



**Municipal
Engineers
Association**

**MUNICIPAL CLASS EA PROCESS
ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT**

October 2016

*Prepared by the Municipal Engineers Association
in consultation with the
Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Part 1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Background Re: Municipal Class EA Parent Document	1
1.3 Approved Municipal Class EA.....	2
1.3.1 Conditions of Approval.....	3
1.3.2 Municipal Class EA Training Sessions	4
1.4 Development of Municipal Class EA Process Monitoring Program	5
1.4.1 Study of Organization and Approach.....	5
1.4.2 Issues/Considerations.....	5
Part 2. MUNICIPAL CLASS EA PROCESS MONITORING PROGRAM.....	9
2.1 Monitoring Program Framework	9
2.1.1 Commitments Already Included in the Municipal Class EA.....	10
2.1.2 What Is To Be Monitored	10
2.1.3 Who Is Undertaking The Monitoring	11
2.1.4 Tools For Collecting Data	11
2.1.5 Monitoring Framework	12
2.2 Implementation and Schedule	12
2.3 Annual Report	12
2.4 Program Administration	12
Part 3. ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT - SEPTEMBER 2014.....	18
3.1 Development of Monitoring Report	18
3.2 Responses from Proponent Municipalities	18
3.3 Responses from Technical Agencies and Key Stakeholders	19
3.4 MOECC Compliance Audit	19
3.5 Creep of Scope of the MCEA Process.....	22
3.6 MCEA Companion Guide.....	22
3.7 New Regulation - Exempt Pre-Approved Projects from part II Order Requests..	22
3.8 Delegate Part II Order Requests.....	22
3.9 OMB and Part II Order Requests for Integrated Projects	23
3.10 Annual Meeting of the MEA Class EA Monitoring Committee and Recommendations	24
3.11 Success of Municipal Class EA	28
3.11.1 Use of Municipal Class EA.....	28
3.11.2 Compliance with Requirements	28
3.11.3 Effectiveness to Meet EA Act Objectives.....	29
3.11.4 Conclusions	30
3.12 Success of Monitoring Program.....	30
3.13 Amendments to the Municipal Class EA.....	30
3.14 Inquiries/Responses.....	30
Appendix A Proposed Minor Amendment	
Appendix B PIOR Summary	

PART 1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The “parent” Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) enables the planning of municipal infrastructure to be undertaken in accordance with an approved procedure designed to protect the environment. The Class EA approach to addressing with municipal infrastructure projects has demonstrated to be an effective way of complying with the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act (EA Act) through nearly 30 years of application. It provides:

a reasonable mechanism for proponents to fulfill their responsibilities to the public for the provision of municipal services in an efficient, timely, economic and environmentally responsible manner;

a consistent, streamlined and easily understood process for planning and implementing infrastructure projects; and

the flexibility to tailor the planning process to a specific project taking into account the environmental setting, local public interests and unique project requirements.

Municipalities undertake hundreds of infrastructure projects. The Class EA process provides a decision-making framework that enables the requirements of the EA Act to be met in an effective and predictable manner. The alternatives to a parent Class EA would be: to undertake individual environmental assessments for all municipal projects; for each municipality to develop their own class environmental assessment process; and/or, for municipalities to obtain exemptions. These alternatives would be extremely onerous, time consuming and costly. Over nearly three decades of experience have demonstrated that considerable public, economic and environmental benefits are achieved by applying the Class EA concept to municipal infrastructure projects.

The Municipal Class EA dated June 2000 was approved with conditions by Order of Cabinet on October 4, 2000. An amendment, to the Class EA, was approved on November 5th, 2007. Condition #4, of the original approval, requires that a Municipal Class EA Monitoring Program be further defined and implemented. The Municipal Class EA Monitoring Program was prepared by the Municipal Engineers Association (MEA) through discussions with the Ministry of the Environment (MOECC) and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) for submission to the Director of the MOECC - Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch (EAAB) and submitted by October 4, 2001 for approval.

Part 1 of this report provides information regarding the parent document and the development of the Monitoring Program prior to describing the actual program in Part 2.

1.2 BACKGROUND RE: MUNICIPAL CLASS EA PARENT DOCUMENT

It is important to understand the history of the Municipal Class EA parent document since this in turn has affected the nature of the Monitoring Program. Section A.1.2 of the Municipal Class EA Parent Document provides a good review with the key points summarized herein.

On April 9, 1987, the first Municipal Class EA parent documents, prepared by MEA on behalf of proponent Ontario Municipalities, were approved under the EA Act. At that time, two Class EAs were to address: i) municipal road projects, and, ii) municipal water and wastewater projects.

In 1993, the Municipal Class EAs were reviewed, determined to be working well, updated and their approval extended until May 31, 1998.

In 1997, the MEA in conjunction with the MOECC-EAAB commenced the Municipal Class EAs Renewal Project that is described in Section A.1.2.4 of the approved Municipal Class EA. From comments received since the Municipal Class EAs were first approved, and during the Renewal Project, many municipalities, MOECC and other key stakeholders have indicated that the process has, and is still working well. This was also borne out through the stakeholder survey done during the 1998 review which included a questionnaire distributed to over 1370 stakeholders, of which 85 completed the questionnaire and returned it to MEA.

Consequently, it was recognized that much had been achieved over the years of working with and refining the Municipal Class EAs and therefore a wholesale change in the process was neither necessary nor appropriate. Therefore, the underlying principle in the review and updating of the Municipal Class EAs was to maintain the substance of the existing process while making any necessary changes.

Through the Renewal Project, the Class EAs for municipal roads and water and waste water projects were consolidated into one document and updated. The Municipal Class EA parent document is broad in scope given its application to a variety of projects being undertaken by numerous proponents across the province. As a result, first and foremost, the Municipal Class EA provides the framework for EA planning of municipal infrastructure projects to fulfil the requirements of the EA Act. It establishes principles and certain minimum mandatory requirements and has been set-up as a proponent-driven self-assessment process which is sufficiently flexible to allow different proponents to meet the needs of specific projects while ensuring that the requirements of the EA Act are met. While the Municipal Class EA defines the minimum requirements for environmental assessment planning, the proponent is encouraged to and is responsible for customizing the process to reflect the specific complexities and needs of a project.

In 2005, the five year review identified a number of issues. These were addressed through three amendments to the Municipal Class EA. In summary, these amendments included:

- a minor amendment which addresses a number of housekeeping issues;
- a major amendment which creates a new sub-class of activities (Schedule A+) and reorganizes the classification of certain activities; and
- a new chapter which expands the scope of the Class EA to include municipal transit projects.

These amendments were approved on September 6th, 2007.

During 2010 and 2011, MEA worked with MOECC to rewrite Section A.2.9 - Integration with the Planning Act. On August 17th, 2011, the Minister approved an amended Section A.2.9 and a consolidated document has been printed.

1.3 APPROVED MUNICIPAL CLASS EA

The Municipal Class EA was approved with conditions on October 4, 2000 by Order in Council No. 1923/2000. It should be noted that the approval is open-ended with the result that there is added responsibility for both MEA and MOECC to ensure the continued effectiveness and compliance of the Municipal Class EA parent document under the EA Act.

The conditions of approval that apply specifically to the Monitoring Program are discussed in Section 1.3.1.

1.3.1 CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Condition of Approval #4 states that:

The proponents, or the Municipal Engineers Association on behalf of the proponents, shall work to further define and implement a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Monitoring Program. Details of this Program and its implementation shall be developed by the proponents, and/or the Municipal Engineers Association acting on behalf of the proponents and approved by the Director of the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch of the Ministry of the Environment. These details shall be submitted to the Director of the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch for approval within one year of the date of this approval. Yearly Monitoring Reports will be submitted to the Director of the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch commencing two years after the date of this approval and then every year thereafter. In order to ensure compliance with the Class environment assessment process and the implementation of the projects under the Class process, the monitoring program shall provide clear documentation of how the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment is consistent with Class Environmental Assessment program objectives.

In addition, Condition of Approval 33 requires that a review of the Municipal Class EA be undertaken every five years from the date of its approval “in order to ensure that the environmental assessment is still compliant with legislative requirements and planning practices and continues to satisfy the purpose of the Environmental Assessment Act”.

Consequently, the following time line has been identified:

October 4, 2000 - Municipal Class EA approved.
October 4, 2001 - MEA to Submit details of proposed Monitoring Program to MOECC-EAAB
October 4, 2002 - MEA to Submit yearly Monitoring Report to MOECC-EAAB
October 4, 2003 - MEA to Submit yearly Monitoring Report to MOECC-EAAB
October 4, 2004 - MEA to Submit yearly Monitoring Report to MOECC-EAAB
October 4, 2005 - MEA to Submit yearly Monitoring Report and 5 Year Review
2006 and 2007 - Work focussed on amendments
September 2008 - MEA submitted yearly Monitoring Report
September 2009 - MEA submitted yearly Monitoring Report
September 2010 - MEA submitted yearly Monitoring Report
September 2011 - MEA submitted yearly Monitoring Report
October 2012 - MEA submitted Monitoring Report and 5 Year Review
2013 - Work focussed on amendments.
September 2014 – MEA submitted yearly Monitoring Report
September 2015 – MEA submitted yearly Monitoring Report
October 2016 – MEA to submit yearly Monitoring Report

1.3.2 Municipal Class EA Training Sessions

Following the approval of the amendment to the Municipal Class EA in 2011, MEA hosted online training sessions. The purpose of the sessions was to provide an overview of the changes to Section A.2.9.

MEA has developed web based training modules that are available on a new MCEA web site.

Also a one day training workshop was held in Toronto in April 2014 and will be repeated October 2014. MEA now presents training workshops regularly.

1.4 DEVELOPMENT OF MUNICIPAL CLASS EA PROCESS MONITORING PROGRAM

1.4.1 Study of Organization and Approach

The Municipal Class EA Process Monitoring Program was developed by the MEA Monitoring Committee in consultation with MOECC-EAAB and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH).

McCormick Rankin Corporation and Ecoplans Ltd were retained by MEA to assist in preparing the Monitoring Program.

The basic steps in the process were:

- review of Conditions of Approval of the Order in Council

- review key issues and considerations including purpose of “monitoring”, what has been done in the past, what are other proponents currently doing, commitments already in place, and available tools for collecting data;

- develop basic approach and prepare draft framework;

- July 24, 2001 meeting with MOECC-EAAB to review basic approach and draft framework. MOECC indicated that the basic approach in general was acceptable.

- expand draft framework (with additional background information and explanatory notes and incorporate comments from MOECC) to become the “Draft Monitoring Program”;

- September 12, 2001 meeting with the MEA Monitoring Committee, MOECC-EAAB and MMAH to review draft Monitoring Program; and,

- revise and submit to the Director of the MOECC-EAAB by October 4, 2001. Once submitted to MOECC-EAAB, there may be some further discussions between MEA and MOECC which may result in minor refinements to the document.

1.4.2 Issues/Considerations

The following issues and considerations were taken into account during the development of the Monitoring Program.

1.4.2.1 Definition of “Monitoring”

The purpose of the Monitoring Program is to monitor the overall parent Class EA process in the broad sense and not to audit specific projects for compliance in terms of process or technical issues. As discussed with MOECC, not only does the auditing of specific projects go beyond the scope of the Conditions of Approval by Order in Council, MEA has neither the legal authority nor the means to monitor any municipality in the province. The results of the Monitoring Program, however, may be of use for MOECC for consideration in project-specific auditing that maybe undertaken by the province.

The purpose, therefore, is to monitor the use, compliance and effectiveness of the Municipal Class EA process as outlined in the parent document. This is discussed further in Part 2.

1.4.2.2 What Has Been Done In The Past

In the past, MEA has not been required to monitor the use and effectiveness of the Municipal Class EA on an ongoing basis. As explained in Section 1.2, however, a review of the Municipal Class EA process was undertaken each time the Class EA approval was renewed.

It should be noted that MOECC's review of bump-up requests for specific projects was and is a form of compliance monitoring. Accordingly, it was recognized that, in the future, the conclusions of the MOECC's review of Part II Order requests would be useful input to the Monitoring Program.

1.4.2.3 What Are Other Proponents Doing

Other proponents of parent Class EA documents have, or are in the process of, developing monitoring programs. The only monitoring program now approved was developed by the Ministry of Transportation (MTO), in consultation with MOECC. MTO's monitoring program was reviewed by MEA in terms of MTO's approach, the tools for collecting information and the format of MTO's document. MTO's Monitoring Program is based on the premise that monitoring must be done on a Class EA overview basis and that the intent is not to undertake either a scientific or project EA compliance monitoring program.

It is recognized, however, that there are fundamental differences between MTO and MEA, for example:

- MTO is the key proponent for their projects and consequently has control over the use of their parent Class EA;
- MTO has "in-house" staff and resources to implement their Monitoring Program; and
- MTO's new Class EA was changed substantially from their previous Class EA document. In essence, MTO developed a new approach for their Class EA which is principal-based, not prescriptive. Consequently, MTO's Monitoring Program has been developed to monitor the "effectiveness" of this new approach. This is different from the Municipal Class EA process which has already been proved to be effective and working well from many years of use and based on the results of previous comprehensive reviews.

1.4.2.4 Administration/Implementation Issues Associated With MEA

MEA is unique among proponents of parent Class EAs. Unlike other proponents, who have the ability to control the use of their Class EA and the projects carried out under their particular Class EA, the Municipal Class EA is used by all municipalities in Ontario as well as the private sector. MEA is a volunteer organization and does not have the mandate or any legal authority over its member municipalities or any others. Furthermore, not all municipalities are members of MEA.

As a result, the actual implementation of a monitoring program for the Municipal Class EA is a major consideration for MEA. Therefore, a monitoring approach has been developed which:

- uses the tools available to MEA;

- relies on input from both MEA and MOECC; and
- relies on the professional expertise and judgment of experienced EA practitioners.

This approach is considered to be reasonable given that the Municipal Class EA has been used for many years and has been proved to be effective and working well.

1.4.2.5 Other

Other points raised during discussions with MOECC are noted below:

- *Ability to quantify the number of Schedule 'A' projects carried out under the Municipal Class EA* - The Schedule 'A' classification (i.e. pre-approved) is used extensively by all municipalities with some estimating that approximately 90% of projects/activities undertaken by a typical municipality are likely Schedule 'A' because they generally entail maintenance and operational activities for existing facilities. The number of Schedule 'A' projects can not accurately be measured since the Schedule 'A' classification could apply not only to projects but programs as well. Given that Schedule 'B' and 'C' projects have greater potential for environmental effects, Notices of Completion are now required to be sent to MOECC for the record. A question, however, has been added to the questionnaire for proponent municipalities of the Municipal Class EA parent document, to obtain information as to the percentage of the municipalities project/activities which are considered to be Schedule 'A'.
- *Ability to monitor the application of the Class EA requirements to the private sector* - The private sector is subject to the EA Act for Schedule 'C' projects servicing residential land use. As a result, private sector proponents would be required to submit copies of their Notice of Completion to MOECC for these projects.
- *Auditing of specific projects* - This is outside of the scope of the Order in Council approval. Furthermore, there is no legal authority for MEA to audit municipalities.
- *Compliance monitoring of specific project activities* - MOECC has advised that, while this is not part of the Municipal Class EA Process Monitoring Program, in the future MOECC will be addressing this as an initiative to be carried out by MOECC.
- *Clarification of the reference in the last sentence of Condition of Approval #4 "... and the implementation of the projects under the Class process..."* - M. Harrison, formerly with MOECC, participated in the drafting of the Conditions of Approval and confirmed that this is referring to the ability to quantify the order of magnitude of projects being implemented under the Class EA process. To this end, proponents are to submit Notices of Completion for Schedule 'B' and 'C' projects and, memos re: Master Plans and the Integrated Approach to MOECC for the record.

1.4.2.6 Conclusion

The results of the review undertaken by MEA and their consultants, and the discussions with MOECC and MMAH, were taken into consideration when developing the Monitoring Program. It is key to recognize that the Municipal Class EA parent document can be used by a multitude of proponents over which MEA has no authority. MEA membership is limited to individuals licenced to practice engineering in Ontario and who are full time Municipal employees. Not all Ontario Municipalities have employees who are members of MEA and no proponents (municipalities or private) are members of MEA. The Monitoring Program, which is outlined in Part 2, has been developed in consideration of this.

1.4.2.7

Since beginning the annual monitoring program, MEA has been circulating paper questionnaires to gather data from stakeholders. Beginning in 2014, data is gathered using an internet based electronic survey tool.

PART 2. MUNICIPAL CLASS EA PROCESS MONITORING PROGRAM

The purpose of the program is to provide the means to:

- ensure that Conditions of Approval #3 and #4 by Order in Council are fulfilled;
- ensure that the Municipal Class EA process is continuing to work well and be effective, and, is in accordance with legislative and regulatory requirements;
- determine if the new “Integrated Approach” is being applied and is working well;
- identify any potential trends or issues to be considered by MEA; and
- identify necessary changes to the parent Class EA document over time.

2.1 MONITORING PROGRAM FRAMEWORK

The Monitoring Program has been developed taking into consideration the following:

- the Conditions of Approval #3 and #4 by Order in Council for the Municipal Class EA parent document;
- the purpose of the Monitoring Program as defined above;
- recognition that the renewed Municipal Class EA maintains the substance of the process which has been used successfully since 1987 and which MEA, MOECC and other key stakeholders agree has and continues to work well and be effective;
- recognition that the Municipal Class EA process is used by a multitude of independent proponents over which MEA does not have authority;
- focus is on monitoring on the Municipal Class EA process in the broad sense and not the auditing of specific projects or compliance monitoring of specific project activities;
- commitments already made in the Municipal Class EA; and
- discussions with MOECC-EAAB.

The framework is provided in Table 2. An input to this table, however, the following sections describe:

- the commitments already in place;
- what is to be monitored; and
- proposed tools for collecting data.

2.1.1. Commitments Already Included In The Municipal Class EA

During the 1998 review of the previous Municipal Class EA, it was determined that it would have been useful if data had been more readily available with respect to the number of Schedule 'B' and 'C' projects carried out following the Municipal Class EA process. Consequently, it was concluded that proponents should submit a copy of their Notices of Completion for Schedule 'B' and 'C' projects to MOECC-EAAB. This in turn would provide a record of the Schedule 'B' and 'C' projects undertaken within the province. This approach was also applied to Master Plans and the integrated approach whereby proponents are to advise MOECC by a memo upon completion of an applicable project.

Accordingly, the following commitments were included in the Municipal Class EA parent document:

- Notice of Completion for a Schedule 'B' or 'C' project to be sent to MOECC-EAAB (Section A.1.5.1);
- MEA to meet with MOECC-EAAB on an annual basis to review Notices received;
- memo to be prepared by a proponent of a Master Plan briefly summarizing how the Master Plan followed Class EA requirements. Memo to be copied to MOECC-EAAB (see Section A.2.7.2 of Municipal Class EA);
- memo to be prepared by a proponent for a specific project following the "Integrated Approach", and submitted to MOECC-EAAB summarizing their application of the "Integrated Approach" (see Section A.2.9.3 of Municipal Class EA); and
- commitment by MEA to monitor the "Integrated Approach" by meeting annually with MOECC and MMAH (see Section A.2.9.3 of Municipal Class EA)

2.1.2 What Is To Be Monitored

It is proposed to monitor the use, compliance and effectiveness of the Municipal Class EA as follows:

Use - Level of use of the Municipal Class EA as reported to MOECC-EAAB, where use refers to number of Schedule 'B' and 'C' projects, Master Plans and projects which followed the integrated approach.

Compliance - Does the Municipal Class EA continue to meet the requirements of it's EA Act approval and the conditions of that approval?

Effectiveness - How effective is the Municipal Class EA in meeting the requirements of the EA Act and MOECC Class EA program objectives? MOECC Class EA program objectives include:

- assessment of environmental effects;
- consultation;
- documentation of decision making;
- streamlined approvals; and self assessment.

2.1.3 Who Is Undertaking The Monitoring

The Monitoring Program will be carried out by the MEA Municipal Class EA Monitoring Committee with input from MOECC and MMAH. The Chair of the MEA Committee will be responsible for implementing the Monitoring Program, receiving information, interpreting it, preparing the Annual Monitoring Report and reviewing it with MOECC and MMAH.

2.1.4 Tools For Collecting Data

The Monitoring Program will maximize the use of tools already in place, available information from MOECC, and the obtaining of information from the proponent municipalities, technical agencies and key stakeholders. The following tools are proposed:

- Summary of notices/memos to MOECC re: Schedule 'B' and 'C' projects, Master Plans and Integrated Approach. Not only will this serve to identify the order of magnitude of Schedule 'B' and 'C' projects completed in a year, it will also provide the basis for comparing the number of projects which receive Part II Order requests to the number of projects for which a Part II Order request is granted. Table 1 provides a sample matrix of how this data could be summarized.
- Summary of number of projects receiving Part II Order requests; number of requests granted or denied; associated rationale - i.e. process versus technical issue.
- Questionnaire for those municipalities who are proponents of the Municipal Class EA parent document (referred to as "proponent municipalities") to:
 - identify any problems experienced with the Municipal Class EA;
 - determine level of satisfaction with the continued effectiveness of the process;
 - identify any process-related issues, and
 - ask if the process continues to be effective.
- Questionnaire for government review agencies (i.e. technical regulatory/commenting agencies) to:
 - determine agency's degree of involvement/participation in the Municipal Class EA process;
 - identify any problems experienced with the process;
 - identify any potential process-related issues as they relate to the agency's mandate; and
 - ask if the process continues to be effective.
- Questionnaire for key stakeholders including:
 - Consulting Engineers of Ontario (CEO)
 - Ontario Professional Planners Institute (OPPI)
 - Urban Development Institute (UDI)
 - Regional Planning Commissioners

- Annual meetings of the MEA Class EA Monitoring Committee with MOECC-EAAB and MMAH to review the information collected and its interpretation.

2.1.5 Monitoring Framework

Table 2 presents the framework for the Municipal Class EA Process Monitoring Program. It outlines:

- what will be monitored;
- what indicators will be used;
- how the indicators will be measured; and
- how the data will be collected.

2.2 IMPLEMENTATION AND SCHEDULE

Implementation of the Monitoring Program is a key consideration since it requires input from MEA, MOECC and MMAH. Therefore, a 12 month calendar has been prepared, as provided in Table 3, to demonstrate the time line to collect data, review and interpret the information and submit the Annual Report. This Monitoring Program will be carried out by the MEA Monitoring Committee under the direction of the Chair of the Committee. MOECC has been invited to participate on the Committee.

2.3 ANNUAL REPORT

A summary report will be prepared annually and submitted to the Director of the MOECC-EAAB. It will summarize the findings regarding use, compliance and effectiveness of the municipal Class EA process as discussed previously and identified in Table 2. It will then present an overview of process-related observations about the Municipal Class EA in terms of its continuing effectiveness in meeting MOECC Class EA program objectives. Commencing in 2002, the Annual Reports will be due by October 4.

2.4 PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

Over time, certain adjustments may be required to this Monitoring Program. Recommendations in terms of what is and is not working with the Monitoring Program, particularly with respect to the relevance and/or level of detail of the data that are collected, and program costs, for example, will be included in the Annual Report as appropriate. Flexibility is desirable to permit refinements to the program as necessary as it evolves and agreed to by MEA and MOECC.

TABLE 2 - SAMPLE MATRIX FOR SUMMARIZING NOTICES OF COMPLETION RECEIVED BY MOECC AND PART II ORDER DATA

Municipality	Projects with Notice of Completion Submitted to MOECC		Projects which Received Part II Order Request	Part II Order Granted	Rationale if Granted		Rationale if Denied		Other
	B's	C's			Process Issue	Technical Issue	Process Issue	Technical Issue	
Municipality 'A'									
Project1	✓		No	--	--	--	--		
2		✓	Yes	No	--	--	--	✓	
3		✓	Yes	No	--	--	--	✓	
4	✓		No	--	--	--	--	--	
5	✓		No	--	--	--	--	--	
etc									
TOTAL									

**TABLE 2 - FRAMEWORK FOR
MUNICIPAL CLASS EA MONITORING PROGRAM**

What will be Monitored	What Indicators Will be Used	How Measured	How Will Data be Collected	Other Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of Municipal Class EA process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use of Municipal Class EA process as represented by number of projects reported to MOECC including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule 'B' projects • Schedule 'C' projects • Master Plans • projects which followed the Integrated Approach 	Numerical summary of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no. of Schedule 'B' and 'C' projects for which copy of Notice of Completion provided to MOECC-EAAB • no. of Master Plans • No. of projects which followed Integrated Approach • designation requests 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MEA to summarize Notices of Completion sent to MOECC-EAAB (see Table 1 for sample matrix) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compliance of municipal proponents for Municipal Class EA, or MEA on their behalf, with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conditions of Approval for parent Class EA document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fulfilment of Conditions of Approval for parent Class EA document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • describe how fulfilled 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MEA Monitoring Committee to review status of requirements for each Condition of Approval for the parent Class EA and document if they have been fulfilled and, if not, when and how they will be. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compliance with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class EA process requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • general assessment of representative projects as to whether they are in compliance with the approved process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • compare number of Part II Orders granted because of process issue to number of projects reported to MOECC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • review Minister's rationale for Part II Orders being denied or granted and identify if process-related • review questionnaire responses for applicable comments/information 	

**TABLE 2 - FRAMEWORK FOR
MUNICIPAL CLASS EA MONITORING PROGRAM**

What will be Monitored	What Indicators Will be Used	How Measured	How Will Data be Collected	Other Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness of Municipal Class EA process in meeting requirements of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) EA Act ii) Class EA Program objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued ability of Municipal Class EA process to meet statutory requirements of EA Act. • continued ability of Municipal Class EA process to meet generic/ broad Class EA program objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • assessment of environmental effects • consultation • documentation of decision-making 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identify any changes to EA Act including regulations and determine implications to Municipal Class EA • summary of Minister's rationale for granting Part II Orders • information received at annual MEA meeting • discussions with MEA Monitoring Committee and MOECC-EAAB • feedback from training sessions 		

**TABLE 2 - FRAMEWORK FOR
MUNICIPAL CLASS EA MONITORING PROGRAM**

What will be Monitored	What Indicators Will be Used	How Measured	How Will Data be Collected	Other Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • streamlined approvals • self-assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no. of projects which would otherwise be individual EAs • qualitative assessment of Part II Order review process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • summary of Notices of Completion sent to MOECC • questionnaire responses from proponent municipalities • questionnaire responses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identify potential changes, enhancements, trends to be considered
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • effectiveness of Integrated Approach (see Section A.2.9 of Municipal Class EA document) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • qualitative review of memos sent to MOECC-EAAB and information received • qualitative review of questionnaire responses • qualitative review of related Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) decisions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • memos sent to MOECC-EAAB • discussions with MEA, MOECC and MMAH • questionnaire responses • feedback from MMAH re: OMB decisions regarding municipal infrastructure. 	

TABLE 3 - 12 MONTH CALENDAR

Date	MEA	MOECC	MMAH
January 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> send questionnaires to proponent municipalities, government review agencies and other key stakeholders requesting information by March 1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> co-ordinate MOECC Regions' response to questionnaire 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> co-ordinate MMAH's response to questionnaire and collection of information pertaining to the Integrated Approach
February 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feb 1 to May 1 - MEA summarizes information received from MOECC re: Notices of Completion and Part II Order requests 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> provide MEA with summary or copies of previous year's Notices of Completion and any memos re: Master Plans and the Integrated Approach received by MOECC provide summary of projects which received Part II order requests and Minister response letters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> provide information about Integrated Approach to MEA
March 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Receive questionnaires from proponent municipalities, agencies and other key stakeholders Review/interpret questionnaire responses 		
April 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> arrange annual meeting of Monitoring Committee to be held by June 30) complete draft Annual Monitoring Report 		
May 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> circulate draft Annual Monitoring Report to MEA Monitoring Committee and MOECC/MMAH 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> review draft Annual Monitoring Report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> review draft Annual Monitoring Report
June 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> hold annual meeting by June 30 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> attend meeting and provide comments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> attend meeting and provide comments
July 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> July 1 to Sept 1 - revise report 		
August 1			
September 1			
October 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> submit report to Director of MOECC-EAAB for approval by October 4 		
November 1			
December 1			

PART 3. ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT - SEPTEMBER 2016

3.1 DEVELOPMENT OF MONITORING REPORT

In the spring of 2016 Proponent Municipalities, Technical Agencies and other Key Stakeholders identified in the Monitoring Program were asked to complete an electronic survey. In 2013-2014, stakeholders provided extensive feedback for the annual monitoring and as part of the major amendment consultation. Stakeholders were advised that this feedback has been recorded and need not be repeated in the 2016 survey. The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change was also asked to provide a summary of the Notices of Completions and Part II Order requests which they had received.

The data gathered through the survey was summarized and on June 10, 2016 the MEA Municipal Class EA Monitoring Committee met and reviewed the responses. Comments from this meeting were then incorporated and the draft Monitoring Report was prepared. The report was circulated to all Committee members for review before it was submitted to the Ministry of the Environment in October 2016.

3.2 RESPONSES FROM PROPONENT MUNICIPALITIES

Noteworthy comments from the responses are:

Prior

- Notices of Completion are not always being sent to EAAB;
- sometimes difficulty selecting project schedule;
- 90% noted trend of increasing effort;
- 90% interested in examining ways to control increased effort;
- some concern that agencies do not respond in a timely manner;
- schedules which include both transit and road projects;
- sometimes MOECC staff is not correct in their interpretation of project schedules;
- challenge for MOECC staff to provide clear and solid advice as they are so far removed;
- standby power in new building - Schedule A or existing building - Schedule A+ seem to be reversed;
- the public can highjack a project by broadcasting misleading information;
- approvals are often too slow;
- time for the Minister's decision on a Part II Order Request is unacceptably long.

2016

- better clarity regarding road diets;
- Project A13 (reconstruct a weir) should not be schedule A;
- MCEA is not streamlined - PIOR decision process is unacceptable; and
- better guidance for First Nation consultation would be helpful.

3.3 RESPONSES FROM TECHNICAL AGENCIES AND KEY STAKEHOLDERS

Prior

Noteworthy comments from the responses are:

- MCEA is 25 years old and has a number of amendments but now needs to be re-written;
- MOECC should reassess how to integrate all environmental programs to create a seamless system to ensure the environmental effects are identified and mitigated before projects proceed;
- MTO would like to discuss active transportation further with MEA;
- heritage issues are not always properly addressed - lengthy comment;
- first nations consultation guidance should be improved;
- public and agencies are not notified of amendments and training modules;
- MEA should partner with Ministries to promote better FN consultation and the Species at Risk;
- RCCAO comments also attached;
- proponent's consultation with First Nations sometimes not adequate;
- proponents not always circulating notices as required;
- the public feels that the time for the Minister's decision on a Part II Order Request is unacceptably long;

2016

- Regional EA Coordinators suggest proponents be provided with better guidance material for First Nation consultation; and
- MTC seeking better implementation of Heritage requirements.

3.4 MOECC COMPLIANCE AUDIT

The following is a sample of the type of concerns that have been raised with MOECC in the past. No new information was available for 2016.

Project Name	Process Related Issue/Concern	Outcome
Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Municipal Servicing Strategy Master Plan - SWM Pond	No Aboriginal consultation was completed	PIOs were denied, and conditions imposed to require state 2 arch. Assessment, Aboriginal consult, and stopping work in event that artifacts/remains found.
Strasburg Road Extension	A segment of the road extension to the north was not included in the scope of the Class EA	As part of its review, the ministry examined the issue and determined it had no concerns, and this segment met the requirements of the Class EA at that time.
Wabagishik Rapids and Marter GS	Inadequate consultation with requesters and first nations	Some gaps in consultation record with FNs, additional info was provided by proponents in follow up. Public and Agency consultation deemed to be adequate.

Project Name	Process Related Issue/Concern	Outcome
Duffin Creek	Requester felt that proponents were not picking the appropriate solution - felt that lakewide water quality concerns were not being addressed by preferred approach.	Decision not yet made; but felt that undertaking was proposed to address a specific problem (capacity limitations and mixing of effluent) as opposed to algae growth and potential limits to amount of phosphorus in plant effluent.
Dundas Sewage Pumping Station	Requester felt that one of the projects proposed by the master plan highly impacted the natural environment. Felt that project should be eliminated from further study at the master plan stage as it would negate the remainder of the solutions identified by the master plan (as opposed to being further studied as a schedule C once master plan complete.	PIIO cannot be made for a master plan. Proponent encouraged to consult with regional MOECC office during schedule C planning; requesters advised that they may submit PIIO request for schedule C project.
Second Avenue Sudbury	Regional EA coordinator not sent project notices as per class EA. No project file completed.	Part II orders dismissed; proponent advised to complete project file and re-issue notice of completion.
Haig Street and Station Road	FN community were inadequately consulted - their territory was adjacent to study area, and traditional territory within study area - believe that archaeological remains may be present and impacted by project.	Proponent directed to send archaeological assessments and project documentation to requester FN, resolution of concerns ongoing.
Hope Side Road Schedule C	Conservation area did not have the opportunity to comment on the draft ESR	The MCEA does not require the proponent to provide review agencies with the opportunity to comment on the draft ESR. Ministry staff were satisfied that the City met consultation requirements of the Class EA
	Concerned that the City adjusted its study area during the project planning - concerned that it reflects poor methodology to assess the alternatives.	City expanded its study area to assess other routes. The ministry was satisfied that the alternatives were adequately assessed.

Project Name	Process Related Issue/Concern	Outcome
Queen Street bike configuration Schedule B. *This Project falls under Schedule A+. Due to public interest the proponent decided to plan the Project under the Schedule B requirements	Residents on perpendicular streets were not notified of the project in the same manner as residents living along Queen Street.	Public notices were advertised and mailed out to property owners abutting Queen Street and any interested stakeholders. The ministry was satisfied that the City met all consultation requirements.
	If the City decides to revert back to the original configuration, the Class EA process would need to be reopened.	The ministry was satisfied that the City will follow the appropriate process under the Class Environmental Assessment if a reversal of the Project was to occur.

Generally, proponents are complying with the MCEA. However, proponents need to properly complete First Nations consultation and provide notices.

3.5 CREEP OF SCOPE OF THE MCEA PROCESS

During 2013 and 2014, various groups (Peel, RCCAO, BILD, Consultants) approached MEA complaining that the scope of preparing a MCEA had, over the years, expanded and they are seeking changes that would reduce the time/cost of preparing a MCEA for a Schedule B or C project. The various groups had different ideas about what should change to accomplish the improvements to the MCEA. MEA decided to bring the various stakeholders together and organized a meeting on April 17, 2014 with this idea as the central topic. At the meeting MEA commented that it was changes to the practices and expectations that were needed not amendments to the MCEA document. This continues to be an issue and Water Tap is the most recent organization to support changes to the current practices.

3.6 MCEA COMPANION GUIDE

MEA is developing an MCEA Companion Guide that would provide useful tips for proponents and illustrate minimum requirements with examples. This Guide would provide practical advice on satisfying the minimum requirements for Schedule A+, B and C projects with real life examples. It will focus on satisfying the minimum requirements for Advertising/Consultation, the EA process including investigation into options and detailed design and Documentation (Schedule A+, B and C) but then explain when additional work could be considered.

To date the following sections have been prepared.

3.7 NEW REGULATION - EXEMPT PRE-APPROVED PROJECTS FROM PART II ORDER REQUESTS

In 2011, MEA learned of a new MOECC legal interpretation that Part II Order Requests would be considered on pre-approved projects (Schedule A and A+). This is a significant change to 25 years of practice and MEA considers correcting this loophole to be a high priority.

MOECC has explained that a new regulation to exempt projects with a low environmental impact (Schedule A and A+) from Part II Order Requests is being planned. However, completing this regulation is not a high priority with senior staff at MOECC as there has not been a history of Part II Order Requests for these types of projects. MEA remains very concerned with the new interpretation that permits a Part II Order Request on Pre-approved projects. MEA takes little comfort in the fact that this has not been a problem to date and strongly encourages MOECC to be proactive and proceed with the regulation. MEA has written to the Minister and is asking other stakeholders to join in lobbying for prompt adoption of this regulation. MEA remains disappointed with the lack of action by MOECC.

3.8 DELEGATE PART II ORDER REQUESTS

MEA continues to recommend that decisions related to Part II Order Requests be delegated to the Director so that decisions can be rendered in a timely manner.

MEA presented data which illustrated that in 2013 the Minister took anywhere from 148 to 581 days (with an average of 304 days) to respond and deny a request for a Part II Order. All 28 requests that were processed in 2013 were denied and only 4 of the denials included any conditions. After reviewing the letters denying the Part II Order Requests, MEA believes that the majority of the requests had little merit and should have been processed and denied in a timely manner. Similar data in 2014 shows that the Ministry's performance is worse with an average time for a decision increasing to 347. These excessive delays in approvals are unnecessarily

holding up key infrastructure projects increasing costs (which is absorbed by Ontario's taxpayers) and slowing growth and economic development. Equally important are the multitude of projects where a delay of a year just cannot be accepted and the proponents are forced to make poor and/or expensive decisions to avoid a Part II Order Request even though the concern really does not have merit. The MCEA requires the Ministry to process Part II Order requests in 66 days (45 days for the EAA branch and 21 days for the Minister) and MEA has written several times to the Minister to strongly encourage the Ministry to improve their review process. Furthermore, MEA strongly believes that the authority for decisions on Part II Order Requests for the MCEA must be delegated to the Director. The authority for these requests related to other Class EAs has been delegated and we note a considerable improvement in the time for a decision (for example, the Forest Class EA has averaged 128 days for a response over the last 5 years). MEA has written to the Minister and is asking other stakeholders to join in lobbying for delegation. Municipalities, MEA, the public and other stakeholders all agree that the timeframe of a Minister's decision is unacceptable and MEA remains disappointed with the lack of action by MOECC.

3.9 OMB AND PART II ORDER REQUESTS FOR INTEGRATED PROJECTS

MEA continues to seek a removal of double jeopardy with respect to Integrated projects and were subject to the OMB but not a Part II Order Request. To review the history of the integrated process:

- i) In 2000, the MCEA was amended to include A.2.9 to Integrate with Planning Act - no provision for Part II Orders;
- ii) Summer 2010, MOECC is lobbied by the Development community who and provides \$100,000 to MEA to update A.2.9; Concurrently, MOECC legal decides Part II Order Requests can be submitted on Integrated Projects;
- iii) Summer 2011, MEA reluctantly submits amendments to A.2.9 making it clear that the double jeopardy must be removed;
- iv) Over the past 5 years, MEA has participated in a number of conference calls with MOECC and RCCAO, a new regulation has been mentioned but no solution.

MEA is frustrated working to improve A.2.9 only to find out that MOECC's new interpretation of the legislation means proponents face the double jeopardy of both an appeal to the OMB and a Part II Order Request. Earlier MOECC had indicated that a regulation, similar to the proposed regulation to address Part II Order Requests on pre-approved projects, is possible so that integrated projects only faced appeals to the OMB. However, MOECC now advises that such a regulation is not being considered. Instead MOECC suggested that, if MEA could demonstrate that selected types of integrated projects (for example collection roads in subdivisions) were of low environmental risk these specific types of integrated projects could be included in the regulation proposed to deal with Part II Order Requests on pre-approved projects. No action has progressed on this issue.

3.10 ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MEA CLASS EA MONITORING COMMITTEE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

**Annual MOECC – MEA Meeting
Monitoring of the MCEA
Agenda with Notes from the Meeting
Friday June 10th, 2016**

- 1) Feedback from Stakeholders
Little new feedback, general agreement that better First Nations guidance is required. Proponents question that MCEA is streamlined.

- 2) MOECC Compliance Audit
MOE did not have any updated data.

- 3) MCEA Companion Guide (“Text from last year”)

“MEA is developing an MCEA Companion Guide that would provide useful tips for proponents and illustrate minimum requirements with examples. This Guide would provide practical advice on satisfying the minimum requirements for Schedule A+, B and C projects with real life examples. It will focus on satisfying the minimum requirements for Advertising/Consultation, the EA process including investigation into options and detailed design and Documentation (Schedule A+, B and C) but then explain when additional work could be considered.

It would likely be similar to the guidance documents that have been prepared by other Class EA proponents for internal use by their staff while they prepare their Class EA projects. MEA would be pleased to review this guidance document with MOECC but formal MOECC approval would not be required.”

MEA will continue to prepare helpful sections.

- 4) AFT/P3 Projects (“Text from last year”)

“Brant County and Town of Erin are planning projects following a streamlined model where the final MCEA approval will provide flexibility so the project could be constructed as a AFP/P3 project.

Brant County Schedule C projects (expand water and wastewater plants) are now underway. It is anticipated that the final ESR focus on impacts to the environment but will contain limited design details so maximum flexibility is available during detailed design/construction and a design build construction model could be used. There is interest in the technical reviewer’s comments when the ESR only includes limited details. MEA will be reporting on the success of this pilot project when complete in early 2016.”

Project did not proceed as envisioned. No report will be prepared.

- 5) New Regulation - Exempt Pre-Approved Projects From Part II Order Requests (“Text from last year”)

“In 2011, MEA learned of a new MOECC legal interpretation that Part II Order Requests would be considered on pre-approved projects (Schedule A and A+). This is

a significant change to 25 years of practice and MEA considers correcting this loophole to be a high priority.

MOECC has explained that a new regulation to exempt projects with a low environmental impact (Schedule A and A+) from Part II Order Requests is being planned. However, completing this regulation is not a high priority with senior staff at MOECC as there has not been a history of Part II Order Requests for these types of projects. MEA remains very concerned with the new interpretation that permits a Part II Order Request on Pre-approved projects. MEA takes little comfort in the fact that this has not been a problem to date and strongly encourages MOECC to be proactive and proceed with the regulation. MEA has written to the Minister and is asking other stakeholders to join in lobbying for prompt adoption of this regulation. MEA remains disappointed with the lack of action by MOECC.”

MEA’s position remains

6) Delegate Part II Order Requests (“Text from last year”)

“MEA continues to recommend that decisions related to Part II Order Requests be delegated to the director so that decisions can be rendered in a timely manner.

MEA presented data which showed that in 2013 the Minister took anywhere from 148 to 581 days (with an average of 304 days) to respond and deny a request for a Part II Order. All 28 requests that were processed in 2013 were denied and only 4 of the denials included any conditions. After reviewing the letters denying the Part II Order Requests, MEA believes that the majority of the requests had little merit and should have been processed and denied in a timely manner. Similar data in 2014 shows that the Ministry’s performance is worse with an average time for a decision increasing to 347. These excessive delays in approvals are unnecessarily holding up key infrastructure projects increasing costs and slowing growth and economic development. Equally important are the multitude of projects where a delay of a year just cannot be accepted and the proponents are forced to make poor and/or expensive decisions to avoid a Part II Order Request even though the concern really does not have merit. The MCEA requires the Ministry to process Part II Order requests in 66 days (45 days for the EAA branch and 21 days for the Minister) and MEA has written several times to the Minister to strongly encourage the Ministry to improve their review process. Furthermore, MEA strongly believes that the authority for decisions on Part II Order Requests for the MCEA must be delegated to the Director. The authority for these requests related to other Class EAs has been delegated and we note a considerable improvement in the time for a decision (for example, the Forest Class EA has averaged 128 days for a response over the last 5 years). MEA has written to the Minister and is asking other stakeholders to join in lobbying for delegation. Municipalities, MEA, the public and other stakeholders all agree that the timeframe of a Minister’s decision is unacceptable MEA remains disappointed with the lack of action by MOECC.”

MEA’s position remains. See attached regarding this year’s denial letters. 21 days – must be political assistance. Interestingly there were only 10 denials compared with approximately 25 other years. How many PIORs are in the que?

7) OMB and Part II Order Requests For Integrated Projects (Text from last year)

“MEA continues to seek a return to when Integrated Projects did not face double

jeopardy for integrated projects and were subject to the OMB but not a Part II Order Request. To review the history of the integrated process:

- i) In 2000, the MCEA was amended to include A.2.9 to Integrate with Planning Act - no provision for Part II Orders;
- ii) Summer 2010, MOECC is lobbied by Developer groups and provides \$100,000 to MEA to update A.2.9; At the same time, MOECC legal decides Part II Order Requests can be submitted on Integrated Projects;
- iii) Summer 2011, MEA reluctantly submits amendments to A.2.9 making it clear that the double jeopardy must be removed;
- iv) Over past 3 years, MEA has participated in a number of conference calls with MOECC and RCCAO, a new regulation has been mentioned but no solution.

MEA is frustrated working to improve A.2.9 only to find out that MOECC's new interpretation of the legislation means proponents face the double jeopardy of both an appeal to the OMB and a Part II Order Request. Earlier MOECC had indicated that a regulation, similar to the proposed regulation to deal with Part II Order Requests on pre-approved projects, might be possible so that integrated projects only faced appeals to the OMB. However, MOECC now advises that such a regulation is not being considered. Instead they suggested that, if MEA could demonstrate that selected types of integrated projects (for example collection roads in subdivisions) were of low environmental risk these specific types of integrated projects could be included in the regulation proposed to deal with Part II Order Requests on pre-approved projects."

MEA's position remains

- 8) Cycling Amendment

Amendment should be promoted.

- 9) Minister's Review of EA Permitting – Request for Review

RCCAO is preparing an Application for Review of the MCEA process, in particular PIIOR process. There is wide spread support from OSWCA and the GTSWCA, ORBA, OGRA, OCIS, OGCA, CELA

- 10) Auditor General

MEA provided considerable information to the Auditor General about the PIIOR process.

- 11) Minor Amendment – Appendix A

Minor amendment should proceed just to clean up discrepancies and improve the format of Schedule 1. MOECC suggested that other minor corrects could also be included.

12) Major Amendment Appendix A

Should we consider filing another Major Amendment to change project schedules and to include new project types (post disaster repairs, pilot or temporary projects).

3.11 SUCCESS OF MUNICIPAL CLASS EA

3.11.1 Use of Municipal Class EA

The Municipal Class EA is extensively used by municipalities as the approved mechanism for their sewer, water and road projects. This process is particularly important for the Schedule A projects which represent up to 95% of a municipalities work. The streamlining and consistence approach described in the Class EA are important advantages.

The survey of proponent municipalities confirm the successful use of the Municipal Class EA. However, concerns have been raised that the process is transitioning to become too onerous and time consuming.

3.11.2 Compliance with Requirements

To comply with all requirements, the proponent municipalities or the MEA on their behalf, must ensure the Conditions of Approval for the parent Class EA documents are satisfied. The following indicates how these conditions have been met.

- 1) *The proponent municipalities, or the MEA on behalf of the proponent municipalities, and any other municipalities or developers for whose works the environmental assessment has been prepared, shall comply with the provisions of the Environmental Assessment all of which are incorporated herein by reference, except as provided in these conditions and as approved in any other approvals under the Environmental Assessment Act and any other statute.*

Municipalities are complying with the provisions of the Environmental Assessment Act.

- 2) *This Municipal Class Environment Assessment replaces the Class Environment Assessment for Municipal Water and Wastewater Projects and the Class Environmental Assessment for Municipal Road Projects, approved pursuant to Order-in-Council No. 836/87 and 837/87 respectively, under the Environmental Assessment Act.*

Condition has been fulfilled.

- 3) *A review of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment shall be undertaken by the proponents, or the Municipal Engineers Association on behalf of the proponents, every five years from the date of this approval in order to ensure that the environmental assessment is still compliant with legislative requirements and planning practices and continues to satisfy the purpose of the Environmental Assessment Act. The proponents, or the Municipal Engineers Association on behalf of the proponents, will provide, by letter, the Director of the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch, the results of the review. This review will include a summary of any issues and amendments that may arise during the review period and will include a detailed account of how the issues and amendments will be addressed, for approval by the Director of the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch. Any revisions, additions or updates can be made using the amending procedure prescribed in the environmental assessment.*

A Review of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment has been considered but is not proceeding because the Minister has announced he will review the entire EA Permitting process.

- 4) *The proponents, or the Municipal Engineers Association on behalf of the proponents, shall work to further define and implement a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Monitoring Program. Details of this Program and its implementation shall be developed by the proponents, and/or the Municipal Engineers Association acting on behalf of the proponents and approved by the Director of the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch of the Ministry of the Environment. These details shall be submitted to the Director of the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch for approval within one year of the date of this approval. Yearly Monitoring Reports will be submitted to the Director of the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch commencing two years after the date of this approval and then every year thereafter. In order to ensure compliance with the Class Environment Assessment process and the implementation of the projects under the Class process, the monitoring program shall provide clear documentation of how the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment is consistent with Class Environmental Assessment program objectives.*

This report satisfies this condition.

- 5) *Following approval of this Class Environmental Assessment, the proponents, or the Municipal Engineers Association on behalf of the proponents, shall incorporate the editorial comments proposed during the review period in the Municipal Class Environment Assessment, as outlined in their letter dated April 23, 1999, and prepare copies of the revised text. Copies of the revised text of the approved Class Environmental Assessment shall be made available by the Municipal Engineers Association no later than 60 days after the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Thirty (30) printed copies of the revised text are to be provided to the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch of the Ministry of the Environment.*

Editorial comments have been incorporated and the 30 printed revised copies have been provided.

There is successful compliance of the Municipal Class EA with all requirements.

3.11.3 Effectiveness to Meet EA Act Objectives

The Municipal Class EA continues to meet the statutory requirements of the EA Act. However, a change to the EA Act or regulations is required to remove the loophole that allows for consideration of a Part II Order Request on a pre-approved project. A review of the questionnaires and of the Minister's decision relating to Part II Orders, confirms that the Municipal Class EA continues to meet the broad Class EA program objectives. The Municipal Class EA streamlines the planning process for municipalities, particularly for Schedule A projects, avoiding the individual EA requirements for thousands of municipal projects. The MOECC's detailed review of selected projects (Part II Order requests) confirms that generally municipalities correctly apply the Class EA's self assessment.

The Municipal Class EA is successful in meeting the objectives of the EA Act.

3.11.4 Conclusions

The Municipal Class EA is successfully used by municipalities to comply with the requirements of the EA Act and effectively meet the broad objective of the Act to protect the environment. The available information supports the conclusion that the Municipal Class EA is successful.

3.12 SUCCESS OF MONITORING PROGRAM

The Monitoring Program has resulted in the preparation of this Annual Report. This Annual Report describes the success of the Municipal Class EA and satisfies the condition of approval. The MOECC, proponent municipalities and other stakeholders were cooperative and provided worthwhile input.

3.13 AMENDMENTS TO THE MUNICIPAL CLASS EA

The purpose of the Annual Monitoring Report is to document and comment on the success of the Municipal Class EA. To continue as a successful process, the Municipal Class EA should be amended when appropriate to address the needs of the proponents and stakeholders.

Amendments to the MCEA were approved in October 2015. A further minor and major amendment is currently being contemplated.

3.16 INQUIRIES/RESPONSES

The new MCEA web site www.municipalclassea.ca provides a forum where proponents or the public may submit inquiries. A listing of inquiries and responses can be found on this website.

APPENDIX A

PROPOSED MINOR AMENDMENT

WASTEWATER

Activity	A	A+	B	C
Maintenance	<p>A1 Normal or emergency operational activities (see Glossary definition for Operation). Such activities may include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • modify, repair, reconstruct existing facilities to provide operational, maintenance or other improvements such as reducing odour, insulating buildings to reduce noise levels and conserve energy, landscaping • on-going maintenance activities • normal operation of sewage treatment plants • installation of new service connections, catchbasins and appurtenances from existing sewers • maintenance and/or minor improvements to grounds and structures • addition or minor buildings, sheds and equipment and materials storage areas • repairs, cleaning, renovations or replacement of sewage treatment facilities, pumping plant equipment or outfalls • cleaning, relining, repairs and renovations to existing sewage collection system • installation or replacement of standby power equipment where new equipment is located within an existing building or structure. 			

Activity	A	A+	B	C
Maintenance	A4 Install chemical or other process equipment for operational or maintenance purposes in existing sewage collection system or existing sewage collection system or existing sewage treatment facility.			
Collection System	A10 Establish, extend, or enlarge a sewage collection system and all necessary works to connect the system to an existing sewage outlet, where it is required as a condition of approval on a site plan, consent plan of subdivision or plan of condominium which will come into effect under the Planning Act prior to the construction of the collection system.	A+1 Establish, extend or enlarge a sewage collection system and all necessary works to connect the system to an existing sewage or natural drainage outlet, provided all such facilities are in either an existing road allowance or an existing utility corridor, including the use of Trenchless Technology for water crossing.	B1 Establish, extend or enlarge a sewage collection system and all works necessary to connect the system to an existing sewage outlet where such facilities are not in an existing road allowance or an existing utility corridor.	C1 Construct new sewage system, including outfall to receiving water body and/or a constructed wetland for treatment.
Pumping Station	A2 Increase pumping station capacity by adding or replacing equipment where new equipment is located within an existing building or structure and where the existing rated capacity is not exceeded.	A+3 Increase pumping station capacity by adding or replacing equipment and appurtenances, where new equipment is located in an existing building or structure and where its existing rated capacity is exceeded.	B7 Construct new pumping station or increase pumping station capacity by adding or replacing equipment and appurtenances, where new equipment is located in a new building or structure.	

Activity	A	A+	B	C
Treatment Plant	<p>A3 Expand / refurbish / upgrade sewage treatment plant including outfall up to existing rated capacity where no land acquisition is required.</p> <p>A5 Provide additional treatment facilities in existing lagoons, such as aeration, chemical addition, post treatment, including expanding lagoon capacity up to existing rated capacity, provided no land acquisition nor additional lagoon cells are required.</p> <p>A6 Expansion of the buffer zone between a lagoon facility or land treatment area and adjacent uses where the buffer zone is entirely on the proponent's land.</p> <p>A7 Dispose of, utilize, or manage biosolids on an interim basis (e.g. further treatment in drying beds, composting, temporary holding at transfer stations), at:</p> <p>a) An existing sewage treatment plant where the biosolids is generated, or</p> <p>b) An existing landfill site, incinerator or organic soil conditioning site, where the biosolids is to be utilized or disposed of.</p> <p>A8 Establish a new biosolids organic soil conditioning site.</p>	<p>A+5 Modify, retrofit, or improve a retention / detention facility including outfall or infiltration system for the purpose of stormwater quality control. Biological treatment through the establishment of constructed wetlands is permitted.</p>	<p>B4 Establish sewage flow equalization tankage in existing sewer system or at existing sewage treatment plants, or at existing pumping stations for influent and/or effluent control.</p> <p>B5 Add additional lagoon cells or establish new lagoons, or install new or additional sewage storage tanks at an existing sewage system, where land acquisition is required but existing rated capacity will not be exceeded.</p> <p>B6 Establish biosolids management facilities at:</p> <p>a) A sewage treatment plant where the biosolids were not generated.</p> <p>b) An existing landfill site, incinerator or organic soil conditioning site where the biosolids are not to be disposed of nor utilized.</p> <p>B8 Expand sewage treatment plant, including relocation or replacement of outfall to receiving water body, up to existing rated capacity where new land acquisition is required.</p>	<p>C2 Construct new sewage treatment plant or expand existing sewage treatment plant beyond existing rated capacity including outfall to receiving water body.</p> <p>C3 Establish new lagoons or expand existing lagoons or install new or additional sewage storage tanks which will increase beyond existing rated capacity.</p> <p>C4 Provide for land application of sewage effluent through spray irrigation system or overland flow.</p> <p>C5 Establish a new biosolids landfill site or new biosolids incineration site for purposes of biosolids disposal.</p> <p>C6 Establish a new transfer station or new storage lagoon not located at a sewage treatment plant, incinerator, landfill site, or organic soil conditioning site, for purposes of biosolids management.</p> <p>C11 Construct a new sanitary or combined sewage retention / detention facility at a new location.</p>

Activity	A	A+	B	C
Treatment Plant	<p>A9 Increase sewage treatment plant capacity beyond existing rated capacity through improvements to operations and maintenance activities only, but without construction of works to expand modify or retrofit the plant or the outfall to the receiving the water body, with no increase to total mass loading to receiving water body as identified in the Certificate of Approval.</p> <p>A19 Installation or replacement of standby power equipment where new equipment is located in a new building or structure.</p>	<p>A+4 Installation or replacement of standby power equipment where new equipment is located in an existing building or structure.</p>	<p>B9 Increase sewage treatment plant capacity beyond existing rated capacity through improvements to operations and maintenance activities only but without construction of works to expand, modify or retrofit the plant or the outfall to the receiving water body where there is an increase to total mass loading to the receiving water body as identified in the Certificate of Approval.</p> <p>B11 Communal sewage systems (new or expanded) with subsurface effluent disposal subject to approval under Section 53 of the Ontario Water Resources Act.</p> <p>B13 Expansion of the buffer zone between a lagoon facility or land treatment area and adjacent uses, where the buffer zone extends onto lands not owned by the proponent.</p> <p>B25 A new holding tank that is designed for the total retention of all sanitary sewage disposed into it and requires periodic emptying.</p>	
<p>A19 is inconsistent with A+4 and both of these conflict with our clarification which states: CLARIFICATION – INSTALLATION OR REPLACEMENT OF STANDBY POWER EQUIPMENT Proponents are reminded that despite the following clauses in Appendix I; Schedule A+ 4) Installation or replacement of standby power equipment where new equipment is located in an existing building or structure. Schedule B 9) Installation or replacement of standby power equipment where new equipment is located in a new building or structure. that under Ont. Reg. 116/01 - Installation or replacement of standby power equipment where new equipment is located in a new building or structure is exempt from the EA Act if the equipment is a generation facility within the meaning of O. Reg. 116/01, is constructed for the purpose or providing electricity to the site where the generation facility is located in the event of a failure of a distributor to deliver electricity to the site, and is carried out by Her Majesty in Right of Ontario, a municipality or a public body as defined in the Environment Assessment Act.</p> <p>SOLUTION - delete both A19 and A+4 and replace with a note under A stating “O. Reg. 116/01, provides for an exception from the EA Act for standby power that is constructed for the purpose or providing electricity to the site where the generation facility is located in the event of a failure of a distributor to deliver electricity to the site.”</p>				

Activity	A	A+	B	C
Stormwater Management	<p>A11 Establish new or replace or expand existing stormwater detention / retention ponds or tanks and appurtenances including outfall to receiving water body provided all such facilities are in either an existing utility corridor or an existing road allowance where no additional property is required.</p> <p>A17 Construction of stormwater management facilities which are required as a condition of approval on a consent, site plan, plan of subdivision or condominium which will come into effect under the Planning Act prior to the construction of the facility.</p>		<p>B2 Establish new stormwater retention / detention ponds and appurtenances or infiltration systems including outfall to receiving water body where additional property is required.</p> <p>B3 Enlarge stormwater retention / detention ponds / tanks or sanitary or combined sewage detention tanks by addition or replacement, at substantially the same location where additional property is required.</p> <p>B21 Construct a stormwater control demonstration or pilot facility for the purpose of assessing new technology or procedures.</p> <p>B24 Establish stormwater infiltration system for groundwater management.</p>	<p>C7 Construct new or modify, retrofit or improve existing retention / detention facility or infiltration system for the purpose of stormwater quality control where chemical or biological treatment or disinfection is included, including outfall to receiving water body.</p>
Water Course	<p>A12 Replace traditional materials in an existing watercourse or in slope stability works with material of equal or better properties, at substantially the same location and for the same purpose.</p> <p>A13 Reconstruct an existing dam weir at the same location and for the same purpose, use and capacity.</p>		<p>B14 Water crossing by a new or replacement sewage facility except for the use of Trenchless Technology for water crossings.</p> <p>B15 Construct berms along a watercourse for purposes of flood control in areas subject to damage by flooding.</p>	<p>C8 Construction of a diversion channel or sewer for the purpose of diverting flows from one watercourse to another.</p> <p>C9 Construct new shore line works, such as off-shore breakwaters, shore-connected breakwaters, groynes and sea walls.</p>

Activity	A	A+	B	C
Water Course	<p>A16 Roadside ditches, culverts and other such incidental stormwater works constructed solely for the purpose of servicing municipal road works.</p>		<p>B16 Modify existing water crossings for the purposes of flood control.</p> <p>B17 Works undertaken in a watercourse for the purposes of flood control or erosion control, which may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • bank or slope regrading • deepening the watercourse • relocation, realignment or channelization of watercourse • revetment including soil bio-engineering techniques • reconstruction of a weir or dam <p>B18 Construction of a spillway facilities at existing outfalls for erosion or sedimentation control.</p> <p>B19 Construct a fishway or fish ladder in a natural watercourse, expressly for the purpose of providing a fishway.</p> <p>B20 Enclose a watercourse in a storm sewer.</p> <p>B22 Reconstruct existing weir or dam at the same location where the purpose, use and capacity are changed.</p> <p>B23 Removal of an existing weir or dam</p>	<p>C10 Construct a new dam or weir in a watercourse.</p>

Activity	A	A+	B	C
Miscellaneous	<p>A14 Expand, improve or modify existing patrol yards, equipment and material storage facilities, maintenance facilities and parking lots for service vehicles, where no land acquisition is required.</p> <p>A20 Expansion, improvement or modification to existing patrol yard equipment or material storage facilities and maintenance facilities where land acquisition is required provided project conforms to Planning Act requirements and with municipal and other requirements.</p> <p>A21 New service facilities (e.g. patrol yards, storage and maintenance facilities, parking lots for service vehicles) provided project conforms to Planning Act requirements and with municipal and other requirements.</p>		<p>B10 Expand, improve or modify existing patrol yards, equipment or material storage facilities and maintenance facilities where additional land acquisition is required.</p> <p>B12 New service facilities (e.g. patrol yards, storage and maintenance facilities, parking lots for service vehicles).</p>	
	<p><i>A14 is inconsistent with A20 is inconsistent with A 21 is inconsistent with B 10 is inconsistent with B12</i></p> <p><i>Solution - delete A14, B10 and B12 and combine A20 and A21 together in the Schedule A column that states “Establish new, or expand, improve or modify an existing patrol yard, equipment or material storage facility or maintenance facility provided project conforms to Planning Act requirements and with municipal and other requirements.</i></p>			

Activity	A	A+	B	C
<p>Miscellaneous</p>	<p>A18 – Any project which would otherwise be subject to this Class EA and has fulfilled the requirements outlined in Section A.2.9 of this Class EA and for which the relevant Planning Act documents have been approved of have come into effect under the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990 Chapter P.13, as amended</p> <p><i>A18 is inconsistent with Section A.2.9 of the MCEA</i></p> <p><i>Solution – delete A18</i></p> <p>A15 Sewage projects planned and approved under Ontario Regulation 586/06 (see Section A.2.10.4 of Municipal Class EA.</p>	<p>A+2 Retire a facility which would have been planned under Schedule A or Schedule A+ of the Municipal Class EA for its establishment (see Glossary definition of Retirement).</p> <p>A+6 Retire a facility which would have been subject to either Schedule B or C of the Municipal Class EA for its establishment (see Glossary definition of Retirement)</p> <p><i>A+2 is inconsistent with A+6</i></p> <p><i>Solution – combine A+2 and A+6 to state “Retire a facility which would have been planned under Schedule A+, B or C of the Municipal Class EA for its establishment (see Glossary Definition of Retirement).</i></p>		

WATER

Activity	A	A+	B	C
Maintenance	<p>A1 Normal or emergency operational activities (see Glossary definition of Operation). Such activities may include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • modify, repair, reconstruct existing facilities to provide operational, maintenance or other improvements such as reducing odour, insulating of buildings to reduce noise levels and conserve energy, landscaping • on-going maintenance activities • normal operation of water treatment plants • install new service connections, hydrants and appurtenances from existing watermains • maintenance and / or minor improvements to grounds and structures • addition of minor buildings, sheds and equipment and materials storage areas • repairs or cleaning of a well or intake • repairs and renovations to treatments and pumping plant equipment, water storage facilities, distribution mains and appurtenances • installation of corrosion protection systems • replacement of standby power equipment where new equipment is located within an existing building or structure • cleaning and / or relining existing watermains. 			

Activity	A	A+	B	C
Distribution System	<p>A6 Establish, extend or enlarge water distribution system and all necessary works to connect the system to an existing system where it is required as a condition of approval on a site plan, consent, plan of subdivision or plan of condominium which will come into effect under the Planning Act prior to the construction of the extension of the collection system.</p> <p>A8 New water systems for which an approval under the Safe Drinking Water Act is not required.</p> <p>A9 Replace/expand existing water storage facilities provided all such facilities are in either an existing road allowance or an existing utility corridor or where no land acquisition is required.</p>	<p>A+1 Establish, extend, or enlarge a water distribution system and all works necessary to connect the system to an existing system or water source, provided all such facilities are in either an existing road allowance or an existing utility corridor, including the use of Trenchless Technology for water crossings.</p>	<p>B1 Establish, extend or enlarge a water distribution system and all works necessary to connect the system to an existing system or water source, where such facilities are not in either an existing road allowance or an existing utility corridor.</p> <p>B9 Water crossing by a new or replacement water facility except for the use of Trenchless Technology for water crossings.</p>	<p>C1 Construct new water system including a new well and water distribution system.</p>
Treatment Plant/Wells	<p>A2 Increasing pumping station capacity by adding or replacing equipment where new equipment is located within an existing building or structure;</p> <p>A3 Install chemical or other process equipment, provide additional treatment facilities such as filtration, for operational or maintenance purposes, in existing treatment plants or in existing pumping stations.</p>	<p>A+4 Expand / refurbish / upgrade water treatment plant up to existing rated capacity where no land acquisition is required.</p>	<p>B2 Establish facilities for disposal of process wastewater (e.g. install sewer connection, construct holding pond, dewatering and hauling operations to disposal sites).</p> <p>B3 Expand existing water treatment plant including intake up to existing rated capacity where land acquisition is required.</p>	<p>C2 Construct a new water treatment plant or expand existing water treatment plant beyond existing rated capacity.</p> <p>C3 Establish a new surface water source.</p> <p>C4 Artificially recharge an existing aquifer from a surface water source for purposes of water supply.</p>

Activity	A	A+	B	C
Treatment Plant/Wells	<p>A4 Install new or replacement wells or deepen existing wells or increase pumping station capacity of existing wells, at an existing municipal well site, where the existing rated yield will not be exceeded.</p> <p>A5 Increase water treatment plant capacity intake through improvements to operations and maintenance activities only, but without construction of works to expand, modify or retrofit the plant, where the increase does not increase the limit in the Permit to Take Water.</p>		<p>B4 Increasing pumping station capacity by adding or replacing equipment and appurtenances where new equipment is located in a new building or structure.</p> <p>B6 Establish new or expand / replace existing water storage facilities.</p> <p>B8 Establish a well at a new municipal well site, or install new wells or deepen existing wells or increase pump capacity of existing wells at an existing municipal well site where the existing rated yield will be exceeded. If a new water system is also required, this will become a Schedule C project.</p> <p>B10 Increase water treatment plant capacity including new or expanded water intake beyond existing rated capacity through improvements to operations and maintenance activities only but without construction of works to expand, modify or retrofit the plant.</p> <p>B11 Replacement of water intake pipe for a surface water source.</p>	

Activity	A	A+	B	C
Treatment Plant/Wells	A12 Installation or replacement of standby power equipment located in a new building or structure.	A+3 Installation of new standby power equipment to an existing building or structure.		
	<p><i>A12 is inconsistent with A+3 and both of these conflict with our clarification which states: CLARIFICATION</i></p> <p><i>INSTALLATION OR REPLACEMENT OF STANDBY POWER EQUIPMENT</i></p> <p><i>Proponents are reminded that despite the following clauses in Appendix I; Schedule A+ 4) Installation or replacement of standby power equipment where new equipment is located in an existing building or structure. Schedule B 9) Installation or replacement of standby power equipment where new equipment is located in a new building or structure. that under Ont. Reg. 116/01 - Installation or replacement of standby power equipment where new equipment is located in a new building or structure is exempt from the EA Act if the equipment is a generation facility within the meaning of O. Reg. 116/01, is constructed for the purpose or providing electricity to the site where the generation facility is located in the event of a failure of a distributor to deliver electricity to the site, and is carried out by Her Majesty in Right of Ontario, a municipality or a public body as defined in the Environment Assessment Act.</i></p> <p><i>Solution – delete both A12 and A+3 and replace with a note under A stating “O. Reg. 116/01, provides for an exception from the EA Act for standby power that is constructed for the purpose or providing electricity to the site where the generation facility is located in the event of a failure of a distributor to deliver electricity to the site.”</i></p>			

Activity	A	A+	B	C
Miscellaneous	<p>A7 Expand, improve, or modify existing patrol yards, equipment or material storage facilities, maintenance facilities and parking lots for service vehicles where no land acquisition is required.</p> <p>A13 Expansion, improvement or modification to existing patrol yard equipment or material storage facilities and maintenance facilities where land acquisition if required provided project conforms to Planning Act requirements and with municipal and other requirements.</p> <p>A14 New service facilities (e.g. patrol yards, storage and maintenance facilities, parking lots for service vehicles) provided project conforms to Planning Act requirements and with municipal and other requirements.</p>		<p>B5 Expansions, improvements and modifications to existing patrol yards, equipment or materials storage facilities, and maintenance facilities where land acquisition is required.</p> <p>B7 New service facilities (e.g. patrol yards, storage and maintenance facilities, parking lots for service vehicles).</p>	
	<p><i>A7 is inconsistent with A13 is inconsistent with A14 is inconsistent with B5 is inconsistent with B7</i></p> <p><i>Solution – delete A7, B5 and B7 and combine A13 and A14 together in the Schedule A column that states “Establish new, or expand, improve or modify an existing patrol yard, equipment or material storage facility or maintenance facility provided project conforms to Planning Act requirements and with municipal and other requirements.”</i></p>			

Activity	A	A+	B	C
Miscellaneous	<p>A10 Projects planned and approved under Ontario Regulation 586/06 (see Section A.2.10.4 of the Municipal Class EA).</p> <p>A11 Any project which would otherwise be subject to this Class EA and has fulfilled the requirements outlined in Section A.2.9 of this Class EA and for which the relevant Planning Act documents have been approved or have come into effect under the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, Chapter P.13, as amended</p> <p>A11 is inconsistent with Section A.s.9 of the MCEA</p> <p>Solution – delete A22</p>	<p>A+2 Retire a water facility which would have been planned under Schedule A or Schedule A+ of the Municipal Class EA for its establishment (See Glossary definition of Retirement).</p> <p>A+5 Retire a water facility which would have been planned under Section B or C of the Municipal Class EA for its establishment (See Glossary definition of Retirement).</p> <p>A+2 is inconsistent with A+5</p> <p>Solution – combine A+2 and A+5 to state “Retire a facility which would have been planned under Schedule A+, B or C of the Municipal Class EA for its establishment (see Glossary definition of Retirement).</p>		

APPENDIX B
PIIOR SUMMARY

Proponent	Project Name	Type	Element Status	# Requestors	Request Submission Date	Decision Date	NoC Date
Central							
Toronto, City of	Investigation of Basement Flooding Area 2	Sewage Works	Part II Request Denied	1	09/12/2014	04/08/2015	20/11/2014
Toronto, City of	Port Union Road (Lawrence Avenue to Kingston Road)	Transportation	Part II Request Denied	4	15/09/2014	28/08/2015	14/08/2014
Burlington, City of	La Salle Park Marina Wave Break Study	Others	Part II Request Denied	3	26/08/2013	20/07/2015	04/07/2013
Durham, Regional Municipality of	Manning Road/ Adelaide Avenue Connection	Transportation	Part II Request Denied	1	24/04/2015	28/08/2015	19/03/2015
Oakville, Town of	Midtown Oakville Transportation and Stormwater Study	Transportation	Part II Request Denied	3	04/07/2014	19/06/2015	05/06/2014
Toronto, City of	Taylor-Massey Creek Restoration Master Plan	Resource	Part II: Project Closed	1	04/03/2015	19/03/2015	NA
Vaughan, City of	Steeles West Secondary Plan East SWM Pond	Sewage Works	Part II Request Withdrawn	1	04/05/2015	21/09/2015	NA
Oakville, Town of	Sixth Line from Dundas Street to Highway 407	Transportation	Part II Request Withdrawn	1	15/09/2014	31/03/2015	31/07/2014
Eastern							
Trent Hills, Municipality of	Campbellford Water System Upgrades	Water Works	Part II Request Denied	1	03/04/2015	17/11/2015	27/09/2014
Utilities Kingston	Portsmouth Pumping Station Flow Direction Study	Sewage Works	Part II Request Denied	1	11/09/2014	27/08/2015	12/08/2014
Belleville, City of	Station Street and Haig Road Extension	Transportation	Part II Request Withdrawn	1	23/01/2015	02/06/2015	NA
Northern							
Kenora, City of	Cameron Bay Sewer and Watermain Extension	Sewage Works	Part II Request Denied	1	13/08/2015	03/09/2015	17/05/2015
Thunder Bay, City of	Boulevard Lake Dam Rehabilitation Project	Others	Part II: Project Closed	2	15/04/2016	02/07/2015	23/04/2015
Greater Sudbury, City of	Second Avenue Infrastructure Improvements	Transportation	Part II: Project Closed	2	15/05/2014	06/02/2015	16/04/2014
Southwestern							
Goderich, Town of	Essex Street Sanitary Servicing	Sewage Works	Part II Request Denied	1	19/08/2015	23/12/2015	14/08/2015
West Central							
Cambridge, City of	Cambridge West Master Environmental Servicing Plan	Others	Part II Request Denied	3	15/04/2014	02/10/2015	21/03/2014
Hamilton, City of	Old Dundas Road Sewage Pumping Station Wet Weather Relief Master Plan	Sewage Works	Part II: Project Closed	6	10/11/2014	09/01/2015	17/10/2014
Niagara, Regional Municipality of	Rainbow Bridge Egress Improvements	Transportation	Part II Request Withdrawn	1	27/05/2014	24/04/2015	01/05/2014