preclude the implementation of the KDA. Section 9.2 also documents a future commitment for coordination with the Town of Richmond Hill regarding the status of the KDA plans at the time of detailed design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Transportation - PRS</td>
<td>Draft ESR – Page vii</td>
<td>ES Exhibit 3 – The preferred cross-section displayed cycling facilities on both side of the boulevard. This exhibit shall be revised to show MUP on the north side and sidewalk on the south side of the boulevard.</td>
<td>This exhibit documents the preferred alternative solution (widen and AT improvements), not the recommended design concept. The design for the typical cross-section, including MUP on the north side and sidewalk on the south side, is illustrated later in the document, under section 8.1.3 (typical cross-sections). However, the exhibit was updated for clarity as suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Reviewer’s Department/Division</td>
<td>Drawing No./ Report page No.</td>
<td>Town Comments</td>
<td>Project Team’s Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Transportation - PRS</td>
<td>Draft ESR – Page 50 (Section 4.2.7 - Pedestrian Facilities)</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk described between Bayview to Leslie and Leslie to Woodbine shall be updated. Continuous sidewalks are provided on both sides of 16th Avenue from Bayview to Mural/Vogell.</td>
<td>Noted- updated in text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Transportation - PRS</td>
<td>Draft ESR – Page 60 (Section 4.4.3 - Noise)</td>
<td>This section is incomplete. Staff will review and may provide comments during the ESR filling period when this section is completed and becomes available.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Transportation - PRS</td>
<td>Draft ESR – Page 86 (Section 5.5 – Active Transportation Opportunities)</td>
<td>This section referenced Section 0 and Section 5.4. Please clarify if the section 0 is a typo?</td>
<td>Revised to reference Section 5.3 and 5.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Policy - PRS</td>
<td>Draft ESR – Page 193 (Section 8.3.2 – Town of Richmond Hill)</td>
<td>This section should reference the Town of Richmond Hill instead of the City of Richmond Hill.</td>
<td>Revised accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Transportation - PRS</td>
<td>Draft ESR - Appendices</td>
<td>Some appendices are missing including Noise Assessment Report and Transportation and Traffic Analysis Reports. Staff will review and may provide comments during the ESR filling period when the information become available.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Transportation - PRS</td>
<td>Draft ESR - General</td>
<td>It is staff understanding that the project scope includes the extension of MUP on Leslie Street from the 16th Avenue. The ESR and the design plate shall be updated to include and specify the limits of this extension.</td>
<td>ESR Section 8.1.5 and the ESR plates (Appendix A of the ESR) have been updated to include the Leslie Street MUP connection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Reviewer’s Department/Division</td>
<td>Drawing No./ Report page No.</td>
<td>Town Comments</td>
<td>Project Team’s Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Development Engineering - PRS</td>
<td>Draft ESR - General</td>
<td>The Town is currently working with Signature Communities to advance the installation of the municipal staircase within the 16th Avenue ROW to facilitate a pedestrian connection as part of their townhouse development (370 Red Maple). Although the Region has been circulated the staircase design and has provided comments, the draft ESR should take into consideration or acknowledge the location of the staircase. The developer will be required to demonstrate how the stairs will connect to the existing sidewalk in the interim as well as the future sidewalk when 16th Avenue is widened.</td>
<td>Noted. Section 8.3.2 of the ESR includes text related to the proposed staircase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Urban Design/Transportation - PRS</td>
<td>Draft ESR – Page 161 (Section 8.1.5) and Design Plates</td>
<td>The multi-use path on the north side of 16th Avenue should be strategically narrowed between Bayview Avenue and Leslie Street where space for additional street tree planting could result. The MUP can be reduced to a minimum of 2.4m as per design standards. This would improve the streetscape and provide the benefits of urban tree planting to the greatest extent possible. The 3.0m MUP may be reduced to a minimum of 2.4m.</td>
<td>The proposed 3.0m MUP is consistent with York Region’s Road Design Guidelines. The reduction of the MUP width to 2.4m is only proposed for short, highly constrained segments, consistent with best practices. A reduction in MUP width for an entire 2km segment would not be consistent with the design guidelines or industry best practices, and as such is not recommended. However, the ESR notes that at the time of detailed design, any changes to design standards and/or industry best practices compared to those available at the time of the EA will be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project: 16th Avenue Environmental Assessment Studies from Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue and from Woodbine Avenue to York/Durham Line

Subject: City of Markham Meeting

Date: Friday, November 11, 2016, 1:30 PM – 3:30 PM

Location: 101 Town Centre Boulevard, Planning Boardroom

Attendees:
- Colin Wong – York Region
- Michelle Mascarenhas – York Region
- Ron Blake – City of Markham
- Henry Lo – City of Markham
- Richard Kendall – City of Markham
- Robert Marinzel – City of Markham
- Joseph Palmisano – City of Markham
- Andrew Johnson – City of Markham
- Sally Campbell – City of Markham
- Ziad Yassi – City of Markham
- Geoff Day – City of Markham
- David Porretta – City of Markham
- Peter Chan – City of Markham
- Ronji Borooah – City of Markham
- Alice Lam – City of Markham
- Reza Fani – City of Markham
- Cheryl Murray – HDR
- Veronica Restrepo – HDR

Minutes by: Merlin Yuen, HDR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 16th Avenue EA Overview</td>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ York Region (YR) provided a brief project introduction and summary of the work completed to date, including preliminary recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ York Region is undertaking two concurrent Schedule ‘C’ Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Studies along 16th Avenue, between Yonge Street and Woodbine Avenue in the Town of Richmond Hill and City of Markham, and between Woodbine Avenue and York/Durham Line in the City of Markham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ The EAs are currently in Phase 2; the project team is looking at alternative solutions that will be presented at the upcoming Open Houses (end of November)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ As identified in the Region’s 2016 TMP Update, 16th Avenue is an important east-west corridor spanning York Region connecting Peel Region and Durham Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ The study will address transportation needs for all modes arising from planned development and growth objectives for the Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Key features and constraints along the corridor include the Highway 404 Interchange, development, and multiple watercourse crossings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 16th Avenue Corridor Travel Patterns</td>
<td>Information and Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Travel patterns along 16th Avenue are vehicular-oriented with a majority of short trips conducted through vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o There is an opportunity to increase transit use and active transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ 16th Avenue has been identified as part of the Region’s frequent transit network. In addition, improving the first and last mile can help to improve transit use along the corridor. The first and last mile refer to the first or last portion of a trip to a rapid transit station, a carpool lot, school, home, place of employment or entertainment. Improving the first and last mile refers to ways to make the first and last mile less auto dependent, enabling the use of more sustainable modes of travel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ As part of understanding active transportation within the corridor,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pedestrian level of service (PLOS) and cycling level of service (CLOS) were assessed, and opportunities to use a multi-modal approach to improve active transportation experience and convert short trips to walking/cycling were identified

- Traffic forecasts are based on a 2041 horizon year, and the analysis uses York Region’s latest transportation model which accounts for planned development in the area.

3. Needs and Opportunities

- Between Yonge Street and Markham Road/Highway 48, traffic analysis identified the need to widen 16th Ave to accommodate future traffic demand
- There is an opportunity to improve the Highway 404 structure as part of an interchange reconfiguration and widening of Highway 404 improvements
- There are opportunities to improve transit, and provide continuous cycling and pedestrian facilities
- Future traffic patterns and increased frequency of trains along the Stouffville GO Line present opportunities to consider a grade separation (overpass or underpass) for the existing at-grade crossing
- There are opportunities to improve geometric deficiencies along the corridor and improve safety for all travel modes

4. Alternative Solutions and Corridor Constraints

The following alternative solutions were considered for each segment of the study area:

- Yonge Street to Markham Road/Highway 48:
  - Do Nothing
  - Active Transportation (AT) Improvements
  - Widen road for general purpose lanes and AT Improvements
  - Widen for Transit/HOV and AT Improvements – PREFERRED

- Markham Road/Highway 48 to Donald Cousens Parkway (DCP):
  - Do Nothing
  - AT Improvements – PREFERRED

- Donald Cousens Parkway to York/Durham Line (YDL) (this segment is predominantly rural and there is minimal demand for AT):
  - Do Nothing
  - Paved Shoulders
  - Multi-Use Path
  - Semi-rural cross-section with Paved Shoulders – PREFERRED

Discussion of alternative solutions and specific constraints along the corridor was as follows:

- The 16th Ave design could consider a trail connection to Rouge Park. The City of Markham is working with Parks Canada on connecting trails within the area and will provide York Region with high-level master plan
- Installation of storm-sewer pipes between DCP and YDL would be required for a semi-rural cross-section.
- City of Markham staff are not in favour of accommodating cyclists and pedestrians on the roadside shoulder. However, the lands between DCP and YDL are mostly rural/agricultural and there is not a high demand for AT facilities.
- As part of the EA process, widening for 6 general purpose lanes was considered, but does not align with Regional Policy objectives. The
Region’s TMP emphasizes a complete streets approach with consideration for all modes of transportation.

- **Extent of widening:**
  - TMP identified widening from Yonge Street to McCowan Road, and EA is identifying widening from Yonge Street to Markham Road/Highway 48
  - There are constraints in the vicinity of Markham Road/Highway 48 including the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District, which might have been a factor to the TMP recommendations

- The City of Markham noted that there are geometric deficiencies east of McCowan Road such as an offset intersection and horizontal alignment issues

- The City of Markham noted that traffic infiltration and signal timing are issues to be reviewed

- City of Markham noted that a raised median as shown in the typical cross-section could promote traffic infiltration. The project team clarified that breaks in the median will be reviewed at intersections, driveways, and access points.

- The City of Markham is concerned with landscaping along the median, believes a narrow median will be beneficial to minimize landscaping maintenance costs. The EA will identify locations for landscaping opportunities, but the extent and types of landscaping will be confirmed during detailed design.

- The City of Markham has concerns with long crossing distance and pedestrian safety with the addition of a median and HOV/transit curb lanes. In many cases, the existing right-turn lanes will be converted into the HOV/transit lane, mitigating further widening and crossing distances.

- The City of Markham is concerned about how the cross-section alternatives will fit within the City’s Trees for Tomorrow policy, and would like a copy of the cross-sections. These will be available as part of the public material for the Open Houses at the end of November. [Post-meeting note: the cross-sections and other Open House material were made available on the project website at http://york.ca/16thavenue]

- There are natural heritage constraints associated with the Rouge River crossing east of the Highway 404 interchange due to the presence of Endangered Species habitat. The design will be developed to minimize structure widening; the alternatives are anticipated to fit within the existing bridge configuration.

- The City of Markham is concerned with maintenance of sidewalks, streetscaping, and cycle tracks

### 5. 16th Avenue and Highway 404 Interchange

- York Region has coordinated with MTO on design alternatives for the 16th Avenue and Highway 404 interchange. Several options have been developed, including those with/without ramp improvements.

- Accommodation of cyclists and pedestrians through the interchange poses a design challenge due to conflicts with turning vehicles at interchange ramps
  - Accommodating pedestrians and cyclists in the median has been discussed and MTO has been receptive to the idea

- Alignment to the north (keep existing structure for eastbound traffic and building additional structures to the north for westbound traffic) is preferred to minimize impacts to surrounding buildings and

Information and Discussion
properties. Construction staging has been discussed with MTO and aligns with MTO plans for Highway 404 widening.

- The EA traffic assessment identified widening of 16th Ave to 6-lanes through the Highway 404 interchange.
- Attendees discussed proposed development in the area and the potential infrastructure requirements to support the development.
- The City of Markham noted that landscaping opportunities have been identified in this area as part of a proposed development. Timing and discussions for the proposed development will be considered in the EA study once the development has status.

### 6. Stouffville GO At-Grade Crossing

- At the existing Stouffville GO at-grade crossing, increased GO train service along the Stouffville GO line in the future is anticipated to cause significant delays resulting from traffic arms stopping vehicles while trains pass at-grade.
- There would be significant challenges for a grade separation at this location. Constraints include the close proximity of Markham Road/Highway 48 and the alignment of Mount Joy Creek adjacent to the rail tracks.
- The City of Markham indicates that Metrolinx has not identified this crossing for a grade separation, however it is identified in the Region’s TMP.
- If a grade separation is to be considered the City of Markham prefers an option with least geometric changes/impacts to homeowners in the area.
- Designing an overpass is anticipated to have less impacts to the natural environment but more impacts to property owners, and vice versa for an underpass.

### 7. Additional Discussion and Next Steps

- The construction timelines will follow YR Capital Construction Program, which currently identifies the segment of 16th Ave from Leslie Street to Woodbine Avenue to begin construction in 2021.
- Property requirements will be reviewed and confirmed at a later phase of the study; this phase identifies the preferred typical cross-section.
- Markham’s Cycling and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CPAC) should be contacted as part of this project; **City of Markham staff will contact them and forward the Open House Notice. [Post-meeting note: it is understood that the City of Markham is coordinating directly with CPAC and forwarding the study notices]**
- City of Markham staff identified an additional development (Secondary Hub at DCP, as part of the Highway 407 Rapid Transitway) that is not currently shown on the map presented at this meeting – **City of Markham to review further and provide any information available for development applications along the study area**
  - HDR to send the City of Markham the slide showing development locations along the study area [Post-meeting note: the slide was sent on November 14, 2016]
  - City of Markham does not currently know the timeframe for the York Downs Redevelopment, but will provide any information they currently have on file [Post-meeting note: Draft plans under review by the City of Markham were received on November 17, 2016]
- City of Markham notes that development west of Markland Street has not progressed – north-south entrance to future development will be
The City of Markham prefers to keep the existing MUP east of Ninth Line as it is part of the City’s MUP network.

- The City of Markham notes that it maintains MUPs as sidewalks (year-round maintenance); however, it does not maintain cycle tracks in the winter and the selection of an MUP would be preferred along this segment.
- Next meeting with the City of Markham will be scheduled prior to Public Open House 2
  - Notification to Council in advance of the Open House will follow the Region’s notification protocol

If there are any errors or omissions to these minutes, please contact Merlin Yuen
## Meeting Minutes

**Project:** 16th Avenue Environmental Assessments (EAs) from Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue and from Woodbine Avenue to York/Durham Line

**Subject:** City of Markham – Design Constraints Meeting

**Date:** Wednesday, March 22, 2017

**Location:** 101 Town Center Boulevard, Canada Boardroom

**Attendees:**
- Alice Lam, City of Markham
- Andrew Johnson, City of Markham
- David Porretta, City of Markham
- Denisa Necula, City of Markham
- Gary Sellars, City of Markham
- Henry Lo, City of Markham
- Loy Cheah, City of Markham
- Peter Chan, City of Markham
- Reena Mistry, City of Markham
- Richard Kendall, City of Markham
- Robert Marinzel, City of Markham
- Sally Campbell, City of Markham
- Colin Wong, York Region
- John MacKenzie, York Region
- Tyrone Gan, HDR
- Veronica Restrepo, HDR
- Merlin Yuen, HDR

**Regrets:**
- Soran Sito, City of Markham
- Nhat-anh Nguyen, City of Markham
- Reza Fani, City of Markham
- Joseph Palmisano, City of Markham
- Andrew Crickmay, City of Markham
- David Miller, City of Markham
- Michelle Mascarenhas, York Region

**Minutes by:** Merlin Yuen, HDR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Project Information and Updates</strong></td>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project Update/Background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o First round of Open Houses held in November 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Next set of open houses being planned for Fall 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Environmental Study Report (ESR) filing anticipated in 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recommended solutions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Yonge Street to Markham Road/Highway 48: Widen to six lanes for Transit/High Occupancy Vehicles (HOV), Active Transportation (AT) improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Markham Road/Highway 48 to Donald Cousens Parkway (DCP) – AT Improvements, no additional lanes required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o DCP to York/Durham Line (YDL) – Semi-rural cross-section with paved shoulders, no additional lanes required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. High Level Design Discussion | Discussion |
| • The project team is looking for input from the City of Markham (City) regarding potential designs and localized constraints – looking to understand cross-section components most important to the City | |
| • AT facilities: | |
| o City’s Official Plan (OP) identifies in-boulevard (separate) cycling facilities due to safety of cyclists and pedestrians. | |
| o Preference for a consistent type of facility as opposed to constant transitions between different types of facilities. | |
- Preference for concrete cycling facilities instead of asphalt if the City is to maintain the facilities.
- Preference for AT facilities that do not exceed 3 m in width (or 1.5 m sidewalk and 1.5 m cycling facility) due to snow clearance constraints.
- Preference for one-way cycling facilities on each side of the road corresponding with the direction of traffic instead of a combined treatment on one side of the road for both directions.

General design principles followed by the EA team are as follows:
- Maintain six lanes between Yonge Street and Markham Road/Highway 48
- AT facilities on both sides (in the form of sidewalk, cycle track, or multi-use path)
- Compromise on width of AT facilities, median, and boulevard planting opportunities if required at constrained locations

York Region to **confirm who (City or Region) will be responsible for maintenance of retaining walls**. The project team will complete a cost/benefit analysis to determine locations of retaining wall and embankments.

- Maintenance service level (i.e. all-season vs. no winter maintenance) on cycling facilities and multi-use paths (MUP) to be determined
- City noted that the Region should consider the type of pedestrian environment being created with focus on auto-intensive alternatives that compromise landscaping areas where right-of-way (ROW) is constrained.
- City’s Trees for Tomorrow policy should be considered; if trees are impacted, compensation is based on type (species) and size of trees to be removed.

3. **16th Avenue between Leslie and Woodbine**

- Key constraints include the Highway 404 interchange, Buttonville Airport Redevelopment and the Rouge River crossing.
- Design options were considered for accommodating cyclists and pedestrians through AT facilities in the boulevards and in the median. If the median AT option is selected, winter maintenance responsibilities will need to be confirmed. The Highway 400 / Highway 7 crossing in the City of Vaughan (similar design with median AT facilities) is anticipated to set a precedent.
- Ministry of Transportation (MTO) accounted for the reconfiguration of the 16th Avenue/Highway 404 interchange to a Parclo A4 as Highway 404 is widened for HOV lanes. However, the interchange reconfiguration would only take place after Buttonville airport closes. Based on this information, leaving the current interchange configuration has been considered an option as part of the 16th Ave EA, with a 6 lane design.
- Status of the north-south road extending from Markland Street to 16th Avenue, and planned extension of Renfrew Drive to 16th Avenue were discussed.
- City preference for protection for both roads in 16th Ave EA, but the Region’s EA can only proceed with development.
applications that have official status.

| City to review and provide status update for the Allstate Parkway / Renfrew extension and north-south road extending from Markland Street to 16th Ave. | City |
| Region to check status of Secondary Plan and mid-block crossing EA documentation regarding Renfrew / 16th Ave intersection. | York Region |
| HDR to send the public report to the City regarding the north-south road between Markland Street and 16th Avenue (west of Woodbine Avenue). | HDR |

### 4. Localized Constraints

- Warden to Kennedy – York Region to confirm if their OP allows for the full ROW widening to be taken from one side where constrained, or if it must be 21.5m from the existing centreline for a 43m ROW. This may allow for additional ROW from York Downs Redevelopment.
- An Official Plan Amendment application related to the York Downs Redevelopment is anticipated in April.
- Kennedy to McCowan: separate AT facilities on both sides of the street would require tree removals on both sides; alternatives will be explored to minimize impacts to the natural environment.
- Markham Road/Highway 48: Heritage constraints, including proximity to Markham Heritage Conservation District
  - The project team will review widening needs based on the constraints approaching Markham Road/Highway 48, and advised if widening should stop at McCowan Road
  - Safety concerns associated with left turns identified at Peter St. The York Region contact is David Atkins. Project team to request additional details.
- Stouffville GO Rail at-grade crossing:
  - Grade separation exposure index already being met with current traffic levels and number of trains crossing. HDR to complete analysis for operations and queuing for future train service.
  - York Region has been in discussion with Metrolinx regarding this at-grade crossing
  - This crossing is not on the grade separation priority list for Metrolinx
  - Metrolinx is also reviewing their needs for an additional track but the location is unclear
  - Metrolinx provided a presentation showing Regional Express Rail (RER) between Union and Lincolnville, including two-way all-day service between Union and Mount Joy. The City will share this presentation, which identifies the proposed train frequency, with the EA team.
- DCP-YDL: current recommendation for semi-rural cross-section with paved shoulders.
  - City preference for an MUP to be considered in this segment
(within Rouge National Park), given the proposed trail off 16th Avenue per Parks Canada’s trail network. The City will provide Parks Canada trail network map.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Additional Discussion</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Anti-whistle/noise policy: City has committed to addressing this in three packages, with construction beginning in Fall 2017 and scheduled for completion in 2018. 16th Avenue is likely on the second or third tender package. Improvements may consist of pedestrian gates and “no whistle” signs. York Region contact for this project is Richard So. The project team can contact Alice for more information on the Anti-whistle project status.</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stormwater Management (SWM): additional run-off associated with road widening will be accommodated through SWM strategy. Region to provide drainage/SWM report as appendix to draft ESR for City to review and comment prior to ESR filing.</td>
<td>York Region</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Next Steps</th>
<th>EA team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Next round of open houses planned for Fall 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• EA team will schedule another meeting with City staff prior to the open houses to discuss the proposed design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If there are any errors or omissions to these minutes, please contact Merlin Yuen.
## Meeting Minutes

**Project:** 16ᵗʰ Avenue Environmental Assessments (EAs) from Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue and from Woodbine Avenue to York/Durham Line

**Subject:** City of Markham – Design Concepts Meeting

**Date:** Friday, July 28, 2017

**Location:** Markham Civic Centre – Planning Boardroom

### Attendees:
- Robert Marinzel, City of Markham
- Andrew Johnson, City of Markham
- Sally Campbell, City of Markham
- Elizabeth Wimmer, City of Markham
- Alice Lam, City of Markham
- Peter Chan, City of Markham
- Loy Cheah, City of Markham
- Reena Mistry, City of Markham
- David Porretta, City of Markham
- Colin Wong, York Region
- Anson Wong, York Region
- Tyrone Gan, HDR
- Veronica Restrepo, HDR

### Regrets:
- Soran Sito, City of Markham
- Nhat-Anh Nguyen, City of Markham
- Joseph Palmisano, City of Markham
- Ronald Blake, City of Markham
- David Miller, City of Markham
- Henry Lo, City of Markham
- Richard Kendall, City of Markham
- Michelle Mascarenhas, York Region

### Minutes by:
Veronica Restrepo, HDR

### Item 1. Project Information and Updates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Update/Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First round of Open Houses held in November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next set of open houses being planned for Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Study Report (ESR) filing anticipated in 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Updated preliminary recommended solutions:
- Limits of proposed widening have been updated and are consistent with York Region’s Transportation Master Plan (TMP), as follows:
  - Yonge Street to McCowan Road: Widen to six lanes for Transit/High Occupancy Vehicles (HOV), Active Transportation (AT) improvements
  - McCowan Road to Donald Cousens Parkway (DCP) – AT Improvements, no additional lanes required
  - DCP to York/Durham Line (YDL) – Semi-rural cross-section with paved shoulders, no additional lanes required

### Item 2. Design Considerations and General Recommendations and Discussion

#### Available right-of-way (ROW) and property considerations:
- Due to the highly constrained corridor, achieving the full designated ROW may not be possible in most segments to avoid impacting back yards, other existing land uses, cultural heritage features, and environmentally sensitive areas.
- York Downs development provides opportunity to achieve 43m ROW. York Region has been coordinating with the developer and York Downs is aware that property is required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

hdrinc.com | 100 York Boulevard, Suite 300, Richmond Hill, ON, CA L4B 1J8 | (289) 695-4600
City staff requested that sight triangles be minimized if possible at the York Downs intersections, while still meeting standards. The City will provide details. The next submission from the developer is expected in September. In the meantime, the City will provide the first submission (this submission has no status).

Retaining walls may be required at some locations to avoid grading impacts onto adjacent back yards. It was confirmed that the Region is responsible for the maintenance of retaining walls.

Proposed Widening and EA Documentation

- The study team is no longer proposing road widening between McCowan Road and Markham Road/Hwy 48 as the benefits of widening were deemed to be marginal compared with the significant impacts that would result from the additional widening and required property.
- For all the cross-section graphics, the curb lane should be labelled “Transit/HOV lane”
- The proposed approach for the segment east of Markham Road/Highway 48 includes documentation of the recommendations in the current EA, but no additional technical studies. York Region will confirm process for how to document and notify stakeholders and the public regarding these segments.

Active Transportation (AT) Facilities:

- The study team’s approach for active transportation is to provide overall network improvements. The current recommendations, subject to further review and consultation, consist of:
  - Off-street cycle track and sidewalk on both sides of the street between Yonge Street and Highway 404 interchange
  - Median AT facilities through the Highway 404 interchange
  - MUP on the north side and sidewalk on the south side between Highway 404 interchange and Warden Avenue
  - MUP on both sides between Warden Avenue and Kennedy Road, where the proposed York Downs development provides an opportunity to achieve a wider ROW and provide trail connections on both sides of 16th Avenue.
  - MUP on the north side and sidewalk on the south side between Kennedy Road and Donald Cousens Parkway

- Additional coordination with MTO is required regarding the AT facilities approach at the Highway 404 interchange.
- Maintenance is a concern for the City of Markham at the median AT facilities at the Highway 404 interchange. The proposed design should consider how snow plows would cross the street for winter maintenance at the interchange.
- It was suggested that wall mounted lighting for median AT be considered at the 404 interchange. Since crossing to the median would be a relatively new concept for cyclists and pedestrians, good signage and education would also be required.
- City staff noted concern that a two-stage crossing may be
confusing and not well utilized. The study team will provide case studies of median AT facilities implemented elsewhere.

- It was noted that a multi-use path (MUP) may attract a greater group of people to try cycling compared to a cycle track.
- Material selection and separation between cyclists and pedestrians for any segments where separate cycle track and sidewalk are recommended are to be addressed during detailed design. The material between the curb and MUP will also be confirmed during detailed design.
- The City standards for sidewalk to back of curb is a minimum of 2.4 m. The City uses 1.5 m sidewalks in general, and 1.8 m for high density areas.
- City staff noted there might be different legal vs. practical requirements with regards to winter maintenance for wider sidewalk facilities.
- At the Rouge River bridge, the barrier between cyclists and travel lanes may pose a potential maintenance concern. The minimum width for plowing identified by the City is 1.9 m.
- City staff noted that since there are more trails on the south side of 16th Avenue, it may be more beneficial to implement a MUP on the south side instead of the north side for the purpose of connectivity. If the EA recommends implementation of MUP on the north side and sidewalk on the south side, and it is decided to change this during detailed design, an EA amendment may be required if there are significant impacts resulting from this change (even if no additional property beyond that protected through the EA is required).
- At York Downs, City noted that implementation of MUP on both sides of 16th Avenue may be sufficient to accommodate AT as pedestrian and cyclists could cross at adjacent signalized intersections. However, if Berczy Creek and Bruce Creek structures are to be replaced, consideration should be made for AT connections in the valley (under the bridge).
- East of York Downs, the study team will confirm if there is sufficient ROW to accommodate MUP on both sides all the way to Kennedy Road. If ROW is not sufficient, MUP on the south side could end at the previous intersection.
- The potential for a wider sidewalk on the south side of 16th Avenue in the vicinity of the Markham Road/Hwy 48 intersection was identified.

Recommendations in Rural Segment

- Implementation of paved shoulders is currently recommended for the segment between Donald Cousens Parkway and York/Durham Line.
- City staff suggested the consideration of more AT facilities for Rouge Park. It was noted that the previous comments received for this segment included providing rural treatment. The EA team will consult with Parks Canada regarding trails through Rouge Park. A meeting is set up for August 2017.
- City staff suggested consideration for a transition of AT facilities at high density areas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>the Little Rouge River bridge.</th>
<th>City of Markham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• EA team should consult the Agricultural Advisory Committee for feedback regarding the recommendation for the rural segment of the study corridor, in particular regarding shoulder width requirements for farming equipment. <strong>City of Markham staff to check internally and confirm how to consult with Agricultural Advisory Committee.</strong></td>
<td>HDR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stouffville Line at-grade crossing:**

| • Currently, Metrolinx does not have plans for grade separation at this location | HDR |
| • City staff noted that per the anti-whistle status, a pedestrian gate will be constructed on 16th Avenue in 2018 based on the existing sidewalk location (pedestrian gate is currently at 30% design). This will need to be considered during the 16th Avenue detailed design and should be **documented in the ESR.** | HDR |

**Other planned roadways along the corridor:**

| • EA team to **protect for Allstate and Renfrew connections as well as connection from 16th Avenue north to Markland Street based on locations identified in the City’s Official Plan** | YR / HDR |
| • For Renfrew connection, the EA should protect for right-in-right-out (RIRO) access only | City of Markham |
| • The **City will provide proposed York Downs intersection locations** as to not preclude future trail connections on the north side of 16th Avenue. | City of Markham |
| • It was clarified that there are no new roadway connections to 16th Avenue proposed as a result of the Seaton development in Durham. | HDR |

**Natural environment:**

| • A tree inventory will be completed as part of the EA. **It will be provided to the City once available.** | HDR |
| • The study team will **document the number of trees anticipated to be removed, and the need for a compensation strategy to be confirmed during detailed design.** The City expressed their preference for the compensation strategy to consist of trees to be planted instead of monetary compensation. | HDR |
| • As part of tree plantings for compensation, City staff suggested that tree plantings in the highway cloverleaves be considered in addition to tree plantings in open spaces and City parks. It was also suggested that planting trees in back yards could be considered as a compensation strategy. The City has done this for a number of subdivisions in the past. | HDR |
| • City staff noted there is a heritage property (schoolhouse) with mature trees at the southwest quadrant of 16th Avenue and Woodbine Avenue. **It should be confirmed that there will be no impacts to trees as a result of the proposed improvements at this location.** | HDR |
| • City staff requested consideration for reduced lighting at valley crossings. **This can be documented as a future commitment** | HDR |
for review during detailed design. City engineering standards for streetlighting (Section N) should be followed.

- At York Downs, it was suggested to consider replacing median plantings with additional space in the boulevard (double row of trees).
- City staff noted that plantings adjacent to hydro lines are restricted to one species, which can be considered to be “boring”. The EA team confirmed that there is a capacity issue for hydro lines, which requires them to be placed on both sides of the street.
- DFO requirements will be reviewed as part of the EA.

Noise:
- There is currently a noise study underway as part of the EA. The City requested an opportunity to provide input regarding the height of noise walls. In general, the City’s preference is for noise walls to be no higher than 2 metres.

Utilities:
- Burying utilities was considered but deemed to be too expensive. **York Region to provide the case study for burying utilities along Davis Drive (York Region/Town of Newmarket).**

Other items:
- City staff noted that a catch basin on the south side of the ROW, east of the second Normandale intersection, is failing. **York Region will review.**
- City staff noted there are drainage issues on the north side of 16th Avenue at some locations, where there is water ponding against the rear lot fencing. **City to provide specific locations of concern.** A drainage and stormwater management assessment will be completed as part of the EA.
- City staff noted that there has recently been landscape work completed at the intersection of 16th Avenue and Markham Road.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Construction Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Based on York Region’s current 2017 10-Year Roads and Transit Capital Construction Program, construction timing for each of the study corridor segments is as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Yonge Street to Leslie Street: construction scheduled to start in 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Leslie Street to Woodbine Avenue: construction scheduled to start in 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Woodbine Avenue to York/Durham Line: construction start is not in the current 10 year plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- This timing is subject to change based on annual review of York Region’s 10-Year Roads and Transit Capital Construction Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- EA team to send presentation to Markham, and Markham staff to provide comments within two weeks. <strong>[Post-meeting note: the presentation slides were provided on August 1, 2017]</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- The design plans will be circulated to the City for review prior to the Open Houses.
- York Region protocols for Open House notice circulation will be followed. The notice should be published in the newspaper approximately two weeks ahead of the Open Houses.
- Local Councillors may request a Council presentation given the project history. Typically, for EAs the Council presentation (if required) is held after the EA is filed, similar to what was done for the Rutherford/Carrville Road EA.

If there are any errors or omissions to these minutes, please contact HDR within ten business days of the issuance of these minutes.
RESPONSE FORM

Regional Municipality of York
Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Studies
16th Avenue from Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue and
16th Avenue from Woodbine Avenue to York-Durham Line
Town of Richmond Hill and City of Markham

Contact Name: Alice Lam

Title: Manager, Infrastructure & Capital Projects

Agency / Organization: City of Markham

Address: 101 Town Centre Blvd, Markham, ON

Postal Code: L3R 9N3

Phone No.: 905-477-7000 ext 2354

Email address: Alam @ Markham.ca

Please note specific concerns and comments (use additional sheets if necessary):

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

Do you wish to be notified for continued involvement in the process?

☐ Yes, please continue to send me updates about the project

☐ No, I do not wish to be kept informed about the project. Please remove our organization from the project contact list.

Please return this form by July 29, 2016 to: Colin Wong, P.Eng.
Project Manager
The Regional Municipality of York
17250 Yonge Street
Newmarket, Ontario L3Y 3Z1
Email: colin.wong@york.ca
RESPONSE FORM

Regan J. Hutcheson, M.C.I.P., R.P.P.
Manager, Heritage Planning
Development Services Commission
City of Markham
Anthony Roman Centre
101 Town Centre Boulevard, Markham, ON L3R 9W3
T: 905.477.7000 x 2080
rhutcheson@markham.ca

File/Routing:

Contact Name: Mr. Regan Hutcheson
Title: Manager, Heritage Planning
Agency / Organization: City of Markham, Planning & Urban Design Dept.
Address: 101 Town Centre Blvd
Markham, ON
Postal Code: L3R 9W3
Phone No.: 905.477.7000 x 2080
Email address: rhutcheson@markham.ca

Please note specific concerns and comments (use additional sheets if necessary):
If you need info on cultural heritage resources within or adjacent to your study corridor:
- 2 heritage conservation districts – Buttonville, Markham Village
Contact me if

Do you wish to be notified for continued involvement in the process?

[ ] Yes, please continue to send me updates about the project

[ ] No, I do not wish to be kept informed about the project. Please remove our organization from the project contact list.

Please return this form by July 29, 2016 to:
Colin Wong, P.Eng.
Project Manager
The Regional Municipality of York
17250 Yonge Street
Newmarket, Ontario L3Y 3Z1
Email: colin.wong@york.ca
December 6, 2018

To:
Peter Chan, P. Eng.
City of Markham

Dear Mr. Chan

Re: Response to Draft Environmental Study Report Comments
16th Avenue Study A (Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue)
Municipal Class Environmental Assessment – Schedule C Road Project
Regional Municipality of York

Thank you for your comments dated November 26, 2018. We understand the City of Markham staff reviewed the drafted Environmental Study Report (ESR) dated October 19, 2018 and associated technical studies available at this time.

Please see the attached table for the project team’s responses to the comments.

Regards,

Tyrone Gan
Consultant Project Manager, HDR

Cc: Colin Wong, York Region
    Nasir Aslam, York Region
    Veronica Restrepo, HDR
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Reviewer’s Department/Division</th>
<th>Drawing No./Report page No.</th>
<th>City Comments</th>
<th>Project Team’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The City continues to advocate and recommend the implementation of two-way cycling facilities on both the north and south sides of 16th Avenue to maximize opportunities to use active transportation on both sides of 16th Avenue, connections to intersecting active transportation facilities also to reduce the need for cyclists to cross 16th Avenue. Therefore, we recommend that the Region also consider adopting this practice.</td>
<td>The project team considered options for cycling and pedestrian facilities on both sides of 16th Ave (for example, cycle track and sidewalk on both sides). However, these were not feasible due to existing constraints along the corridor such as availability of property. Although it might have been feasible to recommend separated cycling facilities on both sides for some short segments of the corridor, the need for consistency restricted this approach. The recommendation for a consistent typical cross-section consisting of multi-use path (MUP) on the north and sidewalk on the south was developed after a review of the existing conditions and constraints along 16th Avenue, and in consultation with stakeholders including representatives from the City of Markham. This recommendation balances the needs of all road users while providing some opportunities for landscaping and minimizing impacts to adjacent properties and features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Based on the comment above and recognizing that the on-going discussion between City and York Region regarding boulevard jurisdiction along Regional roads, the EA document should include a provision that allows the Region to enhance the pedestrian and cycling facilities along 16th Avenue at the detailed design stage (in the event the Region take responsibility for the boulevard jurisdiction before the project is constructed).</td>
<td>The EA documents that at the time of detailed design, any changes to design standards and/or industry best practices compared to those available at the time of the EA are to be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Where it is physically not feasible within the boulevard to implement MUP on both the north and south sides of 16th Avenue, the MUP on the one side of the road should be as wide as possible</td>
<td>The proposed 3.0m MUP is consistent with York Region’s Road Design Guidelines, which state that no sidewalk or MUP shall exceed 3.0 metres. Prior direction from City staff also</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Reviewer’s Department/Division</td>
<td>Drawing No./Report page No.</td>
<td>City Comments</td>
<td>Project Team’s Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(up to 4.0m) in order to maximize user safety and accessibility.</td>
<td>noted a preference for active transportation facilities that do not exceed 3m in width due to snow clearance constraints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Boulevard width on the south side of 16th Avenue at the 404 structure does not appear to correspond to the MTO preliminary design, with the south boulevard appearing quite narrow in comparison to the north boulevard. Further to comments above on the MUPs, we request that this boulevard also protect or allow for a 2.4-3m wide MUP</td>
<td>The design of the structure at 16th Ave and Hwy 404 is subject to ongoing discussions between York Region and MTO. Although the active transportation recommendations under the structure are consistent with the rest of the 16th Ave corridor (MUP on the north side and sidewalk on the south side), the structure is intended to be designed to protect for future considerations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Proper intersection and driveway treatments along 16th Avenue should be reviewed and implemented to address bicycle access and pedestrian crossing requirements.</td>
<td>Comment noted. The following is included in the ESR as a commitment for detailed design: “The Region is in the process of developing Active Transportation guidelines, which should be reviewed during detailed design to ensure the proposed design conforms to the updated guidelines. This includes consideration of the applicable standards for pedestrian and cyclist treatment across entrances and intersections.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>Section 4.3.4</td>
<td>In Section 4.3.4 of the ESR (Designated Natural Area), the Rouge River is identified as a valleyland in Markham’s Official Plan and is considered to meet the criteria of Significant Valleyland by Markham natural heritage staff.</td>
<td>Comment noted. This section of the ESR refers only to Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSIs), Provincially Significant Wetlands (PSWs) or Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) along the corridor. However, the project team acknowledges the significance of the Rouge River and other natural features, which are further documented in the natural heritage report (Appendix G of the ESR). Natural environment criteria were a key aspect of the evaluation of alternatives throughout this study, and the recommended designs aim to minimize impacts to natural heritage features,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Reviewer's Department/Division</td>
<td>Drawing No./ Report page No.</td>
<td>City Comments</td>
<td>Project Team's Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Engineering Department</td>
<td>Section 8.2</td>
<td>In Section 8.2 (Potential Environmental Impacts and Mitigation), Table 8-11, #11 – Vegetation and Vegetation Communities (Proposed mitigation i). It is noted in both the draft ESR and natural heritage report that the vegetation along the Rouge River is highly disturbed and includes high proportion of non-native and/or invasive species. City staff have been on-site south of 16th Avenue and noted concentrations of dog strangling vine (an invasive plant species). The current proposed mitigation in the ESR is to allow for adjacent plant species to recolonize disturbed areas which would allow invasive species to further negatively impact natural areas. A more proactive approach is recommended to restore and stabilize all disturbed lands with native species immediately after construction occurs, in particular along the Rouge River. Native pollinator seed mixes are recommended to complement Markham's Monarch Butterfly pledge.</td>
<td>The mitigation noted in Table 8-11 generally notes that disturbed areas will be re-vegetated. The City’s recommendation has been documented in Section 8.3.3 of the ESR.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting Minutes

Project: 16th Avenue Environmental Assessments (EAs) from Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue and from Woodbine Avenue to York/Durham Line

Subject: City of Pickering Meeting

Date: Monday, January 08, 2018

Location: Pickering City Hall, Engineering Services Meeting Room # 4 – 1 The Esplanade S

Attendees:
- Scott Booker, City of Pickering
- Nadeem Zahoor, City of Pickering
- Colin Wong, York Region
- Tyrone Gan, HDR
- Veronica Restrepo, HDR

Minutes by: Veronica Restrepo, HDR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>16th Ave EA Introduction and Project Background</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ The project team provided a brief project introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ The Region’s Transportation Master Plan (TMP) update was completed in 2016 and identified the need for improvements to 16th Avenue and other Regional roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Project Timelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o First round of Open Houses was held in November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Last set of open houses was held in October 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Environmental Study Report (ESR) filing is anticipated in 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Recommended solutions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Limits of proposed widening are consistent with the York Region (YR) TMP, as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Yonge Street to McCowan Road: Widen to six lanes for Transit/High Occupancy Vehicles (HOV), provide Active Transportation (AT) improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ McCowan Road to Donald Cousens Parkway – AT Improvements, no additional traffic lanes required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Donald Cousens Parkway to York/Durham Line – rural cross-section with paved shoulders, no additional traffic lanes required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ City of Pickering (City) representatives inquired regarding the paved shoulder between Donald Cousens Parkway and York/Durham Line, specifically whether it would be painter or buffered to distinguish it from the travel lanes. The project team clarified these details will be confirmed during detailed design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ It was confirmed that York/Durham Line within the study area is under YR jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Information Only</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Existing Conditions and Design Considerations**

| | **Information and Discussion** |
| | ▪ There is an at-grade crossing of the CP Havelock Rail Corridor approximately 200m south of the 16th Avenue and York/Durham Line intersection, and a watercourse crossing (Major Creek) approximately 45m north of the intersection. |
| | ▪ City confirmed there are no current plans to add a fourth leg at |
- The project team received a Pickering CAO report from a member of the public at one of the October 2017 Open Houses, related to the proposed Pickering Airport. This member of the public noted there were plans for an east-west connection into the City of Pickering from 16th Avenue. **The project team to send the CAO report for City staff to confirm.** [Post-meeting note: the CAO report was sent to the City on January 8, 2018].

- There is a farm field entrance approximately 45m south of 16th Avenue, on the east side of York/Durham Line.

- The current alternative design considerations at the 16th Avenue and York/Durham Line intersection as part of the EA consist of implementing either a signalized intersection or a roundabout. Both alternatives are still under consideration at this time.

- City staff noted that they are in agreement with both alternatives presented and did not identify a strong preference for either signalized intersection or roundabout, noting that the EA process should determine which alternative is selected. **The project team will share additional information associated with the evaluation of these alternatives with the City once available.**

Conclusions related to a potential roundabout include:

- It was noted that in order to implement an enhanced roundabout, property acquisition will be required. This is a more intrusive alternative and City representatives raised concerns regarding impacts to properties.

- In order to assess potential property impacts, the project team requires access to property boundary information (GIS files). **HDR will request these from Durham Region,** as the City’s agreement with Durham Region prohibits them from sharing these files. **The project team to advise the limits of potential impact/assessment on the east side of York/Durham Line, so the City can provide contact information for owners within those limits.** [Post-meeting note: the limits were provided on January 8, 2018].

- Continuity for roundabouts should be considered. There is an existing roundabout at the York/Durham Line and Concession Road 9 intersection which was implemented by York Region. **The project team should assess how this roundabout has been operating.** Implementing a roundabout at 16th Avenue and York/Durham Line should consider how other adjacent or nearby intersections are proposed to be treated.

- As part of York Region’s policies regarding the design of intersections, a roundabout must be considered at any intersection where signalization is being proposed.

3. Other Considerations

- The City of Pickering is currently in Phase 1 of its Integrated Transportation Master Plan (ITMP)
  - Completion is scheduled for June 2019
  - The City is updating its active transportation master plan as part of the ITMP
The YR TMP identified York/Durham Line to be widened to 4 lanes between Steeles Avenue and Stouffville Road. A separate EA will be required for these improvements, and it should re-examine the 16th Avenue and York/Durham Line intersection.

4. **Next Steps**

- Request GIS files/property boundaries from Durham Region
- City to provide property ownership information to the project team
- Continue to send notices to City (via Nadeem)
- Send a copy of the presentation from today’s meeting to Nadeem

[post-meeting note: PDF of the presentation was sent on January 8, 2018].

If there are any errors or omissions to these minutes please contact Veronica Restrepo within ten business days of the issuance of these minutes.
# Meeting Minutes

**Project:** 16th Avenue Environmental Assessments from Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue and from Woodbine Avenue to York/Durham Line

**Subject:** CN Rail Meeting

**Date:** Friday, January 27, 2017

**Location:** HDR Boardroom (100 York Boulevard, Suite 300, Richmond Hill ON L4B 1J8)

**Attendees:**
- Ryan Coward, CN Police
- Richard Di Biase, CN Police
- Ray Hicks, CN Rail
- Vincent White, CN Rail
- Dan Terzievski, Richmond Hill
- Samson Wat, Richmond Hill
- Colin Wong, York Region
- Michelle Mascarenhas, York Region
- John MacKenzie, York Region
- Tyrone Gan, HDR
- Sardar Nabi, HDR
- Merlin Yuen, HDR

**Minutes by:** Merlin Yuen, HDR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>CN Rail Crossing – Current Pedestrian Issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project Introduction/Background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o York Region (YR) highlighted pedestrian issues with Red Maple Road and the reluctance of pedestrians to use the overpass.</td>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CN Rail Police indicated significant trespassing around CN tracks, which results in tickets/fines; attempts to educate the community have been ineffective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Town of Richmond Hill (RH) noted they would prefer a shorter crossing path given there will be further development on the south east quadrant of the overpass crossing near Red Maple Road (development application submitted for that parcel of land), and due to public complaints of pedestrian level of service surrounding the Red Maple Road area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- RH to <strong>confirm if pedestrian issues will be addressed in the Yonge Street/16th Avenue KDA Secondary Plan</strong></td>
<td>RH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>CN Rail Crossing – Alternative Design Options</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Option 1 – Staircases to connect to 16th Overpass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o CN Rail (CN) suggested that the use of landscaping around fencing may deter trespassers.</td>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o CN Police indicated that trespassing is also prevalent near Berwick Crescent and design should attempt to address this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Examples of staircases can be found at Burlington GO Station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Option 2 – Pedestrian tunnel under rail tracks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o CN indicated that proper illumination and landscaping around tunnel has the potential to reduce trespassing at other locations. This would be an AODA friendly option, but may not remedy loitering issue, and construction of this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Meeting Minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 – Direct underground crossing through the tunnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  - CN would maintain jurisdiction of the tunnel; however, construction/maintenance would be joint with YR |
| Option 3 – Pedestrian overpass over rail tracks |  
  - CN indicated that an overpass requires a minimum clearance of 23 ft. as the preferred design must protect for electrification |
| Option 4 – Signalized Pedestrian At-Grade Crossing |  
  - CN would not support an at-grade grossing; concerns that it will result in loitering and safety issues |
| Based on the options discussed, CN Police suggested a staircase crossing overpass that connects from Red Maple Road to 16th Avenue on the other side of the tracks or to South-Hill Shopping Centre. |
| As HDR begins to send design alternatives to CN Rail staff, level of detail should include a conceptual design, list of benefits/disadvantages, and cost. |
| If HDR needs to do any further site visits to the CN property, contacting CN (Ray) will ensure that a track supervisor can meet staff at the appropriate location for safety purposes. |
| CN indicated that vertical clearance is an issue to be aware of; CN can send HDR a profile of the crossing. As HDR begins to develop alternatives, another meeting can be set up with CN to discuss. |
| Regarding future CN plans at this location, there is currently no confirmation of the potential for another track; however, CN recommends protecting for new track in the future. |
| CN is unaware of Metrolinx discussions regarding a potential station in the area. |

### 3. Action Items and Next Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Items</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RH to confirm if pedestrian issues will be addressed in the KDA Secondary Plan</td>
<td>RH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN Rail to provide crossing profile to HDR</td>
<td>CN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDR to develop preliminary designs and send to CN prior to next meeting</td>
<td>HDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once CN reviews preliminary designs, HDR to schedule next meeting with CN</td>
<td>CN/HDR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If there are any errors or omissions to these minutes, please contact HDR within ten business days of the issuance of these minutes.
# Meeting Minutes

**Project:** 16th Avenue Environmental Assessments from Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue and from Woodbine Avenue to York/Durham Line

**Subject:** CN Rail Meeting

**Date:** Friday, September 15, 2017

**Location:** 1 Administration Rd, Concord, ON L4K 2R8, Canada

**Attendees:**
- Michael Vallins, CN Rail
- Derek Basso, CN Rail
- Colin Wong, York Region
- Michelle Mascarenhas, York Region
- Tyrone Gan, HDR
- Iakov Bravinski, HDR
- Tamkin Naghshbandi, HDR

**Minutes by:** Tamkin Naghshbandi, HDR

## Item 1. 16th Avenue EA Update

- Tyrone provided a brief project update since the first meeting, including the alternative design concepts to be presented to the public at the Fall 2017 Open Houses.
- The purpose of the meeting is to present the preferred design concept and obtain input from CN prior to the Open Houses.

## Item 2. CN Rail Crossing – Preferred Design Concept

- Four alternative design concepts were briefly presented
  - Widening to both sides
    - This is the preferred option. This option will balance the impacts of widening to both sides, specifically minimizing impacts to existing retaining wall structures (RSS).
  - Widening to the south
    - The RSS wall located along the south embankment at each approach will need to be completely rebuilt to accommodate the widening of the road.
  - Widening to the north
    - This option is the least desirable with respect to the road alignment impacts
  - Complete replacement
    - This is the highest cost alternative with largest impact to the rail operations.
- Widening to both sides is the preferred design concept. The steel girder superstructure is proposed to control deformations.
- The existing superstructure and the new structure can be joined with this option at the completion of construction.
- **The Metrolinx rail clearance envelope should be cross-referenced for the design.**
- Overall, CN sees no change in the clearance envelope and does...
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Detailed Design Commitments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Minimal disturbance to track time during construction is one of CN’s main priorities and should be documented in the EA as a detailed design commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CN advises that all construction activities take place outside of the clearance envelope of the train.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Construction of the pier and footing should be conducted with the presence of flagmen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An important factor to be considered is whether or not the vibration from the train will have negative effects during concrete curing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Girder erection should be conducted during a permissible train operation window.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A crane and lift plan will be needed and the lift should be planned within the natural time of the train passing as a detailed design commitment. This calls for a 2-3 month window of discussion before construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The construction tender should be discussed prior to detailed design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CN requested that they be provided details about how the bridge widening will be constructed, when available during detailed design.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| HDR |

4. CN Rail Crossing – Pedestrian Issues

| HDR |

| • Addressing trespassing is one of CN’s main concerns and should be documented in the EA. Public safety plays a large role in this concern. |
| • Since there is no adequate crossing at this location, people walk under the bridge and cross the rail tracks. |
| • There is a possible residential development west of the rail corridor which would potentially result in more people crossing the tracks. |
| • Fencing is not a solution as there have been several instances where people have cut the fences to get through. |
| • The project team discussed the possibility of staircases being constructed at both sides of the bridge near the side roads. CN indicated that they would be open to this approach. |

5. Action Items and Next Steps

| HDR |

| • HDR to follow up with Metrolinx with regards to the electrification clearance envelope. |
| • HDR to document CN’s recommendations and considerations in the ESR with regards to: |
| | o Construction activities as detailed design considerations |
| | o Pedestrian trespassing as a public safety issue |

If there are any errors or omissions to these minutes, please contact Tamkin Naghshbandi within ten business days of the issuance of these minutes.
## Meeting Minutes

**Project:** 16th Avenue Environmental Assessment from Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue  
**Subject:** CN Rail Meeting  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 17, 2018  
**Location:** HDR Office – 100 York Boulevard, Suite 300, Richmond Hill ON L4B 1J8  
**Attendees:**  
- Derek Basso, CN Rail  
- Colin Wong, York Region  
- Nasir Aslam, York Region  
- Hasmig Bedrossian, York Region  
- Iakov Bravinski, HDR  
- Veronica Restrepo, HDR  
**Minutes by:** Veronica Restrepo, HDR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 16th Avenue EA Update</td>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - The project team provided a brief project update, including an overview of the proposed design adjacent to the CN Rail Crossing east of Yonge Street.  
- The purpose of the meeting was to present the proposed design and obtain input from CN prior to filing the Environmental Study Report (ESR). | |
| 2. CN Rail Crossing – Proposed Design | Information and Discussion |
| - Recommendations for the 16th Avenue study corridor from Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue include widening from four to six lanes (where curb lanes are for transit/HOV) and active transportation improvements in the form of a multi-use path (MUP) on the north side and a sidewalk on the south side of 16th Avenue.  
- The project team described that widening 16th Avenue about the centerline is proposed (widening on both sides of the existing bridge), as discussed with CN during previous meetings. CN representative agreed with this approach.  
  - The bridge will be widened approximately 3.75m to the south and approximately 4.75m to the north.  
- As discussed in a previous meeting, trespassing over the rail tracks has been identified as a corridor-wide issue for CN. Pedestrian connections in the vicinity of the 16th Avenue bridge over the CN rail are being reviewed beyond the scope of the 16th Avenue EA studies. A potential staircase is being explored as part of a site plan application for adjacent development.  
- The Yonge Street to Bayview Avenue segment of 16th Avenue is not included in the Region’s 2018 10-year Capital Plan, and as such, construction is anticipated to start sometime beyond 2028. The Plan undergoes annual review and is subject to change.  
- CN noted there are no concerns related to the proposed 16th Avenue design. Additional consultation will be required during detailed design to minimize rail disruption during construction. The project team will include wording in the ESR to document a commitment to minimize impacts to rail operations and the |
3. **Next Steps**

- The project team explained the timeline for filing the ESR (anticipated in December 2018)
- **The project team will share excerpts from the draft ESR (only the sections related to the CN crossing).**
- CN will review the ESR material and provide any comments by November 14, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HDR</th>
<th>CN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If there are any errors or omissions to these minutes, please contact Veronica Restrepo within ten business days of the issuance of these minutes.
### Meeting Minutes

**Project:** 16th Avenue Environmental Assessments from Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue and from Woodbine Avenue to York/Durham Line

**Subject:** Metrolinx Meeting

**Date:** Wednesday, November 9, 2016

**Location:** Metrolinx Offices (97 Front Street, room CB4F)

**Attendees:**
- Mohamed Alkoka – Metrolinx (RH Corridor)
- Trevor Anderson – Metrolinx (RER)
- Mike Sone – Metrolinx (RER)
- Michelle Mascarenhas – York Region
- Tyrone Gan – HDR
- Veronica Restrepo – HDR

**Regrets:**
- Colin Wong – York Region
- Karla Avis-Birch – Metrolinx

**Minutes by:** Veronica Restrepo, HDR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Introduction and EA Study Overview</strong></td>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• York Region (YR) provided a brief project introduction and summary of the work completed to date, including preliminary recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Two 16th Avenue Schedule ‘C’ Class EAs (Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue in the Town of Richmond Hill and the City of Markham, and Woodbine Avenue to York/Durham Line in the City of Markham) are being conducted concurrently, but documented separately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There are opportunities to improve all modes of transportation along the study corridor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The study corridor is designated as a frequent transit network (service every 15 minutes) in the Region’s TMP, currently there are significant transit delays from traffic congestion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There are two rail crossings along the study corridor (grade-separated CN’s Richmond Hill GO Line east of Yonge Street, and at-grade Stouffville GO Line east of Markham Road/Highway 48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **2. Richmond Hill (RH) GO Line Crossing** | Information and Discussion |
| • Current land uses in this area are commercial (NW quadrant of the Richmond Hill GO rail crossing at 16th Avenue) and residential | |
| • Existing jug handles are proposed to be removed as part of Richmond Hill’s Key Development Area (KDA) study for the Yonge Street/Carrville Road/16th Avenue area | |
| • Existing bridge configuration of 16th Avenue over the railway consists of four general purpose lanes and sidewalks on both sides | |
| • Town of Richmond Hill plans indicate a new proposed GO Station within the KDA area | |
| • This is not reflected in Metrolinx plans and has no status | |
| • Metrolinx announced 12 new stations earlier in 2016 and requested ratification from each municipality – all municipalities agreed with the 12 stations proposed by Metrolinx and no new stations were suggested in the KDA area by any municipality | |
| • Recommended solution for the CN Richmond Hill GO Line Bridge consists of widening for Transit/HOV lanes and continuous Active Transportation (AT) facilities | |
| • In general, widening options include widening about the centreline, to the north, and to the south | |
| • If widening occurs to one side instead of about the centreline, the 16th Avenue alignment would shift | |
### Meeting Minutes

- As the study team develops structural options, Metrolinx will be consulted for input
- **Metrolinx to provide track elevations (track grades)**
- It was confirmed that Metrolinx has no current plans for additional tracks at this location
- **Study team to confirm if CN has future plans for additional tracks at this location**
- The EA should consider that Metrolinx is protecting for electrification at this crossing

---

#### 3. Stouffville GO Line Crossing

- Existing land uses consist of historic and heritage properties on the SW quadrant of the Stouffville GO rail crossing at 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue, new homes on the SE quadrant, a busy shopping centre on the NW quadrant, and a school, community centre and natural heritage features on the NE quadrant
- Mount Joy Creek runs parallel and adjacent to the rail tracks at this location
- Queues at the at-grade rail crossing when the arms are down affect vehicles, transit users, pedestrians, and cyclists
- There are a high number of pedestrian and cyclist trip generators in this area
- Safety is of concern due to the number of collisions along 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue in proximity to the rail crossing (based on 2011 to 2015 collision records)
- Metrolinx has conducted a system-wide grade separation study; safety issues were not identified for this crossing
- Exposure index indicates that a grade separation is warranted based on existing conditions as well as the 2041 horizon forecasts
  - Metrolinx noted that the exposure index calculations should be based on 15 trains per day for 2016 (instead of the 12 currently shown by the EA study team), and more than 36 trains per day for 2041 (RER) as currently shown by the EA study team.
  - **Metrolinx to confirm these numbers**
- Alternative solutions being considered at this location as part of the EA include:
  - Retain existing 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue 4-lane configuration with potential to narrow lanes to allow for cycle tracks in the boulevard
  - Safety improvements to the at-grade crossing
  - A grade separation is challenging at this location
    - The adjacent watercourse results in an overpass being more desirable from a natural heritage perspective
    - The existing grades and proximity of the Markham Road/Highway 48 intersection are not ideal for an underpass or overpass
    - No concepts have been developed for either an overpass nor underpass as it is too early in the study to do so
- Metrolinx noted their existing plans for this crossing (per current RER/funding) include a level crossing with one track
  - Metrolinx indicated their preference is to protect for two tracks; however, the location for the second track (east or west of the exiting track) has not been identified and **Metrolinx plans need to be confirmed (Karla)**
  - Trevor’s group will determine if a second track is required, and Karla’s team will identify on which side of the existing track the proposed second track would be located.
  - **Potential for a second track will be confirmed in early 2017**: it is premature to develop grade separation concepts until this has
been determined and direction provided by Metrolinx on their requirements.

- **Metrolinx to provide examples of cycling and pedestrian treatments at other at-grade crossings**
- Metrolinx owns this segment of the track and electrification is planned for the Stouffville GO corridor within the 10-year program
  - Any undertaking as part of the Region’s EA should protect for electrification at this crossing (including appropriate horizontal and vertical clearances; **Metrolinx to provide details**)
- EA study team should **discuss cost sharing options with Metrolinx (Andrew Poslick)**
- Anti-Whistle by-law (not yet in effect) may require upgrades to this crossing even if there is no grade separation
  - This section of 16th Avenue is not in YR’s 10-year capital plan; **discussions with the City of Markham are required regarding the Anti-Whistle Policy**

### 4. Next Steps

- First round of Open Houses scheduled for November 2016
- Second round of Open Houses is tentatively scheduled for Spring 2017
  - EA study team would need to know if a grade separation is recommended by Spring 2017 open house
- The EA recommendations should consider Metrolinx’s requirements for electrification at both rail crossings; **Metrolinx to provide electrification requirements, including appropriate horizontal and vertical clearances (Karla)**
- Further inquiries and data requests are to be coordinated through Trevor (for both rail lines)

If there are any errors or omissions to these minutes, please contact Veronica Restrepo.
### 1. Introduction and EA Study Overview

- **Project Update/Background**
  - First round of Open Houses held in November 2016
  - Next set of open houses being planned for Fall 2017
  - ESR filing anticipated in 2018
- **Preliminary recommended solutions:**
  - Yonge Street to Markham Road/Highway 48: Widen to six lanes for Transit/HOV, Active Transportation (AT) improvements
  - Markham Road/Highway 48 to Donald Cousens Parkway (DCP) – AT Improvements, no widening required
  - DCP to York/Durham Line (YDL) – Semi-rural cross-section with paved shoulders
  - Stouffville GO rail crossing – AT and safety improvements will be considered at this time.

### 2. Scope Change

- Based on Phase 2 recommendations, widening is not required between Markham Road/Highway 48 and YDL
- Active transportation improvements and urbanization could potentially be carried out as Schedule A/A+, and not a Schedule C
- Options discussed include:
  1. Carry on as Schedule C for all segments, but this is not an efficient use of resources
  2. Carry on as Schedule A/A+ east of Markham Road/Highway 48
     a. Maintain Woodbine Avenue to YDL as a single EA, but no further assessment work for Markham Road/Highway 48 segment
     b. Split Woodbine to YDL into two EAs, with Markham Road/Highway 48 to YDL to be completed as Schedule A/A+ at a later date (revise study corridor B limits to end at Markham Road/Highway 48)
- Although splitting the EA could confuse the public, continuing without full assessment of all segments could result in Part II requests. MOECC (Emilee) to **review MCEA guidelines and advise on process and examples of how this has been done in the past.**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Air Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Site specific Air Quality modeling is suggested based on clusters of sensitive receptors such as schools, community centres, and parks. MOECC noted that residential properties along the roadway are also considered to be sensitive receptors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Due to the scale of the 16th Avenue corridor and the number of receptors, including homes adjacent to the road, MOECC would expect a full air quality impact assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Similar to the analysis of sensitive receptor clusters, it was suggested that a residential area could be used as a representative sample for the assessment, instead of modeling the entire study corridor. MOECC agreed that this approach is acceptable, but several “worst-case” residential locations should be assessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MOECC is open to discussion regarding the air quality assessment methodology. The baseline for comparison with assessed scenario needs to be confirmed. It was suggested that air quality impacts associated with the preferred design could be compared against business as usual. <strong>MOECC and YR to discuss further.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Consultation with representatives from 34 First Nation Communities and Aboriginal Groups for this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MOECC has a new process for identifying Aboriginal Communities to be consulted for each project, with the goal of streamlining consultation and not overwhelming Aboriginal groups with too many notices. Once the Notice of Commencement is issued, MOECC will include a project-specific list of Aboriginal Communities in their response to the notice. The ongoing project consultation (including the Notice of Commencement) only needs to take place with those Aboriginal Communities identified by MOECC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- For the 16th Avenue EAs, the project team should carry on with ongoing consultation with all the groups already identified/contacted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- For future EA studies, list of Aboriginal Communities should be obtained from MOECC prior to sending the Notice of Commencement to any Aboriginal groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Next MOECC meeting with York Region to be scheduled in approximately two months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If there are any errors or omissions to these minutes, please contact HDR within ten business days of the issuance of these minutes.
Date: December 11, 2017  
Time: 10:00am – 1:00pm  
Location: 5775 Yonge Street, Newtonbrook Room  

Participants:  
MOECC – Zeljko Romic, Emilee O’leary, Amanda Graham, Steven McAvoy, Christina Labarge  
HDR – Tara Erwin, Michelle Mascarenhas, Veronica Restrepo  
York Region – Paul Acquaah, David Atkins, Gerard Sullivan, Jamal Ahmed, Vitha Sivatharman, Lloyd Fernandes, Jackson Marin, Billy Cheung, Edward Chiu, Jessica Lee, Colin Wong, Kenny Sun, Teresa Li  

Meeting Purpose: York Region/Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) Liaison Meeting. These minutes are limited to only the portion of the discussion relating to the 16th Avenue Environmental Assessment.

AGENDA TOPIC: 16th Avenue EA Air Quality Impact Assessment (AQIA)  
DISCUSSION LEADER: Colin Wong

Discussion:

Project Background and Recommendations: 
- Details of the 16th Avenue EA were summarized.  
  - 16th Avenue is being conducted as two studies: Study A from Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue, and Study B from Woodbine Avenue to York/Durham Line.  
  - Different recommendations were developed in three segments as follows: Active Transportation (AT) Improvements and an additional curb lane for Transit/HOV is recommended from Yonge St. to McCowan Rd.; from McCowan Rd. to Donald Cousens Parkway (DCP), only AT improvements are recommended; while from DCP to York/Durham Line, the shoulders are to be paved.  
- The 16th Ave. EA is anticipated for filing in the Spring of 2018.

16th Avenue AQIA Plan:  
- Internal discussion at York Region identified different approaches to AQIA for each Environmental Assessment (EA) currently in progress  
- AQIA for 16th Avenue is proposed to be carried forward under Category #2 as per MOECC draft air quality assessment guidelines.  
  - Since there is widening for Transit/HOV on 16th Ave., in addition to having a diesel/gasoline based transit fleet and simple road geometry, the project qualifies for a Category #2 AQIA (hotspot analysis).  
  - It should be noted that York Region has a program in place to achieve an electric powered fleet  
  - For worst-case impacts, modelling is to be located at poorly performing intersections, and at areas where there are high number of receptors.  
- Intersections with poor Level of Service were discussed further with regards to traffic delays, and land-uses to further screen for the intersections with worst-case impacts.  
- The intersections at Bayview Ave, Woodbine Ave., and Warden Rd. were selected, and proposed for modelling.
- York Region would like comments from the MOECC before scoping work with the consultant.
- MOECC had no critiques of the proposed areas for assessment. They were generally satisfied with the segment-by-segment breakdown of information, inclusion of intersection performance, and receptors identified near and further away from the intersections to capture dispersion patterns.
- York Region inquired when the AQIA protocol will be finalized. MOECC stated that it is to be determined and that the Ministry is incorporating comments provided by the Region towards the protocol.

**Conclusion:**
- York Region can move ahead with the proposed areas for the AQIA of the 16th Avenue EA

**ACTION ITEMS:** N/A

---

**AGENDA TOPIC: MOECC Re-organization**

**DISCUSSION LEADER: Zeljko Romic**

**Discussion:**
- The MOECC had a re-organization on December 5, 2017, where the operations and approvals division was split into the EA and Permissions Division (EAPD), and the Drinking Water and Environmental Compliance Division
- Implementation of a one-year service standard for ECAs was done to improve the service, which includes improvements to the electronic ECA

**Class EA Improvements:**
- The improvements to the process are as follows: Standardized electronic smart form for Part II Order Requests and preliminary regulation to make the form mandatory, policy for submission of Part II Order Requests, training and guidance on Climate Change and Indigenous Consultation, and increased transparency through improving online access to EA info
- YR highlighted that currently there is no deadline for decisions on Part II Order Requests, compared to the 45-day deadline in the past.
  - MOECC (Zeljko) directed that if the Region has not heard from the Minister in a reasonable amount of time, then it would be safe to proceed.

**Additional Feedback for MOECC**
- YR raised concerns that all Part II Order Requests are treated the same
  - some requests do not warrant the review of the entire EA but rather a focused approach is more appropriate
- YR commented that for ECA renewal a more straight-forward process should be in place if minimal/no changes are made to the design and/or MOECC policy, rather than going through the entire process again
  - A screening tool was suggested so that the Region can determine whether a full process is warranted or if a more simple method is appropriate – such as a flat fee
  - Problems may occur when the permit expires – with sewage pipes, since it is the first piece of infrastructure to be constructed/installed in a road, a policy change would require the pipes to be redone which would not be economically feasible as the new road would need to be reconstructed.
Conclusion:
- The MOECC is committed to further consultations with stakeholders, such as York Region, to provide comments for MCEA improvements

ACTION ITEMS: MOECC to provide the organization Chart and Presentation from the Liaison meeting to York Region
Date: June 28, 2018  
Time: 10:00am – 1:00pm  
Location: 90 Bales Drive, Room 20010  
Participants:  
- MOECC – Emilee O’leary, Peter Brown  
- HDR – Veronica Restrepo  
- York Region – Gerard Sullivan, Colin Wong, Nadiya Voynichenko, Herishanth Easwaran  
- Novus – Jenny Vesely, Jason Slusarczyk  

Meeting Purpose: York Region/Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) 16th Avenue EA Coordination

### AGENDA TOPIC: EA Process  
**DISCUSSION LEADER:** Colin Wong

**Discussion:**
- Notification:
  - A project information form will need to be completed by the project team. There is now one primary email address to deliver notices to, EANotification.CRegion@ontario.ca.  
  - All appropriate MOECC staff will be circulated on notices delivered to this address.  
- MCEA Part II Order Requests  
  - MOCEP are considering changes to the Part II Order Request process.  
  - Discussions will take place over the summer.

**ACTION ITEMS:**  
N/A

### AGENDA TOPIC: 16th Ave EA Air Quality Modelling  
**DISCUSSION LEADER:** Colin Wong

**Discussion:**
- Novus presented the findings of the modelling at the 3 hotspots identified by York Region and previously agreed to by MOECC (Bayview Avenue, Woodbine Avenue and Warden Avenue). These were selected based on exposure to emissions and proximity to receptors. In general, existing levels already exceed the threshold for certain criteria, and the additional projected impacts as a result of the proposed 16th Ave improvements are generally negligible compared to existing levels.  
- No project-specific mitigation is warranted or recommended, but York Region’s policies and best practices such as tree plantings, accommodating AT, etc., will help mitigate impacts.  
- MOECC does not have concerns with the information presented or the recommendations, and suggested moving forward with reporting.  
- HDR to send the presentation to MOECC for review. [post-meeting note: this was completed]
- MOECC to review the materials internally. [post-meeting note: this was completed. MOECC confirmed that there were no concerns and Novus can move forward with documentation of findings and recommendations as presented at the meeting]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION ITEMS</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

July 20, 2016

Cathy Parmer (BY EMAIL ONLY)
Communications and Community Engagement Specialist
Regional Municipality of York
17250 Yonge Street
Newmarket ON L3Y 6Z1

RE: 16th Avenue Study A, between Yonge Street and Woodbine Avenue
    16th Avenue Study B, between Woodbine Avenue and York/Durham Line
    Regional Municipality of York
    Municipal Class Environmental Assessment – Schedule C Road Projects
    Response to Notice of Commencement

Dear Ms. Parmer,

This letter acknowledges that the Regional Municipality of York has indicated that its two studies are following the approved environmental planning process for Schedule C projects under the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA).

The attached “Areas of Interest” document provides guidance regarding the ministry’s interests with respect to the Class EA process. Please identify the areas of interest which are applicable to your project and ensure they are addressed. Proponents who address all of the applicable areas of interest can minimize potential delays to their project schedule.

Please note that an air quality impact assessment is required for these projects. Please contact this office early in the planning process to discuss air quality.

Please ensure that the ESRs clearly document the rationale for the two separate projects near the beginning of the reports. York Region should be clear and transparent with stakeholders during the consultation process on this rationale.

Per the recent amendments to the Municipal Engineers Association Class EA parent document, proponents undertaking a Municipal Class EA project must identify early in the process whether a project is occurring within a source water protection vulnerable area. This must be clearly documented in a Project File report or ESR. If the project is occurring in a vulnerable area, then there may be policies in the local Source Protection Plan (SPP) that need to be addressed (requirements under the Clean Water Act). The proponent should contact and consult with the appropriate Source Protection Authority (SPA), the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, to discuss potential considerations and policies in the SPP that apply to the project.

Please include a section in the report on Source Water Protection. Specifically, it should discuss whether or not the project is located in a vulnerable area and provide applicable details about the area. If located in a vulnerable area, proponents should document whether any project activities are a prescribed drinking water threat and thus pose a risk to drinking water (this should be consulted on with the SPA). Where an activity poses a risk to drinking water, the proponent must document and discuss in the Project File Report/ESR.
how the project adheres to or has regard to applicable policies in the local SPP. This section should then be used to inform and should be reflected in other sections of the report, such as the identification of net positive/ negative effects of alternatives, mitigation measures, evaluation of alternatives etc. (As a note, even if the project activities in a vulnerable area are deemed to not to be a drinking water risk, there may be other policies that apply and so consultation with the local SPA is important).

Failure to properly follow the Municipal Class EA process is an offence under the Environmental Assessment Act. It may also result in the ministry withholding/revising an approval provided under the Act and/or the Minister issuing a Part II Order for the project.

Draft copies of the ESRs should be sent to this office prior to the filing of the final draft, allowing approximately 30 days review time for the ministry’s reviewers to provide comments. Please also forward our office the Notices of Completion and ESRs when completed. Should your team have any questions regarding the above, please contact me at emilee.oleary@ontario.ca or 416-326-3469.

Sincerely,

Emilee O’Leary
Environmental Resource Planner and EA Coordinator
Air, Pesticides and Environmental Planning

cc: Paul Martin, Supervisor, Technical Support Section, MOECC
    Celeste Dugas, Manager, York Durham District Office, MOECC
    Colin Wong, Project Manager, Regional Municipality of York
    Michelle Mascarenhas, Project Coordinator, Regional Municipality of York
    Veronica Restrepo, Transportation Engineer, HDR

Central Region EA File
A & P File
AREAS OF INTEREST

It is suggested that you check off each applicable area after you have considered / addressed it.

☐ Ecosystem Protection and Restoration

- Any impacts to ecosystem form and function must be avoided where possible. The ESR should describe any proposed mitigation measures and how project planning will protect and enhance the local ecosystem.

- All natural heritage features should be identified and described in detail to assess potential impacts and to develop appropriate mitigation measures. The following sensitive environmental features may be located within or adjacent to the study area:
  - Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSIs)
  - Rare Species of flora or fauna
  - Watercourses
  - Wetlands
  - Woodlots

We recommend consulting with the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) and your local conservation authority to determine if special measures or additional studies will be necessary to preserve and protect these sensitive features. In addition, you may consider the provisions of the Rouge Park Management Plan if applicable.

☐ Surface Water

- The ESR must include a sufficient level of information to demonstrate that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or ecological functions of any watercourses within the study area. Measures should be included in the planning and design process to ensure that any impacts to watercourses from construction or operational activities (e.g. spills, erosion, pollution) are mitigated as part of the proposed undertaking.

- Additional stormwater runoff from new pavement can impact receiving watercourses and flood conditions. Quality and quantity control measures to treat stormwater runoff should be considered for all new impervious areas and, where possible, existing surfaces. The ministry’s Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual (2003) should be referenced in the ESR and utilized when designing stormwater control methods. We recommend that a Stormwater Management Plan should be prepared as part of the Class EA process that includes:
  - Strategies to address potential water quantity and erosion impacts related to stormwater draining into streams or other sensitive environmental features, and to ensure that adequate (enhanced) water quality is maintained
  - Watershed information, drainage conditions, and other relevant background information
  - Future drainage conditions, stormwater management options, information on erosion and sediment control during construction, and other details of the proposed works
  - Information on maintenance and monitoring commitments.

- Ontario Regulation 60/08 under the Ontario Water Resources Act (OWRA) applies to the Lake Simcoe Basin, which encompasses Lake Simcoe and the lands from which surface water drains into Lake Simcoe. If the proposed sewage treatment plant is listed in Table 1 of the regulation, the ESR should describe how the proposed project and its mitigation measures are consistent with the requirements of this regulation and the OWRA.
Groundwater

- The status of, and potential impacts to any well water supplies should be addressed. If the project involves groundwater takings or changes to drainage patterns, the quantity and quality of groundwater may be affected due to drawdown effects or the redirection of existing contamination flows. In addition, project activities may infringe on existing wells such that they must be reconstructed or sealed and abandoned. Appropriate information to define existing groundwater conditions should be included in the ESR.

- If the potential construction or decommissioning of water wells is identified as an issue, the ESR should refer to Ontario Regulation 903, Wells, under the OWRA.

- Potential impacts to groundwater-dependent natural features should be addressed. Any changes to groundwater flow or quality from groundwater taking may interfere with the ecological processes of streams, wetlands or other surficial features. In addition, discharging contaminated or high volumes of groundwater to these features may have direct impacts on their function. Any potential effects should be identified, and appropriate mitigation measures should be recommended. The level of detail required will be dependent on the significance of the potential impacts.

- Any potential approval requirements for groundwater taking or discharge should be identified in the ESR. In particular, a Permit to Take Water (PTTW) under the OWRA will be required for any water takings that exceed 50,000 litres per day.

Air Quality, Dust and Noise

- If there are sensitive receptors in the surrounding area of this project, an air quality/odour impact assessment will be useful to evaluate alternatives, determine impacts and identify appropriate mitigation measures. The scope of the assessment can be determined based on the potential effects of the proposed alternatives, and typically includes source and receptor characterization, a quantification of air quality impacts by determining emission rates and conducting dispersion modelling, and an assessment of effects. The assessment will compare to all available standards for any contaminants of concern. Please contact this office during the scoping process to confirm the appropriate level of assessment.

- Dust and noise control measures should be addressed and included in the construction plans to ensure that nearby residential and other sensitive land uses within the study area are not adversely affected during construction activities.

- The ESR should consider the potential impacts of increased noise levels during the operation of the undertaking due to potentially higher traffic volumes resulting from this project. The proponent should explore all potential measures to mitigate significant noise impacts during the assessment of alternatives.

Servicing and Facilities

- Any facility that releases emissions to the atmosphere, discharges contaminants to ground or surface water, provides potable water supplies, or stores, transports or disposes of waste must have an Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) before it can operate lawfully. Please consult with the Environmental Approvals Access and Service Integration Branch (EAASIB) to determine whether a new or amended ECA will be required for any proposed infrastructure.
• We recommend referring to the ministry’s “D-Series” guidelines – Land Use Compatibility to ensure that any potential land use conflicts are considered when planning for any infrastructure or facilities related to wastewater, pipelines, landfills or industrial uses.

□ Contaminated Soils

• Since the removal or movement of soils may be required, appropriate tests to determine contaminant levels from previous land uses or dumping should be undertaken. If the soils are contaminated, you must determine how and where they are to be disposed of, consistent with Part XV.1 of the Environmental Protection Act (EPA) and Ontario Regulation 153/04, Records of Site Condition, which details the new requirements related to site assessment and clean up. Please contact the ministry’s District Offices for further consultation if contaminated sites are present.

• Any current or historical waste disposal sites should be identified in the ESR. The status of these sites should be determined to confirm whether approval pursuant to Section 46 of the EPA may be required for land uses on former disposal sites.

• The location of any underground storage tanks should be investigated in the ESR. Measures should be identified to ensure the integrity of these tanks and to ensure an appropriate response in the event of a spill. The ministry’s Spills Action Centre must be contacted in such an event.

• The ESR should identify any underground transmission lines in the study area. The owners should be consulted to avoid impacts to this infrastructure, including potential spills.

□ Mitigation and Monitoring

• Design and construction reports and plans should be based on a best management approach that centres on the prevention of impacts, protection of the existing environment, and opportunities for rehabilitation and enhancement of any impacted areas.

• All waste generated during construction must be disposed of in accordance with ministry requirements.

• Contractors must be made aware of all environmental considerations so that all environmental standards and commitments for both construction and operation are met. Mitigation measures should be clearly referenced in the ESR and regularly monitored during the construction stage of the project. In addition, we encourage proponents to conduct post-construction monitoring to ensure all mitigation measures have been effective and are functioning properly. The proponent’s construction and post-construction monitoring plans should be documented in the ESR.

□ Planning and Policy

• Parts of the study area are subject to the Greenbelt Plan and Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. The ESR should demonstrate how the proposed study adheres to the relevant policies in these plans.
• Applicable policies of the Provincial Policy Statement (2014) should be referenced in the ESR, and the proponent should demonstrate how this proposed project is consistent with these policies. Assessment reports can be found on the Conservation Ontario website at: http://www.conservation-ontario.on.ca/uncategorised/143-otherswregionsindex.

□ Class EA Process

• If this project is a Master Plan: there are several different approaches that can be used to conduct a Master Plan, examples of which are outlined in Appendix 4 of the Class EA. The Master Plan should clearly indicate the selected approach for conducting the plan, in particular by identifying whether the levels of assessment, consultation and documentation are sufficient to fulfill the requirements for Schedule B or C projects. Please note that any Schedule B or C projects identified in the plan would be subject to Part II Order Requests under the Environmental Assessment Act (EAA), although the plan itself would not be.

• The ESR should provide clear and complete documentation of the planning process in order to allow for transparency in decision-making. The ESR must also demonstrate how the consultation provisions of the Class EA have been fulfilled, including documentation of all public consultation efforts undertaken during the planning process. Additionally, the ESR should identify all concerns that were raised and how they have been addressed throughout the planning process. The Class EA also directs proponents to include copies of comments submitted on the project by interested stakeholders, and the proponent’s responses to these comments.

• The Class EA requires the consideration of the effects of each alternative on all aspects of the environment. The ESR should include a level of detail (e.g. hydrogeological investigations, terrestrial and aquatic assessments) such that all potential impacts can be identified and appropriate mitigation measures can be developed. Any supporting studies conducted during the Class EA process should be referenced and included as part of the Project File.

• Please include in the ESR a list of all subsequent permits or approvals that may be required for the implementation of the preferred alternative, including MOECC’s PTTW and ECAs, conservation authority permits, and approval under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA).

• Ministry guidelines and other information related to the issues above are available at http://www.ontario.ca/environment-and-energy/environment-and-energy under the publications link. We encourage you to review all the available guides and to reference any relevant information in the ESR.

□ Aboriginal Consultation

• Your proposed project may have the potential to affect Aboriginal communities who hold or claim Aboriginal or treaty rights protected under Section 35 of Canada’s Constitution Act 1982. The Crown has a duty to consult First Nation and Métis communities when it knows about established or credibly asserted Aboriginal or treaty rights, and contemplates decisions or actions that may adversely affect them.

• Although the Crown remains responsible for ensuring the adequacy of consultation with potentially affected Aboriginal communities, it may delegate procedural aspects of the consultation process to project proponents.
• The environmental assessment process requires proponents to consult with interested persons and government agencies, including those potentially affected by the proposed project. This includes a responsibility to conduct adequate consultation with First Nation and Métis communities.

• The ministry relies on consultation conducted by proponents when it assesses the Crown’s obligations and directs proponents during the regulatory process.

• Where the Crown’s duty to consult is triggered in relation to your proposed project, the Ontario Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change is delegating the procedural aspects of rights-based consultation to you through this letter.

• Steps that you may need to take in relation to Aboriginal consultation for your proposed project are outlined in the “Aboriginal Consultation Information” checklist below. Please complete the checklist contained there, and keep related notes as part of your consultation record. Doing so will help you assess your project’s potential adverse effects on Aboriginal or treaty rights.

• You must contact the Director, Environmental Approvals Branch if you have reason to believe that your proposed project may adversely affect an Aboriginal or treaty right, consultation has reached an impasse, or if a [Type of request to be chosen as applicable: Part II Order request; elevation request] has been submitted. The ministry will then assess the extent of any Crown duty to consult in the circumstances, and will consider whether additional steps should be taken and what role you will be asked to play in them.
ABORIGINAL CONSULTATION INFORMATION

Consultation with Interested Persons under the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act

Proponents subject to the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act are required to consult with interested persons, which may include First Nations and Métis communities. In some cases, special efforts may be required to ensure that Aboriginal communities are made aware of the project and are afforded opportunities to provide comments. Direction about how to consult with interested persons/communities is provided in the Code of Practice: Consultation in Ontario’s Environmental Assessment Process available on the Ministry’s website:


As an early part of the consultation process, proponents are required to contact the Ontario Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs’ Consultation Unit and visit Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada’s Aboriginal and Treaty Rights Information System (ATRIS) to help identify which First Nation and Métis communities may be interested in or potentially impacted by their proposed projects.

ATRIS can be accessed through the Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada website:

http://sidalt-atriis.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/atriis_online/

For more information in regard Aboriginal consultation as part of the Environmental Assessment process, refer to the Ministry’s website:

www.ontario.ca/government/environment-assessments-consulting-aboriginal-communities

You are advised to provide notification directly to all of the First Nation and Métis communities who may be interested in the project. You should contact First Nation communities through their Chief and Band Council, and Metis communities through their elected leadership.

Rights-based consultation with First Nation and Métis Communities

Proponents should note that, in addition to requiring interest-based consultation as described above, certain projects may have the potential to adversely affect the ability of First Nation or Métis communities to exercise their established or credibly asserted Aboriginal or treaty rights. In such cases, Ontario may have a duty to consult those Aboriginal communities.

Activities which may restrict or reduce access to unoccupied Crown lands, or which could result in a potential adverse impact to land or water resources in which harvesting rights are exercised, may have the potential to impact Aboriginal or treaty rights. For assistance in determining whether your proposed project could affect these rights, please refer to the attached “Preliminary Assessment Checklist: First Nation and Métis Community Interest.”

If there is likely to be an adverse impact to Aboriginal or treaty rights, accommodation may be required to avoid or minimize the adverse impacts. Accommodation is an outcome of consultation and includes any mechanism used to avoid or minimize adverse impacts to Aboriginal or treaty rights and traditional uses. Solutions could include mitigation such as adjustments in the timing or geographic location of the proposed activity. Accommodation may in
certain circumstances involve the provision of financial compensation, but does not necessarily require it.

For more information about the duty to consult, please see the Ministry’s website at:

www.ontario.ca/government/duty-consult-aboriginal-peoples-ontario

The proponent must contact the Director, Environmental Approvals Branch if a project may adversely affect an Aboriginal or treaty right, consultation has reached an impasse, or if a Part II Order or an elevation request is anticipated; the Ministry will then determine whether the Crown has a duty to consult.

The Director of the Environmental Approvals Branch can be notified either by email with the subject line “Potential Duty to Consult” to EAASIBgen@ontario.ca or by mail or fax at the address provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email:</th>
<th><a href="mailto:EAASIBgen@ontario.ca">EAASIBgen@ontario.ca</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject:</td>
<td>Potential Duty to Consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax:</td>
<td>416-314-8452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>Environmental Approvals Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>135 St. Clair Avenue West, 1st Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toronto, ON, M4V 1P5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Delegation of Procedural Aspects of Consultation**

Proponents have an important and direct role in the consultation process, including a responsibility to conduct adequate consultation with First Nation and Métis communities as part of the environmental assessment process. This is laid out in existing environmental assessment codes of practice and guides that can be accessed from the Ministry’s environmental assessment website at www.ontario.ca/environmentalassessments

The Ministry relies on consultation conducted by proponents when it assesses the Crown’s obligations and directs proponents during the regulatory process. Where the Crown’s duty to consult is triggered, various additional procedural steps may also be asked of proponents as part of their delegated duty to consult responsibilities. In some situations, the Crown may also become involved in consultation activities.

Ontario will have an oversight role as the consultation process unfolds but will be relying on the steps undertaken and information you obtain to ensure adequate consultation has taken place. To ensure that First Nation and Métis communities have the ability to assess a project’s potential to adversely affect their Aboriginal or treaty rights, Ontario requires proponents to undertake certain procedural aspects of consultation.

The proponent’s responsibilities for procedural aspects of consultation include:

- Providing notice to the elected leadership of the First Nation and/or Métis communities (e.g., First Nation Chief) as early as possible regarding the project;
• Providing First Nation and/or Métis communities with information about the proposed project including anticipated impacts, information on timelines and your environmental assessment process;

• Following up with First Nation and/or Métis communities to ensure they received project information and that they are aware of the opportunity to express comments and concerns about the project. If you are unable to make the appropriate contacts (e.g. are unable to contact the Chief) please contact the Environmental Assessment and Planning Coordinator at the Ministry's appropriate regional office for further direction.

• Providing First Nation and/or Métis communities with opportunities to meet with appropriate proponent representatives to discuss the project;

• Gathering information about how the project may adversely impact the relevant Aboriginal and/or Treaty rights (for example, hunting, fishing) or sites of cultural significance (for example, burial grounds, archaeological sites);

• Considering the comments and concerns provided by First Nation and/or Métis communities and providing responses;

• Where appropriate, discussing potential mitigation strategies with First Nation and/or Métis communities;

• Bearing the reasonable costs associated with these procedural aspects of consultation, which may include providing support to help build communities’ capacity to participate in consultation about the proposed project.

• Maintaining a Consultation Record to show evidence that you, the proponent, completed all the steps itemized above or at a minimum made meaningful attempts to do so.

• Upon request, providing copies of the Consultation Record to the Ministry. The Consultation Record should:
  o summarize the nature of any comments and questions received from First Nation and/or Métis communities
  o describe your response to those comments and how their concerns were considered
  o include a communications log indicating the dates and times of all communications; and
  o document activities in relation to consultation.

Successful consultation depends, in part, on early engagement by proponents with First Nation and Métis communities. Information shared with communities must be clear, accurate and complete, and in plain language where possible. The consultation process must maintain sufficient flexibility to respond to new information, and we trust you will make all reasonable efforts to build positive relationships with all First Nation and Métis communities contacted. If you need more specific guidance on Aboriginal consultation steps in relation to your proposed project, or if you feel consultation has reached an impasse, please contact the Environmental Assessment and Planning Coordinator at the Ministry's appropriate regional office.
**Preliminary Assessment Checklist: First Nation and Métis Community Interests and Rights**

In addition to other interests, some main concerns of First Nation and Métis communities may pertain to established or asserted rights to hunt, gather, trap, and fish – these activities generally occur on Crown land or water bodies. As such, projects related to Crown land or water bodies, or changes to how lands and water are accessed, may be of concern to Aboriginal communities.

Please answer the following questions and keep related notes as part of your consultation record. “Yes” responses will indicate a potential adverse impact on Aboriginal or treaty rights.

Where you have identified that your project may trigger rights-based consultation through the following questions, you should arrange for a meeting between you and the Environmental Assessment and Planning Coordinator at the Ministry’s appropriate regional office to provide an early opportunity to confirm whether Ontario’s duty to consult is triggered and to discuss roles and responsibilities in that event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are you aware of concerns from First Nation and Métis communities about your project or a similar project in the area? The types of concerns can range from interested inquiries to environmental complaints, and even to land use concerns. You should consider whether the interest represents on-going, acute and/or widespread concern.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is your project occurring on Crown land, or is it close to a water body? Might it change access to either?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is the project located in an open or forested area where hunting or trapping could take place?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the project involve the clearing of forested land?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is the project located away from developed, urban areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is your project close to, or adjacent to, an existing reserve? Projects in areas near reserves may be of interest to the First Nation and Métis communities living there.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Will the project affect First Nations and/or Métis ability to access areas of significance to them?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Is the area subject to a land claim? Information about land claims filed in Ontario is available from the Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs; information about land claims filed with the federal government is available from Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Does the project have the potential to impact any archaeological sites?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 6, 2018

To:
Emilee O’Leary
Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks

Dear Ms. O’Leary

Re: Response to Draft Environmental Study Report Comments
16th Avenue Study A (Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue)
Municipal Class Environmental Assessment – Schedule C Road Project
Regional Municipality of York

Thank you for your comments dated November 9, 2018. We understand the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) staff reviewed the drafted Environmental Study Report (ESR) dated October 19, 2018 and associated technical studies available at this time.

Please see the attached table for the project team’s responses to the comments.

Regards,

Tyrone Gan
Consultant Project Manager, HDR

Cc: Colin Wong, York Region
Nasir Aslam, York Region
Veronica Restrepo, HDR
Anthony Reitmeier, HDR
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>MECP Comments (November 9, 2018)</th>
<th>Project Team Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>As of July 1, 2018, a <strong>Part II Order Request Form</strong> must be used to request a Part II Order. Accordingly, please include the following additional text in Section 1.4.1 and in the Notice of Completion for this project:</td>
<td>Text was added to Section 1.4.1 and the notice of completion as requested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;As of July 1, 2018, a <strong>Part II Order Request Form</strong> must be used to request a Part II Order. The Part II Order Request Form is available online on the Forms Repository website (<a href="http://www.forms.ssb.gov.on.ca/">http://www.forms.ssb.gov.on.ca/</a>) by searching “Part II Order” or “012-2206E” (the form ID number).&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A coordinated review of Ontario’s four land use plans (Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, Greenbelt Plan, Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation 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. As such please review the 2017 plans (<a href="http://www.mah.gov.on.ca/Page186.aspx">http://www.mah.gov.on.ca/Page186.aspx</a>) and update section 1.5.1 in relation to the 2017 plans.</td>
<td>Section 1.5.1 was updated as suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Further to the above, we note that the project does cross a new land use designation under the Greenbelt Plan called &quot;Urban River Valleys&quot; (<a href="http://www.mah.gov.on.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=18296">http://www.mah.gov.on.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=18296</a>). Section 6 policies of the Greenbelt Plan apply.</td>
<td>Noted. Section 1.5.1 was updated to include this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Further to the above, the Growth Plan contains policies applicable to infrastructure.</td>
<td>Noted. Section 1.5.1 was updated to include this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Some indigenous communities expressed interest in the archaeological findings/reports. Was the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment provided for review?</td>
<td>Yes, the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment report was provided in October 2018 to all those groups that requested it. The Huron-Wendat Nation acknowledged receipt of the report and noted they agree with the content and recommendations. No responses were received from the other groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>It was recognized that the preferred approach would generate moderate impact on surface water with increased roadway width and hard surface area. Particularly the increased imperious surface would generate more runoff and potentially bring more TSS into storm sewers and creeks. Mitigation measures have been proposed in the Drainage and Stormwater Management Report, including infiltration trenches and online storage pipes. With current proposed measures the impacts of increased</td>
<td>Per the July 20, 2016 letter from MECP (as a response of the Notice of Commencement), only new pavement areas are required to be treated (and where possible, existing areas as well). The proposed design meets this requirement as it treats a greater area than the new proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>MECP Comments (November 9, 2018)</td>
<td>Project Team Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impervious surface are not fully mitigated, including water balance, peak flow control and water quality. It has not demonstrated that enhanced water quality treatment will be achieved for the entire project. We recommend that additional LID measures be considered and implemented to encourage infiltration and provide additional water quality treatment.</td>
<td>pavement area. Water balance will be addressed through the proposed infiltration systems that are proposed for water quality control at each of the three watercourses, which meets the TRCA requirements of retention of the first 5mm of rainfall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>It is understood that certain constrains exist with the proposed road work. However, during detail design stage, whenever opportunities arise, LID measures should be used to not only mitigate the proposed negative impact, but also to improve stormwater management with both quantity and quality in the area, including maintaining thermal status of the streams.</td>
<td>This is addressed in Section 4.4.3 of the stormwater management report. Thermal mitigation was added to this section of the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>During construction stage should a Permit to Take Water be required, it is imperative that a discharge management plan be prepared together with erosion and sediment control measures if work is required around water features. The proposed plans should take into consideration of sensitive natural environment features and fish habitat to protect.</td>
<td>Comment noted. This was added as a future commitment in Section 9.2 of the ESR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 8.1.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Please describe how any complaints during construction will be managed by the proponent.</td>
<td>York Region has a protocol and specific department dedicated to addressing complaints during construction. Details were added to Section 8.1.19 of the ESR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The Ministry recommends that non-chloride dust suppressants be used.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 8.2, Table 8-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Under &quot;Climate Change&quot;, please elaborate on (ix) &quot;Potential effects to consider pertaining to construction include the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with the construction period, including the physical machinery and equipment, travel distance and time for construction workers to get to and from the site, and the sourcing of building materials.&quot; Please provide some information on how these effects are being considered and addressed.</td>
<td>This table is Table 8-14 of the final ESR. This is typically completed during detailed design; however, some consideration was documented in Table 8-14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Under &quot;Climate Change&quot;, please discuss how climate change adaptation has been considered (how will the project adapt to the expected impacts of climate change on infrastructure such as more frequent extreme weather conditions etc.).</td>
<td>Text was added to Table 8-14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>We note that the &quot;Noise&quot; factor is to be updated. Please ensure both operation and construction are discussed.</td>
<td>Text was added to Table 8-14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>We note that the &quot;Source Water Protection factor is to be updated. In accordance with Source Protection Plan Policy SAL-11, it is recommended that the proponent commit to utilizing best management practices for the application of road salt across 16th Avenue Road to protect sources of municipal drinking water as the parts of the project are located on lands designated as a Highly Vulnerable Aquifer.</td>
<td>Text was added to Table 8-14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>MECP Comments (November 9, 2018)</td>
<td>Project Team Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Please ensure that the &quot;Soil Removal and Contaminants&quot; text is updated per the email discussion on October 24, 2018.</td>
<td>Text was updated as suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The report should be revised to include the 1 hour and annual NO2 2025 CAAQS in addition to the AAQCs.</td>
<td>The Air Quality report was updated as suggested. Per conversation between Novus and MECP, the new CAAQ NO2 objectives were included in the final Air Quality report, but the analysis has not been updated to allow for direct comparison against them. This is in line with what the MECP has been requesting from consultants for any existing analysis. MECP also noted that a similar approach is acceptable for the 16th Ave Study B Air Quality assessment, which is ongoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Please note that during construction the ministry recommends that non-chloride dust suppressants be applied.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 1. Introduction and EA Study Overview

- YR provided a brief project introduction and summary of the work completed to date, including preliminary recommendations
- Two 16th Avenue Schedule 'C' Class EAs (Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue in the Town of Richmond Hill and the City of Markham, and Woodbine Avenue to York/Durham Line in the City of Markham) are being conducted concurrently, but documented separately
- Needs and Justification – Towards a multi-modal approach
  - 16th Avenue is designated as a future frequent transit network in the Region’s TMP to provide 15 minute service for 2041
  - Significant need for all modes, especially between Yonge Street and Highway 48
- Alternative Solutions Recommendations:
  - Widening for Transit/HOV is preferred between Yonge Street and Highway 48
  - Increased service along the Stouffville GO Line and projected increases in traffic demand indicate need to improve at-grade crossing
  - Widening is not recommended between Highway 48 and Donald Cousens Parkway (DCP), maintaining 4 lanes with active transportation improvements is preferred
  - Maintaining 2 lanes with active transportation improvements is preferred between DCP and York/Durham Line (YDL)
  - Durham Region has no plans to change the YDL and 16th Avenue t-intersection

### Item 2. Overview of Key Natural Areas and Corridor Characteristics

- LGL provided a brief overview of the key corridor characteristics, with a focus on natural areas
- Natural environment assessment and surveys have been completed in accordance with specific timing windows
- Species at risk (SAR) within the study area include Redside Dace, Barn Swallow (not in close proximity to structures), Wood Pewee and Bobolink
- Surveys focused on structures that are likely to be impacted and where the proposed work will be conducted
- There are no ANSIs, ESAs, or PSWs in proximity to the study area
- Permit 166/06 will be required from the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Information and Discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Authority (TRCA)
- ESA permit 17(2)(c) may be required if Redside Dace habitat is impacted. The proposed design will minimize Redside Dace impacts, and if possible avoid the need for this permit to be triggered.
- Redside Dace habitat consists of the meander belt plus 30 m on each side. It is understood that it might not be cost effective to span the entire meander belt + 30 m area.
- It was noted that East Beaver Creek is likely not considered to be a regulated watercourse (need to confirm with TRCA), and this enclosed system likely receives stormwater from adjacent parking lots. [Post-meeting note: TRCA confirmed the ditch at 16th Avenue just west of Highway 404 is the daylighted remnant of a former watercourse and is no longer a regulated feature].

### Rouge River crossing (Redside Dace regulated watercourse)
- The proposed design aims to narrow the roadway cross-section to fit into the existing road platform and structure – MNRF indicated support for narrowing the cross-section to avoid widening the bridge.
- Any work proposed within the valley (even if not for bridge widening) would require further examination to determine if a permit is required.
- A potential pedestrian bridge may fall under an exemption regulation depending on the amount of area impacted, however mitigation towards overall benefit would still be required.
- A new pedestrian crossing adjacent to each side of the existing bridge, resulting in vegetation removal and impacts to watercourse, would still trigger the requirement for a permit.
- A new structure would generally trigger the requirement of a permit; however, the specific design needs to be further examined.
- Widening of the existing structure may be preferred over an alternative to add two new but adjacent crossings.
- “Notice of activity” could apply if the study team were to modify existing pedestrian crossings and incorporate as part of the 16th Avenue design, instead of adding two new crossings (a total of three versus a total of five watercourse crossings in the area).
- **MNRF will confirm if the meander belt information for the Rouge River crossing is available from the existing Buttonville studies** [post-meeting note: the Rouge River meander belt report was provided].

### Other Redside Dace regulated watercourses
- Existing conditions were discussed at the other Redside Dace regulated watercourses, which include: Berczy Creek, Bruce Creek, and Robinson Creek.
- For all Redside Dace regulated watercourses, ESA permit 17(2)(c) may be required if Redside Dace habitat (the meander belt plus 30 m on each side) is impacted.

### Discussion regarding permits:
- MNRF suggests that one permit can be pursued for all watercourse crossings, with overall benefit requirements also combined instead of an individual permit per watercourse crossing.
  - MNRF’s preference for overall benefit compensation is within the specific watercourse or watershed being impacted.
- Permit applications require 60% detailed design.
- Alternatives considered as part of the EA could satisfy alternative avoidance form requirements for a permit.
- MNRF indicates that there is no time limit for the permit, whereas TRCA
If there are any errors or omissions to these minutes, please contact Veronica Restrepo.

| outlines that construction must occur within two years of the permit being issued |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| • As part of the EA, MNRF indicates that area calculations/figures for impacts would satisfy requirements for Alternative Avoidance Form |
|   ○ If the area of impact is < 300 m², a permit will not be required |

Meeting attendees discussed the proposed development in the area and potential infrastructure requirements

3. **Next Steps**

   • In lieu of an official approval in principle for the EA, MNRF suggests submitting a letter that states that they have worked with York Region throughout the course of the EA and are supportive of the preferred solution
   
   • Moving forward, Emily Funnell will be the main MNRF contact for the 16th Avenue EA, but correspondence is to be sent to both Emily and Megan

Information Only
### Introduction and EA Study Overview

- **YR provided a brief project introduction and summary of the work completed to date, including preliminary recommendations**
- **Two 16th Avenue Schedule ‘C’ Class EAs (Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue in the Town of Richmond Hill and the City of Markham, and Woodbine Avenue to York/Durham Line in the City of Markham) are being conducted concurrently, but documented separately**
- **Needs and Justification – Towards a multi-modal approach**
  - 16th Avenue is included within the future frequent transit network in the Region’s TMP to provide 15 minute service for 2041
  - Significant need for all modes, especially between Yonge Street and Highway 48
- **Alternative Solutions Recommendations:**
  - Widening for Transit/HOV is preferred between Yonge Street and Highway 48
  - Widening is not recommended between Highway 48 and Donald Cousens Parkway (DCP), maintaining 4 lanes with active transportation improvements is preferred
  - Maintaining 2 lanes with active transportation improvements is preferred between DCP and York/Durham Line (YDL)
- **The designated right-of-way (ROW) along 16th Avenue where road widening is proposed (Yonge Street to Highway 48) is 43m per York Region’s Official Plan; however, existing ROW varies greatly along the study corridor and there might not be opportunities to acquire property to achieve the 43m ROW.**

### Overview of Key Natural Areas and Corridor Characteristics

- **LGL provided a brief overview of the key corridor characteristics and natural areas, with a focus on watercourses that are known to have Redside Dace habitat**
- **MNRF to provide 2017 Redside Dace mapping,** showing occupied and contributing habitat
- **ESA permit 17(2)(c) will be required if Redside Dace habitat is impacted.**
  - Documentation to assist in the permit application should be started during the EA. It was suggested that separate permit applications be submitted for the various segments, based on their anticipated construction years (one permit per construction year).
- **MNRF agreed with the EA team’s approach to modify the design as feasible to minimize impacts, and document why impacts couldn’t be**
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- Further minimized.
  - Where impacts are unavoidable, compensation is to be within the affected watercourse system, if feasible; otherwise, should review other locations for compensation. Potential locations for overall benefit compensation should be identified during the EA.
  - MNRF noted that the Markham Future Urban Area (FUA) will require overall benefit for impacts to Berczy and Bruce creeks; it was suggested that **YR coordinate with the City of Markham** for overall benefit compensation activities for these two watercourses.
  - Redside Dace habitat consists of the meander belt plus 30 m on each side. It is understood that it might not be cost effective to span the entire meander belt + 30 m area.
  - MNRF noted that for all Redside Dace crossings, bridges (and in particular tall bridges) are preferred over culverts, and open bottom culverts are preferred over closed bottom culverts.
  - The EA will take into account DFO regulations and permit requirements in addition to MNRF regulations and permit requirements.
  - All four Redside Dace crossings (Rouge River, Berczy Creek, Bruce Creek and Robinson Creek) meet hydraulic criteria, but may overtop during Regional events. As such, replacement would be based on existing conditions (structural), not hydraulics.

### 3. Site Visit Observations

#### 3a Rouge River

- Riprap currently on northeast corner of crossing could be removed and this area vegetated to create new habitat
- Natural gas pipeline was observed along north side of 16th Avenue
- Possible hybrid butternut trees in northeast corner of crossing *(LGL to confirm)*
- Sanitary sewer was observed on the southeast bank
- EA team is looking at cross-section options that would not impact this crossing structure (fit all cross-section elements on the existing bridge)

#### 3b Berczy Creek

- The existing 2-cell culvert is on a skew angle, with riprap boxes along banks by the bridge; the barrier on the north side appears newer than the one on the south side.
- Erosion is evident on the bend south of 16th Avenue
- Enbridge natural gas pipeline was observed along the south side of 16th Avenue
- York Downs proposed development (York Downs) is located on the north side of 16th Avenue; **HDR to review York Downs fluvial geomorphology and drainage reports**
- This culvert could be extended; MNRF suggested diverting the flow to one cell and providing a wildlife passage through the other cell

#### 3c Bruce Creek

- The existing bridge has a narrow footprint; currently accommodates 4 lanes + sidewalk (no shoulder)
- Stormwater outfall was observed on the south side
- Bell/hydro line, utilities, buried gas line were observed on the south side
- There appears to be ample ROW, especially on the north side; however, the north side exhibits high quality Redside Dace habitat consisting of a nice meander, deep pools with some woody debris, and vegetation growing overhanging the banks of the creek.
- Banks appear to be eroding more on the north side immediately adjacent to the structure; bank stabilization was completed by the City of Markham on the south side of the crossing
- EA team is considering widening to the north side at this location; there

---

*Information and Discussion*

*YR*

*LGL*

*HDR*
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3d</th>
<th>Robinson Creek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hydro line was observed on the north side, one crossing to guy wire on the south side of 16th Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Approx. 1 ft. of water was observed flowing through the culvert, with fish present in the culvert (north side of 16th Avenue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Culvert is considered to be in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>MNRF noted that replacing this culvert with a bridge or an open bottom culvert would go a long way towards overall benefit compensation for the entire project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3e</th>
<th>Other Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>MNRF recommended to identify butternut, bats, barn swallows at all the watercourse crossings at the start of detailed design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>MNRF suggested following the Guelph protocol, whereby any dead tree (stag) should be considered to provide bat habitat. Any removal of trees considered to provide bat habitat would need to be replaced with bat boxes. MNRF confirmed that a letter of advice would be sufficient in this circumstance and the need for a full permit would not be required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Next communication with MNRF would be once the EA team has developed alternatives and rationale for why certain impacts could not be avoided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information and Discussion
AGENDA TOPIC: 16th Avenue (Rouge)  DISCUSSION LEADER: Soheil Kashi

Discussion:

- Since the first Open House the limits to widening were reduced from Markham Road to McCowan Road which will not affect traffic as demand within the area is relatively low
- Within the study 16th Ave study area there are 12 water courses with existing crossings, of which four are known to contain Red Side Dace: Rouge River, Berczy Creek, Bruce Creek, and Robinson Creek.
- Consider use of OGSs to improve water quality
- MNRF suggested avoiding use of traditional sloped embankments and using vertical walls in addition to storm-water improvements where applicable to gain overall benefit
- At the Rouge River, there will be no structural modifications as there is constrained right-of-way for the bridge
  - MNRF advised that a Redside Dace evaluation will need to be completed to assess the impacts to the meanderbelt width plus 30 metres area. Mitigation and compensation will need to be studied (Action: HDR)
  - YR suggested studying potentially converting the abutments to semi-integral to remove the expansion joints, as the current concrete girder structure is half way through its service life (Action: HDR)
- Berczy Creek
  - There is planned extension for the open box culvert at Berczy Creek as the current structure is hydraulically deficient: overtopping is expected for the 50, 100, and Regional design floods by a maximum of 1.8m
  - In its current state, when overtopping occurs, emergency vehicles would not be able to pass
  - It was agreed that solely extending the culvert at Berczy was not adequate, thus MNRF and HDR agreed the best alternative is to replace the structure with a bridge to create a wider opening for wildlife with an allowance for meandering of the creek and raising road profile; adding another culvert was eliminated as an option as it would increase erosion and potential of decreased flow through material collection at culvert edges
- Bruce Creek has a need for extension of both sides of the bridge to support multi-use path on the north and sidewalk on the south side, with expected extension of 7m and 4m respectively
  - The Bruce Creek structure does not meet the required freeboard for the 50 and 100 flood year (0.8m freeboard
During Regional flooding, overtopping of the roadway is expected but not as severely as Berczy Creek. HDR expressed that it is not ideal to replace the entire bridge as the structure and the water course is in good condition.

- **Robinson Creek** currently has a single CSP which was recently extended on the south side.
- The culvert needs to be extended to accommodate multi-use path and sidewalk, on the north and south side respectively.
- With respect to hydraulic condition, during the Regional Storm the culvert is overtopped.
- The road segment in which structure is located in is not in the 10-year York Region Capital Plan; however, it will need to be replaced when the segment is undergoing construction.
- Recommendation for the Robinson Creek CSP to be replaced with a bridge to offset Red Side Dace impact and increasing overall benefit, furthermore, MNRF pointed out that the existing culvert is deficient as the opening diameter is less than the water course opening which confines flow and increases risk of structural failure.

### AGENDA TOPIC: Species At Risk
**DISCUSSION LEADER:** Gerard Sullivan

**Discussion:**
- No updates regarding new species at risk in the study area

### AGENDA TOPIC: Provincial Wetlands Mapping Update
**DISCUSSION LEADER:** Gerard Sullivan

**Discussion:**
- Mapping update is provided on the MNRF website

### AGENDA TOPIC: MNRF Presentations – Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act
**DISCUSSION LEADER:** MNRF

**Discussion:**
- York Region provide a copy of the presentation of Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act to MNRF *(Action: York Region)*
- York Region to send sites that are of interest to MNRF to retrieve Red Side Dace sampling info for the desired areas *(Action: York Region)*
Date: May 23, 2018  
Time: 9:00am – 11:00am  
Location: 90 Bales Drive E, Room 20010  

Participants:  
Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) – Jeff Andersen  
LGL – Connie Agnew, Judson Vernier  
HDR – Veronica Restrepo, Tony Reitmeier  
York Region – Colin Wong, Gerard Sullivan, Lindsay Jackson, Shu Zhu, Doug Mackay, Praveen John, Herishanth Easwaran, Nadiya Voynichenko, Tim Cameron  

Meeting Purpose: CPD & MNRF Monthly Meeting

**AGENDA TOPIC: 16th Avenue (Rouge)**  
**DISCUSSION LEADER: Colin Wong & HDR**

**Discussion:**
- The EA study is currently in Phase 4. The focus of the discussion related to impacts within Study Area A (Yonge St. to Woodbine Ave).
- Rouge River is the only Redside Dace watercourse within Study Area A.
- The space needed for improvements on the bridge was reduced by minimizing the active transportation facility width by having a MUP on the north side and a sidewalk on the south side, and eliminating the raised centre median. The existing bridge is proposed to be retained.
- Existing direct storm outfalls on the east and west sides of the Rouge River will be removed and relocated into the valley with OGSSs and vegetated outfall channel.
- Will be increasing plantings in the valley within appropriate proximity to the channel.
- Three potential options to assess for embankment slopes:
  a) 2:1 slope install being the recommended option; b) 1:1 slope with RSS option and; c) Retaining Wall option.
- All three options require construction work in the valley, but the slopes are proposed to be re-vegetated.

**Conclusion:**
- Original bridge structure will be maintained in order to avoid channel impacts.
- Enhanced water quality will be utilized to improve roadside runoff from preexisting conditions.
- 2:1 slope design is the recommended design as it balances impacts and costs and since the valley isn’t deep, there is less of an impact when grading. MNRF agreed with this approach but noted a permit will likely be required.
- Information Gathering Form (IGF) should be submitted to MNRF now to get the file started, followed by the Avoidance Alternative Form (AAF).

**ACTION ITEMS:** HDR/LGL to begin IGF submission to MNRF.
### AGENDA TOPIC: MNRF Updates: Protocols
**DISCUSSION LEADER:** Gerard Sullivan

#### Discussion:
- Bat monitoring protocols are not written by MNRF, Guelph protocol is approved for use.
- Blanding’s Turtle protocol that should be in use is the 2015 MNRF Blanding’s Turtle Protocol.

#### Conclusion:
- If bat habitat is present, assume SAR bats are present and mitigate appropriately for linear projects.
- Continue using available protocols for bats and Blanding’s Turtles.

#### ACTION ITEMS:
- N/A

### AGENDA TOPIC: MNRF Updates: Legislation
**DISCUSSION LEADER:** MNRF

#### Discussion:
- COSSARO Spring species assessment was May 8-9.
- COSSARO Fall species assessment TBA.

#### Conclusion:
- Potential for Peregrine Falcon to be down-listed.
- Monarch Butterfly will be reviewed in the fall with potential to be up-listed.

#### ACTION ITEMS:
- N/A

### AGENDA TOPIC: Other Business
**DISCUSSION LEADER:** Gerard Sullivan

#### Discussion:
- Need a project timing priority list.

#### Conclusion:
- Look at ways to streamline permitting process from MNRF by tracking project timelines.

#### ACTION ITEMS:
- Track project progression to ensure permitting needs are being met.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Introduction and EA Study Overview</td>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YR provided a brief project introduction and summary of the work completed to date, including preliminary recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two 16th Avenue Schedule ‘C’ Class EAs (Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue in the Town of Richmond Hill and the City of Markham, and Woodbine Avenue to York/Durham Line in the City of Markham) are being conducted concurrently, but documented separately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16th Avenue is designated as a future frequent transit network – 15 minute transit service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic congestion and delays for various modes require assessment of multi-modal improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Solutions Recommendations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Widening for Transit/HOV is preferred between Yonge Street and Highway 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Increased service along the Stouffville GO Line and projected increases in traffic demand indicate need to improve at-grade crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Widening is not recommended between Highway 48 and Donald Cousens Parkway (DCP), maintaining 4 lanes with active transportation (AT) improvements is preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Maintaining two lanes with active transportation improvements is preferred between DCP and York/Durham Line (YDL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Durham Region has no plans to change the 16th Avenue / YDL t-intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Overview of Key Natural Areas and Corridor Characteristics</td>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LGL provided a brief overview of the key corridor characteristics, with a focus on natural areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vegetation consists of cultural ELC codes (no great significance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permit 166/06 will be required from TRCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Redside Dace regulated watercourses in the study area include the Rouge River, Berczy Creek, Bruce Creek, and Robinson Creek crossings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No SAR nests were found on any structures within the study area as part of the surveys conducted for the EA; studies have indicated that SAR birds are present on the agricultural fields in proximity to YDL.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Woodlands are not present within the study area, only valley lands are present and of natural significance
- No adverse impacts are anticipated to natural environment features
- East Beaver Creek – Drainage System
  - An enclosed municipal storm system occurs at this location, with a short segment that daylights north of 16th Avenue
  - TRCA to confirm if this is considered a watercourse feature

  [Post-meeting note: TRCA confirmed the ditch at 16th Avenue just west of Highway 404 is the daylighted remnant of a former watercourse and is no longer a regulated feature].

TRCA

3. Drainage and Stormwater Management

- TRCA is concerned about stormwater management (SWM); stormwater design as part of the EA should be consistent with adjacent developments (for example in terms of volume).
  - York Downs Golf and Country Club is currently at the Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP) stage.
- The EA team noted that transportation corridors are linear facilities, and it is a challenge to meet similar SWM elements as in subdivisions. The study team will work with TRCA to develop an appropriate SWM design.
- SWM design will largely be dependent on soil conditions and infiltration
- TRCA and Credit Valley Conservation (CVC) have good literature related to infiltration through hard soils, and CVC has literature on the retrofitting of roads with improved SWM infrastructure. TRCA to provide literature.

  [Post-meeting note: TRCA provided literature related to infiltration in tight soils; however, literature related to the retrofitting of roads with improved SWM infrastructure has not been provided].
- TRCA noted there is existing overtopping under Regional events at Berczy Creek and Bruce Creek; HDR will review as part of the drainage assessment.

TRCA

4. Design Options

- 16th Avenue design options have been developed based on a 6-lane configuration
- Discussions with MTO are ongoing regarding the 16th Avenue and Highway 404 interchange
- Attendees discussed proposed development in the area and the potential infrastructure to support the development
- Impacts will depend on the extent of widening/extensions
- HDR is undertaking structural assessments, previous assessments identified that the majority of structures are in good condition
- HDR will review capacity of culverts to understand if they can adequately convey post-widening flows
- TRCA noted they would have concerns if there were extensions proposed at Berczy Creek and Bruce Creek
- TRCA property east of DCP may become part of Rouge Park and may be conveyed to Parks Canada. TRCA recommends that the design at this location stay within the existing road right-of-way (ROW)
- Design options across the Highway 404 interchange with AT facilities in the boulevards and in the median were discussed. TRCA indicated its agreement with safety benefits of median AT facilities through the Highway 404 interchange.
- TRCA noted their requirements are different for infrastructure parallel to watercourses vs. perpendicular crossings of watercourses.

HDR

5. Timelines and Next Steps

- The first round of public open houses (OHs) for these studies is
| If there are any errors or omissions to these minutes, please contact Veronica Restrepo. |

| scheduled for the end of November 2016; the second round of OHs is scheduled for Spring 2017 and the ESR is expected to be filed by the end of 2017. |
| Open houses in November will present recommendation for six lane widening from Yonge Street to Highway 48/Markham Road based on approved development. |
| This meeting satisfies item 1.4 of the TRCA service level agreement with York Region |
| Data collection request is complete |
| **Scott to forward items related to hydrogeology** for HDR to review as the EAs move forward. [Post-meeting note: comments were provided in an email on November 14, 2016] |
**Project:** 16th Avenue Environmental Assessments from Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue and from Woodbine Avenue to York/Durham Line

**Subject:** Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) Meeting

**Date:** Friday, September 29, 2017

**Location:** TRCA Office – 101 Exchange Ave, Duffins Room

**Attendees:**
- Colin Wong – York Region
- Gerard Sullivan – York Region
- Kenny Sun – York Region
- Anthony Reitmeier – HDR
- Veronica Restrepo – HDR
- Scott Smith – TRCA
- Rebecca Elliot – TRCA
- Christine Furtado – TRCA
- Gretel Green – TRCA
- Greg Neill – LGL
- Scott Smith – TRCA
- Rebecca Elliot – TRCA
- Christine Furtado – TRCA
- Gretel Green – TRCA
- Greg Neill – LGL

**Regrets:**
- Tyrone Gan – HDR
- Michelle Mascarenhas – York Region

**Minutes by:** Veronica Restrepo, HDR

## Item

### 1. EA Study Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- YR provided a brief project update and summary of the work completed to date, including the general recommendations to be presented at the upcoming open houses
- Updated recommendations consist of:
  - Yonge Street to McCowan Road: Widen to six lanes for Transit/High Occupancy Vehicles (HOV), provide Active Transportation (AT) improvements
  - McCowan Road to Donald Cousens Parkway (DCP) – AT Improvements, no additional traffic lanes required
  - DCP to York/Durham Line (YDL) – maintain rural cross-section with paved shoulders, no additional traffic lanes required
- AT improvements between Yonge Street and DCP generally consist of multi-use path (MUP) on the north and sidewalk on the south, with the exception of the segment between Warden Avenue and Kennedy Road where MUP is proposed on both north and south to provide trail connections where sufficient space can accommodate wider AT facilities
- In general, widening is proposed about the centreline to balance impacts on both sides of 16th Avenue within areas that are generally already disturbed. At watercourse crossings, the design was optimized as feasible to minimize impacts.

### 2. Watercourse Crossings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information and Discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Individual watercourse crossings, including the proposed roadway improvement recommendations at each crossing, were discussed.
  - German Mills Creek
    - Significant grading required, but no culvert extension or replacement
    - Once the slope is re-graded, it can be re-vegetated
    - TRCA inquired about the possibility of a retaining wall at this location, but YR noted it is not being recommended as part of the proposed design
  - Beaver Creek
    - The existing on-line quantity pond with controlled inlet structure restricts fish passage
    - The existing structure has one cell at the inlet and two cells at the outlet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Rouge River    | - The existing bridge is proposed to be maintained  
- Opportunities to reduce grading will be reviewed in an effort to minimize impacts to Redside Dace habitat  
- TRCA noted that the outfalls for storm sewers into the Rouge River should be considered as part of the impacts associated with the roadway improvements  
- The study team clarified that the general footprint impacts will be documented in the ESR, but the stormwater management and Low Impact Development (LID) details will be confirmed during detailed design |
| Apple Creek    | - This location is the top end of the watershed, and there is a stormwater facility with a control structure upstream  
- There is a concrete-encased pipe within the opening  
- The proposed design consists of an optimized cross-section to avoid a culvert extension and minimize impacts  
- The study team does not have hydraulic data at this location. TRCA to provide any available hydraulic data, including an estimated model or the report for the upstream pond.  
- The study team will review City of Markham data to identify any information related to the pond |
| Berczy Creek   | - Existing structure does not meet MTO hydraulic design criteria for passage under the 50 year storm event, with overtopping occurring east of the crossing  
- The amount of overtopping does not allow safe emergency passage  
- Recommendation is to raise the road profile and replace with a larger opening bridge, which will be a benefit for Redside Dace  
- The fluvial geomorphology assessment at the crossing (not necessarily the entire reach) will influence the bridge design and opening size |
| Bruce Creek    | - This is a permanent warmwater watercourse but is a Redside Dace regulated watercourse so the timing windows will apply  
- The existing rigid frame structure is in good condition and it has good, stable banks on both sides; a potential structure replacement would have significant impacts to the optimal existing habitat  
- This structure is also overtopping under the Regional storm (not the 100 year storm), but the hydraulic concerns are not as severe. Depth and velocity of overtopping will be documented in the ESR and/or associated appendices.  
- Recommendation is to extend both sides of the structure to allow a wider (optimized) roadway platform |
| Eckhardt Creek | - Extension on both sides is recommended  
- Because the existing structure has high headwalls, the cost associated with the extension may be high and the Region may consider replacement if warranted. A pre-cast structure could be considered for |
This location. TRCA would support a replacement with a larger opening.

**Robinson Creek**
- The existing structure is aging and showing deterioration
- The existing channel is generally stable, with some erosion visible
- A culvert extension is required on the north side
- A pre-cast concrete span with a larger opening may be considered to reduce overtopping under the Regional storm
- TRCA requested that the MUP alignment be optimized to minimize impacts along the entire valley and Redside Dace habitat. **The study team will review opportunities to optimize the design at this location.**

**Mount Joy Creek**
- Also known as "Exhibition Creek" per TRCA files
- Watercourse is adjacent to the rail tracks
- Minor rehabilitation is required, but the existing structure is in good overall condition
- Extension is required on the north side to accommodate the MUP
- The upstream pond is likely municipally owned; TRCA requested that the study team review the pond design to confirm impacts from the extension, as this is potentially a wetland pocket
- The option to cantilever the MUP was discussed, however this is not feasible with the existing structure

**Little Rouge River**
- Recently constructed bridge (approx. 2012)
- TRCA is in agreement that the new bridge provides a good design and no modifications are required as part of the current EA

**Major Creek**
- Crosses YDL, not 16th Ave
- The existing unevaluated wetland on both sides of the watercourse is likely to be identified as a Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW). **TRCA to provide wetland mapping.**
- TRCA’s headwater feature mapping shows two features (culverts) between DCP and YDL; **TRCA to provide headwater mapping** although it may not apply to the recommendations of this EA. It was clarified that headwater features analysis would not be required, but crossing analysis may be required if the two culverts are to be extended.

For all the watercourse crossings, TRCA suggested that the **study team consider narrowing the cross-section footprint for the entire valley corridor, not just at the crossing itself.**

### 3. Other Considerations

- TRCA referred to their crossing guidelines for terrestrial passage. It was suggested that the **ESR documentation include text to identify at which of the watercourse crossings dry passage for wildlife is provided.**
- TRCA inquired regarding the material for the MUP, and if permeable surfaces can be considered. This will be determined during detailed design.
- In general, overall benefit work has already been undertaken by the City and developers, in particular in the vicinity of Bruce and Berczy Creeks. **The study team will review locations where overall benefit can be**
If there are any errors or omissions to these minutes, please contact Veronica Restrepo within ten business days of the issuance of these minutes.
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**Project:** 16th Avenue Environmental Assessment from Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue  
**Subject:** Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) Meeting  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 17th, 2018  
**Location:** TRCA Office – 101 Exchange Ave, Duffins Room  
**Attendees:**  
- Colin Wong – York Region  
- Nasir Aslam – York Region  
- Gerard Sullivan (via phone) – York Region  
- Veronica Restrepo – HDR  
- Tony Reitmeier – HDR  
- Judson Vender – LGL  
- Harsimrat Pruthi – TRCA  
- Abdul Djirdeh – TRCA  
- Don Ford – TRCA  
- Matt Kuyntjes – TRCA  
- Gretel Green – TRCA  
**Minutes by:** Veronica Restrepo, HDR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. 16th Ave EA Study Update</strong></td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • The project team provided a brief project update and summary of the work completed to date, including the changes since Open House #2 and the last TRCA meeting, which consist of:  
  o Ramp modifications at the 16th Ave/Hwy 404 interchange as a result of ongoing discussions and coordination with MTO work along Hwy 404  
  o Design modifications at bridges and culverts to enhance pedestrian and cyclist operations, including the addition of physical barriers between the curb lane and the AT facilities at bridges longer than 35m  
• Environmental Study Report (ESR) filing for Study A (Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue) is scheduled for the end of 2018. ESR filing for Study B (Woodbine Avenue to York/Durham Line) is anticipated in 2019; that study corridor, including natural features and the proposed design, will be discussed at a future meeting. | |
| **2. Watercourse Crossings** | Information and Discussion |
| **German Mills Creek** | HDR |
| • There are no proposed culvert modifications (extension or replacement) as a result of the proposed design.  
• TRCA inquired about opportunities to reduce grading in the north side of 16th Ave in order to minimize impacts at this crossing  
  o The ESR will include a general commitment to explore options to reduce impacts to natural features during detailed design  
• It was noted that there might be opportunities to plant better vegetation where grading impacts occur, and York Region has a policy regarding the provision of net benefit or improved habitat  
• The Natural Heritage Report should be updated to note that this crossing provides terrestrial passage. |  
| **Beaver Creek** | LGL |
| • There are no proposed culvert modifications (extension or replacement) as a result of the proposed design.  
• There is an online stormwater pond located at the inlet of the culvert with a flow control structure that prohibits fish and wildlife movement within |
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- TRCA suggested that the Natural Heritage Report could be updated to discuss the need for connectivity if the culvert is replaced after the implementation of improvements associated with the 16th Ave EA. However, it was noted that this is beyond the scope of the 16th Ave EA and any future work at this location would require TRCA permits, so the connectivity issues could be addressed at that time through the permitting process.

**Rouge River**
- There are no proposed bridge modifications (widening or replacement), as the proposed 16th Ave cross-section has been modified to fit within the existing bridge platform.
- It was noted that the watercourse is making contact with one side of the existing bridge; however, there are no visible signs of scour.
- The study team confirmed that since the existing culvert/structure at each of the three watercourses (German Mills Creek, Beaver Creek, and Rouge River) is proposed to be retained, the hydraulic capacity of the bridge/culvert crossings is not being changed as part of the proposed 16th Ave design. As such, there are no proposed changes to the bridge/culvert opening area (i.e. no bridge/culvert replacement and proposed maintenance measures would not reduce opening), the bridge/culvert width (i.e. no extensions), and the vertical alignment of the road (i.e. the spill condition for relief flow will not be affected).

3. **Stormwater Management**
- The strategy is to provide treatment that meets or exceeds the additional pavement area associated with the proposed road widening
- Infiltration trenches are proposed for water quality control
- There is currently no specific section in the Stormwater Management (SWM) Report that speaks to erosion control or water balance, but these items are generally mentioned within the SWM report text.
  - The SWM Report will be updated to include additional text on the aforementioned items.
    - Documentation should note that infiltration in proximity to properties of contamination concern should be avoided.
- TRCA suggested that OGS units or catch basin guards be considered for pre-treatment. The ESR will include a commitment to review measures for pre-treatment during detailed design.
- The SWM report will be updated to address TRCA’s comments (to be sent via email), including comments related to:
  - TRCA criteria related to retention of the first 5 mm of rainfall
  - Post-to-pre benefits documentation
  - Sizing of the infiltration trenches based on MOE equations 4.2 and 4.3 instead of the ones from TRCA’s Low Impact Development Manual

4. **Other Considerations**
- TRCA noted that an update on hydrology for the Rouge watershed is anticipated to be completed by the end of 2018
- The park west of Strathearn Avenue on the north side was identified as a wetland, regulated by TRCA.
  - TRCA will provide updated mapping (including ELC data in GIS) if available.
- TRCA noted their new proposed legislation will apply to the footprint
within 120 metres of natural features. This change is not anticipated to impact the 16th Ave Study A, but it may impact Study B.

- **TRCA to confirm**
- TRCA has no comments on the Contamination Overview Study report at this time.
- Regarding the geotechnical assessment, the project team will **confirm with Golder if the 2:1 slopes used for grading are stable**
  - It was noted that if 3:1 slopes are used, a wider footprint is required which will result in greater impacts to features
  - York Region confirmed that a 2:1 slope is used in most York Region projects, and these slopes are stable and vegetated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Next Steps</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The project team will provide TRCA with four hard copies of the ESR and the draft design drawings on October 19th</td>
<td>HDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TRCA to provide updated mapping data/ELC files if available</td>
<td>TRCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TRCA to provide preliminary comments on technical reports via email as soon as possible, and official comments on the draft ESR and appendices by November 14th</td>
<td>TRCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ESR filing is anticipated in December 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If there are any errors or omissions to these minutes, please contact Veronica Restrepo within ten business days of the issuance of these minutes.
**APPENDIX A: EA COMMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TRCA COMMENTS (November 14, 2018)</th>
<th>PROPOSENT/CONSULTANT RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Further to our meeting on October 17, 2018, ELC data provided to YR for the project in May 2016 is the most updated data available. Please update the ESR to reflect ELC units (MAS, MAM, SWT) and areas of impact as discussed during the meeting.</td>
<td>Comment noted. Addressed within the Natural Heritage report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Section 4.7 of the ESR, TRCA recognizes that no culvert or bridge works are required at this time; thus, no crossing sizes are presented in the draft ESR. Please make a note that when bridges/ culverts are replaced, the crossing size be designed using the TRCA Crossing Guidelines for Valley and Stream Corridors (2015) <a href="http://www.trca.on.ca/dotAsset/214493.pdf">http://www.trca.on.ca/dotAsset/214493.pdf</a>.</td>
<td>Comment noted. Text was added to Section 8.3.8 of the ESR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The draft ESR outlines that a number of modifications be implemented to minimize impacts within the corridor. The modifications include reducing the MUP to 2.4 meters, removal of the raised median and elimination of the boulevard space (2.9 meters). Please note that these reductions may possibly reduce encroachments up to 5.0 meters. Please consider modifications listed in the draft ESR and explore opportunities to reduce grading impacts to natural features at the following locations during detail design: a. German Mills – 10+395 to 10+475 b. Dry Pond/ Wetland - 12+370 to 12+470 (Our mapping identifies wetland ELC communities at this chainage, please investigate if this area is considered a SWM facility) c. Beaver Creek - 13+890 to 14+060 d. Rouge River - 15+500 to 15+800 (north side)/ 15+700 (south side)</td>
<td>Text is included in Sections 8.3.8 and 9.2 of the ESR to note that opportunities to reduce grading impacts to natural features should be explored during detailed design. Additional text was added to these two sections to specify the locations of concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>As discussed during our meeting on October 17, 2018, urban rivers are subject to degradation due to increased flows, poor water quality and thermal impacts. While design may meet storm water criteria for the increased area, TRCA requests that where feasible, the existing road drainage treatment be improved. Please ensure, where possible, that TRCA water quality and quantity criteria are met to assist in stream health incorporating opportunities for water storage, a treatment train approach for water quality which may include infiltration trenches as shown and OGS units located prior to discharge to the creek, and Thermal regime (cooling of water) to be addressed through infiltration trenches.</td>
<td>The current proposed stormwater management system will meet MECP’s requirements for quality control and water balance. Quantity control is not required based on TRCA’s stormwater manual with the exception of German Mills Creek; however, quantity control is provided for all 16th Ave storm systems discharging to municipal storm sewer systems and German Mills Creek. The Region will review opportunities to improve/enhance stormwater management mitigation during detailed design.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Staff suggests to include Thermal Mitigation for surface water entering creeks in Table 8.2 in Section 5 Climate Change of the draft ESR. It appears that thermal mitigation may be accomplished through the proposed Low Impact Development (LIDs).

   Text was updated as suggested.

6. HDR confirmed in the meeting held on October 17, 2018 that the hydraulic capacity of the bridge/culvert crossings are not being changed as part of the proposed design. In particular, of the project's three watercourse crossing bridges/culverts, it was confirmed that there would be no change to: the bridge/culvert opening area (i.e. no bridge/culvert replacement and proposed maintenance measures would not reduce opening), the bridge/culvert width (i.e. no extensions), and the vertical alignment of the road (i.e. the spill condition for relief flow will not be affected). TRCA staff requires that this be explicitly noted in the meeting minutes and included in the draft ESR and/or Appendices, as appropriate.

   Comment noted. This is included in the October 17, 2018 meeting minutes and Section 8.1.12 of the ESR.

7. a) Please note that the direction provided in this comment pertaining to the Drainage and Stormwater Management Report, is also applicable to the ESR. The Quantity control (i.e. 2 to 100 year post-to-pre development) is required by TRCA for the flow contributing to the Don River watershed (i.e. German Mills Creek). It is noted in the Drainage and Stormwater Management Report that control can be provided for more frequent storm events (e.g. 5 year) but that it is not feasible to meet quantity control requirements for larger, less frequent storm events, given site constraints. Page 168 of the draft ESR (i.e. Water Quantity Control, Watercourse Crossings) also notes that quantity control can be provided for the minor system runoff (e.g. 5 year) but that it is not feasible to meet quantity control requirements for major flows.

   TRCA requires that an assessment be done for each of the 2, 5, 10, 25, 50, and 100-year storm events, demonstrating the storm events which receive post-to-pre quantity control and for storm events in which post-to-pre quantity control is not feasible, please provide detailed calculations of the required mitigation measures to meet post-to-pre. (i.e. What is the storage volume that would be required to achieve criteria for each storm event). If the required storage volume cannot be incorporated into the proposed condition, please provide detailed justification as to why it cannot be achieved and show how best efforts have been demonstrated. TRCA recommends that this be addressed at the EA stage. If this assessment is to be deferred to detailed design, wording to be included in the Drainage and Stormwater Management Report noting that this assessment must be completed at that time.

   b) Please note that the Drainage and Stormwater Management Report should be signed and stamped by a professional engineer.

   a) Post-to-pre storage requirements for German Mills Creek will be included in the stormwater management report and ESR; however, the reports will state that the only feasible option is underground storage at the low points east and west of the CN bridge, and other opportunities for LIDs can be explored during detailed design.

   b) Comment noted.

8. Please provide a section on erosion control and water balance in the Drainage and Stormwater Management Report and draft ESR, noting TRCA criteria (i.e. retention of the first 5 mm of rainfall) and how it will be met through the proposed design. TRCA strongly recommends that supporting calculations be provided now to ensure feasibility. During the detailed design stage, it will need to be clearly demonstrated that the erosion control / water balance requirements are being met with the proposed design.

   Wording was added to the stormwater management report to document that water balance and erosion control will be met through the proposed infiltration systems that are proposed for water quality control at each of the three watercourses.

9. As per our meeting on October 17, 2018, please revise the sizing of the infiltration trenches to conform to

   The TRCA formulas were applied,
10. A draft Geotechnical report for the proposed improvements to 16th Avenue was submitted. Please note that a final report is to be signed and sealed by Licensed Professional Engineer as part of the ESR. Comment noted.

11. Please revise the Geotechnical report to include cut/fill recommendations (i.e. acceptable side slope inclination, type of material etc.). A general discussion has been added to Section 10.5 of the geotechnical report.

12. a) Please confirm if the Draft Preliminary Foundation Investigation and Design Report dated July 18, 2018 prepared by Golder Associates is the same report as Appendix K: Geotechnical and Foundations Report mentioned in the Draft ESR Appendices (Refer Page xxv).
   b) Also, please confirm if Appendix L: Structural Assessment and Bridge General Arrangements and Appendix N: Hydrogeological Report were submitted as part of the technical reports. Please note that staff would like to review these reports.
   a) Yes, they are the same report
   b) Appendix L and N of the ESR were submitted to TRCA separately on November 20, 2018.
# APPENDIX B: DETAILED DESIGN COMMITMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TRCA COMMENTS (November 14, 2018)</th>
<th>PROPONENT/CONSULTANT RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>As stated in the draft ESR, compensation for tree removals be completed where feasible. Please note that at detailed design stage, TRCA has interest in reviewing the impacts and mitigation to natural features identified in the chainages areas mentioned in Item #3 in Appendix A. Staff suggests that any impacts to natural features be quantified and compensation provided on site or in other sites within the watershed.</td>
<td>As discussed during October 17, 2018 meeting, the ESR includes a statement for opportunities to reduce grading impacts adjacent to natural features to be reviewed during detailed design. However, with the exception of the Rouge River, compensation is not mandatory at the study area watercourse crossings. Compensation will be provided at the Rouge River to meet Endangered Species Act requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Staff suggests that utility relocation (Gas/ Water) be located within the ROW and possibly within the MUP or sidewalk areas to avoid impacts in chainage areas listed under Item #3 in Appendix A.</td>
<td>Comment noted. Text was added to Sections 8.3.8 and 9.2 of the ESR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Please identify all new outfall locations or any outfalls that may require improvements or relocation as this may impact the natural features.</td>
<td>No new outfall locations or outfall improvements are proposed as a result of the design. No action required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>a) As discussed during our meeting on October 17, 2018, during detailed design, TRCA will review that the storage volume of the infiltration trenches is located at an elevation below the outlet of the trench. b) Staff recommends providing pre-treatment for the proposed infiltration trenches (e.g. CB inserts).</td>
<td>a) This has been added as commitment for detailed design (Section 9.2 of the ESR). b) This will be considered subject to operational review during detailed design; documented in Section 9.2 of the ESR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The proposed cut/fill plan should be reviewed by a qualified Geotechnical engineer. Please demonstrate that the proposed side slopes of the cuts satisfy a minimum safety factor of 1.50.</td>
<td>Comment noted as a commitment for detailed design (Section 9.2 of the ESR). A general discussion was also added to Section 10.5 of the geotechnical report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Please provide a topographical survey that clearly illustrates the existing top of slope, contours of the</td>
<td>Comment noted; to be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.</strong> Please submit the engineering drawings of the bridges, abutments/wing walls, culverts etc at detailed design.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted; to be addressed during detailed design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.</strong> Please provide cross-sections along the alignment in adequate intervals. The cross-sections to clearly depict the proposed grade with respect to the existing ground and illustrate all slopes/banks and other features. The proposed grades also be shown on the site plan at the detailed design stage.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted; to be addressed during detailed design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. a)</strong> Please ensure that at detailed design:</td>
<td></td>
<td>a) Comments noted; added as commitments for detailed design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. the road alignment adjacent to the properties with either moderate or high risk ranking (Table 4.1 in Contaminant Overview Study by Golder) is adequately assessed as part of the detailed design process; and</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) This is documented as item 17i in Table 8-11 of the ESR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. infiltration trenches are not sited in areas where the alignment is impacted by adjacent property use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) It is our understanding that any impacted soil and/or groundwater in the road alignment will be assessed and remediated as required in accordance with O. Reg. 153/04.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.</strong> Please confirm if there are any property requirements for the proposed works as TRCA owns adjacent lands on the south side of 16th Avenue at German Mills Creek.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Property requirements are not anticipated adjacent to German Mills Creek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.</strong> The report states that there may be artesian conditions at the crossing for Highway 404. TRCA requests to please identify any direct/indirect impacts of dewatering to the Rouge River at this location.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted. Since MTO is leading the design at the 16th Ave / Highway 404 interchange with York Region’s input, the comment has been forwarded to MTO so it can be addressed during detailed design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.</strong> Staff recommends to please use the data regarding ground water levels and conductivity to determine if LID measures will be feasible. The data provided in Table 6: Statis Groundwater Elevations may not represent seasonal fluctuations and additional information may be required for any proposed infiltration.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted. As documented in Section 9.2 of the ESR, LID strategies will be reviewed during detailed design.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Project: 16th Avenue Environmental Assessments (EAs) from Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue and from Woodbine Avenue to York/Durham Line

Subject: Parks Canada Meeting

Date: Thursday, August 24, 2017

Location: HDR Main Boardroom – 100 York Boulevard, Suite 300, Richmond Hill, ON L4B 1J8

Attendees: Richard Scott, Parks Canada  
Cass Stabler, Parks Canada  
Peter Feldmann, Parks Canada  
Kenny Sun, York Region  
Michelle Mascarenhas, York Region  
Veronica Restrepo, HDR

Regrets: Colin Wong, York Region  
Yvonne Kaczor, York Region  
Tyrone Gan, HDR

Minutes by: Veronica Restrepo, HDR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 16th Ave EA Introduction and Project Background</td>
<td>Information Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❧ York Region (YR) provided a brief project introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❧ The Region’s Transportation Master Plan (TMP) update was completed in 2016 and covers phases 1 and 2 of the Environmental Assessment (EA) process at a high level. It identified the need for improvements to 16th Avenue and other Regional roads. The current 16th Ave EA covers phases 1-4 in more detail.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❧ Project Timelines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o First round of Open Houses was held in November 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Next set of open houses being planned for Fall 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Environmental Study Report (ESR) filing anticipated in 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❧ Recommended solutions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Limits of proposed widening are consistent with YR’s TMP, as follows:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o York Street to McCowan Road: Widen to six lanes for Transit/High Occupancy Vehicles (HOV), provide Active Transportation (AT) improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o McCowan Road to Donald Cousens Parkway (DCP) – AT Improvements, no additional traffic lanes required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o DCP to York/Durham Line (YDL) – Semi-rural cross-section with paved shoulders, no additional traffic lanes required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Land Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>❧ The area surrounding Rouge Park (within the DCP to YDL segment) has a designated right-of-way (ROW) of 36 m per the YR Official Plan. The existing ROW is approximately 20 m.</td>
<td>Information and Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❧ Currently, the eastern side of the corridor is Provincial land while the western side is under the authority of TRCA. Lands north of the study area have already been transferred to Parks Canada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(PC). Lands for the Rouge Park adjacent to 16th Avenue have not yet been transferred from TRCA. Land transfer to PC is anticipated by the end of 2017:
- Provincial land transfer scheduled as soon as September 2017
- TRCA land transfer scheduled for the end of 2017

- Once the land has been transferred from TRCA, the transfer from federal land to YR would occur under the Federal Act and would be subject to restrictions:
  - Under the Rouge National Urban Park Act, only up to 200 hectares of land can be transferred to municipalities.
  - There may be a need to go back to parliament to amend legislation in order to transfer lands beyond 200 hectares, or alternatively the land may be leased to York Region. This process needs to be confirmed.
- PC suggested that it is important to identify any YR land requirements at this time, prior to TRCA land transfer, in order to protect for additional land required for roadway improvements.

**YR to discuss internally with the Region’s official contact for PC (Ian Buchanan) to confirm if the Region’s land requirements have already been protected as part of previous YR comments.**

- **YR to confirm if the existing ROW or the Official Plan ROW should be protected as part of the land transfer discussions.**
- **If impacts associated with the proposed improvements extend beyond the YR designated ROW, there may be a trigger for a federal Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), which falls under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA) process.**

### 3. Preliminary Design Discussion

#### Design Considerations

- **PC noted their preference for the road to have a posted speed of no more than 60 km/h., with lanes that are wide enough to accommodate farm equipment, and AT facilities for connections to park trails.**
- **ESR to document the need for coordination for future trail connections**
- **PC requested that opportunities to provide wildlife crossings be considered. The study team confirmed that the Little Rouge River Bridge provides a significant wildlife crossing and there are no other watercourse crossings in this segment of the 16th Ave study corridor.**
- **PC noted that impacts to agricultural operations, cultural resources, park visitor experience, and tile drainage should all be considered with respect to the roadway improvements. For example, the traffic circle at York/Durham Line at 19th impacts farming operations.**
- **This segment of the 16th Avenue corridor is not currently illuminated. The study team to confirm if illumination is proposed in the future.** PC noted that the Rouge Park should comply with Dark-Sky illumination restrictions, but YR clarified that the roadway design must meet the Region’s illumination restrictions.
standards.
- PC is seeking improvements to promote the ecological integrity of the area, rather than just minimizing impacts.
- The EA team clarified that there are no significant changes proposed for this segment of 16th Avenue.
- PC’s key considerations include:
  - Property protection
  - Drainage and stormwater management
  - Accommodating farming operations with a potential mountable curb and a proposed paved shoulder
  - Trails/connections
  - Ongoing open communication between YR and PC
- PC is concerned about any potential vegetation removals (including vegetation within the YR ROW).

**Little Rouge River bridge**
- The original bailey bridge was maintained below the new bridge constructed in 2012. The original bridge was decommissioned but maintained on site because of its heritage value. The current EA does not propose any changes to the Little Rouge River bridge.
- PC inquired about the possibility of using the original bailey bridge for AT connections. **PC to discuss this with YR** (Yvonne) at a separate upcoming meeting. YR suggested that PC review the ESR from the DCP to east of Reesor improvements to confirm the original bridge’s cultural heritage features and recommendations for AT connections. **YR (Michelle) to provide relevant excerpts from this ESR to PC.** [Post-meeting note: this was provided]
- PC requested to be included in any discussion regarding future plans for this bridge.

**Drainage / Stormwater Management**
- Consideration should be given to whether or not a mountable curb would accommodate tile drainage. **The EA team will confirm drainage/Stormwater Management strategy and potential impacts.**
- Stormwater management is a priority for PC. Roadside character is also an important consideration and the park function should be respected.
- **YR to discuss internally and advise on lessons learned from the 9th Line design and coordination with TRCA for that project.**

**Trails and Connections**
- The PC trails map is very preliminary and should not be published. It was prepared as a draft for discussion with municipalities and is subject to substantial changes. Because of the nature of Rouge Park, the standards trail type classification may be modified.
- The trail management map is more high level but it is also preliminary. The park boundaries shown are out of date as they do not show the park lands east of York/Durham Line into Durham/Uxbridge.
If there are any errors or omissions to these minutes please contact Veronica Restrepo within ten business days of the issuance of these minutes.
### 1. Introduction and EA Study Overview

- York Region (YR) provided a brief project introduction and summary of the work completed to date, including preliminary recommendations
  - Two 16th Avenue EAs (Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue in the Town of Richmond Hill and the City of Markham, and Woodbine Avenue to York/Durham Line in the City of Markham) are being conducted concurrently
- YR sent study area information to Patrick at Alectra. Alectra’s redline department to provide mark-up with existing and planned Alectra infrastructure.
- Relocation design will be undertaken in detailed design; the intent of this meeting is to understand the required offsets and explore the possibility of shifting poles, potentially consolidating all Alectra infrastructure on one side of 16th Ave only
- 16th Ave corridor design is based on 60 km/h design speed, 60 km/h posted speed

### 2. Alectra Existing Infrastructure and Design Requirements

- Alectra infrastructure consists of local service along the 16th Ave corridor, with concrete poles at standard spacing
- The existing location of poles shifting from the north boulevard to the south boulevard along the study corridor is driven by (a) availability of ROW in the boulevard or (b) TRCA regulated areas and permitting requirements and/or (c) underground conflicts. Alectra generally prefers their infrastructure to stay on the same side of the street rather than switching back and forth.
- The need for poles on both sides of the street depends on the number of circuits, as there can be no more than 4 circuits per pole line. Where there currently are 3 circuits per pole line on either side of the street, all 6 circuits cannot be consolidated on one side of the street.
- At the CN bridge, existing hydro line is offset beyond the bridge on the south side of 16th Ave (closer to Red Maple Rd)
- At the Rouge River crossing there currently are hydro lines on both sides of 16th Ave
- From Leslie Street to Highway 404 there are hydro lines on both sides of 16th Ave; could be combined on one side of the street as there are 4 circuits in total
- The lines from Woodbine Avenue to Rodick Road cannot be combined as there are 6 circuits
- West of Woodbine Ave, the hydro lines crossing 16th Ave are directly serving customers
- For 60km/h design speed, a 1.0m offset is required from pole to curb (to face of pole, not centre). Study team to confirm clearance based on MTO requirements and YR standards.
- Alectra requires 0.3m clearance from face of pole to back of active transportation

---

**Item** | **Action**
--- | ---
1. Introduction and EA Study Overview | Information Only
2. Alectra Existing Infrastructure and Design Requirements | Information Only
(AT) facilities

- Pole size: 0.7 m is largest diameter of poles, more typical size is 0.6 m diameter
- Utilities zone should be 1.0m clearance from curb + 0.6m pole diameter + 0.3m clearance from back of AT facilities = 1.9m total (as opposed to the 1.5m currently shown on the EA draft cross-section options)
- YR to **confirm if placing a hydro pole that encroaches into the MUP** might be acceptable at some locations. This might present a hazard and result in snow clearance issues.
- When narrowing boulevards to accommodate all cross-section elements within a constrained ROW, need to consider other underground infrastructure.
- Swing of wires needs to be considered for easements. For approx. 50m pole spacing, approx. 1.0m needs to be considered for swing. Therefore, a clearance of approx. 1.0m is required from the edge of the pole to the ROW line. Easements would be ground easements, not aerial easements. Alectra typically registers easements under their name. **YR to check who is responsible for obtaining easement** (YR or utility company).
- Guying is to counter tension (at an angle). Available space for guying is generally 3-3.5 m, sometimes more. Alectra’s preference is to contain guying within the road ROW. Some deflection of existing poles has been observed and guy wires may be required.
- Underground infrastructure would be approximately 1-1.5m below ground, and a 1m clearance from other underground utilities is required. However, underground infrastructure affects capacity and as such Alectra prefers to maintain overhead infrastructure.
- Relocation costs for concrete poles are in the magnitude of $50,000-60,000 per pole, with higher cost if there are switches or other infrastructure or equipment on those poles. Self-supporting poles are more expensive, and may be more costly than going underground.
- Cost to implement underground hydro infrastructure is approximately 6 to 10 times the cost of overhead facilities
- On each pole, there could be a hydro line, plants, streetlights, and telecom infrastructure, so coordination with all utilities will be required during detailed design
- Typically, tenants apply for joint use approvals from Alectra to keep using their poles after relocation, but Alectra dictates the pole location
- Underground gas infrastructure needs to be considered as constraint to pole relocation
- In order to receive feasibility sign-off from Alectra, the study team will need to **provide the proposed curb and sidewalk location, as well as the profile and cross-sections** to determine the elevation for the existing and proposed design

### 3. Planned Alectra Infrastructure

- Alectra is planning a line on the north side of 16th Ave between Leslie St and Woodbine Ave; this project is on hold until the Buttonville airport closes. East of Leslie St there is already hydro infrastructure on both sides of 16th Ave as it is required to meet capacity.
- In the long term if the airport stays, Alectra would run their infrastructure underground. Alectra would need to decide in 2019 if their infrastructure for this segment will be located overhead or underground.
- Alectra has identified the need for another transformer station in Newmarket. One option is to expand the Buttonville transformer station near Rodick Rd and run a dual line (both sides of 16th Ave) from Leslie St to Kennedy Rd (6 circuits would be required from Rodick Rd to Kennedy Rd).
- From Rodick Rd to Kennedy Rd, depending on timing the entire cost of underground infrastructure may need to be covered by Alectra; however, relocation of existing lines from Woodbine Ave to Rodick Rd would need to be paid by YR
- KDA at Yonge St and 16th Ave is not likely to require two lines; the only location that requires 2 lines where they don’t already exist is between Rodick Rd and Kennedy Rd

Information Only
### Timelines and Coordination

- A Class EA is required for the transformer station/transmission expansion, and it is likely to start next year (Mid 2018)
- Pole line to be built in 2022-2025 (if the poles are located in the boulevard, Alectra does not need to complete a Class EA for this component of the work)
- YR’s planned roadway improvement timing (per the most current (2017) 10-year capital construction program) is as follows:
  - Yonge to Leslie: 2023
  - Bayview to Woodbine: 2021
  - Woodbine to York/Durham Line: after 2027
- **Post meeting note:** YR’s planned roadway improvement timing per the 2018 10-year capital construction program is as follows:
  - Yonge to Leslie: not in the 2018 10-year plan (construction anticipated beyond 2028)
  - Leslie to Woodbine: 2021
  - Woodbine to York/Durham Line: not in the 2018 10-year plan (construction anticipated beyond 2028)
- Coordination between YR construction, MTO construction and Alectra infrastructure construction at Hwy 404 will be required
- HDR to focus on the Woodbine to Warden segment in the design review, as the ROW at this location is highly constrained

### Next Steps

- Alectra to provide **mark-up of existing and planned infrastructure**, including the number of circuits for each segment so the EA team can identify where there are opportunities to consolidate lines on one side of 16th Ave
- HDR to review cross-section at each intersection (on both approaches) between Woodbine and Warden

---

If there are any errors or omissions to these minutes please contact Veronica Restrepo within ten business days of the issuance of these minutes.
RESPONSE FORM

Regional Municipality of York
Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Studies
16th Avenue from Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue and
16th Avenue from Woodbine Avenue to York-Durham Line
Town of Richmond Hill and City of Markham

Contact Name: Dianne More
Title: President
Agency / Organization: Markham Village Conservancy
Address: 214 Main Street N.
Markham, Ontario
Postal Code: L3P 1Y5
Phone No.: 905-294-7766
Email address: addcmore@rogers.com

Please note specific concerns and comments (use additional sheets if necessary):


Do you wish to be notified for continued involvement in the process?

☑ Yes, please continue to send me updates about the project

☐ No, I do not wish to be kept informed about the project. Please remove our organization from the project contact list.

Please return this form by July 29, 2016 to: Colin Wong, P.Eng.
Project Manager
The Regional Municipality of York
17250 Yonge Street
Newmarket, Ontario L3Y 3Z1
Email: colin.wong@york.ca
RESPONSE FORM

Regional Municipality of York
Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Studies
16th Avenue from Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue and
16th Avenue from Woodbine Avenue to York-Durham Line
Town of Richmond Hill and City of Markham

Contact Name: Ken Rudy
Title: Secretary
Agency / Organization: Markham Village Conservancy
Address: 214 Main Street N
Markham, Ontario
Postal Code: L3P 1Y5
Phone No.: 905-471-9741
Email address: krudy@rogers.com

Please note specific concerns and comments (use additional sheets if necessary):


Do you wish to be notified for continued involvement in the process?

☑ Yes, please continue to send me updates about the project

☐ No, I do not wish to be kept informed about the project. Please remove our organization from the project contact list.

Please return this form by **July 29, 2016** to: Colin Wong, P.Eng.
Project Manager
The Regional Municipality of York
17250 Yonge Street
Newmarket, Ontario L3Y 3Z1
Email: colin.wong@york.ca
RESPONSE FORM

Regional Municipality of York
Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Studies
16th Avenue from Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue and
16th Avenue from Woodbine Avenue to York-Durham Line
Town of Richmond Hill and City of Markham

Contact Name:  Gilbert Luk
Title:  Planner

Agency/Organization:  YORK REGION DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD
Address:  60 Wellington St W, Aurora ON
Postal Code:  L4G 3N2

Phone No.:  905-737-0002 Ext 2439
Email address:  gilbert.luk@ydsb.ca

Please note specific concerns and comments (use additional sheets if necessary):

Sixteenth Avenue PS is located at 400 Sixteenth Ave, Town of RM. Access for the school is on Sixteenth Ave and
must be preserved and any works should not negatively affect operations of the school.

Do you wish to be notified for continued involvement in the process?

☐ Yes, please continue to send me updates about the project
☐ No, I do not wish to be kept informed about the project. Please remove our organization from the project contact list.

Please return this form by July 29, 2016 to: Colin Wong, P.Eng.
Project Manager
The Regional Municipality of York
17250 Yonge Street
Newmarket, Ontario L3Y 3Z1
Email: colin.wong@york.ca
RESPONSE FORM

Regional Municipality of York
Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Studies
16th Avenue from Yonge Street to Woodbine Avenue and
16th Avenue from Woodbine Avenue to York-Durham Line
Town of Richmond Hill and City of Markham

Contact Name: Adam McDonald
Title: Senior Planner
Agency / Organization: York Catholic District School Board
Address: 320 Bloomingdale Road W
Aurora ON Postal Code: L4G 0M1
Phone No.: 905.731.1211 x12379
Email address: adam.mcdonald@ycdsb.ca

Please note specific concerns and comments (use additional sheets if necessary):
The Board has a secondary school located at 6100 16th Ave (east of Markham Road) located within Study 1B Area. Board staff request to be involved in any discussions that may impact/alter access to this property.

Do you wish to be notified for continued involvement in the process?

☐ Yes, please continue to send me updates about the project
☐ No, I do not wish to be kept informed about the project. Please remove our organization from the project contact list.

Please return this form by **July 29, 2016** to:

Colin Wong, P.Eng.
Project Manager
The Regional Municipality of York
17250 Yonge Street
Newmarket, Ontario L3Y 3Z1
Email: colin.wong@york.ca
November 8, 2016

Cathy Parmer
Regional Municipality of York
Roads.ea@york.ca

Dear Ms. Parmer:

Re: Information on the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012

Thank you for your correspondence of July 27, 2015 regarding the Regional Municipality of York’s 16th Avenue Study A and Study B.

The Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012 (CEAA 2012) focuses federal environmental reviews on projects that have the potential to cause significant adverse environmental effects in areas of federal jurisdiction and applies to physical activities described in the Regulations Designating Physical Activities (the Regulations). Based on the information provided, your project does not appear to be described in the Regulations. Kindly review the Regulations to confirm applicability to the proposed project.

According to section 25 (c) of the Regulations the construction, operation, decommissioning and abandonment of a new all-season public highway that requires a total of 50 km or more of new right of way may require a Federal Environmental Assessment.

If you believe the project is not subject to a federal environmental assessment, and do not submit a project description, we kindly request that you remove the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency from your distribution list.

If you have questions, please get in touch with our office through the switchboard at 416-952-1576. The attachment that follows provides web links to useful legislation, regulation, and guidance documents.

Sincerely,

Anjala Puvananathan
Director, Ontario Region
Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency
Attachment – Useful Legislation, Regulation, and Guidance Documents
Attachment – Useful Legislation, Regulation, and Guidance Documents

For more information on the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012 (CEAA 2012), please access the following links on the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency’s (the Agency) website:

Overview of CEAA 2012

Regulations Designating Physical Activities, and Prescribed Information for a Description of a Designated Project Regulations
http://www-ceaa-.gc.ca/Default.aspx?lang=En&n=9EC7CAD2-1

If your project is in a federally designated wildlife area or migratory bird sanctuary please check section 1 of the Regulations, which details the designated projects specific to those locations.

If it appears that CEAA 2012 may apply to your proposed project, you must provide the Agency with a description of the proposed project. Please see the link below to the Agency’s guide to preparing a project description.

Guide to Preparing a Description of a Designated Project
http://www-ceaa-.gc.ca/Default.aspx?lang=En&n=3CA9CEE5-1
Response to EA Notice

Thank you for providing Infrastructure Ontario (IO) with a copy of your Environmental Assessment Notice. From the information you have provided, it is unclear if you are proposing to use lands under the control of the Ministry of Infrastructure (MOI lands) to support your proposed project.

Prior to MOI consenting to the use of MOI lands, the applicable environmental assessment, duty to consult Aboriginal peoples (if triggered) and heritage obligations will need to be met. In order for MOI to allow you access to MOI lands and to carry out proposed activities, MOI must ensure that provincial requirements and due diligence obligations are satisfied. These requirements are in addition to any such obligations you as the proponent of the project may have.

You as the proponent of the project will be required to work with Infrastructure Ontario (IO) to fulfill MOI’s obligations which may include considering the use of any MOI lands as part of your individual environmental assessment. All costs associated with meeting MOI’s obligations will be the responsibility of the proponent. Please note that time should be allocated in your project timelines for MOI to ensure that its obligations have been met and to secure any required internal government approvals required to allow for the use of the MOI lands for your proposed project.

In order for MOI and IO to assist you to meet your required project timelines, please recognize that early, direct contact with IO is imperative. The due diligence required prior to the use of MOI lands for your proposed project, may include but may not be limited to the following:

- Procedural aspects of the Provincial Crown’s Aboriginal Duty to Consult obligations – see Instruction Note 1
- Requirements of the MOI Public Work Class Environmental Assessment – see Instruction Note 2
- Requirements of the Ministry of Tourism Culture and Sport (MTCS) Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists – see Instruction Note 3
- Requirements of the MTCS Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties Consultant Archaeologists – see Instruction Note 4

Representatives from IO are available to discuss your proposed project, the potential need for MOI lands and the corresponding provincial requirements and due diligence obligations.

Please review the attached instruction notes which provide greater detail on the due diligence obligations associated with the use of MOI lands for your proposed project. We are providing this information to allow you as the proponent to allocate adequate time and funding into your project schedule and budgets. If your project requires you to study MOI lands, then an agreement is required and all studies undertaken on MOI lands will be considered confidential until approval is received. IO will require electronic copies of all required studies on MOI lands that you undertake.

We strongly encourage you to work with IO as early as possible in your process to identify if any MOI lands would be required for your proposed project. Please note that on title MOI control may
be identified under the name of MOI or one of its predecessor ministries or agencies which may include but is not limited to variations of the following: Her Majesty the Queen/King, Hydro One, MBS, MEI, MEDEI, MGS, MOI, OLC, ORC, PIR or Ministry of Public Works1.

Please provide Rita Kelly with a confirmation in writing of any MOI lands that you propose to use for your proposed project and why the lands are required along with a copy of a title search for the MOI lands.

For more information concerning the identification of MOI lands in your study area or the process for acquiring access to or an interest in MOI lands, please contact:

Rita Kelly  
Project Manager  
Land Transactions, Hydro Corridors & Public Works  
Infrastructure Ontario  
1 Dundas Street West, Suite 2000  
Toronto, ON  
M5G 2L5  
Tel: (416) 212-4934  
Email: rita.kelly@infrastructureontario.ca

An application package and requirements checklist is attached for your reference. Please note that transfer of an interest in MOI lands to a proponent can take up to one year and there is no certainty that approval will be obtained.

For more information concerning the MOI Public Work Class Environmental Assessment process and due diligence requirements, please contact:

Lisa Myslicki  
Environmental Specialist  
Infrastructure Ontario  
1 Dundas Street West, Suite 2000  
Toronto, ON  
M5G 2L5  
Tel: (416) 557-3116  
Email: lisa.myslicki@infrastructureontario.ca

---

1 MBS - Management Board Secretariat; MEI - Ministry of Energy and Infrastructure; MEDEI – Ministry of Economic Development, Employment and Infrastructure; MGS - Ministry of Government Services; MOI - Ministry of Infrastructure; OLC - Ontario Lands Corporation; ORC - Ontario Realty Corporation; PIR - Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal.
If MOI lands are not to be impacted by the proposed project, please provide a confirmation in writing to Infrastructure Ontario.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide initial comments on your proposed project.

Sincerely,

Patrick Grace  
Director  
Land Transactions, Hydro Corridors & Public Works  
Infrastructure Ontario  
1 Dundas Street West, Suite 2000  
Toronto, ON, M5G 2L5
INSTRUCTION NOTE 1

Provincial Crown’s Aboriginal Duty to Consult obligations

The Crown has a constitutional Duty to Consult (DTC) in certain circumstances and Aboriginal consultation may be required prior to MOI granting access to MOI lands or undertaking other activities. The requirement for Aboriginal consultation may be triggered given Aboriginal or treaty rights, established consultation or notification protocols, government policy and/or program decisions, archaeological potential or results, and/or cultural heritage consultation obligations. The requirement for Aboriginal consultation will be assessed by MOI.

Prior to the use of MOI lands, MOI must first meet any duty to consult obligations that may be triggered by the proposed use of MOI lands. It is incumbent on you to consult with IO as early in the process as possible once you have confirmed that MOI lands would be involved.

MOI will evaluate the potential impact of your proposed project on Aboriginal and treaty rights. MOI may assess that the Crown’s Duty to Consult (DTC) requires consultation of Aboriginal communities. Proponents should discuss with IO whether MOI will require consultation to occur and if so, which communities should be consulted.

Where MOI determines that Aboriginal consultation is required, MOI will formally ask you to consult or continue to consult with Aboriginal peoples at the direction of MOI.

On behalf of MOI you will also be required to:
1. Maintain a record and document all notices and engagement activities, including telephone calls and/or meetings;
2. Provide the Ministry updates on these activities as requested; and
3. Notify the Ministry of any issues raised by Aboriginal communities.

If consultation has already occurred, IO strongly encourages you to provide complete Aboriginal consultation documentation to IO as soon as possible. This documentation should include all notices and engagement activities, including telephone calls and/or meetings.

Any duty to consult obligations must be met prior to publically releasing the Notice of Completion for the assessment undertaken under the MOI PW Class EA.
INSTRUCTION NOTE 2

Requirements of the MOI Public Work Class Environmental Assessment

MOI has an approved Class EA (the Ministry of Infrastructure Public Work Class Environmental Assessment (Public Work Class EA) to assesses undertakings that affect MOI lands including disposing of an interest in land or site development. Details on the Public Work Class EA can be found at: http://www.infrastructureontario.ca/Templates/Buildings.aspx?id=2147490336&langtype=1033

You may be required to work with IO to complete an environmental assessment under the Public Work Class EA for the undertakings related to MOI lands. IO will work with you to ensure that all of the MOI undertakings or activities related to the use of MOI lands are identified, that the appropriate Category of undertaking is used and a monitoring and report back mechanism is established to ensure that MOI’s obligations are met.

The completion of another environmental assessment process that assesses the undertakings related to MOI lands may satisfy MOI’s obligations under the Public Work Class EA. You will be required to work with IO to determine the most appropriate approach to meeting the Public Work Class EA obligations for undertakings related to MOI lands on a case by case basis.

Where it is decided that the assessment of undertakings related to MOI lands can be assessed as part of the environmental assessment being undertaken by the proponent then it is likely that the following provisions will be required:

- that the environmental assessment documents set out that one process will be relied on by both the proponent and MOI to evaluate their respective undertakings and meet their respective obligations to assess the potential impacts of their undertakings;
- that the proponent’s description of the undertaking to be assessed include all of the MOI undertakings related to the use or access to MOI lands (see Glossary of Terms);
- the associated EA Category from the Public Works Class EA be identified and met by the environmental assessment (see Figure 22. Category Listing Matrix and/or Tale 2.1 EA Category Identification Table);
- that the proponent’s environmental assessment indicate that MOI would be relying on the proponent’s assessment to satisfy MOI’s obligations under the Environment Assessment Act;
- establish a monitoring and report back mechanism to ensure that any obligations of MOI resulting from the assessment will be met; and

An environmental assessment consultation plan be developed to ensure that all stakeholders required to be consulted regarding the undertakings on the MOI lands are consulted

Other Due Diligence Requirements

There may also be other additional due diligence requirements for the use of MOI lands in the proposed project. These may include:
- Phase One Environmental Site Assessment and follow up
- Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment and follow up
- Survey
- Title Search
- Species at Risk Survey(s)
- Appraisal
INSTRUCTION NOTE 3 – ARCHAEOLOGY - (see also Instruction Note on Duty to Consult)

Archaeological sites are recognized and protected under the Ontario Heritage Act. Carrying out archaeological fieldwork is a licensed, regulated activity under the 2011 Ministry of Culture Standards and Guidelines for Consulting Archaeologists. Please visit………………

Archaeological due diligence is required for any proposed project on MOI land that could cause significant below ground disturbance such as, new building construction, installation/modification of site services, and installation/maintenance of new pipelines or transmission lines.

You, as the proponent, must engage IO prior to undertaking any archaeological work on MOI lands.

IO has two in-house licensed archaeologists who should be consulted early in the preparatory stages of a proposed project when geographic and site locations are being considered so that the potential for archaeological resources including historic and Aboriginal material (e.g., Aboriginal villages and burials sites) can be assessed.

To support both the Public Work Class EA and MOI’s duty to consult analysis, archaeological assessments are required to determine if there are any significant findings that may be of cultural value or interest to Aboriginal people (e.g., archaeological or burial sites).

Archaeological work can begin before the assessment under the Public Works Class EA begins but the Class EA cannot be completed until the duty to consult that may be triggered regarding archaeological resources are fulfilled.

Depending upon the number or significance of resources found, the duty to consult may be triggered during any of the 4 phases of archaeological work (see below) or anytime during project construction.

The discovery of Aboriginal resources can impact on activities, including project and site plans, timelines and all costs. As the proponent, you are expected to ensure that you project timelines include adequate time and resources to address MOI due diligence obligations, including internal government approvals. All costs associated with meeting MOI’s archaeological obligations will be the responsibility of the proponent.

For Archaeological Assessments (Stages 1 through 4), proponents must adhere to the four stage archaeological fieldwork process prescribed by the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) as per the 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists. Not all noted Stages will be necessary for all work. Respondents must follow industry procedures and practices as per the MTCS Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists 2011 for each Stage of archaeological assessment, all reporting criteria and formatting, and any other license requirements and/or obligations.

- **Stage 1** Background Study - Evaluation of Archaeological Potential
  - Archival research and non-intrusive site visit

- **Stage 2** Property Assessment
• In-field systematic pedestrian survey or test pitting and reporting

• **Stage 3** Site-specific Assessment
  • Limited excavation to determine site significance and size
  • Field works and reporting

• **Stage 4** Site mitigation
  • Through either avoidance/protection or excavation Field work 4 to 8 weeks
  • Develop summary report
  • MTCS review – expedited review of summary report 6 weeks
  • Final report
  • Time to develop and implement mitigation measures – negotiation, legal protections, avoidance

IO Contact Information and direction to IO website….
INSTRUCTION NOTE 4 – HERITAGE REQUIREMENTS

Built Heritage/Cultural Landscapes

Built heritage/cultural landscapes (cultural heritage) are recognized and protected under the Ontario Heritage Act, the regulations to that Act and the 2010 Ministry of Culture Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (S&Gs) Criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest are set out in O. Reg. 9/06 and 10/06. The S&Gs set out a process for identifying properties of cultural heritage value, and the standards for protection, maintenance, use and disposal of these properties. Please visit……………

Cultural heritage due diligence will be required for any proposed project on MOI land with the potential to impact cultural heritage resources, such as new building construction, installation/modification of site services, landscape modifications and installation/maintenance of new pipelines, transmission lines.

To support MOI’s heritage and MOI PW Class EA obligations, proponents will be required to undertake cultural heritage assessments for all projects that require MOI lands. This will help to determine if the MOI lands are of cultural value or interest to the Province and the level of heritage significance. Where a property has heritage value, proponents may be required to develop appropriate conservation measures/plans and heritage management plans.

You, as the proponent, are strongly encouraged engage IO heritage staff as early in your project planning process as possible and in advance of beginning any cultural heritage assessment work. IO staff will be able to provide advice on the S&Gs and will provide any available heritage information for the MOI lands.

Proponents must also follow industry procedures and practices for all components of cultural heritage assessment work, all reporting criteria and formatting, and any other requirements and/or obligations. IO heritage staff can help identify any required reports.

Should MOI lands be identified under the S&Gs as a Provincial Heritage Property (local significance) or a Provincial Heritage Property of Provincial Significance, IO must be engaged to determine next steps.

Please note that if a Provincial Heritage Property of Provincial Significance is to be impacted, it is likely that consent from the Minister, Ontario Minister, Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) will be required prior to access being granted to MOI lands. Minister’s consent requires a detailed application and approvals should land dispositions or building demolitions be applied for as part of the proposed project.

As the proponent, you are expected to ensure that your project timelines include adequate time and resources to address MOI’s heritage due diligence obligations, including internal government approvals. All costs associated with meeting MOI’s heritage obligations are the responsibility of the proponent.

Staff contacts……..
May 8, 2017 (EMAIL ONLY)

Veronica Restrepo,
Transportation Engineer
HDR
255 Adelaide Street West
Toronto, ON M5H 1X9
E: veronica.restrepo@hdrinc.com

RE: MTCS file #: 0004362
Proponent: York Region
Subject: Notice of Study Commencement (July 2016) and Notice of Open House #1 (November 2016)
16th Avenue: Study A between Yonge Street and Woodbine Ave;
Study B: Between Woodbine Ave and York/Durham Line
Location: Town of Richmond Hill and City of Markham

Dear Ms Restrepo

Thank you for providing the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) with the Notices of Commencement and Open House #1 for this project. We apologize for our late reply; however we take this opportunity to provide our comments and recommendations. MTCS’s interest in this Environmental Assessment (EA) project relates to its mandate of conserving Ontario’s cultural heritage, which includes:

- archaeological resources, including land-based and marine
- built heritage resources, including bridges and monuments and
- cultural heritage landscapes.

We note that the Open House display panels available on the project website make no mention of cultural heritage resources or how they will be considered in evaluating project alternatives. Under the EA process, the proponent is required to determine a project’s potential impact on cultural heritage resources.

**Considerations of Cultural Heritage Resources**

While some cultural heritage resources may have already been formally identified, others may be identified through screening and evaluation. Aboriginal communities may have knowledge that can contribute to the identification of cultural heritage resources, and we suggest that any engagement with Aboriginal communities includes a discussion about known or potential cultural heritage resources that are of value to these communities. Municipal Heritage Committees, historical societies and other local heritage organizations may also have knowledge that contributes to the identification of cultural heritage resources.

**Archaeological Resources**

This EA project may impact archaeological resources and you should screen the project with the MTCS Criteria for Evaluating Archaeological Potential to determine if an archaeological assessment is needed. MTCS archaeological sites data are available at archaeology@ontario.ca. If this EA project area exhibits archaeological potential, then an archaeological assessment (AA) should be undertaken by an
archaeologist licenced under the OHA, who is responsible for submitting the report directly to MTCS for review.

**Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes**
The MTCS Criteria for Evaluating Potential for Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes should be completed to help determine whether this EA project may impact cultural heritage resources. The Clerks or heritage planning staff for the Town of Richmond Hill and the City of Markham can provide information on property registered or designated under the Ontario Heritage Act. Municipal Heritage Planners can also provide information that will assist you in completing the checklist.

If potential or known heritage resources exist, MTCS recommends that a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), prepared by a qualified consultant, should be completed to assess potential project impacts. Our Ministry's Info Sheet #5: Heritage Impact Assessments and Conservation Plans outlines the scope of HIAs. Please send the HIA to MTCS and the municipal heritage planning staff for review, and make it available to local organizations or individuals who have expressed interest in review.

**Environmental Assessment Reporting**
All technical heritage studies and their recommendations are to be addressed and incorporated into EA projects. Please advise MTCS whether any technical heritage studies will be completed for this EA project, and provide them to MTCS before issuing a Notice of Completion. If your screening has identified no known or potential cultural heritage resources, or no impacts to these resources, please include the completed checklists and supporting documentation in the EA report or file.

Thank you for consulting MTCS on this project. Please continue to do so through the EA process, and contact me for any questions or clarification.

Sincerely,

Rosi Zirger
Heritage Planner
rosi.zirger@ontario.ca