



**Municipal
Engineers
Association**

**MUNICIPAL CLASS EA PROCESS
ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT**

October 2017

Recognizing 30 Years of Application

*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	4
1.4.1 Study of Organization and Approach	4
1.4.2 Issues/Considerations.....	4
Part 2. MUNICIPAL CLASS EA PROCESS MONITORING PROGRAM.....	8
2.1 Monitoring Program Framework	8
2.1.1 Commitments Already Included in the Municipal Class EA	9
2.1.2 What Is To Be Monitored	9
2.1.3 Who Is Undertaking The Monitoring	10
2.1.4 Tools For Collecting Data	10
2.1.5 Monitoring Framework	11
2.2 Implementation and Schedule	11
2.3 Annual Report	11
2.4 Program Administration	11
Part 3. ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT - SEPTEMBER 2014.....	17
3.1 Development of Monitoring Report	17
3.2 Responses from Proponent Municipalities	17
3.3 Responses from Technical Agencies and Key Stakeholders	18
3.4 MOECC Compliance Audit	19
3.5 Environmental Assessment Review.....	19
3.6 Creep of Scope of the MCEA Process.....	19
3.7 MCEA Companion Guide.....	20
3.8 New Regulation - Exempt Pre-Approved Projects from part II Order Requests..	20
3.9 Delegate Part II Order Requests.....	20
3.10 OMB and Part II Order Requests for Integrated Projects	21
3.11 Auditor General's Report and Recommendations	21
3.12 Climate Change	22
3.13 Annual Meeting of the MEA Class EA Monitoring Committee and Recommendations	22
3.14 Success of Municipal Class EA – Recognizing 30 Years of Application	24
3.14.1 Use of Municipal Class EA.....	24
3.14.2 Compliance with Requirements	24
3.14.3 Effectiveness to Meet EA Act Objectives.....	26
3.14.4 Conclusions	26
3.15 Success of Monitoring Program.....	26
3.16 Amendments to the Municipal Class EA.....	26
3.17 Inquiries/Responses.....	27
Appendix A MCEA Summary	
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). The year 2017 marks 30 years of its application in the planning of municipal infrastructure in Ontario. 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. A 2015 version of the document was issued to incorporate all approved amendments since 2011 including a number of amendments approved in October 2015.

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 submitted yearly Monitoring Report
October 2017 – MEA to submit a yearly Monitoring Report and a separate 5 Year Review

1.3.2 Municipal Class EA Training Sessions

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 the Spring of 2016. MEA is continuing to present training workshops regularly.

MEA is also retaining a consultant to refine and finalize the MCEA Companion Guide. The purpose of this document is to provide greater guidance to practitioners in plain language.

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 30 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 cannot 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. This was the means used to collect data for this report.

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.

- 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 2017 Proponent Municipalities, Technical Agencies and other Key Stakeholders identified in the Monitoring Program were asked to complete an electronic 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 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 2017.

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;
 - MCEA is not streamlined - PIOR decision process is unacceptable; and
 - better guidance for First Nation consultation would be helpful.
- 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 hijack 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.

2017

- delay in a Part II Order request decision resulted in cancellation of a project due to a budgetary restriction;
- all new municipal engineers should attend MCEA training
- Stormwater related projects require better definition in the schedules and leave a lot of room for interpretation, currently undertaking Schedule B for very minor projects
- Conservation Authorities charging significant fees for review of EAs, did not think this was allowable
- Processing of PIIO's must be accelerated
- Under Duty to Consult, proponents need direction on how to manage requests for capacity payments from aboriginal groups that are received well after the 30 day review period has expired
- Cost assumptions when determining which Class EA Road Schedule are poorly

- understood
- Minor water crossing relocations should be schedule A+ provided that approvals is required from conservation authority
- Difficult to differentiate the application of a schedule for wastewater vs stormwater project
- Need to streamline the process including permits/approvals
- Comments from MOECC staff during a study did not align with Minister's decision
- Sometimes consultants want to push for a lighter schedule while municipalities lean more towards the side of caution
- Part II Order Requests considered frivolous
- Need more project readiness information and strict time line with the submission requirements. Review time should be shortened.
- These topics to be included or elaborated during the study period:
 - Vulnerability and climate change adaptive measures
 - Recommends to update form the design and standards specification
 - Consistent with Asset Management implementation approaches and ISO standards
 - Apply limitations on project completion time after WA approved
- Stakeholders are overwhelmed with information and not able to understand how the project is going to impact them
- Agencies are aware they will be consulted any way during the permit process or during design for approvals or permits, hence except a few agencies, not all are interested to provide comments and not all have resources to meet comment time lines
- The EA process has a tendency to draw out those who simply wish to oppose a project or object to issues that are part of normal municipal construction/reconstruction (e.g. tree removal and replacement). We receive many such requests that would be characterized as frivolous.

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;

2017

- *Engineers need to understand that for most works stemming from municipal class EA within the area of the Niagara Escarpment Plan, development permits may be required*

- from the Niagara Escarpment Commission and those permits must be obtained before any other municipal or agency planning approvals*
- *Understanding of provincial planning policy and the new Provincial Plans (Niagara Escarpment Plan, Greenbelt Plan, Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, Growth Plan) and the role of provincial planning approvals*
 - *Concern with pre-screening for cultural heritage by providing a deficient CHER, identifying no cultural heritage value or interest thereby limiting their project to an A or A+*
 - *Project cost is not an appropriate basis for determining a project schedule, concerned about underlying archaeological resources*
 - *Bridge projects including rehabilitation and replacement need to be reminded of Municipal Heritage Bridge Cultural, Heritage and Archaeological Resources Assessment checklist*
 - Notification rarely hear from municipalities in the SW and NW, in some cases consultants fail to notify
 - Sometimes Notice of Completion is the first notice provided and is too late to provide meaningful input
 - Not sure if its MEA or MOECC (regional offices) have a role to play in monitoring notificaitons
 - Smaller municipalities often resist MTCS's recommendations to conduct AAs
 - Study documentation varies according to overall experience, qualifications and expertise
 - MEA homepage is inaccessible, need a login password to again access to the amendment
 - MTCS would appreciate the opportunity to clarify how to address the cultural heritage component within the EA process the MTCS expectations

3.4 MOECC COMPLIANCE AUDIT

No new information was available for 2017.

3.5 ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVIEW

The Fall of 2016, MEA and RCCAO (Residential and Civil Construction Alliance of Ontario) submitted a joint application to the MOECC requesting a review of the Environmental Assessment Act to identify issues and implement reforms needed to allow municipal proponents to complete studies in a more timely and effective manner. The application was prompted by the recommendations from the Ontario Auditor General's Value for Money audit. Spring of 2017 it was announced that the MOECC will be undertaking a review of the Environmental Assessment Act. It is anticipated that it will be completed by December 2018.

3.6 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. MEA recommends that this issue be considered as part of the Environmental Assessment review.

3.7 MCEA COMPANION GUIDE

MEA is developed an MCEA Companion Guide that would provide useful tips for proponents and illustrate minimum requirements with examples. This Guide, which was uploaded in December 2016, provides practical advice on satisfying the minimum requirements for Schedule A+, B and C projects with real life examples. It focuses 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 explains when additional work could be considered.

MEA sought and received comments from the MOECC on the draft Guide on January 12, 2016. On March 6, 2017, MOECC sent MEA a letter outlining issues with the document. Areas of concern include incorrect names of multiple provincial ministries and federal Canadian as well as a request to remove the Part II Order Request form. The comments received from the MOECC will be addressed in 2017. Furthermore, MEA is retaining the assistance of a consultant to refine and finalize the companion guide. However, a great deal of effort will not be expended in this regard as the MOECC will be undertaking a review of Environmental Assessment.

3.8 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 recommends that this issue be considered as part of the Environmental Assessment review.

3.9 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 recommends that this issue be considered as part of the Environmental Assessment review.

MEA presented data which illustrated that in 2016, the Minister took anywhere from 107 to 927 days (with an average of 445 days) to respond and deny a request for a Part II Order. The nine (9) requests that were processed in 2016 were denied with the exception of one (1), the Parkway Corridor in the City of Peterborough. Data indicates that the Ministry's performance is worse with an average time for a decision increasing from 347 in previous years to a current average of 445 days. 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. MEA would like timely decisions to be a key consideration in the recently announced EA reform process.

3.10 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 utilize the provisions in A.2.9 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 when 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 collector 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. MEA recommends that this issue be reviewed as part of the Environmental Assessment review.

3.11 AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

MEA has met with MOECC staff regarding the Auditor General's report and recommendations. Arising from those discussions was the need to raise awareness of the requirement to submit Notices of Commencement and Notices of Completion to the MOECC. As part of the preparation of this monitoring report, the question of submitting notices was raised and most respondents indicated that they were aware of this requirement and were submitting them to the MOECC.

Furthermore, respondents were asked if they felt a website where public and indigenous communities could access information on MCEA studies and their status would be beneficial. Those who responded indicated that they current post this information on their own website and did not feel a central website would be beneficial. Some indicated it would be duplication of effort.

As previously noted, the Auditor General's report prompted an application for and initiation of the review of the Environmental Assessment Act.

3.12 CLIMATE CHANGE

MOECC issued its Climate Change Guidance Document and met with MEA in early 2017 to discuss incorporating this document into the MCEA process. As part of the preparation of this monitoring report, the question of considering climate change impacts in MCEA studies was raised. Most respondent indicated that they do consider climate change impacts in their studies. Some also indicated that the detailed design is the correct stage to consider climate change.

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

**Notes From Meeting
Thursday June 15, 2017
135 St Clair Ave W. Toronto
3rd Floor Boardroom
9:30 – 11:00 am**

Present	Representing	Comments
Kathleen O'Neill	MOECC	Left at 10:30am
Annamaria Cross	MOECC	
Solange Desautels	MOECC	
Anne Cameron	MOECC	
Paul Knowles	MEA	
Lisa De Angelis	MEA	Note taker

Due to Director Hedley's time constraint, the agenda, as provided, was not followed to provide an opportunity to discuss specific issues with her present.

1) Contact for MCEA

MEA indicated that the current Chair of the MCEA Monitoring Committee, Paul Knowles, is retiring but will continue to be the contact until the end of 2018.

2) EA Review/Reform

MOECC has reviewed the Federal Government's proposed approach to update the Federal EA process i.e. including Impact Assessments, broadening the definition of environment, and consideration for cumulative effects. MOECC feels that the proposed approach, which is undergoing public consultation, aligns well with the Provincial approach in terms of the broad definition of environment. The Federal Government is preparing a discussion paper on the proposed approach to Federal EA and is anticipating its completion at the end of June. The Federal "Let's Talk EA" site which has been set up for receiving comments has been overwhelmed.

With respect to Federal EA reform, MOECC indicates that topics for discussion include consideration of climate change, consent from indigenous communities, a designated project list,

eco-systems approach and regional EA. MOECC is looking at using a “risk based” lens in any reform of Provincial EA.

MOECC is envisioning having a targeted round table discussion with experts and will be looking for assistance in compiling a list of invitees. Timing would be early September. A similar approach was taken with the EBR. MOECC would like some questions from our sector to feed into the discussion. There will be more discussion on this topic at the upcoming meeting of the EAPG.

3) Part II Order Requests

MOECC explained that new requirements to provide clarity related to Part II Order requests may be addressed in advance of EA Reform. The issues may include:

- Low impact/low risk Schedule A and A+ projects being subject to Part II (this includes daily operations of infrastructure) as requested by MEA;
- Information requirements for Part II Order requests; and
- March 6, 2017 letter from MOECC to MEA indicating that a Part II Order request may be submitted and considered at any time and a Part II Order may be issued at any time.

MEA expressed concern with the length of time for the ministry to review Part II Orders and wished for that to be reviewed. MEA expressed an interest in delegation of decision making.

MEA noted that the MOECC should give consideration to having a requirement that a PIIO requester must have participated in the Class EA process in order for their request to be considered.

MEA is concerned that Municipal Councils and Provincial Ministries, such as Ministry of Infrastructure, who make commitments to funding for infrastructure are not aware or informed that these undertakings could be subject to a Part II Order request at any time.

- 4) With respect to the Companion Guide Form that was discussed in the MOECC letter of March 6, 2017, MOECC indicated that only the Ministry can prescribe a form. However, if the form is optional to be used to assist a Part II Order request, then that is acceptable. MOECC is considering this issue. **Electronic Version of the MCEA**

MEA Board has agreed to provide MOECC with an electronic copy of the MCEA. The Board is concerned, however, of the MOECC posting the document publicly. Sales of the MCEA document is one of MEA's only means of recovering the cost of managing the MCEA. MEA is a wholly non-for-profit, volunteer based organization. Unlike other Class EA proponents, MEA does not have a sustained source of revenue.

MOECC suggested approaching the RCCAO, AMO, City of Toronto or RPWCO for funding. MEA indicated that, with the exception of RCCAO, they had approached all of these organizations in the past including RPWCO and they were not forthcoming with support. In addition, MEA has considered a levy on municipalities based on either population or size of capital program.

5) Posting Notices on a Central Site

MOECC is considering a potential central website for Class EA related notices/information. However, MEA noted that if the audience for the notices is the general public, posting on the municipal website is more effective. MOECC would like MEA to make posting on the municipalities' websites mandatory under the Class EA requirements

6) Aboriginal Community Consultation

MOECC advised that proponents should contact their Regional EA Coordinator to confirm which communities have an interest and need to be consulted. MOECC will confirm whether or not proponents may cease circulating to the Federal Ministry of Indigenous and Northern Affairs.

MOECC advises that indigenous communities can access New Relationship Funding to participate in studies but the pool is quite small.

7) Climate Change

MOECC will be finalizing its climate change guide this summer. MOECC is expecting details of design to be included in Project File Reports and ESRs such as the elevation of a bridge such that it addresses extreme weather events. MOECC indicated that they are under pressure from a conservation authority to include this level of detail in the MCEA documentation for the preferred alternative. MEA disagrees that this detail should be included in the MCEA study and has indicated that a commitment to address extreme weather is appropriate and that the permitting phase of construction is the appropriate mechanism. MEA would like more information on number of requests from Conservation Authority(s) that are being cited in this example.

8) A.2.9. – OMB/Part II Order “Double Jeopardy”

MOECC has indicated that there are two integrated MCEA studies currently before the OMB. The MOECC is currently “holding” the Part II Orders pending the outcome at the Board. Double Jeopardy will be a discussion topic through the EA Reform process.

9) Compliance Audit

MOECC is compiling information on the Part II Orders issued in 2016 and will forward to MEA.

10) Further MCEA Amendments

To be discussed on Tuesday at the EAPG meeting. Items are related to Audit recommendations.

3.14 SUCCESS OF MUNICIPAL CLASS EA – RECOGNIZING 30 YEARS OF APPLICATION

3.14.1 Use of Municipal Class EA

For 30 years, 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.

3.14.2 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.

3.14.3 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.

3.14.4 Conclusions

For 30 years, 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.

3.15 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.

3.16 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. No further minor and major amendments are currently being contemplated due to the Environmental Assessment Act review.

3.17 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
MCEA SUMMARY

Proponent	Project Name	Project Information	Project Type	Class EA Schedule	Date of Completion	Addendum Received
Central						
Toronto, City of	Emery Village Road 2A	The road will alleviate congestion at the Finch Ave W/Weston Road intersection, provide improved access for heavy trucks to/from the industrial area in the northwest quadrant and will also improve Mtrolinx Finch LRT operations	Transportation	Schedule C	19-Jan-17	
Peel, Region of	East to West Wastewater Diversion Strategy	Diverting a portion of wastewater from the east trunk sewer to the west trunk sewer; involves constructing an 11km deep gravity sewer using a tunnel boring machine. There will be seven tunnel access shafts located along the sewer route to facilitate the planned work.	Water Works	Schedule C	17-Jan-17	
Oakville, Town of	Morrison Creek Stabilization and Rehabilitation: Upper Middle road to McCraney Street	Assessing creek erosion and stability of West Morrison Creek from Upper Middle Road to McCraney Street. Alternative solutions for stabilizing and rehabilitating the creek channel and banks were developed.	Water Works	Schedule B	18-Dec-16	
Toronto, City of / Toronto and Region Conservation Authority	East Don Trail	4.8 km new trail along East Don River, connecting existing East, West and Lower Don Trails, as well as Taylor Creek Trail	Transportation	Schedule C	10-Nov-16	
Richmond Hill, Town of	Yonge Street and Elgin Mills Road - Flood Vulnerable Area	Remediating existing surface flooding during the Regional storm in the area. Includes the review and evaluation of flood remediation options to reduce or eliminate the Regional floodplain and the selection of preferred alternative.	Water Works	Schedule B	28-Nov-16	
Toronto, City of	Liberty Village New Street	Construction of a new east-west road extending between Dufferin Street and Strachan Avenue in Liberty Village, located on the north side of the GO Transit Lake Shore West rail corridor.	Transportation	Schedule C	28-Oct-16	
Brampton, City	Bram West Parkway and Financial Drive		Transportation	Schedule C	29-Sep-16	
York, Regional Municipality of	2016 Water and Wastewater Master Plan		Water Works	Master Plan	15-Sep-16	
New Tecumseth, Town of	Water Supply, Distribution and Storage Master Plan	Evaluates alternatives and identify the preferred strategy to provide security of water supply and to accommodate current and long term growth needs in Alliston, Beeton and Tottenham to 2031 and beyond.	Water Works	Master Plan	11-Oct-16	
Vaughan, City of	Portage Parkway Extension from West of Black Creek to Creditstone Road	Multi-modal street to extend Portage parkway from West of Black Creek to Creditstone Rd, establishing new street right-of-way with active transportation facilities, 4 general purpose lanes with wider curb lanes facilitating transit vehicles and trucks, and signalized intersections at the future Maplecrete Road extension and Creditstone Rd; also a new street crossing of Black Creek channel with provision and opportunity for accommodating and facilitating under passage for north-south active transportation linkages and facilities	Transportation	Schedule C	11-Oct-16	
Toronto, City of	Investigation of Basement Flooding Control & Improvement of Stormwater Runoff Quality: Study Area 26	Recommendations to reduce the risk of future basement and surface flooding during extreme storm events and to improve the quality of stormwater runoff in the study areas	Sewage Works	Schedule B	7-Oct-16	
Innisfil, Town of	6th Line from County Road 27 to St. John's Road	Improvements will better serve motorists, pedestrians, cyclists and help manage increasing traffic resulting from development growth in the Town	Transportation	Schedule C	6-Oct-16	
Newmarket, Town of	Lions Park Drainage Improvements	Improve surface water drainage and create recreational space within Lions Park as well as wildlife habitat within D'Arcy Creek	Water Works	Schedule B	19-Sep-16	
Toronto, City of	Investigation of Flooding & Improvement of Stormwater Runoff Quality (Area 21, 23)	Recommendations to reduce the risk of future basement and surface flooding during extreme storm events and to improve the quality of stormwater runoff in the study areas	Sewage Works	Schedule B	4-Aug-16	
Vaughan, City of	Portage Parkway Widening and Easterly Extension to West of Black Creek	Road improvements to Portage Parkway from Applewood Cres to West of Black Creek	Transportation	Schedule C	15-Jul-16	
Burlington, City of	Tuck Creek Flood Assessment and Crossing Upgrade	Investigate flood remediation alternatives	Conservation Authority	Schedule B	27-Jun-16	
Mississauga, City of	Creditview Road from Bancroft Drive to Old Creditview Road	Investigate the need for increased north-south capacity	Transportation	Schedule C	8-Jun-16	
Halton, Regional Municipality of	Trafalgar Road RR3 from north of 10 Side Road RR10 to Highway 7	The Project improves public safety and address future travel demands on the Trafalgar Road (Regional Road 3) corridor from north of 10 Side Road (Regional Road 10) to Highway 7 within the Town of Halton Hills. The Project will widen Trafalgar Road from two to four lanes with the addition of road bike lanes, as well as a multi-use path on the east side and a sidewalk on the west side.	Transportation	Schedule C	2-Jun-16	
Toronto, City of	Highland Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Biosolids Management	Preferred approach to biosolids management from HCTP	Sewage Works	Schedule B	2-Jun-16	
Halton, Regional Municipality of	Trafalgar Road from Steeles Avenue to north of 10 Side Road	The project improves public safety and addresses future travel demands on the Trafalgar Road (Regional Road 3) corridor from Steeles Avenue (Regional Road 8) to north of 10 Side Road (Regional Road 10), within the Town of Halton Hills	Transportation	Schedule C	2-Jun-16	
Brampton, City of	McVean Drive Improvements - Castlemore Road to Mayfield Road		Transportation	Schedule C	19-May-16	
Penetanguishine, Town of	Navy Lane Sanitary Pumping Station	reviewing alternatives to remediate the problems with the existings Navy Lane Sanitary Pumping Station	Sewage Works	Schedule B	22-Apr-16	
Brampton, City of	McVean Drive Improvements	Address the deficiencies of the north-south capacity	Transportation	Schedule C	18-May-16	
Caledon, Town of	Loring Drive Stormwater Management Pond Retrofit	Loring Drive Stormwater Management facility retrofitting in Bolton, Ontario	Water Works	Schedule B	5-Apr-16	
Adjala-Tosorontio, Township of	Community of Colgan Master Servicing Plan Amendment	Study alternative water supply and storage strategy; and, wastewater collection, treatment and disposal servicing strategies.	Sewage Works	Master Plan	29-Feb-16	21-Mar-16
Oshawa, City of	Townline Road North from Taunton Road East to Conlin Road East		Transportation	Schedule B	12-Feb-16	
Halton Hills, Town of	Halton Hills Drive (Maple Avenue to Princess Anne Drive)	Study for the connection of Halton Hills Drive from Maple Avenue to Princess Anne Drive in the Town of Halton Hills.	Transportation	Schedule B	7-Feb-16	
Toronto, City of	West Toronto Railpath Extension	Extension of the existing West Toronto Railpath, south from Dundas Street to the downtown CBD.	Transportation	Schedule C	15-Feb-16	
York, Regional Municipality of	West Vaughan Sewage Servicing	Identification of west Vaghan servicing alternatives	Sewage Works	Schedule C	6-Jun-13	2-Dec-16
Durham Region	Additional Water Supply Plant Capacity for the Newcastle Urban Area, Municipality of Clarington	Expand Newcastle Water Supply Plant on existing site in Village of Newcastle. Addendum confirms preferred alternative is still valid given the current planning context and legislation	Water Works	Schedule C	31-Oct-16	
Milton, Town of	Fifth Line Improvements - Britannia Road to Derry Road		Transportation	Schedule C	13-Oct-16	

Milton, Town of	Fifth Line Improvements - Britannia Road to Derry Road		Transportation	Schedule C	13-Oct-16	
Eastern						
Ottawa, City of	Kanata North Urban Expansion Area		Water Works	Master Plan	20-Aug-16	
Selwyn, Township of	Lakefield Sanitary Servicing Upgrades	Address problems with sanitary system	Sewage Works	Schedule B	17-Jun-16	
Ottawa, City of and United Counties of Prescott-Russell	Ottawa Road 174/ Prescott-Russell County Road 17 Improvements		Transportation	Schedule C	2-Jun-16	
Hailburton, County of	Bark Lake Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements	Infrastructure improvements to service new subdivision	Sewage Works	Schedule C	27-May-16	
Russel, Township of	Master Plan Update for Water, Wastewater, Transportation and Recreation Facilities	Update the findings of the 2005 Master Plan to account for development in the urban sectors and to identify new infrastructure or improvements to existing infrastructure to accommodate future development	Water Works	Master Plan	4-Mar-16	
Northumberland, County of	Trent River Crossing and Arterial Road Network	Additional crossing is required to accommodate the increased capacity and serve the needs of the community.	Transportation	Schedule C	3-Mar-16	
Wesport, Village of	Proposed Rehabilitations/Expansion of the Village of Westport Wastewater Treatment System	The study developed, assessed and evaluated alternatives for the proposed wastewater treatment system rehabilitation or expansion.	Sewage Works	Schedule C	30-Jan-16	
Belleville, City of	Mineral Road and Maitland Drive Class EA Farnham Road Master Plan		Transportation	Schedule C	15-Jan-16	
Nation Municipality	Village of Limoges Potable Water and Wastewater Master Plan - Wastewater Treatment - Amendment		Water and Sewage Works			6-Sep-16
Northern						
Timmins, City of	Kraft Creek Bridge Airport Road	The preferred solution is to replace the existing bridge with a new two-lane, two span bridge	Transportation	Schedule B	14-Sep-16	
Timmins, City of	Timmins Connecting Link	Road and infrastructure along Timmins Connecting Link Improvements	Transportation	Schedule B	9-Jun-16	
Timmins, City of	Connecting Link		Transportation	Schedule B	4-Jun-16	
Greater Sudbury, City of	Second Avenue Infrastructure Improvements	Road improvements to Second Ave to accommodate population/traffic projections	Transportation	Schedule B	6-May-16	
Sault Ste Marie, City of	Black Road and Third Line Improvements Addendum		Transportation	Schedule C	16-Jan-16	11-Nov-17
Sault Ste. Marie, City of	Black Road and Third Line Corridor Improvements	Road Improvements	Transportation	Schedule C	16-Feb-16	
Armour, Township of	Bridge Replacement on North Pickere Lake Road		Transportation	Schedule B	18-Apr-16	
Greater Sudbury, City of	Second Avenue (MR72) Infrastructure Improvements		Transportation	Schedule B	8-May-16	
Southwestern						
Chatham-Kent, Municipality of	Oxley Drive / Sandys Street Sewage Pumping Station No. 11	Identification of a long-term sanitary servicing strategy to handle current and projected wastewater flows in the area. Opportunity for the Municipality to address existing capacity and operational limitations with the existing SPS No. 11.	Sewage Works	Schedule B	25-Nov-16	
Bayham, Municipality of	Port Burwell Master Drainage Study	Master Plan identifies the recommended infrastructure to service the future growth of Port Burwell while minimizing environmental impacts.	Water Works	Schedule C	16-Nov-16	
Leamington, Municipality of	Leamington Active Transportation Plan & Implementation Strategy		Transportation	Master Plan	12-Oct-16	
London, City of	Colonel Talbot Pumping Station	New sanitary pumping station and forcemain/sewer in the vicinity of Colonel Talbot Road and Diane Crescent	Sewage Works	Schedule B	26-Oct-16	
London, City of	Thames Valley Parkway North Branch Connection Richmond St to Adelaide S	The City of London completed a Schedule B project under the MEA Class EA study to identify the preferred alternative to complete an existing gap in the Thames Valley Parkway (TVP) between Richmond Street and Adelaide Street. The preferred alignment includes two new pedestrian bridges; one to Ross Park and one to the North London Athletic Fields, with the pathway connecting the bridges north of the river.	Transportation	Schedule B	11-Aug-16	
London, City of	Pedestrian pathway crossing for Richmond Street	Determine the most appropriate means of linking the recreational pathway system across Richmond St north of Sunningdale Rd	Transportation	Schedule C	4-Aug-16	
Chatham-Kent, Municipality of	Renewal of Thamesville Bridge on Victoria Road	Rehabilitation or replacement of Thamesville Bridge on Victoria Road over the Thames River.	Transportation	Schedule C	6-Jul-16	
Central Elgin, Municipality of	Port Stanley Area Sanitary Servicing	Examine existing and future WW services for current and future developments, and upgrade or replace the pumping stations	Sewage Works	Schedule C	4-Apr-16	
London, City of	Blackfriars Bridge	Evaluate alternative solutions for the future use of the Blackfriars Bridge.	Transportation	Schedule C	30-Mar-16	
London, City of	West London Dyke Master Repair Plan	West London Dyke Maintenance and Master Repair Plan (phases 1 +2)	Transportation	Schedule B	29-Mar-16	
Samia, City of	Shoreline protection of Centennial Park along the Samia Bay Harbour Front	Purpose is to find the preferred solution for the intersections and roadway corridor.	nservation Autho	Schedule C	11-Mar-16	
Northern Bruce Peninsula, Municipality of	Concession 4 Bridge, Sideroad 10 Bridge & Ira Lake Road Bridge	Investigating alternative for deteriorating infrastructure	Transportation	Schedule B	4-Mar-16	
Public Utilities Commission (With Municipality of Chatham-Kent)	South Chatham-Kent Water Supply System Improvements (Addendum)	Identification and modification of Water Supply System for the South Chatham-Kent service area.	Water Works	Schedule C	25-Feb-16	
South Bruce Peninsula, Town of	Warton Master Servicing Plan and Gould Street Sanitary Sewer Upgrade	Study was done to identify a preferred strategy to support existing servicing needs and projected growth.	Sewage Works	Schedule B	25-Jan-16	
Arran-Elderslie, Municipality of	Young Bridges Replacement Sideroad 15 (South of Concession 10)	Study to determine preferred solution for deteriorating bridge	Transportation	Schedule B	16-Jan-16	
Chatham-Kent, Municipality of	South Chatham-Kent Water Supply System Improvements	Identify preferred water supply design concept and associated system upgrades and modifications required	Water Works	Schedule C	20-Aug-15	25-Jan-16
West Central						
Erin, Town of	Hillsburgh Dam and Bridge	Dam rehabilitation and bridge reconstruction along Station Street in the hamlet of Hillsburgh in the Town of Erin	Transportation	Schedule B	14-Dec-16	
Lincoln, Town of	Jordan Village Improvements Class EA Study		Transportation	Schedule B	9-Nov-16	
Woolwich, Township of	Joint Breslau Settlement Master Plan	Master plan to address land use, transportation system and stormwater management systems	Sewage Works	Master Plan	21-Jul-15	
Cambridge, City of	Black Bridge Road	Bridge manegment plan	Transportation	Schedule C	16-Jun-16	
Kitchener, City of	Integrated SWM Master Plan	Storm water manement master plan for prioritizing work	Sewage Works	Schedule B	10-Jun-16	
Brantford, City of	Water Storage for Pressure District #1	Evaluation of water storage tank	Water Works	Schedule B	26-May-16	
Waterloo, City of	Beaver Creek Road and Conservation Drive Upgrades and Extension of Municipal Services	potential upgrades of Roadways, 2 sewage pumping stations and forcemains for sanitary servicing, extension of gravity sewers and watermains and stormwater management upgrades	Sewage Works	Schedule C	2-May-16	
Waterloo, Regional Municipality of	Fischer-Hallman Road Improvements (Beams Road to Plains Road)	Road improvements to Fisher-Hallman Road to provide two lanes and update services in project location	Transportation	Schedule C	21-Apr-16	
Waterloo, Regional Municipality of	Pedestrian access improvements for Hanson/Hayward Industrial and Alpine Village Area	pedestrian access improvements for Hanson/Hayward industrial and Alpine Village Area in City of Kitchener, Waterloo region	Transportation	Schedule B	4-Apr-16	

APPENDIX B

PIIOR SUMMARY

Proponent	Project Name	Type	Element Status	# Requestors	Request Submission Date	Decision Date	Number of Days	NoC Date
Central								
Milton, Town of	Boyne Survey Community Collector Road 16 Mile Creek Crossing	Transportation	Denied	1	21-Apr-15	8-Mar-16	322	2-Apr-15
Milton, Town of	Fifth Line Improvements - Derry Rd to Hwy 401 and Main St	Transportation	Denied	1	1-Jun-15	8-Mar-16	281	21-May-15
Halton, Regional Municipality of	Britannian Road (Regional Road 6) Transportation Corridor Improvements	Transportation	Denied	4	12-Nov-14	30-May-16	565	9-Oct-14
Tay, Township of	Grandview Beach and Paradise Point- Expansion of Sewer and Water	Sewage Works	Denied	3	21-Sep-15	6-Jul-16	289	10-Sep-15
Toronto, City of	West Toronto Railpath Extension	Transportation	Denied	1	31-Jan-16	17-May-16	107	15-Feb-16
Eastern								
Peterborough, City of	Parkway Corridor (Lansdowne St to Water St at Carnegie Ave)	Transportation	Granted	91	4-Mar-14	16-Sep-16	927	14-Jan-16
West Central								
City of Hamilton	Cormorant Road Extension	Transportation	Denied	1	14-Dec-15	24-Jun-16	558	5-Mar-15
Waterloo, Regional Municipality of	River Road Extension	Transportation	Denied	3	18-Jul-14	16-Jun-16	699	13-Jun-14
County, Norfolk	Porters Bridge Class Environmental Assessment	Transportation	Denied	1	17-Aug-15	8-May-16	265	1-Jun-15