

## MCEA's FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

FAQ document is broken into 6 Categories:

1. Consultation for Schedule **A+** Projects
2. Heritage Bridge Evaluation
3. COVID19 Related
4. General Questions
5. Recent Changes in EA
6. Municipal Road Projects
7. Municipal Water and Wastewater Projects

### Consultation for Schedule **A+** Projects

1	<p><b>Q</b> for upgrade w/ww facility is there guidance on complexity where is not <b>A+</b></p> <p><b>A</b> Complexity should be considered when determining the consultation plan for Schedule A+ projects. For Schedule <b>B</b> or <b>C</b> projects the MCEA specifies the minimum consultation requirements. A proponent may also consider the complexity of a Schedule <b>B</b> or <b>C</b> project and may consider enhancing the minimum consultation required by the MCEA.</p>
2	<p><b>Q</b> <b>Re: slide 20: isn't traffic calming exempt in the Environmental Assessment Act itself? Is this changing?</b></p> <p><b>A</b> Correct and it is not changing. It is simply listed in the Schedule for reference - all projects in Schedule <b>A</b> or <b>A+</b> are exempt.</p>
3	<p><b>Q</b> <b>Could Part II order be filed for Schedule <b>A/A+</b> projects?</b></p> <p><b>A</b> No. It would not be accepted by MECP</p>
4	<p><b>Q</b> <b>Aren't bridge replacements a Schedule <b>B</b> or <b>C</b> until the new amendments are approved?</b></p> <p><b>A</b> Bridge replacement for non-heritage bridges are currently Schedule <b>A+</b>. The classification for heritage bridges will change with the new checklist and amendment to the MCEA.</p>

5	<p><b>Q</b> How much time before the beginning of construction should notices be sent? Is 2 weeks prior to the start considered enough?</p> <p><b>A</b> The timing for notice should suit the needs of the project.</p>
6	<p><b>Q</b> Paul, you mentioned that it is not possible to elevate schedule <b>A+</b> project to <b>B</b> or <b>C</b> schedule. So, what needs to be done if during detailed design it was identify that Schedule <b>A+</b> is not sufficient enough and requires higher schedule?</p> <p><b>A</b> During detailed design, if you discover that the project no longer matches the project description for Schedule <b>A+</b> and instead now matches the project description for a Schedule <b>B</b> or <b>C</b> project, then the project has changed and you would need to follow the Schedule <b>B</b> or <b>C</b> process.</p>
7	<p><b>Q</b> When would the proposed amendments to the MCEA be in place?</p> <p><b>A</b> we hope MECP moves ahead with the amendment soon</p>
8	<p><b>Q</b> If a project that would regularly require significant public consultation under schedule <b>B</b> or even <b>C</b> is now schedule <b>A</b>, what is holding the proponent to hold the level of consultation you are describing for this project?</p> <p><b>A</b> Municipalities are responsible to their citizens. MEA has provided guidance for consultation but it is the municipality's responsibility.</p>
9	<p><b>Q</b> Is "<i>present to council for final approval</i>" a requirement for Schedule <b>A+</b> project?</p> <p><b>A</b> Present to Council is not a Schedule <b>A+</b> requirement. Projects would be approved by whatever normal approval process exists in the municipality.</p>
10	<p><b>Q</b> For Schedule <b>A+</b>, <b>B</b> and <b>C</b> projects, is it necessary for the municipal clerk's name to be on the notifications as they are typically in charge of Legislative Services or can the public works manager issue the notices? Should the municipality have a policy which staff member should release the notices?</p> <p><b>A</b> There is no requirements in the MCEA for the contact that should be named. This is the proponent's decision.</p>
11	<p><b>Q</b> You mentioned at the end of the presentation that arterial/collector roads within subdivisions require an EA. I thought they were exempt under the planning act. Can you please expand or correct my assumption?</p>

	<b>A</b>	The MCEA currently exempts local roads contained within a subdivision. The amendment to the MCEA, if approved, would allow for approval of arterial and collector roads under certain circumstances.
12	<b>Q</b>	<b>What is the date that A+ projects became exempt?</b>
	<b>A</b>	June 2019.
13	<b>Q</b>	<b>Would a Master Plan have to have identified a project as A or A+ in order for it to be exempt?</b>
	<b>A</b>	The Master Plan should identify the project but need not comment on the MCEA Schedule.
14	<b>Q</b>	<b>If a municipal bridge rehab falls under transit expansion projects. Transit expansion also partnered with Province and Metrolinx. So, for such project how do we proceed with Provincial EA or MCEA?</b>
	<b>A</b>	The transit section of the MCEA is currently under review. The amended MCEA should clarify this issue.

## Heritage Bridge Checklist

1	<b>Q</b>	<b>Part 1 - #2 states that it is Schedule B if there is an increase in vehicle capacity and/or a substantial change in bridge location. What would be the schedule for a bridge replacement with NO additional vehicle capacity, at approximately the same location?</b>
	<b>A</b>	The MCEA Companion Guide offers the following advice - Same location means there is not a substantial change in location. A substantial change could be considered a change of >10%. For example a road allowance 20m wide and 1km long has an area of 20,000m <sup>2</sup> and a change less than 2,000m <sup>2</sup> would be <10%. Also, there should not be a requirement for new property – see CG-A1-15 (new property should trigger <b>Schedule B</b> ).
2	<b>Q</b>	<b>New bridge does not include replacement, correct?</b>
	<b>A</b>	Correct.

3	<p><b>Q Does the A+ designation for "emergency work" apply only to repairs/stabilization or can it apply to replacement as well once temporary stability work is done.</b></p> <p><b>A</b> It would apply to any work undertake as an emergency</p>
4	<p><b>Q Can you confirm the statement that a culvert with a span greater than 3 metres is considered a bridge under the MEA? The definition of a culvert is an "opening through soil", which does not provide a span limitation. As culverts are considered differently in the example projects, this would provide overlap for structures that could be classified as bridges and culverts.</b></p> <p><b>A</b> For culverts, the MCEA glossary references CSA-S6-00 which states "A structure that provides a roadway or walkway for the passage of vehicles, pedestrians, cyclists across an obstruction, gap, and has a span greater than 3 m."</p>
5	<p><b>Q As per UNSCO heritage structures to be preserved and repair to look same as is. if we have to rehabilitate a heritage bridge then where will find the specs?</b></p> <p><b>A</b> This is a detailed design question that is outside the EA process. Likely need to engage a professional with appropriate expertise</p>
6	<p><b>Q What if it is a lane reduction or permanent removal of the bridge?</b></p> <p><b>A</b> The new amended MCEA Manual clarifies that lane reductions (road diets) are Schedule A+. It also states "22a. Retirement of existing roads and road related facilities including bridges Note – A retired bridge with cultural heritage value is not to be removed without clearance from Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI) – use screening checklist developed with the MHSTCI and posted on the MEA website." Therefore if you are removing a bridge follow the checklist and <b>Schedule A+</b></p>
7	<p><b>Q In the Bridge Checklist / question #4b: By "plain concrete" do you mean non-reinforced or plain/simple in appearance?</b></p> <p><b>A</b> 1956 is a date when post WWII (modern mechanized) construction techniques would have been used.</p>
8	<p><b>Q Can the answers to the heritage questions be answered by heritage planners at the municipality or does it have to be an external consultant?</b></p> <p><b>A</b> Can be answered by internally at the Municipality even by the bridge engineer. No need for a heritage specialist at this point.</p>

9	<p><b>Q</b> In an emergency situation, why would it be an <b>A+</b> instead of an <b>A</b>, as it seems putting out public notice for an emergency issue seems unnecessary?</p> <p><b>A</b> Consultation requirement for <b>Schedule A+</b> are not onerous</p>
10	<p><b>Q</b> Regarding potential heritage value - would you please highlight on how the valuation will be done?</p> <p><b>A</b> The checklist is the valuation.</p>
11	<p><b>Q</b> Are the municipal or local heritage planners contacted as part of the heritage screening process?</p> <p><b>A</b> It is likely good practice to contact municipal or local heritage planners. You should exercise professional judgement depending upon the project.</p>
12	<p><b>Q</b> Our Class EA is on the border of Phase 1 and 2. The municipal co-proponent has a hold on non-essential newspaper advertisements to avoid distraction from COVID-related notices. Would the minimum consultation requirements still be met if a “joint notice of commencement and invitation of public comment” was issued in Phase 2? There is an example of this in the MEA manual.</p> <p><b>A</b> Joint notices are acceptable</p>
13	<p><b>Q</b> Do you have any suggestions about how to ensure that directly impacted property owners are properly notified when they are a business that is currently closed due to COVID-19, and there is no one on site to receive a registered letter?</p> <p><b>A</b> Ask owners for their tenant's contact information and/or enlist assistance from Chamber of Commerce or BIA to contact business owners.</p>
14	<p><b>Q</b> Does MEA have a list of qualified consultants to undertake <b>CHER</b> and <b>HIA</b> studies? We are finding it difficult to find such Consultants in rural Ontario.</p> <p><b>A</b> You may want to check for qualified consultants through the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals. Local municipal and regional governments may also have rosters for pre-qualified heritage consultants who can undertake this type of work, if not suggestions of consultants they have worked with and have demonstrated their experience.</p>

15	<p><b>Q</b> It appears the rehab/replacement of many heritage bridges are going to go from a current Schedule B to a C, particularly if the CHER recommends keeping it (even if it is unrealistic from an engineering perspective). Additionally, this appears to put Heritage firms (HF) in conflict with engineering good sense) - it gives them the HF a lot of power in determining the process - something they didn't have before.</p> <p><b>A</b> As the checklist demonstrates, the Ministry as agreed that a heritage bridge railing can be replaced if it does not meet current crash test requirements and this can proceed without even involving an expert - approval is automatic. You should work with the expert you have hired to find a solution that makes engineering sense. If you fail to find a solution you end up in a <b>Schedule C</b> process (which is the current process). This new checklist allows the opportunity to avoid the <b>Schedule C</b> process if you can successfully work with your heritage expert.</p>
16	<p><b>Q</b> Installing a new barrier between vehicle lanes and sidewalks can become a safety hazard. (Depends on location.) Please consider softening the guidance to consider adding a barrier in this location as an approach to be considered and evaluated for safety and suitability on a site-by site basis.</p> <p><b>A</b> The existing wording "consider providing a new barrier wall between road and sidewalk if adequate space and bridge capacity is available, and snow clearing operations can continue" begins with consider. This is intended to give the proponent the ability to make the best decision for the project.</p>
17	<p><b>Q</b> Could you please clarify how maintenance/repair is distinguished from change in Question 10 of the Bridge Checklist?</p> <p><b>A</b> Maintenance, Repair and Rehabilitation are all defined in the checklist instructions. Leaving the bridge unchanged is a rehabilitation project where the appearance looks new but is otherwise not changed</p>
18	<p><b>Q</b> What do you do if you do not know the age of the bridge or don't have records or someone who knows?</p> <p><b>A</b> use your professional judgement based on the available information</p>
19	<p><b>Q</b> A bridge previously went through the <b>B</b> process and was filed, but scope changes occurred during detailed design could trigger a <b>C</b>. Following the new Checklist, it would be <b>A+</b>. Would the best course be to issue an addendum stating the rationale for it going to <b>A+</b>, plus adequate consultation (e.g., open house)?</p>

	<p><b>A</b> Phase in provisions in the amended MCEA include "Any <b>Schedule B</b> or <b>C</b> project for which a Notice of Commencement has been issued under the 2000 Class EA as amended in 2015 shall continue under the 2000 Class EA as amended in 2015 until the project is completed, unless the proponent provides a Notice of Schedule Change to impacted stakeholders, government agencies, Indigenous communities and any interested persons due to the 2020 Class EA Amendments. While the 2020 amendments to the Class EA have changed schedules for various undertakings, proponents that have commenced an undertaking under the previous scheduling should consider whether it is appropriate to downgrade EA requirements based on how far along they are in the process (i.e. phase), the potential for environmental effects, public interest and the complexity of the project.</p>
--	---

## COVID19 Related

1	<p><b>Q</b> I would like to know your opinion on how to effectively consult with Indigenous communities during COVID-19 as many communities are closed now or unstaffed.</p> <p><b>A</b> I suggest you try personal contact but, if consultation is not possible, the project may have to be postponed</p>
2	<p><b>Q</b> Can you do a virtual PIC, if your municipal Bylaw does not specifically include this?</p> <p><b>A</b> The municipal bylaw/policy needs to specify how Notices are provided. In these notices the format for consultation will be described and this consultation could be in-person or virtual. The form may vary from project to project so the form of the consultation should not be detailed in the bylaw/policy.</p>
3	<p><b>Q</b> Are you required to mail out notices for virtual PICs, if the municipal bylaw doesn't cover this process?</p> <p><b>A</b> The MCEA minimum is a notice in 2 editions of a newspaper or follow individual municipal policy. But you are required to make reasonable efforts to reach impacted stakeholders and must therefore exercise judgement.</p>

4	<p><b>Q</b> Is there a concern that doing consultation primarily online could result in more Part II Order requests because it isn't seen by the public as adequate?</p> <p><b>A</b> It likely depends on how well the online consultation is done. Even with the COVID-19 restrictions personal follow up with individual stakeholders should happen.</p>
5	<p><b>Q</b> Just for clarification and for schedule B projects, instead of PIC we can have a virtual PIC by presenting boards online and asking for comments and it meets min requirements?</p> <p><b>A</b> Yes</p>
6	<p><b>Q</b> If it is the case, should we send a letter to the resident letting them know about it?</p> <p><b>A</b> the notice that is distributed to stakeholders should describe the consultation process. If a virtual PIC is planned to replace a previously anticipated in-person PIC then the notice should describe the change and the reason for the change</p>
7	<p><b>Q</b> Where you place your Enviro. Project Report for the 30 day review period if you cannot place them at public locations?</p> <p><b>A</b> Online is the most obvious location. The Notice of Completion needs to identify the location where the documents can be reviewed. Special arrangements should be made to accommodate those without access to a web site.</p>
8	<p><b>Q</b> There are certainly lots of online options for virtual open house or posting of information/reports; however, the fundamental issue is accessibility. Not everyone has access to computer/cell phone/laptop/tablet. The public may be criticizing the lack of accessibility and the integrity of the study process</p> <p><b>A</b> Efforts should be made to accommodate individual stakeholders in-person.</p>
9	<p><b>Q</b> Paul, is it sufficient to post only the boards on the website for public consultation with a comments sheet?</p> <p><b>A</b> yes -Your notices need to describe this consultation. Keep in mind that you need to exercise judgement and your consultation methods should match the complexity of the project.</p>
10	<p><b>Q</b> Does the consultation plan need to be updated if projects are mid-course?</p>



	<b>A</b>	If the consultation methods or timing have changed then the consultation plan needs to be updated
11	<b>Q</b>	<b>Do you have any recommendations for filing of a Master Plan?</b>
	<b>A</b>	The proponent needs to know and understand their community and use judgement when proceeding
12	<b>Q</b>	<b>Our Class EA is on the border of Phase 1 and 2. The municipal co-proponent has a hold on non-essential newspaper advertisements to avoid distraction from COVID-related notices. Would the minimum consultation requirements still be met if a “joint notice of commencement and invitation of public comment” was issued in Phase 2? There is an example of this in the MEA manual.</b>
	<b>A</b>	Joint notices are acceptable
13	<b>Q</b>	<b>Do you have any suggestions about how to ensure that directly impacted property owners are properly notified when they are a business that is currently closed due to COVID-19, and there is no one on site to receive a registered letter?</b>
	<b>A</b>	Ask owners for their tenant's contact information and/or enlist assistance from Chamber of Commerce or BIA to contact business owners.
14	<b>Q</b>	<b>The basic activity of preparing a physical mailout to adjacent landowners is logistically challenging (or not feasible) if consultant/municipal offices are closed.</b>
	<b>A</b>	If a mailout is deemed the appropriate method for contact and this challenge cannot be overcome the project may need to be postponed
15	<b>Q</b>	<b>For ongoing projects, we don't have everyone's email addresses, so we won't be able to contact all interested party electronically (and some may just not be feasible because they don't have access). How can that be overcome?</b>
	<b>A</b>	may have use other means to contact stakeholders
16	<b>Q</b>	<b>For the Main St. reconstruction Schedule A+ example; would you recommend completing some additional studies within the Schedule B and C category as well?</b>
	<b>A</b>	Addition studies (ie parking or lighting) should be completed when appropriate but it is all within the Schedule A+ process. Schedule A+ projects are exempted from the requirements of the EA Act and therefore not eligible to use the Schedule B or C process.

17	<p><b>Q</b> Could this be a time where the public may be more palatable for the public and is there any concern with extremely large levels of participation due to boredom and access on the internet?</p> <p><b>A</b> The proponent needs to know and understand their community and use judgement when proceeding</p>
18	<p><b>Q</b> Could this be a time where online consultation is more palatable for the public and is there any concern with extremely large levels of participation due to boredom and access on the internet?</p> <p><b>A</b> The proponent needs to know and understand their community and use judgement when proceeding</p>
19	<p><b>Q</b> Do remote meetings meet AODA requirements? Is MECP is OK with it, given that some portion of the population doesn't have access to a computer/internet at home?</p> <p><b>A</b> MECP reviewed and supported this presentation. As highlighted in the presentation, the proponent needs to make efforts to accommodate those that have difficult accessing the material</p>
20	<p><b>Q</b> For clarification, for Transportation Master Plan projects, can a virtual PIC/extending the comment period satisfy the min requirements?</p> <p><b>A</b> Yes - Notice must clearly explain the intended consultation</p>
21	<p><b>Q</b> Your thoughts on engaging during major a major crisis such as COVID, or some other global crisis of a similar scale. Is it appropriate, or might residents be distracted, disengaged, and focused on other more critical issues?</p> <p><b>A</b> A recent survey by Hill+Knowlton Strategies in March 27-29 2020 found that 79% of people feel that government consultations on line can be as effective as in-person. 58% feel that government engagement on issues not related to COVID-19 is still important at this time and 55% do not think in-person consultations will ever be appropriate again. So going forward proponent needs to carefully consider the project and the community when developing consultation plan.</p>
22	<p><b>Q</b> I think the fundamental questions is while we have tons of options for online engagement but the principle of the MCEA is we don't want members of the public and the community to feel left out. And the lack of accessibility to online forum are leaving out a segment of the population who we want to consult.</p>

	<p><b>A</b> The proponent needs to know and understand their community and use judgement when proceeding</p>
--	--

## General Questions

1	<p><b>Q</b> In the scope of recent changes to the Class EA, has there been any changes to the Cost Limit that establishes the appropriate Schedule?</p> <p><b>A</b> The cost limits have been adjusted for inflation to \$2.7m and \$10.3m in 2019. However, for the future, MEA is planning to amend the MCEA to remove cost as a criterion for determine the schedule of a project.</p>
2	<p><b>Q</b> Should the glossary definition of a “local road” be understood to include private roads?</p> <p><b>A</b> A private road is not a municipal road and therefore is not covered by the Municipal Class EA. The MCEA only covers municipal projects. Projects not included in the MCEA are exempt from the EA Act by Ontario Regulation 334/90 provided they cost less than \$3.5m</p>
3	<p><b>Q</b> would a low volume road, that is approved as part of a plan of subdivision, be considered a Class A project? (According to the project description #23 in Appendix-1)</p> <p><b>A</b> According to Project description #23 in Appendix-1, The construction of <b>local roads</b> (which are required as condition of approval of site plan, subdivision, etc.) is covered as Schedule A project.</p>

4	<p><b>Q A town is planning for a municipal facility (museum/tourist center) expansion that would be located entirely within a municipal water lot. Would it be subject to a Municipal Class EA process?</b></p> <p><b>A</b> The Municipal Class EA applies to road, water and sewer projects. The project described in the question statement does not fall within the scope of the MCEA, rather it should comply with the Planning Act, Conservation Authority and Building Code requirements.</p>
5	<p><b>Q Our city completed a MCEA Schedule-C process for X municipal project. Given the following details, do we need to complete an addendum to ensure that our environmental mitigative measures for this project are still valid? Should we be completing addendums for the individual projects that have not yet been started?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The process yielded several preferred alternative projects</li> <li>• The 30-day review of this study ended a 11 years ago</li> <li>• We started work on one, or more, of the preferred projects</li> </ul> <p><b>A</b> This part of the answer assumes that a definition of one problem was made clear in the original ESR (e.g. expand the capacity of a water treatment system), and it was also made clear that the solution was a series of projects that were necessary components of such solution.</p> <p>As long as you have begun construction on a part of the solution (one of the component projects) then you can proceed with implementing the solution by constructing the remaining component projects. To proceed, it is simply suggested that you document in your file; how proceeding is effectively implementing the main solution as per the original ESR. Given the timeframe, it would also be worthwhile to document that nothing in the environment has changed that would warrant a re-consideration of the preferred solution.</p>
6	<p><b>Q We have an EA that was completed 18 years ago, and a portion of the work was completed a year after the EA (17 years ago). The remainder of improvements as identified in the EA have yet to be completed. Would this EA still be valid or would a new one be required?</b></p> <p><b>A</b> Since you have begun the project, the EA is not considered expired. However, it is recommended to consider the following steps given the length of time since the last phase of the project. Since you have begun the project in less than 10 years of completing the EA, the EA is not considered expired. However, it is recommended to consider the following points given the length of time since the last phase of the project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply your professional judgement</li> <li>• Will the project still proceed as described in the original EA?</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has anything significant changed in the environment around the project?</li> <li>• Include a memo in your file which outlines your reasoning for concluding that the EA is still valid</li> <li>• Alternatively, you could prepare a short addendum report that describes how the project is still relevant and circulate the addendum</li> </ul>
7	<p><b>Q We completed a Schedule-B EA for the replacement of a 100 year heritage bridge. One of several recommendations of the EA was that a hydraulic assessment of the flow passing the bridge be completed. To our knowledge, there has never been an issue with the bridge opening. Would it be a contravention of the EA if a hydraulic assessment was not included in the design of the new bridge ?</b></p> <p><b>A</b> Since the EA has been completed and the commitment to complete a hydraulic capacity study was included in the preferred solution, then the proponent must follow through with everything that was included in the preferred solution. Alternatively, you could amend the EA and remove this commitment per your professional judgement and justification.</p>
8	<p><b>Q What EA Schedule is appropriate for decommissioning of a Municipally owned structure (bridge or structural culvert)?</b></p> <p><b>A</b> As per item #39-MCEA page I-6, <i>Retirement of existing roads and road related facilities</i> is <b>Schedule A+</b></p>
9	<p><b>Q I want to understand more about the differences in typical Class EA Schedule A versus Schedule B projects?</b></p> <p><b>A</b> The best way for understanding the different between <b>Schedule A</b> and <b>B</b> projects is to review the project examples in each of the Schedules in Appendix 1.</p>

## Recent Changes in Environmental Assessment

1	<p><b>Q In the scope of recent changes to the Class EA, has there been any changes to the Cost Limit that establishes the appropriate Schedule?</b></p> <p><b>A</b> The cost limits have been adjusted for inflation to \$2.7m and \$10.3m in 2019. However, for the future, MEA is planning to amend the MCEA to remove cost as a criteria for determine the schedule of a project.</p>
---	--

## Municipal Road Projects

1	<p><b>Q</b> Should the glossary definition of a “local road” be understood to include private roads?</p> <p><b>A</b> A private road is not a municipal road and therefore is not covered by the Municipal Class EA. The MCEA only covers municipal projects. Projects not included in the MCEA are exempt from the EA Act by Ontario Regulation 334/90 provided they cost less than \$3.5m</p>
2	<p><b>Q</b> would a low volume road, that is approved as part of a plan of subdivision, be considered a Class A project? (According to the project description #23 in Appendix-1)</p> <p><b>A</b> According to Project description #23 in Appendix-1, The construction of <b>local roads</b> (which are required as condition of approval of site plan, subdivision, etc.) is covered as <b>Schedule A</b> project.</p>
3	<p><b>Q</b> Is it possible to have a private road over a wetland? Which schedule would it trigger?</p> <p><b>A</b> Even if it was a municipal road (project), the fact that the road crosses a wetland is not a trigger that would be used to determine the category of assessment. There is other legislation that protects wetlands.</p>
4	<p><b>Q</b> Is a MCEA process required if a municipality is acquiring and dedicating land parts as public highway (no construction required) ?</p> <p><b>A</b> Assuming road under these circumstances should <u>not</u> trigger MCEA requirements as there is no physical construction. Definition of an undertaking under the EAA should therefore not apply. On the other hand, it would be good practice to treat it as <b>Schedule A+</b> project for transparency and to inform landowners in the vicinity of the road allowance of the change in ownership.</p>
5	<p><b>Q</b> Our municipality is designing a roundabout for an intersection of two rural roads, which Schedule does this project fall under ?</p>

	<p><b>A</b> The project falls under <b>Schedule A</b> or <b>A+</b>. A roundabout could be considered as an operational improvement at an intersection, or as a traffic control device. Refer to MCEA Document page I-5 items 12 and 13.</p>
6	<p><b>Q</b> <b>We completed a Schedule-B EA for the replacement of a 100 year heritage bridge. One of several recommendations of the EA was that a hydraulic assessment of the flow passing the bridge be completed. To our knowledge, there has never been an issue with the bridge opening. Would it be a contravention of the EA if a hydraulic assessment was not included in the design of the new bridge ?</b></p> <p><b>A</b> Since the EA has been completed the hydraulic capacity study was included in the preferred solution, then the proponent must follow through with everything that was included in the preferred solution. Alternatively, you could amend the EA and remove this commitment per your professional judgement and justification.</p>
7	<p><b>Q</b> <b>Regarding the construction of a new pedestrian bridge/water crossing associated with multi-use path cycling facility:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>What Schedule EA is required?</b></li> <li>• <b>What Schedule would be required if the pedestrian bridge were to be constructed inside the right-of way?</b></li> </ul> <p><b>A</b> If you have an existing bridge which you can modify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cycle lanes in a right-of-way are <b>Schedule A+</b> as per item #19 - MCEA page I-5</li> <li>• Cycle lanes outside of right-of-way are also <b>Schedule A+</b> as per item #22 - MCEA page I-5</li> </ul> <p>If you are looking to construct a <b>new multi-use path</b> connecting to a new water crossing that is intended only for cycling path, then your project falls under <b>Schedule A+</b> according to item #22 – MCEA page I-5</p>
8	<p><b>Q</b> <b>What EA Schedule is appropriate for decommissioning of a Municipally owned structure (bridge or structural culvert)?</b></p> <p><b>A</b> As per item #39-MCEA page I-6, <i>Retirement of existing roads and road related facilities</i> is <b>Schedule-A+</b></p>
9	<p><b>Q</b> <b>Are vertical profiles (of the road) required to be included in the ESR for a Schedule C MCEA for a road realignment?</b></p>

	<p><b>A</b> The ESR needs to define the project clear enough so that impacts are understood by all and can be evaluated. If the area is all generally flat and the vertical profile of the finished road will generally match surrounding properties, then a vertical profile is not likely necessary. However, if the new alignment includes some grade changes to the vertical profile this could have a significant impact on adjacent property owners and should be shown so it can be understood and evaluated.</p>
<p>10</p>	<p><b>Q</b> <b>Would a realignment of a road be considered as a new road, or as the reconstruction of a road according to MCEA?</b>  <b>In our project, the realignment will allow for the road to maintain its same purpose, without changes to its operation. I would like to receive clarification to determine the EA class schedule.</b></p> <p><b>A</b> The Municipal Class EA defines a NEW ROAD as "<i>the construction of an improved surface for vehicular traffic on a new right-of-way where the right-of-way is entirely separate from any previous right-of-way. Also refers to construction of a road on a road allowance where no road surface previously existed.</i>"</p> <p>This is commonly interpreted to mean that if your project includes purchasing some property to improve a curve but to basically reconstruct on the same right-of-way this would be a <b>Schedule A+</b> project (see example no. 19 of the Appendix 1 Road Section Tables).</p> <p>On the other hand, if your project involves constructing a road on mostly new property (even if it is for the same use and capacity) then it is considered a NEW ROAD or a road not at the same location and therefore a <b>Schedule B</b> or <b>C</b> (see example no. 20 or 21 of the Appendix 1 Road Section Tables ).</p> <p>Another consideration is if the project is related to a planning act approval it may be a <b>Schedule A</b> (see example no. 23 of the Appendix 1 Road Section Tables ).</p>
<p>11</p>	<p><b>Q</b> <b>I am doing the design for the separation of a combined sewer and road reconstruction. I would like to confirm if this type of project falls under a MCEA Schedule A.</b></p> <p><b>A</b> Your project likely fits this project type and therefore is a <b>Schedule A+</b></p> <p>According to MCEA, "<i>Establish, extend or enlarge a sewage collection system and all necessary works to connect the system to an existing sewage or natural drainage outlet, provided all such facilities are in either an existing road allowance or an existing utility corridor, included the use of Trenchless Technology for water crossings.</i>"</p>



	For the road portion of the project look at no. 19, Reconstruction, of the Appendix 1 Road Section Tables. It states that the reconstructed road or other linear paved facilities will be for the same purpose, use, capacity and at the same location as the facility being reconstructed (e.g. no change to the number of lanes) which is also <b>Schedule A+</b> .
12	<p><b>Q</b> If a 2-lane concrete bridge is in poor condition and needs replacement now but an EA has been completed as part of the flood protection study that recommends increasing the span of the bridge but implementation will take 8-10 years. If the bridge is replaced now with a steel structure as a temporary measure (8-10 years) until the future permanent structure is build and converted into active transportation facility. Is an EA study is necessary to construct the temporary bridge? If so, what will be the schedule?</p> <p><b>A</b> The answer depends on whether the EA completed as part of the flood protection study an MCEA process, and did the study concluded that the span of the bridge should be increased. When the MCEA is amended (hopefully soon) a change in hydraulic capacity will not be a factor in determining the MCEA Schedule. The MCEA does not include special provisions for temporary infrastructure. Define your project and then follow Part A of the Bridge Checklist to determine the MCEA Schedule.</p>

## Municipal Water and Wastewater Projects

1	<p><b>Q</b> Our city completed a MCEA Schedule-C process for our main wastewater treatment plant. Given the following details, do we need to complete an addendum to ensure that our environmental mitigative measures for this project are still valid? Should we be completing addendums for the individual projects that have not yet been started?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The process yielded several preferred alternative projects (new pumping station, new chlorine contact tanks, new membrane filtration facility)</li> <li>• The 30-day review of this study ended a 11 years ago</li> <li>• We started work on one, or more, of the preferred projects</li> </ul> <p><b>A</b> This part of the answer assumes that a definition of one problem was made clear in the original ESR (e.g. expand the capacity of the system), and it was also made clear that the solution was a series of projects that were necessary components of such solution.</p>
---	--

	<p>As long as you have begun construction on a part of the solution (one of the component projects) then you can proceed with implementing the solution by constructing the remaining component projects. To proceed, it is simply suggested that you document in your file; how proceeding is effectively implementing the main solution as per the original ESR. Given the timeframe, it would also be worthwhile to document that nothing in the environment has changed that would warrant a re-consideration of the preferred solution.</p>
2	<p><b>Q</b> <b>Our municipality is working on a project that involves upgrading/maintenance on an existing dock/port. Where does it fit in the Municipal Class EA and what Schedule would it fall under?</b></p> <p><b>A</b> Both Schedule B and C for Wastewater projects list a number of projects along or in a water course. I suggest you review this list and, if your project falls within one of these categories then the project would be covered by that schedule.</p> <p>If your project is not included in any of the projects listed in Schedule A, A+, B or C then it would not be covered by the MCEA. Projects not included in the MCEA are exempt from the EA Act by Ontario Regulation 334/90 provided they cost less than \$3.5m</p>
3	<p><b>Q</b> <b>A municipality is looking at developing a marina. The marina development would include floating docks, breakwaters, shoreline work, a building and dredging. The shoreline work and breakwaters are covered by Schedule C of the MCEA. How are the docks and dredging handled in a Provincial Class EA? or how does the MCEA cover these components of the project? We understand there will be a Federal review of the project as well.</b></p> <p><b>A</b> Both Schedule B and C for Wastewater projects list a number of projects along or in a water course. It is suggested that you review this list and, if your project falls within one of these categories then the project would be covered by that schedule.</p> <p>If your project is not included in any of the projects listed in Schedule A, A+, B or C then it would not be covered by the MCEA. Projects not included in the MCEA are exempt from the EA Act by Ontario Regulation 334/90 provided they cost less than \$3.5m</p>
4	<p><b>Q</b> <b>I am doing the design for the separation of a combined sewer and road reconstruction. I would like to confirm if this type of project falls under a MCEA Schedule-A.</b></p> <p><b>A</b> Your project likely fits this project type and therefore is a <b>Schedule A+</b></p> <p>According to MCEA, <i>“Establish, extend or enlarge a sewage collection system and</i></p>

	<p><i>all necessary works to connect the system to an existing sewage or natural drainage outlet, provided all such facilities are in either an existing road allowance or an existing utility corridor, included the use of Trenchless Technology for water crossings."</i></p> <p>For the road portion of the project look at no. 19, Reconstruction, of the Appendix 1 Road Section Tables. It states that the reconstructed road or other linear paved facilities will be for the same purpose, use, capacity and at the same location as the facility being reconstructed (e.g. no change to the number of lanes) which is also schedule A+.</p>
<p>5</p>	<p><b>Q My first question is about triggers for an Environmental Assessment under the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act (OEAA). An example could be the construction of a new Domestic Water Supply that will not involve the likely release of a polluting substance into a water body and will have a location more than 30m from a water body.</b></p> <p><b>What are the mechanisms used to determine if this will qualify for an EA under the OEAA? Also, how would it be decided if a Municipal Class EA can be used instead of preparing an individual EA?</b></p> <p><b>A</b> The triggers you mention (and even the term "triggers") sound like Federal EA.</p> <p>All municipal undertakings are subject to Ontario's EA Act. An individual EA is required unless the undertaking is exempt or is covered by a Class EA. It sounds like the undertaking you are describing would be covered by the Municipal Class EA as a <b>Schedule C</b> activity. However, you should carefully review the charts in Appendix 1 of the MCEA to determine the appropriate schedule for your project.</p>