



**Municipal  
Engineers  
Association**

MUNICIPAL CLASS EA PROCESS  
ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT

September 2008

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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
<b>Part 1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1 Introduction .....	1
1.2 Background Re: Municipal Class EA Parent Document .....	1
1.3 Approved Conditions of Approval .....	3
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 .....	5
<b>Part 2. MUNICIPAL CLASS EA PROCESS MONITORING PROGRAM</b> .....	<b>9</b>
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
<b>Part 3. ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT - SEPTEMBER 2003</b> .....	<b>18</b>
3.1 Development of Monitoring Report .....	18
3.2 Responses from Proponent Municipalities .....	18
3.3 Responses from Technical Agencies .....	19
3.4 Responses from Key Stakeholders .....	19
3.5 Notices of Completion .....	19
3.6 Part II order Requests .....	19
3.7 June 17 <sup>th</sup> , 2003 Meeting of the MEA Municipal Class EA Monitoring Committee	20
3.8 Success of Municipal Class EA .....	20
3.8.1 Use of Municipal Class EA .....	20
3.8.2 Compliance with Requirements and Approval .....	20
3.8.3 Effectiveness to Meet EA Act Objectives .....	22
3.8.4 Conclusions .....	22
3.9 Success of Monitoring Program .....	22
3.10 Amendments to Municipal Class EA .....	23
<b>Appendix A Questionnaire &amp; Summary of Questionnaires from Proponent Municipalities</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<b>Appendix B Summary of Notices of Completion</b>	
<b>Appendix C Summary of Part II Order Requests</b>	
<b>Appendix D Notes From Annual Meeting of the MEA Class EA Monitoring Committee</b>	

## 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 dealing with municipal infrastructure projects has been proved to be an effective way of complying with the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act (EA Act) through over ten years of experience. 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 projects. The Class EA process provides a decision-making framework that enables the requirements of the EA Act to be met in an effective 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 a decade of experience has 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 5<sup>th</sup>, 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 has been prepared by the Municipal Engineers Association (MEA) through discussions with the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) for submission to the Director of the MOE - Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch (EAAB) by October 4, 2001 for approval.

Part 1 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 implemented to deal with: 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 MOE-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, MOE and other key stakeholders have indicated that the process has, and is 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 or 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 6<sup>th</sup>, 2007 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 MOE 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 MOE-EAAB
- October 4, 2002 - MEA to Submit yearly Monitoring Report to MOE-EAAB
- October 4, 2003 - MEA to Submit yearly Monitoring Report to MOE-EAAB
- October 4, 2004 - MEA to Submit yearly Monitoring Report to MOE-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
- 2009 - MEA to Submit yearly Monitoring Report
- 2010 - MEA to Submit yearly Monitoring Report
- 2011 - MEA to Submit yearly Monitoring Report
- 2012 MEA to Submit yearly Monitoring Report and 5 Year Review

### 1.3.2 Municipal Class EA Training Sessions

Following the approval of the amendment to the Municipal Class EA, MEA arranged for training sessions to be held across the province. The purpose of the sessions was to provide an overview of the main changes to the amended Municipal Class EA while at the same time providing a general understanding of the process to new users. Three sessions titled Introduction to the MCEA, Amendments to the MCEA and Transit Projects in the MCEA were scheduled in:

- *Mississauga*
- *Region of Waterloo*
- *City of Ottawa*
- *City of Markham*
- *City of London*

One day training workshops were also held in North Bay, Sudbury, Sault. St. Marie and Thunder Bay.

The Transit Projects Course was cancelled due to the March 28<sup>th</sup> release of MOE's proposed legislation to conditionally exempt Transit from the EA Act.

## 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 MOE-EAAB and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH).

The MEA Monitoring Committee includes the following. *The municipalities shown with an (\*) are also proponent municipalities for the Municipal Class EA Parent Document.*

- |   |                         |
|---|-------------------------|
| ● Paul Knowles, P. Eng, Committee Chair | Town of Carleton Place* |
| ● Uwe Mader, P. Eng.                    | City of Toronto*        |
| ● Dave Bounsall                         | City of Peterborough    |
| ● Richard Forward                       | City of Barrie          |

- Rick Kester City of Belleville

MOE-EAAB staff who participated included

- Gemma Connolly MOE-EAAB
- Donna Dougherty MOE-EAAB

Usman Ahmed, as the MMAH government reviewer for EA projects, was also requested to participate.

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 MOE-EAAB to review basic approach and draft framework. MOE indicated that the basic approach in general was acceptable.
- expand draft framework (with additional background information and explanatory notes and incorporate comments from MOE) to become the “Draft Monitoring Program”;
- September 12, 2001 meeting with the MEA Monitoring Committee, MOE-EAAB and MMAH to review draft Monitoring Program; and,
- revise and submit to the Director of the MOE-EAAB by October 4, 2001. Once submitted to MOE-EAAB, there may be some further discussions between MEA and MOE 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 MOE, 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 MOE 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 MOE’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 MOE’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 MOE. 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 MOE; 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 MOE 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 MOE 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 MOE for these projects.
- *Generic criteria for Class EA Annual Reports being developed by MOE* - At the time of writing, MOE was developing generic criteria, however, they were still very preliminary and being reviewed internally by MOE.
- *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* - MOE has advised that, while this is not part of the Municipal Class EA Process Monitoring Program, in the future MOE will be addressing this as an initiative to be carried out by MOE.
- *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 MOE, 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 MOE for the record.

#### **1.4.2.6 Conclusion**

The results of the review undertaken by MEA and their consultants, and the discussions with MOE 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.

## 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, MOE 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 MOE-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 about 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 MOE-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 MOE 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 MOE-EAAB (Section A.1.5.1);
- MEA to meet with MOE-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 MOE-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 MOE-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 MOE 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 MOE-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 MOE Class EA program objectives? MOE 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 MOE 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 MOE and MMAH.

### 2.1.4 Tools For Collecting Data

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

- Summary of notices/memos to MOE 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
  - Other selected EA practitioners (see list in Appendix C)

- Annual meetings of the MEA Class EA Monitoring Committee with MOE-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, MOE 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. MOE 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 MOE-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 MOE 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 MOE.

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

Municipality	Projects with Notice of Completion Submitted to MOE		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									
<b>TOTAL</b>									

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"> <li>• <b>Use</b> of Municipal Class EA process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• use of Municipal Class EA process as represented by number of projects reported to MOE including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schedule 'B' projects</li> <li>• Schedule 'C' projects</li> <li>• Master Plans</li> <li>• projects which followed the Integrated Approach</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Numerical summary of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no. of Schedule 'B' and 'C' projects for which copy of Notice of Completion provided to MOE-EAAB</li> <li>• no. of Master Plans</li> <li>• No. of projects which followed Integrated Approach</li> <li>• designation requests</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MEA to summarize Notices of Completion sent to MOE-EAAB (see Table 1 for sample matrix)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Compliance</b> of municipal proponents for Municipal Class EA, or MEA on their behalf, with:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conditions of Approval for parent Class EA document</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• fulfilment of Conditions of Approval for parent Class EA document</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• describe how fulfilled</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Compliance with:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Class EA process requirements</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• general assessment of representative projects as to whether they are in compliance with the approved process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• compare number of Part II Orders granted because of process issue to number of projects reported to MOE</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• review Minister's rationale for Part II Orders being denied or granted and identify if process-related</li> <li>• review questionnaire responses for applicable comments/information (See Question 2.10 of questionnaire for Proponent Municipalities in Appendix A)</li> </ul>	

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"> <li>• <b>Effectiveness</b> of Municipal Class EA process in meeting requirements of:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) EA Act</li> <li>ii) Class EA Program objectives</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continued ability of Municipal Class EA process to meet statutory requirements of EA Act.</li> <li>• continued ability of Municipal Class EA process to meet generic/ broad Class EA program objectives:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• assessment of environmental effects</li> <li>• consultation</li> <li>• documentation of decision-making</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• identify any changes to EA Act including regulations and determine implications to Municipal Class EA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• summary of Minister's rationale for granting Part II Orders</li> <li>• information received at annual MEA meeting</li> <li>• questionnaire responses (see Questions 7, 8, 11 of questionnaire for Proponent Municipalities in Appendix A; Question 3 of questionnaire for government agencies in Appendix B)</li> <li>• discussions with MEA Monitoring Committee and MOE-EAAB</li> <li>• feedback from training sessions</li> </ul>	

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"> <li>• streamlined approvals</li>   <li>• self-assessment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no. of projects which would otherwise be individual EAs</li>   <li>• qualitative assessment of Part II Order review process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• summary of Notices of Completion sent to MOE</li> <li>• questionnaire responses from proponent municipalities</li> <li>• questionnaire responses (see Question 11 of questionnaire for Proponent Municipalities in Appendix A)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• identify potential changes, enhancements, trends to be considered</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• effectiveness of Integrated Approach (see Section A.2.9 of Municipal Class EA document)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• qualitative review of memos sent to MOE-EAAB and information received</li> <li>• qualitative review of questionnaire responses</li>   <li>• qualitative review of related Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) decisions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• memos sent to MOE-EAAB</li> <li>• discussions with MEA, MOE and MMAH</li> <li>• questionnaire responses (see Question 13 of questionnaire for proponent municipalities in Appendix A; Question 15 of questionnaire for government review agencies in Appendix B)</li> <li>• feedback from MMAH re: OMB decisions regarding municipal infrastructure.</li> </ul>	

TABLE 3 - 12 MONTH CALENDAR

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

## PART 3. ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT - MAY 2008

### 3.1 DEVELOPMENT OF MONITORING REPORT

In 2008 questionnaires were circulated to the Proponent Municipalities, Technical Agencies and other Key Stakeholders identified in the Monitoring Program. The Ministry of the Environment was also asked to provide a summary of the Notices of Completions and Part II Order requests which they had received.

The responses from the questionnaires were summarized and a draft Monitoring Report was produced in June 2008. On June 16, 2008 the MEA Municipal Class EA Monitoring Committee met and reviewed the draft Monitoring Report. Comments from this meeting were then incorporated and the draft Monitoring Report was finalized. The finalized report was circulated to all Committee members for review before it was submitted to the Ministry of the Environment in September 2008.

### 3.2 RESPONSES FROM PROPONENT MUNICIPALITIES

A detailed summary of the responses from Proponent Municipalities to the questionnaire is found in Appendix 'A'. The questionnaire was answered by Public Works/Engineering staff except in one municipality. These responses indicated that:

- 1) Only larger municipalities in growth areas complete many Schedule B or C projects. Municipalities are filing Notices of Study Commencement and Notices of Completion appropriately;
- 2) Project schedules are appropriate;
- 3) Municipalities do not have difficulty determining appropriate schedule and are not challenged on the choice;
- 4) Interpretation of project schedules is consistent;
- 5) No amendments, to the project schedules, are suggested;
- 6) The Municipal Class EA is easy to follow. Some municipalities would use the new transit regulation rather than the new Class EA transit chapter;
- 7) The Municipal Class EA provides for the appropriate level of documentation;
- 8) Although some proponents have, at times, been requested for additional information, generally stakeholders are satisfied with the level of documentation;
- 9) Technical agencies sometimes do not respond in a timely manner;
- 10) Only some proponents have received a Part II Order request in the past year. MOE's review of Part II Order requests has not been timely in some cases;
- 11) Proponents are satisfied that Class EA process continues to be effective;

- 12) Only some municipalities have applied Schedule A+. Those that applied this process found it effective;
- 13) Administration costs are generally 5-10% of total budget. Schedule A projects represent 25-95% of the total budget. A single large Schedule B or C project can shift this percentage dramatically for a given year especially in a small municipality; and
- 14) Most municipalities support the MEA taking steps to alter the shelf life for consistency.

### **3.3 RESPONSES FROM TECHNICAL AGENCIES**

None

### **3.4 RESPONSES FROM KEY STAKEHOLDERS**

None

### **3.5 NOTICES OF COMPLETION**

A summary of the Notices of Completion for Schedule B and C projects is found in Appendix B. This summary shows that in 2007 MOE received 64 Notices of Completion of Schedule B projects and 48 Notices of Completion of Schedule C projects and 4 notices related to the integrated approach. In 2007, 91 difference municipalities submitted Notices of Completion, an increase from 51 municipalities in 2002.

### **3.6 PART II ORDER REQUESTS**

A summary of the Part II Order Requests which were dealt with by MOE in 2007 is found in Appendix C. This summary shows that of the 20 requests received, all 20 requests were denied and no orders were issued in 2007. The time for the Minister to respond ranged from 149 days to 840 days.

MEA finds this response time unacceptable. In 2006, the Director of the EA Branch promised that the authority to respond to Part II Order Request would be delegated to the Director and that the responses would be provided in a timely manner. MEA is disappointed that this does not seem to have occurred;

MOE advised that the Ministry is currently clearing a backlog of Part II Order Requests and plans to be more timely with responses in the future.

### **3.7 ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MEA CLASS MONITORING COMMITTEE AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Notes from the Annual Meeting of the MEA Class EA Monitoring Committee meeting are included in Appendix D.

#### **Recommendations**

A copy of the clarification and the minor amendment are included in Appendix D.

MEA intends to submit a minor amendment, to the Municipal Class EA, to adjust the cost limits identified for Schedule B and C projects and ensure the 10 year shelf life applies to all Schedule B and C projects completed after September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2007;

MEA will forward a draft clarification, to MOE for comment, which explains pumping stations are located throughout a collection system and that the headworks of a Sewage Treatment Plant should not be considered a pumping station.

### **3.8 SUCCESS OF MUNICIPAL CLASS EA**

#### **3.8.1 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 new provisions for an "Integrated Approach" for planning projects are not yet well used.

**The survey of proponent municipalities confirm the successful use of the Municipal Class EA.**

#### **3.8.2 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 will be completed by October 4<sup>th</sup>, 2012.**

- 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.**

Compliance also requires that municipalities follow the approved process while planning their sewer, water and road projects. In 2002, the MOE reviewed in detail the process followed while planning 11 projects. MOE reports that there are examples of Municipalities which have not properly applied the Class EA process and their documentation has been incomplete. However, generally, municipalities follow the approved process.

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

### **3.8.3 Effectiveness to Meet EA Act Objectives**

The Municipal Class EA continues to meet the statutory requirements of the EA Act and no changes to the EA Act or regulations are contemplated. 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 MOE's detailed review of selected projects (Part II Order requests) confirms that generally municipalities correctly apply the Class EA's self assessment.

The Integrated Planning Act Approach is not commonly used by municipalities at this time. An assessment of the effectiveness of this approach will be made in the future when more information is available.

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

### **3.8.4 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, however, implementing the following recommendations would improve the process.

## **3.9 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 MOE, proponent municipalities and other stakeholders were cooperative and provided worthwhile input.

### **3.10 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.

*APPENDIX A*

*QUESTIONNAIRE AND*

*SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRES*

*FROM PROPONENT MUNICIPALITIES*

# **MUNICIPAL CLASS EA PROCESS QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INPUT INTO MONITORING REPORT PROPONENT MUNICIPALITIES**

---

## **INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

The Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process has been in place since 1987 with comprehensive reviews being undertaken in 1992 and 1998. Many municipalities, MOE and other key stakeholders have indicated that the Municipal Class EA process has and is working well, and recognize that much has been achieved over the years of working with the Municipal Class EA process. Consequently, the "renewed" Municipal Class EA, which was approved on October 4, 2000, and amended in 2007, maintained the substance of the basic process while including any necessary changes.

As a Condition of Approval of the Municipal Class EA, the proponent municipalities, or MEA on their behalf, are required to implement a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Monitoring Program to monitor the use, compliance and effectiveness of the Municipal Class EA on an annual basis. The Annual Monitoring Reports in turn will be used as input to the five year review. As input to the Monitoring Program, a series of questionnaires have been developed to solicit information from key stakeholders to assist MEA in monitoring the continued ability of the Municipal Class EA process to meet generic class environmental assessment program objectives, including:

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

In addition, MEA will be monitoring to determine any potential issues that may require an amendment to the Municipal Class EA. Questionnaires have been prepared for:

- proponent municipalities
- government review agencies
- other key stakeholders

## **PURPOSE OF QUESTIONNAIRE**

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine your municipality's:

- degree of involvement/participation in the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process
- identification of any problems experienced with the process
- level of satisfaction with the continued effectiveness of the Municipal Class EA process
- identification of any potential process-related issues

The questionnaire has been sent to the MEA contact for your municipality. It is important, however, that input be obtained from both the public works department and the planning department particularly given the new Integrated Approach (see Section A.2.9 of the Municipal Class EA).

**Note:** It is not intended to solicit comments regarding issues of a technical issue. Although the focus of your comments should be process-related, reference to specific projects may be used for illustrative purposes. Individual project monitoring, however, will not be reported.

**MUNICIPAL CLASS EA PROCESS  
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INPUT INTO MONITORING REPORT  
PROPONENT MUNICIPALITIES**

---

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Municipality: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Fax: \_\_\_\_\_

e-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

Please indicate what departments provided input to this questionnaire response:

Public Works            Planning     

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

1. Please indicate the number of projects your municipality completed in the past calendar year.

In 2007, the 2007 portion of the survey includes that part of the year's efforts where the September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2007 amendments were approved. Circulation of those amendments did not however take place until October 25<sup>th</sup>, 2007 and may not have had much effect of reported activities in 2007 - if it did - please advise as appropriate.

	2006		2007	
	Initiated	Completed	Initiated	Completed
<b>Schedule 'A+'</b>	NA	NA		
<b>Schedule 'B'</b>				
<b>Schedule 'C'</b>				
<b>Master Plans</b>				
<b>Addendum</b>				

Did your municipality file a Notice of Study Commencement with the Regional EA Coordinator at the Ministry's local regional office for each project not including Schedule A+?

Yes       No

**MUNICIPAL CLASS EA PROCESS  
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INPUT INTO MONITORING REPORT  
PROPONENT MUNICIPALITIES**

---

Did your municipality file a Notice of Completion with the Regional EA Coordinator at the Ministry's local regional office the MOE's Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch in Toronto for each project not including Schedule A+?

- Yes                       No

2. In general, do you find the project schedules appropriate for the type and scope of your projects?

	Yes	No	Comments
• roads	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
			_____
			_____
			_____
• water	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
			_____
			_____
			_____
• waste water	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
			_____
			_____
			_____
• transit (2007 only)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
			_____
			_____
			_____

3. Do you have difficulty determining the appropriate schedule including A+ and transit?  
(Note: A+ and transit came into effect in 2007)

Often	Sometimes	Never	Comments
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
			_____
			_____

a) Has your choice/interpretation been challenged?

Often	Sometimes	Never	Comments
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
			_____
			_____

**MUNICIPAL CLASS EA PROCESS  
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INPUT INTO MONITORING REPORT  
PROPONENT MUNICIPALITIES**

---

4. Do you find that your municipality, your consultants and MOE staff are consistent when interpreting the project schedules?

Often	Sometimes	Never	Comments
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

5. Are there any specific project schedules (see Appendixes of the Municipal Class EA) which should be modified/changed/deleted/added.

Yes                       No

a) If yes, please identify the specific schedule and provide comments.

---



---



---

6. The renewed Municipal Class EA includes a new Schedule (A+) for projects and a chapter for Transit.

a) In general, is the Municipal Class EA process easy to follow and to apply?

Yes	No	Comments
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

b) MOE has now announced plans to introduce a regulation to exempt transit projects from the EA Act if they follow the process in the regulation. Would your municipality use this new regulation or the Municipal Class EA approval process?

New Transit Regulation                       Municipal Class EA

**MUNICIPAL CLASS EA PROCESS  
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INPUT INTO MONITORING REPORT  
PROPONENT MUNICIPALITIES**

---

7. Does the Municipal Class EA process provide for the appropriate level of documentation for the applicable project schedule?

		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
i.e.	Notice only for Schedule A+ Projects	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Project File for Schedule "B" Projects	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Environmental Study Report for Schedule "C" Projects		<b>0</b>	

8. In general, do project stakeholders indicate that they are satisfied with the level of notice, consultation and documentation?

<b>Usually Satisfied</b>	<b>Sometimes Request Additional Information</b>	<b>Always Request Additional Information</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

9. In general, do technical agencies participate in the process and provide input/comments in a timely manner?

<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

10. Have you received any Part II Order requests in 2006 or 2007?

<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

**MUNICIPAL CLASS EA PROCESS  
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INPUT INTO MONITORING REPORT  
PROPONENT MUNICIPALITIES**

---

If yes, please provide the following on each Part II Order request.

**Project #1 Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

Did MOE request any additional information and if so what information:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

How long did it take to receive a decision from MOE? \_\_\_\_\_

Were you satisfied with the manner in which the Part II order request was processed?

Yes                       No

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Project #2 Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

Did MOE request any additional information and if so what information:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

How long did it take to receive a decision from MOE? \_\_\_\_\_

Were you satisfied with the manner in which the Part II order request was processed?

Yes                       No

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Project #3 Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

Did MOE request any additional information and if so what information:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

How long did it take to receive a decision from MOE? \_\_\_\_\_

Were you satisfied with the manner in which the Part II order request was processed?

Yes                       No

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**MUNICIPAL CLASS EA PROCESS  
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INPUT INTO MONITORING REPORT  
PROPONENT MUNICIPALITIES**

---

**Project #4 Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

Did MOE request any additional information and if so what information:  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

How long did it take to receive a decision from MOE? \_\_\_\_\_

Were you satisfied with the manner in which the Part II order request was processed?

Yes                       No

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Please detail any additional projects on a separate sheet.

11. Based on your experience, are you generally satisfied that the Municipal Class EA process is continuing to be effective in meeting MOE's generic class environmental assessment program objectives, including:

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
• assessment of environmental effects	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____ _____ _____
• opportunities for stakeholder consultation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____ _____ _____
• documentation of decision-making	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____ _____ _____
• streamlined approvals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____ _____ _____
• emphasis on self-assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____ _____ _____

**MUNICIPAL CLASS EA PROCESS  
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INPUT INTO MONITORING REPORT  
PROPONENT MUNICIPALITIES**

---

12. A new feature of the renewed Municipal Class EA process is the creation of Schedule A+. For Schedule A+ projects, impacted members of the public are to be notified only. Although the notice may prompt input, there is no appeal route for these projects outside discussions with the proponent

	Yes	No	Comment
a) Has your municipality applied this process on any projects	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
b) If yes, was this approach effective in communicating with the public?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

13. MOE has asked for some indication of the use of the Schedule 'A' classification by municipalities. MEA has advised MOE that since Schedule 'A' projects are pre-approved and can include not only specific projects but also activities as well as programs, it is not possible to quantify the use of the Schedule 'A' classification. As a coarse measure, however, proponent municipalities are being requested to indicate how funds are allocated within their roads, water and wastewater departments. Please indicate this below.

Administration		%
Schedule 'A' , 'A+' projects / activities	_____	%
	_____	
Schedule A+ (late 2007 only)	_____	%
Schedule 'B' & Schedule 'C' projects	_____	
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>%</b>

14. MOE has advised that the new 10 year shelf life provision in the 2007 MEA does not apply to projects where the Notice of Completion was filed prior to September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2007. This results in the potential for users of the 2007 document without reference to the 2000 version being unfamiliar with the distinction and assume that 10 years applies to all projects.

Do you support MEA action to:

- a) Take steps to alter shelf life for consistency: or
- b) Provide clarification of the status quo

**MUNICIPAL CLASS EA PROCESS  
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INPUT INTO MONITORING REPORT  
*PROPONENT MUNICIPALITIES***

---

**COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE**

Thank you for your assistance. Please forward your completed questionnaire by mail, fax or e-mail to:

Mr. Paul Knowles, P. Eng.  
Chair, MEA Municipal Class EA Monitoring Committee  
Town of Carleton Place  
175 Bridge Street  
Carleton Place, ON K7C 2V8  
phone: (613) 257-6202  
fax: (613) 257-8170  
email: [pknowles@town.carleton-place.on.ca](mailto:pknowles@town.carleton-place.on.ca)

The information obtained from the questionnaire responses will be collected, analyzed, summarized and interpreted by MEA as input into the preparation of their Annual Monitoring Report.



Municipal Class EA Process  
 Summary of Questionnaires - - Proponent Municipalities  
 April 2008

Respondent	Choice/ Interpretation Challenged			Municipality, Consultants & MOE consistent when interpreting			Schedules modified, changed, deleted or added?		Municipal Class EA						
									Easy to Follow		New Transit or Municipal Class EA		Provide appropriate level of documentation for the applicable schedule		
	O	S	N	O	S	N	Y	N	Y	N	T	EA	A+	B	C
Pat Mauro, Manager Engineering City of Thunder Bay			√	√				√	√			√	√	√	-
Ralph Scheuneman, Manager of Infrastructure Planning, City of Barrie		√		√				√	√		√		√	√	
John Presta, Director, Environmental Services, Region of Durham			√	√				√	√			√	√	√	√
Brian Hughes, Associate Director, Transportation Engineering, Regional Municipality of Niagara			√			√	√		√				√	√	
Sunil Sharma, Manager, Design & Construction, Regional Municipality of Niagara			√	√			√		√			√	√	√	
Stephen Allan, Director of Public Works, County of Lanark			√	√				√	√			√	√	√	
Paul Knowles, Engineer, Town of Carleton Place			√			√		√	√		√		√	√	√
Uwe Mader, Transportation Eng. City of Toronto			√		√			√	√		√		√	√	√
John Lucas, Manager, Transportation Planning & Design, City of London			√	√				√	√		√	√	√	√	√

Municipal Class EA Process  
 Summary of Questionnaires - - Proponent Municipalities  
 April 2008

Respondent	Project Stakeholders Satisfied with level of documentation			Technical Agencies participate in timely manner		Any Part II Order Requests this Year		Additional Information		If Yes, Time to receive a decision from MOE  # of months	Satisfied with manner Part II Order request proceeded	
	US	SRA	ARA	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N		Y	N
Pat Mauro, Manager Engineering City of Thunder Bay	√			√			√					
Ralph Scheuneman, Manager of Infrastructure Planning, City of Barrie	√				√	√			√	NA		√
John Presta, Director, Environmental Services, Region of Durham		√			√	√		√		NA		√
Brian Hughes, Associate Director, Transportation Engineering, Regional Municipality of Niagara	√			√		√		√		5-17		√
Sunil Sharma, Manager, Design & Construction, Regional Municipality of Niagara		√		√		√			√	18		√
Stephen Allan, Director of Public Works, County of Lanark	√			√			√					
Paul Knowles, Engineer, Town of Carleton Place	√			√			√					
Uwe Mader, Transportation Eng. City of Toronto	√				√	√		√				√
John Lucas, Manager, Transportation Planning & Design, City of London	√			√			√					

Municipal Class EA Process  
 Summary of Questionnaires - - Proponent Municipalities  
 April 2008

Respondent	Generally satisfied that Class EA process continuing to be effective meeting MOE's generic class EA objectives										Schedule A+ Projects			
	Assessment of environmental effects		Opportunities for stakeholder consultation		Documentation of decision-making		streamlined approvals		emphasis on self assessment		Applied this process		If yes, effective to notify public	
	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Pat Mauro, Manager Engineering City of Thunder Bay	√		√		√		√		√			√		
Ralph Scheuneman, Manager of Infrastructure Planning, City of Barrie	√		√		√		√		√			√		
John Presta, Director, Environmental Services, Region of Durham	√		√		√		√		√		√		√	
Brian Hughes, Associate Director, Transportation Engineering, Regional Municipality of Niagara	√		√		√		√		√		√		√	
Sunil Sharma, Manager, Design & Construction, Regional Municipality of Niagara	√		√		√			√	√		√		√	
Stephen Allan, Director of Public Works, County of Lanark	√		√		√		√		√		√		√	
Paul Knowles, Engineer, Town of Carleton Place	√		√		√		√		√		√		√	
Uwe Mader, Transportation Eng. City of Toronto	√		√		√		√		√		√		√	
John Lucas, Manager, Transportation Planning & Design, City of London	√		√		√		√		√			√		

Municipal Class EA Process  
 Summary of Questionnaires - - Proponent Municipalities  
 April 2008

Respondent	Allocation of Funds %				10 Year Shelf Life in the 2007 MEA/ Do you support MEA Action to:	
	Admin	A & A+	A+ Late 2007 only	B & C	Take steps to alter shelf life for consistency	Provide clarification of the status quo
Pat Mauro, Manager Engineering City of Thunder Bay	10-15	95-85	NA	NA		√
Ralph Scheuneman, Manager of Infrastructure Planning, City of Barrie	5	5		90	√	
John Presta, Director, Environmental Services, Region of Durham	15	25		60	√	
Brian Hughes, Associate Director, Transportation Engineering, Regional Municipality of Niagara	10	20	30	40	√	
Sunil Sharma, Manager, Design & Construction, Regional Municipality of Niagara	15	10	75		√	
Stephen Allan, Director of Public Works, County of Lanark	5	80		15	√	
Paul Knowles, Engineer, Town of Carleton Place	10	40	50	varies		√
Uwe Mader, Transportation Eng. City of Toronto	18	67		15	√	
John Lucas, Manager, Transportation Planning & Design, City of London	2	49		49	√	

Municipal Class EA Process  
Summary of Questionnaires - - Proponent Municipalities  
April 2008

**COMMENTS FROM:**

**1. Pat Mauro, Manager Engineering, City of Thunder Bay**

- 9) Maybe not always timely
- 12a) Will in 2008

**2. Peter Scheunemann, Manager of Infrastructure Planning, City of Barrie**

- 3a) Developers exemption is often difficult to explain.
- 9) Technical agencies are slow to respond and aren't bound by the outcome of the Class EA.
- 10) Duckworth Street Transportation Municipal Class EA - No, Part II Order was withdrawn - Decision was not rendered in a timely manner.

**3. John Presta, Director, Environmental Services, Region of Durham**

- 8) Notices in local paper and distributed are missed by residents at times.
- 9) Technical agencies participate but do not always provide input/comments in a timely manner.
- 10) **Altona Road (Reg. Rd. 27) Kingston Road to Finch Avenue** - yes copy of ESR, Response to concerns raised, well locations, First nations contact details - Asked for a decision from the Minister on January 16, 2008 because resolution could not be achieved and have not received a decision yet.
- 11) Approvals from some agencies are still time consuming to acquire.

**4. Brian Hughes, Associate Director, Transportation Engineering, Regional Municipality of Niagara**

- 2) Difficulty with schedule B or C for structure attention/replacement if structure greater than 40 years
- 5) For Municipal Road projects #30 relating to reconstruction or alteration or grading adjacent to a structure over 40 years old. We feel that this age should be changed to at least 80 years old.

Municipal Class EA Process  
Summary of Questionnaires - - Proponent Municipalities  
April 2008

**COMMENTS FROM:**

**Brian Hughes, Associate Director, Transportation Engineering, Regional Municipality of Niagara** (Continued)

6) Don't know

10) **Reconstruction of Reg. Rd. 87 (Lakeshore Road) Lakeport Road to Niagara St. - St. Catherines**

Yes, all public comments, documentation used during consultation period, confirmation of agencies circulated, comments on air pollution and would Region reconsider need for left turn lane - 17 months - Much too long considering the minor nature of the Part II order request.

**O'Reilly's Bridge over the Welland River - Township of Wainfleet/Town of Pelham**

Yes, MOE requested a response to a list of issues and concerns expressed by the Part II Order requester - Routine months

**Geometric Improvements of Reg. Rd. 81 (St. Paul St. W) Ninth Street to Seventh Street St. Catherines/Lincoln**

Yes - same as in O'Reilly's Bridge above - 7 months - Decision took too long considering that all requested information was provided promptly.

**Reconstruction of Reg. Rd. 87 (Lakeshore Road), Welland Canal to Read Road St. Catherines**

Yes, copy of ESR (Screening report) and copies of minutes of meeting with Part II Order requester - 10 months - Decision took too long considering that all requested information was provided promptly.

**5. Sunil Sharma, Manager, Design & Construction, Regional Municipality of Niagara**

3) Subtle change in project can change an A+ to A B

5) Schedule A+ - Where existing utility corridor exists any slight change to location or size of the corridor required to construct work should not change the schedule if the works are generally in the same location.

9) Technical Agencies participate but input/comments sometimes are not timely

10) **Baker Road WWTP - Phase 3**

Yes - copy of ESR, copy of Conceptual Design Report, Table A - Proponent Response to Part II Order Requests, correspondence between requester and proponent - 18 months - time to process Part II order appeared excessive

11) Projects can be delayed at approvals level due to volume or inconsistent requirements.

Municipal Class EA Process  
Summary of Questionnaires - - Proponent Municipalities  
April 2008

**6. Uwe Mader, Transportation Eng. City of Toronto**

- 9) No, often even when technical agencies participate in the process they do not do so in a timely manner.
- 10) **Keele Street and Wilson Avenue New Road Construction**  
Yes, they requested clarification on how we addressed issues raised by residents - 11 months - While we were satisfied with MOE staff who dealt with the Part II Order, the length of time required to resolve this Part II Order request on the part of the MOE is unacceptable.
- 2250mm Watermain from FJ Horgan Water Filtration Plant to Ellesmere Reservoir and PS**  
Yes, the Project Evaluator repeatedly requested the same information - 2.5 years - Part of the delay was that there was a provincial election that resulted in a hold over from before to after the election before a decision was reached.
- Coatsworth Cut CSO and Stormwater Outfalls Study**  
Yes, requested additional aboriginal information - Still awaiting decision - Yes, request that MOE increase the level of cooperation amongst its staff.
- 11) In general yes to all, however, there are still areas with respect to gray areas where interpretation is unclear. Work is needed between the MOE, MEA and EA practitioners on dealing with such issues.
- 12) The City has been notifying on such projects even before they were designated A+ - The City believes that it is.

**7. John Lucas, Manager, Transportation Planning & Design, City of London**

- 3) There is still interpretation involved in the use of the tables, but that is acceptable.
- 6) Probably a blend, given that the need for a project will still have to be articulated when engaging the public.
- 8) Yes, on occasion the general public or particular stakeholders lack interest in the project until a specific alternative is proposed.

*APPENDIX B*

*SUMMARY OF*

*NOTICES OF COMPLETION*

**MEA Municipal Class EA  
NoCs for Schedule B and C Projects**

January to December, 2007

<b>PROPONENT</b>	<b>PROJECT NAME</b>	<b>PROJECT TYPE</b>	<b>LOCATION</b>	<b>SCHEDULE</b>	<b>DATE OF COMPLETION</b>
Township of Madawaska Valley	Barrys Bay Wastewater Treatment Plant	Waste Water	Madawaska Valley	C	05-Jan-07
The Corporation of the Town of Whitby in the Regional Municipality of Durham	Durham Street (Winchester Road to Cassels Road), Brooklin	Road	Town of Whitby	B	12-Jan-07
County of Simcoe	Replacement of Bridge 014075 over Bailey Creek	Road	Simcoe County	B	31-Jan-07
County of Simcoe	Replacement of Bridge 056080 Drysdale Bridge	Road	Simcoe County	B	31-Jan-07
Municipality of Powassan	Powassan Wastewater Treatment Facility	Waste Water	Powassan	C	31-Jan-07
Town of Innisfil	Seventh Line Storm Drainage Outlet	Waste Water	Innisfil	B	02-Feb-07
City Of Ottawa	Greenbank road Improvements	Road	Malvern Rd to Cambrian Rd	C	09-Feb-07
Municipality of Clarington	Green Rd Extension and CP Rail Grade Separation	Road	Boswell Dr to Baseline Rd	C	09-Feb-07
Municipality of Greenstone	Proposed Municipal Industrial Park	Road	Longlac Town	B	14-Feb-07
Municipality of Markstay-Warren	Village of Warren Water Supply	Addendum	Municipality of Markstay-Warren	C	14-Feb-07
Town of New Tecumseth	10th Line Bridge Replacement over Beaton Creek	Road	County of Simcoe	B	17-Feb-07
City of Hamilton	Dartnall Road Extension Environmental Study Report	Road	City of Hamilton	C	19-Feb-07
City of London	Nelson St Sewer/Water Replacement	Waste Water	City of London	B	19-Feb-07
Municipality of West Perth	Watermain Construction Campbell/Henry and Wellington Streets Mitchell Ward	Water Works	Municipality of West Perth	B	24-Feb-07
Municipality of Tweed	Doreen, Sherry Bridge Replacement and Marbank Culvert replacement	Road	Municipality of Tweed	B	25-Feb-07
City of St. Catharines	Port Dalhousie Trunk Sewer and CSO Study	Waste Water	City of St. Catharines	B	05-Mar-07
Region of Waterloo	Wilnot Industrial Trunk Watermain	Water Works	Township of Wilnot	B	06-Mar-07
City of Kawartha Lakes	Omeme Water and Wastewater EA	Waste Water	Kawartha Lakes	C	12-Mar-07

**MEA Municipal Class EA  
NOCs for Schedule B and C Projects**

January to December, 2007

PROPONENT	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT TYPE	LOCATION	SCHEDULE	DATE OF COMPLETION
Township of Edwardsburgh/Cardinal	New Road Construction	Road	Industrial Park to Johnstown	B	15-Mar-07
Township of Bonnechere Valley	Eganville Sewage Treatment Plant	Waste Water	Township of Bonneshere Valley	B	21-Mar-07
City of Toronto	Glendarling Road to Bearwood Drive Sanitary Sewer Servicing Deficiencies	Waste Water	Glendarling Dr to Valecrest Dr	B	22-Mar-07
City Of Belleville	Waterfront redevelopment Master Plan	Master Plan	Belleville	B	23-Mar-07
Region of Peel	Meadowdale Feeder Main	Water Works	Mississauga (Meadowdale)	B	23-Mar-07
City of Windsor	Walker Road Corridor Improvements Riverside Drive to Provincial Road (City Limits) Grand Marais Road East Improvements	Addendum	City of Windsor	C	04-Apr-07
City of Waterloo	Weber Street Improvements 100 Metres North of Northfield Drive to Benjamin Road	Road	City of Waterloo	C	05-Apr-07
Regional Municipality of Peel	300mm Diameter Watermain Across the Humber River at Highway 50	Water Works	Regional Municipality of Peel	B	05-Apr-07
Durham Region	Provisin of Additional Water Pollution Control Plant for the Bomanville Urban Area	Waste Water	Bomanville	C	07-Apr-07
Regional Municipality of Niagara	Lockview Combined Sewer Overflow Storage Facility	Waste Water	City of St. Catharines	B	16-Apr-07
County of Perth	Rehabilitation of Fullarton Bridge	Road	County of Perth	B	20-Apr-07
Township of North Dundas	Winchester Water Supply System Upgrade	Water Works	Township of North Dundas	C	20-Apr-07
Region of Peel	Lakeview and Port Credit Sanitary Sewer Improvements	Waste Water	Region of Peel	C	25-Apr-07
The County of Brant, Brant East (Cainsville)	Wastewater Treatment Capacity	Waste Water	The County of Brant, Brant East (Cainsville)	C	11-May-07
Town of Caledon	Road Alignment for the WVN2 link of the Bolton Arterial Roads (BAR) Stage 2 network	Road	Town of Caledon	C	11-May-07
Municipality of Kincardine	Water and Sanitary Sewage Servicing Lake Street North - Community of Inverhuron	Waste Water	Municipality of Kincardine	B	12-May-07

**MEA Municipal Class EA  
NoCs for Schedule B and C Projects**

January to December, 2007

<b>PROPONENT</b>	<b>PROJECT NAME</b>	<b>PROJECT TYPE</b>	<b>LOCATION</b>	<b>SCHEDULE</b>	<b>DATE OF COMPLETION</b>
Town of Midland	Replacement of "RCA" Sewage Pumping Station (Pump Station #4, Aberdeen Boulevard)	Waste Water	Town of Midland	B	20-May-07
City of Windsor	Howard Avenue at the Canadian Pacific Railway Crossing	Road	City of Windsor	C	25-May-07
City of Hamilton	Special Policy Area 'C' Transportation Improvements	Road	City of Hamilton	C	29-May-07
County of Huron	Rehabilitation of Cookes, Tuckersmith and Varna Bridges	Road	Huron County	B	31-May-07
Town of Markham	Markham Watercourses Erosion Restoration Implementation Plan	Water Works	Town of Markham	B	01-Jun-07
Municipality of Leamington	Erie Street North Reconstruction, Phase 3 KMK Project Number 2850.01	Road	Municipality of Leamington	C	02-Jun-07
City of Pickering	Pine Creek Dam Removal - David Farr Memorial Park	Water Works	City of Pickering, David Farr Memorial Park	B	08-Jun-07
Town of New Tecumseth	Water Distributuoin and Storage Master Servicing Plan	Master Plan	New Tecumseth		08-Jun-07
Town of Cochrane	Cochrane St Reconstruction	Road	cochrane	B	10-Jun-07
City of Toronto and York Region	Milliken Reservoir Expansion and Pumping Station	Water Works	Town of Markham	B	11-Jun-07
County of Wellington	Moore's Bridge and Burnett's Bridge Wellington Road 7	Road	Township of Centre Wellington	B	11-Jun-07
City of Toronto	Mimico Creek Watermain Crossing from Martin Grove to Sedgebrook Crescent	Water Works	City of Toronto, West Deane Park	B	13-Jun-07
Cable Bridge Enterprises Limited	Wastewater Treatment Needs for Approved Development at the Nottawasaga Inn and Recreational Facility and Development Complex	Waste Water	Nottawasaga Inn, Alliston	C	14-Jun-07
Township of Brooke-Alvinston	Inwood Sewage Collection System	Waste Water	Township of Brooke-Alvinston	B	18-Jun-07
Municipality of West Elgin	Graham Road Watermain Extension	Water Works	Municipality of West Elgin	B	29-Jun-07

**MEA Municipal Class EA  
NoCs for Schedule B and C Projects**

January to December, 2007

<b>PROPONENT</b>	<b>PROJECT NAME</b>	<b>PROJECT TYPE</b>	<b>LOCATION</b>	<b>SCHEDULE</b>	<b>DATE OF COMPLETION</b>
Huron County	Rehabilitation of Wroxeter Bridge	Road	Wroxeter	B	30-Jun-07
Regional Municipality of Durham	Simcoe Street North between Oshawa Creek and Conlin Road	Road	Regional Municipality of Durham (the Region)	C	03-Jul-07
Township of Faraday/Town of Bancroft Waste Management Board	Faraday Landfill Leachate Management Project	Waste Water	Township of Faraday/Town of Bancroft Waste Management Board (WMB)	B	03-Jul-07
Regional Municipality of Peel	Ben Machree Sewage Pumping Station	Waste Water	Mississauga (meadowdale)	B	04-Jul-07
Bram West Developers' Group	Sub-Area 40-3 Block Plan and Transportation Master Plan in the Bram West Secondary Plan Integrated Planning Approach	Master Plan	City of Brampton	C	04-Jul-07
Municipality of Chatham-Kent	Ridgetowns Sewage Treatment Plant	Waste Water	Municipality of Chatham-Kent	C	05-Jul-07
Corporation of the City of Barrie	Cedar Pointe Drive Improvements (Dunlop Street West to Edgehill Drive)	Road	The Corporation of the City of Barrie	B	05-Jul-07
Township of Southwold	Water System Improvements South Service Area	Water Works	Southwold	B	06-Jul-07
City of North Bay	Pressure Zone 4- Servicing CFB Northbay and North Bay Airport	Water Works	North Bay	B	09-Jul-07
Town of Collingwood	Collingwood Wastewater Servicing Needs	Waste Water	Town of Collingwood	C	14-Jul-07
Township of Perth South	Rehabilitation of Line 15 and 16 Bridges	Road	Perth South	B	26-Jul-07
Municipality of Strathroy-Carleton Place	Extension of Wright St and adair Boulevard	Road	Strathroy	B	27-Jul-07
City of Hamilton	Trinity Church Arterial Corridor	Road	City of Hamilton	C	30-Jul-07
City of Oshawa	John St East Extension	Road	Oshawa	B	01-Aug-07
Loyalist Township	Fairfield Water System Storage Project	Water Works	Loyalist Township	B	02-Aug-07
Municipality of Chatham-Kent	Wallaceburg Water Treatment Plant	Waste Water	Wallaceburg	C	03-Aug-07
Regional Municipality of Waterloo	Fairway Road extension	Road	Zeller Dr to Fountain St	C	07-Aug-07
Township of East Zorra-Tavistock	Master Storm System Drainage Plan	Master Plan	Village of Tavistock	B	10-Aug-07

**MEA Municipal Class EA  
NoCs for Schedule B and C Projects**

January to December, 2007

<b>PROPONENT</b>	<b>PROJECT NAME</b>	<b>PROJECT TYPE</b>	<b>LOCATION</b>	<b>SCHEDULE</b>	<b>DATE OF COMPLETION</b>
Town of Collingwood	High Street reconstruction and infrastructure improvements	Road	Poplar sideroad to Third St	C	13-Aug-07
Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	McCowan Road Reconstruction	Road	Bloomington Rd to Aurora Rd	B	13-Aug-07
Regional Municipality of Niagara	Regional Road 81 (ninth st -seventh st) improvement study	Road	Town on Lincoln/City of St. Catharines	C	17-Aug-07
Regional Municipality of Waterloo	Hespeler Rd CPR Grade Separation	Road	250 m North of Delta Intersection	c	17-Aug-07
Town of Ajax	Range Line Road	Road	Traffic Calming	B	17-Aug-07
Town of Oakville	Cornwall Road Improvements	Road	Maple Grove Dr. and Winston Churchill Blvd	C	21-Aug-07
Municipality of Oliver Paipoonge	Pole Line Road Bridge Replacement	Road	Pole Line Rd at Corbett Creek	B	24-Aug-07
City of Barrie	Anne St Improvements	Road	Dunlop West to Edgell Drive	C	27-Aug-07
City of Barrie	Duckworth St Improvements	Road	Rose St to Cundles Rd	C	27-Aug-07
City of Barrie	Mapleview Drive East Improvements	Road	Bayview to Young st	C	27-Aug-07
City Of Timmins	West of Mattagami River Sanitary Capacity Study	Waste Water	Timmins	B	04-Sep-07
Municipality of Port Hope	Construction of Treated Water Storage Reservoir	Water Works	Port Hope	B	05-Sep-07
Town of Huntsville	Hanes Road Improvements	Road	Huntsville	B	14-Sep-07
Region of Peel	Lakeview and Port Credit Sanitary Sewer Improvements	Waste Water	Port Credit	C	21-Sep-07
City of Hamilton	City of Hamilton Biosolids Master Plan	Master Plan	City of Hamilton, Woodward Ave Wastewater Treatment Plant	B	09-Oct-07
Town of Newmarket	Cane Parkway Class EA	Road	Cane Parkway - north of William Roe Blvd.	B	02-Feb-07
City of Toronto and York Region	Watermain from Kennedy pumping station to major mackenzie Drive	Water Works	Region of York Kennedy Road to Major Mackenzie	B	19-Oct-07
City of Hamilton	HCA2 Bridges Master Plan	Master Plan	Replacement of Bridges 95 and 297	B	03-Dec-07
Town of Milton	Main Street East/CPR Grade Separation	Road	Main Street East - East of Ontario St.	C	06-Dec-07

**MEA Municipal Class EA  
NoCs for Schedule B and C Projects**

January to December, 2007

<b>PROPONENT</b>	<b>PROJECT NAME</b>	<b>PROJECT TYPE</b>	<b>LOCATION</b>	<b>SCHEDULE</b>	<b>DATE OF COMPLETION</b>
City of Hamilton	Ward One Combined Sewage Overflow Storage Tank	Master Plan	Master Plan Addendum - Revised Location Of Storage Tanks - McMaster Zone 6 Parking Lot	B	07-Jan-08
City of Welland	Thorold Road Intersection	Road	Thorold Road/Rice Road to South Pelham Road - City of Welland	C	09-Jan-08
City of Brantford	Henry St Improvements	Road	stanley st to garden st	C	31-Dec-07
Municipality of Meaford	Expansion of the Meaford Wastewater Treatment Plant	Waste Water	Meaford	C	10-Jan-08
Village of Point Edward	Alexandra Ave Water Pollution Control Plant & Storm Station	Waste Water	Village of Point Edward	B	24-Dec-07
Municipality of Southwest Middlesex	Glencoe Sanitary Sewage Collection and Treatment System	Waste Water	Glencoe	C	21-Dec-07
The Town of Milton	Main St east CPR grade Separation	Road	Milton	C	06-Dec-07
The Township of Tay	Tay Area Water System Upgrades	Water Works	Tay Township	B	02-Jan-08
Township of North Huron	Replacement of a Sanitary Sewage Forcemain (wongham sewage treatment plant)	Addendum	Town of Wingham	B	08-Dec-07
Municipality of South Huron	Construction of a transmission watermain	Water Works	Community of Exeter- Thames Rd - Dashwood Rd	B	16-Nov-07
Township of Georgian Bluffs	Cobble Beach Wastewater Treatment Plant	Addendum	Cobble Beach	C	19-Dec-07
City of Brantford	Trunk sanitary sewer replacement	Waste Water	Glenwood Drive to Wastewater Treatment Plant	B	17-Dec-07
City Of Belleville	Bell Boulevard East Extension	Addendum	North Park St to Cannifton Road	C	09-Dec-07
City of Niagara Falls	Warren Creek Watershed	Water Works	Niagara Falls	B	28-Dec-07
Municipality of Halton	Georgetown water purification plant expansion and upgrades	Water Works	Cedarvale Well Field	C	10-Dec-07
Region of Waterloo	Integrated urban water system	Water Works	Cambridge East	B	28-Dec-07

**MEA Municipal Class EA  
NoCs for Schedule B and C Projects**

January to December, 2007

PROPONENT	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT TYPE	LOCATION	SCHEDULE	DATE OF COMPLETION
*Westhill Developments Limited	Lebovic Enterprises Limited	Water Works	Aurora	C	*Private sector. Integrated approach. Appealed to the OMB
City of Hamilton	Hamilton Conservation Authority	Master Plan	Master Plan for Bridge Replacements	B	03-Dec-07
Town of Milton	Main Street East/CPR Grade Separation	Road	Main Street East - CPR Grade Separation.	C	06-Dec-07
Regional Municipality of York	Water Supply and Storage King City	Water Works	Dufferin Street and King Road	C	05-Oct-07
County of Norfolk	Port Rowan WPCP Upgrade	Waste Water	Construction of New Pumping Station - Ellist Street	B	29-Sep-07
City of Kitchener	Consolidated Maintenance Facility Review	Road	New Site - 131 Goodrich Drive	C	31-Dec-07
Region of Waterloo	Townline Road Improvements	Road	Can-Amara Parkway to Gore/Avenue Road	C	19-Nov-07
Township of Norwich	Avery's Lane Bridge Replacement	Road	Avery's Lane	B	02-Nov-07
City of Mississauga	Rehabilitation of the Barbetown Bridge	Road	Barbetown Bridge - Credit River	B	11-Nov-07
District Municipality of Muskoka	Kelvin Grove Park Bridge	Road	Kelvin Grove Park-Muskoka Road	B	16-Nov-07
City of Hamilton	Rymal Road Improvements	Road	ROPA 9	C	01-Oct-07
Regional Municipality of Waterloo	Well K36	Water Works	Well K36- Brigadoon	C	19-Jul-07
Master Plan					
Road					
Water Works					
Waste Water					
Addendum					
<b>Total</b>					

*APPENDIX C*

*SUMMARY OF*

*PART II ORDER REQUESTS*

## MINISTER'S DECISIONS

Proponent	Appeal Date	Decision Date	Review Time	Decision	Number of Conditions
Loyalist	2005-02-09	2007-05-30	840	Deny	2
Chatham-Kent	2005-05-20	2007-01-24	614	Deny	16
London	2005-06-02	2007-06-25	753	Deny	14
Brampton	2005-12-10	2007-04-05	481	Deny	6
Peel	2005-12-14	2007-08-29	623	Deny	0
Hamilton	2005-12-15	2007-01-16	397	Deny	0
Brampton	2006-02-14	2007-06-05	476	Deny	3
Barrie	2006-02-26	2007-01-10	318	Deny	0
Sault Ste. Marie	2006-03-28	2008-01-15	658	Deny	0
York	2006-04-10	2007-05-15	400	Deny	0
London		2007-07-04		Deny	0
Mississauga	2006-05-09	2007-01-08	244	Deny	3
London	2006-06-08	2008-01-15	586	Deny	0
Brantford	2006-06-12	2007-01-10	212	Deny	0
Wellington North	2006-07-23	2007-03-27	247	Deny	0
Ottawa	2006-08-21	2007-07-07	320	Deny	1
Cavan-Millbrook- North Monaghan	2006-09-22	2007-04-27	217	Deny	5
Central Huron	2006-09-26	2007-08-29	337	Deny	0
York-Durham	2006-10-23	2007-03-21	149	Deny	15
Prince Edward County	2006-11-10	2007-09-10	304	Deny	0

*APPENDIX D*

*NOTES FROM*

*ANNUAL MEETING OF THE*

*MEA CLASS EA*

*MONITORING COMMITTEE*

**NOTES FROM ANNUAL MEETING OF  
MEA CLASS EA MONITORING COMMITTEE WITH MOE  
June 16<sup>th</sup>, 2008**

---

---

Present: Paul Knowles - MEA  
Uwe Mader - MEA  
Jeffrey Dea - MOE  
Solange Desautels - MOE

- 1) A draft Monitoring Report, which follows the format of previous Monitoring Reports, was reviewed.
- 2) An analysis, of the Minister's responses to Part II Order Requests, shows that 20 requests were denied and no orders were issued in 2007. The time, for the Minister to respond, ranged from 149 to 840 days. MEA finds this response time unacceptable. In 2006, the Director of the EA Branch promised that the authority to respond to Part II Order Request would be delegated to the Director and that the responses would be provided in a timely manner. MEA is disappointed that this does not seem to have occurred;  
  
MOE advised that the Ministry is currently clearing a backlog of Part II Order Requests and plans to be more timely with responses in the future. Even though it is 2008 data, MOE will provide copies of recent Minister's letters so data can be included in the Monitoring Report;
- 3) MEA intends to submit a minor amendment, to the Municipal Class EA, to;
  - a) adjust the cost limits identified for Schedule B and C projects; and
  - b) ensure the 10 year shelf life applies to all Schedule B and C projects completed after September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2007;
- 4) MEA will forward a draft clarification, to MOE for comment, which explains pumping stations are located throughout a collection system and that the headworks of a Sewage Treatment Plant should not be considered a pumping station; and
- 5) MEA will forward proposed minor amendment and clarification to MOE. MEA will finalize and submit monitoring report prior to October 4<sup>th</sup>, 2008.

## CLARIFICATION PUMPING STATIONS vs SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANTS

---

**Pumping Stations** are sewage works located throughout the collection system that pump the sewage from a low area directly to a Sewage Treatment Plant or up into a gravity sewer so it can continue flowing to the Sewage Treatment Plant. They are generally comprised of a wet well, pumps and a forcemain and are often located in residential areas. The Municipal Class EA Project Schedules set out criteria to classify pumping stations, specifically;

**Schedule A (2)** - 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;

**Schedule 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;

**Schedule B (8)** - 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; and

**Schedule C** - NA

**Sewage Treatment Plants** are located at the end of the sewage collection system where they treat the sewage before discharge to the environment. They are generally located in an isolated area with a buffer to sensitive land uses. Sewage Treatment Plants are generally comprised of:

**headworks** - where the sewage is lifted, screened and grit removed;

**clarifiers** - tanks where solids in the sewage are settled and removed;

**Aeration tanks** - tanks where air is added for the biological stabilization of organic matter;

**solid handling system** - where solids, from sewage, are collected, dewatered, stabilized and then released into the environment;

**disinfection** - where final effluent is treated before discharge; and

**outfall** - pipe/conduit that discharges treated effluent to the environment.

The Municipal Class EA Project Schedules set out criteria to classify Sewage Treatment Plants, specifically:

**Schedule A (3)** - Expand/refurbish/upgrade sewage treatment plant including outfall up to existing rated capacity where no land acquisition is required;

**Schedule A (9)** - Increase sewage treatment plant capacity beyond existing rate 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.

**Schedule A+** - NA

**Schedule B (10)** - 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;

**Schedule B (11)** - 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; and

**Schedule C (2)** - Construct new sewage treatment plant or expand existing sewage treatment plant beyond existing rated capacity including outfall to receiving water body.

A Sewage Treatment Plant includes all components of both the liquid and solid treatment process and, although the individual components may not be separately identified, the criteria, established in the Class EA Project Schedules, are designed to apply to all components of the Sewage Treatment Plant. Works, at the Sewage Treatment Plants, must be planned following the appropriate Project Schedule for Sewage Treatment Plants whether the work involves several components of the plant or just a single component.

MOE advised that the Ministry is currently clearing a backlog of Part II Order Requests and plans to be more timely with responses in the future.

October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2008

Director of Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch  
Ministry of the Environment  
2 St. Clair Avenue West, Floor 12A  
Toronto, ON  
M4V 1L5

**RE: Municipal Class EA Minor Amendment**

Dear Director:

MEA has now completed the 2007 Monitoring Report and has identified the need for a minor amendment to address two issues:

- 1) Adjust Cost Limits - The Project Schedule Tables, which begin on Page I-4, set cost limits of 2.2m and 8.7m. The Class EA also states "*the MEA Monitoring committee will review these costs on an annual basis and any change will be subject to a minor amendment*". The attached Tender Price Index, produced by MTO, shows that the average annual increase for the past year has been 10.24%. MEA hereby requests a minor amendment to increase the cost limits, in the schedules, from 2.2m to 2.4m and 8.7m to 9.5m;
- 2) Shelf Life - During the preparation of the 2007 Municipal Class EA, it was intended that the Lapse of Time limits, for all Schedule B and C Projects, should be consistent. MEA hereby requests a minor amendment to:

Revise Section A.4.1.1 Revisions to Schedule B projects to read:  
*"Similarly, if the period of time from (i) filing of the Notice of Completion of ESR in the public record or (ii) the MOE's denial of a Part II Order request(s), to the proposed commencement of construction for the project exceeds ten (10) years, the proponent shall review the planning and design process and the current environmental setting to ensure that the project and the mitigating measures are still valid given the current planning context."*

We ask for your approval of these two minor amendments to the Municipal Class EA.

Yours truly

Paul Knowles, Chair, Municipal Engineers Association  
Monitoring Committee  
613-257-6207