

Regional Municipality of York

Appendix 3D

Changes to the Evaluation Criteria and Indicators in the Pine Valley Drive Transportation Corridor ToR

Prepared by:

AECOM

Project #

60114489

Date:

September, 2011

Changes to the Evaluation Criteria and Indicators in the Pine Valley Drive Transportation Corridor ToR

Proposed Draft Criteria / Indicators	Proposed Final Criteria / Indicators	Rationale for Change from Draft Criteria / Indicators
1. Transportation		
1.1. Provision of adequate road transportation capacity within the study area 1.1.1. Ability to achieve peak hour volume-to-capacity performance at defined north-south and east-west screenlines within the study area for the horizon year that reflects full build-out of planned study area development 1.1.2. Indicators to be further developed during the EA process	1.1 Potential effects on road transportation capacity within the study area in 2031 1.1.1 Peak hour volume-to-capacity performance on arterial roads within the study area in 2031 <i>No other indicators were deemed to be required for applying the criterion based on the Project Team's review or in response to comments received</i>	1.1 Minor rewording to clarify criterion, specify the horizon year, and to make consistent with wording of other criteria 1.1.1 Minor rewording to clarify indicator
1.2. Efficiency of the transportation system within the study area 1.2.1. Average travel time for auto trips originating in and/or destined for traffic planning zones within the study area for the peak hours for the horizon year 1.2.2. Average trip length (in kilometres) for auto trips originating in and/or destined for traffic planning zones within the study area for the peak hours for the horizon years. 1.2.3. Total out-of-way travel (in vehicle-kilometres) for road and transit trips 1.2.4. The number of major signalized intersections within the study area, which after being optimized with respect to configuration and operation would nonetheless be unable to achieve volume-to-capacity performance standards in the horizon year 1.2.5. Indicators to be further developed during the EA process	1.2 Potential effects on transportation system efficiency within the study area in 2031 1.2.1 Travel time to, from and within the study area for the AM peak hours in 2031 1.2.2 Trip length to, from and within the study area for the AM peak hours in 2031 <i>No other indicators were deemed to be required for applying the criterion based on the Project Team's review or in response to comments received</i>	1.2 Minor rewording to clarify criterion , specify the horizon year, and to make consistent with wording of other criteria 1.2.1 Minor rewording to clarify indicator 1.2.2 Minor rewording to clarify indicator 1.2.3 More appropriate to be considered at the Alternative Methods evaluation phase because detail could not be measured at this time 1.2.4 More appropriate to be considered at the Alternative Methods evaluation phase because detail could not be measured at this time
1.3. Potential Effects on public transit, cycling and pedestrians 1.3.1. Effects on the public transit related objectives of the Regional Transportation Master Plan 1.3.2. Change in the number of dwelling units and businesses within 300 metres of transit services 1.3.3. Change in transit access time to planned rapid transit service in the Highway 7 corridor 1.3.4. Effects on the integrity of the Vaughan Pedestrian and Cycling Master Plan	1.3 No Change 1.3.1 Public transit usage for originating and destined travel in 2031 1.3.2 Consistency with the public transit related objectives of the Regional Transportation Master Plan and with the Vaughan Pedestrian and Cycling Master Plan	1.3 No rationale necessary 1.3.1 Original indicator combined with 1.3.4 to form a new indicator (1.3.2) because of their commonality; New indicator added to evaluate expected transit usage within study area in place of 1.3.2 and 1.3.3 1.3.2 Original indicator is more appropriate to be considered at the Alternative Methods evaluation phase because detail could not be measured at this time; See comment on 1.3.1 above for new indicator 1.3.3 More appropriate to be considered at the Alternative Methods evaluation phase because detail could not be measured at this time 1.3.4 See comment on 1.3.1 above
1.4. Potential effects on public safety 1.4.1. Total daily travel within the study area (in-vehicle – kilometres) in the horizon year, as a proxy for the number of accidents 1.4.2. The number of existing complex or unusual road design elements that will be subjected to significantly increased traffic volumes for the horizon year and the number of additional complex or unusual road design elements in the study area. 1.4.3. Ability to satisfy standard fire, police, and paramedical service response times within the study area for the horizon year	1.4 No Change 1.4.1 Number of collisions within the study area in 2031 1.4.2 Change in emergency services response times within the study area by 2031	1.4 No rationale necessary 1.4.1 Proposed indicator used as the measure for the number of collisions 1.4.2 Original indicator is more appropriate to be considered at the Alternative Methods evaluation phase because detail could not be measured at this time; New indicator was moved from 1.4.3 and was reworded for clarity and to specify the horizon year 1.4.3 See comment on 1.4.2 above
	1.5 Potential approval requirements 1.5.1 Local/regional approval and permit requirements 1.5.2 Provincial approval and permit requirements 1.5.3 Federal approval and permit requirements	1.5 Final criteria and indicators added to the Transportation Factor from the proposed criteria and indicator associated with the Social Factor because the approval requirements reflect more than just the Social Factor
2. Natural Environment		
2.1. Potential Effects on the Aquatic Environment 2.1.1. Direct loss of aquatic habitat and functions 2.1.2. Indirect loss of aquatic habitat and functions through sedimentation, road salt, and/or dewatering 2.1.3. Direct loss of aquatic species 2.1.4. Indirect loss of aquatic species through sedimentation and/or road salt 2.1.5. Severance of/encroachment on aquatic/wetland ecosystems 2.1.6. Impact on species at risk (Species At Risk Act), including rare, threatened, endangered and species of local concern 2.1.7. Changes to surface water quality (increased pollutants) and quantity (flood levels and erosion) 2.1.8. Changes to groundwater quality (increased pollutants) and quantity (fluctuation of groundwater levels) 2.1.9. Changes to groundwater functions in relation to recharge/ discharge and aquatic/wetland habitat	2.1 No Change 2.1.1. Effects on aquatic habitats and functions 2.1.2. Effects on wetland habitats and functions 2.1.3. Effects on aquatic species at risk (according to COSSARO and COSEWIC), including endangered, concern/rare species and provincially rare species (S1-S3 NHIC) 2.1.4. Changes to surface water quality (increased pollutants) and quantity (flood levels and erosion)	2.1 No rationale necessary 2.1.1 Indicator broadened to include loss (direct and indirect) and disturbance (e.g., through encroachment) 2.1.2 New indicator added to address effects on wetlands separately 2.1.3 Indicator broadened to include loss (direct and indirect) of species at risk 2.1.4 Original indicator included in 2.1.3; New indicator was originally 2.1.7 2.1.5 Indicator included in 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 (effects of road salt and other pollutants also addressed in 2.3.4) 2.1.6 Indicator included in 2.1.3 2.1.7 Indicator moved to 2.1.4 2.1.8 Original indicator included in criterion 2.3, which allows groundwater to be addressed separately and in more detail 2.1.9 Original indicator included in criterion 2.3, which allows groundwater to be addressed separately and in more detail

Changes to the Evaluation Criteria and Indicators in the Pine Valley Drive Transportation Corridor ToR

Proposed Draft Criteria / Indicators	Proposed Final Criteria / Indicators	Rationale for Change from Draft Criteria / Indicators
<p>2.2. Potential Effects on the Terrestrial Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.2.1. Direct loss of wildlife habitats and functions 2.2.2. Direct loss of interior forest nesting wildlife 2.2.3. Indirect loss of interior forest nesting wildlife 2.2.4. Indirect loss of wildlife habitats and functions through noise, dust, spray, air quality, etc. 2.2.5. Barrier effect on wildlife travel corridors 2.2.6. Wildlife-vehicle accidents 2.2.7. Severance of/encroachment on upland ecosystems 2.2.8. Effect of invasive plant species on vegetation communities 2.2.9. Impact on species at risk (Species at Risk Act) including rare, threatened, endangered and species of local concern 2.2.10. Effects on ANSIs, ESAs, or PSWs 2.2.11. Severance of greenways or open space linkages 2.2.12. Effects on forest cover 2.2.13. Effects on biodiversity 2.2.14. Effects on ecosystem integrity 	<p>2.2 No Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.2.1. Effects on wildlife habitats / forest cover 2.2.2. Effects on terrestrial species at risk (according to COSSARO and COSEWIC), including endangered, threatened and special concern/rare species, provincially rare (S1-S3 NHIC) and locally significant sensitive species (according to MNRs <i>Significant Wildlife Habitat Manual</i>) 2.2.3. Effects on ANSIs, ESAs, or PSWs 	<p>2.2 No rationale necessary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.2.1 Indicator broadened to include loss (direct and indirect) and disturbance to terrestrial habitat 2.2.2 Reordered from indicator 2.2.9 2.2.3 Reordered from indicator 2.2.10 2.2.4 More appropriate to be considered at the Alternative Methods evaluation phase because detail could not be measured at this time 2.2.5 Addressed in indicator 2.4.1 (Effects on ecological connectivity, within and outside or the study area) as barrier effect and degree of ecological connectivity are directly related 2.2.6 More appropriate to be considered at the Alternative Methods evaluation phase because detail could not be measured at this time 2.2.7 See comments on indicator 2.2.1 above 2.2.8 More appropriate to be considered at the Alternative Methods evaluation phase because detail could not be measured at this time 2.2.9 See comments on indicator 2.2.2 above 2.2.10 See comment on indicator 2.2.3 above 2.2.11 Included in indicator 2.4.2 (Effects on Natural Heritage System or open space), which was broadened to include effects on potential natural cover, including severance, removal, etc. 2.2.12 Included in indicator 2.2.1 - see comments on indicator 2.2.1 above 2.2.13 More appropriate to be considered at the Alternative Methods evaluation phase because detail could not be measured at this time 2.2.14 Addressed in criteria 2.1 and 2.2, as the concept of ecological integrity captured in indicators that address effects on habitats and species
<p>2.3.</p>	<p>2.3 Potential Effects on Groundwater</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.3.1. Effects on groundwater recharge areas. 2.3.2. Effects on groundwater discharge areas. 2.3.3. Effects on water supply and groundwater quantity in shallow wells 2.3.4. Changes to groundwater quality. 	<p>2.3 Indicators were consolidated from other sections so that groundwater could be addressed separately and in more detail (effects of stream crossings are addressed in indicator 2.1.1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.3.1 No rationale needed 2.3.2 No rationale needed 2.3.3 No rationale needed 2.3.4 No rationale needed
<p>2.4. Potential effects on the broader regional Natural Heritage System</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.4.1. Effects on ecological connectivity, within and outside or the study area 2.4.2. Effects on habitat patch quality (i.e., size/shape) 2.4.3. Effects on the distribution of species and vegetation communities of concern within and outside of the study area 	<p>2.4 No Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.4.1. <i>No change</i> 2.4.2. Effects on Natural Heritage System or open space 	<p>2.4 No rationale necessary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.4.1 No rationale needed 2.4.2 Original indicator is more appropriate to be considered during the Alternative Methods evaluation phase because detail could not be measured at this time; New indicator addresses effects on potential natural cover, including severance, removal, etc 2.4.3 More appropriate to be considered at the Alternative Methods evaluation phase because detail could not be measured at this time
<p>2.5. Potential effects on natural resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.5.1. Loss of soils 2.5.2. Effects on woodland resources 2.5.3. Effects on native vegetation 	<p>2.5 Deleted</p>	<p>2.5 Deleted because indicators reflected in other criteria/indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.5.1 Moved to indicator 3.1.3 as it is a better fit with <i>Potential Effects on Existing Land Uses/ Resources</i> 2.5.2 Included in criterion 2.2 as effects on woodland resources addressed through discussion of effects on terrestrial habitat 2.5.3 Included in criterion 2.2 as effects on native vegetation addressed through discussion of effects on terrestrial habitat
3. Socio-Economic Environment		
<p>3.1. Potential effects on existing land uses/resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.1.1. Effects on residences 3.1.2. Effects on businesses 3.1.3. Effects on recreational/community facilities 3.1.4. Effects on TRCA (administration, activities, resources) 3.1.5. Effects on the Boyd Conservation Area 3.1.6. Effects on Kortright's operation 	<p>3.1 Potential effects on existing land uses/resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.1.1 Disturbance to residential communities, businesses, institutions, and/or recreational/community facilities 3.1.2 Disturbance to individual residences outside of residential communities 3.1.3 Loss of / disturbance to open space land uses 3.1.4 Loss of Class 1, 2, and 3 agricultural soils 3.1.5 Changes to noise levels 	<p>3.1 No rationale needed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.1.1 Quantitative approach used for this indicator and includes other original indicators 3.1.2 Original indicator included in 3.1.1; Quantitative approach used for the new indicator which includes other original indicators 3.1.3 Original indicator included in 3.1.1; Quantitative approach used for this indicator and includes other original indicators

Changes to the Evaluation Criteria and Indicators in the Pine Valley Drive Transportation Corridor ToR

Proposed Draft Criteria / Indicators	Proposed Final Criteria / Indicators	Rationale for Change from Draft Criteria / Indicators
3.1.7. Loss of Class 1,2 and 3 agricultural soils 3.1.8. Impacts to property 3.1.9. Permanently closing or altering pedestrian/bicycle accesses 3.1.10. Permanently closing or altering driveway/business accesses 3.1.11. Through traffic infiltration via local roads 3.1.12. Disruption of infrastructure/services including rail lines and pipelines 3.1.13. Encroachment upon waste disposal sites and contaminated property 3.1.14. Effects on educational values and interpretive uses 3.1.15. Effects on existing and planned regional trail systems 3.1.16. Effects on drinking water 3.1.17. Effects on access to natural heritage resources 3.1.18. Community effects 3.1.19. Effects on passive recreation potential of scenic/natural adjacent sites 3.1.20. Increased roadway noise levels 3.1.21. Construction disturbances through noise, dust, fumes, temporary closure of driveways/accesses 3.1.22. Changes to air quality	3.1.6 Changes to air quality	3.1.4 Original indicator included in 3.1.1; New indicator is moved from 3.1.4 3.1.5 Original indicator included in 3.1.3; New indicator is moved from 3.1.20 3.1.6 Original indicator included in 3.1.3; New indicator is moved from 3.1.22 3.1.7 Moved to 3.1.4 3.1.8 Included in indicators 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 3.1.9 Included in indicators 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 3.1.10 Included in indicator 3.1.1 3.1.11 More appropriate to be considered at the Alternative Methods evaluation phase because detail could not be measured at this time 3.1.12 More appropriate to be considered at the Alternative Methods evaluation phase because detail could not be measured at this time 3.1.13 More appropriate to be considered at the Alternative Methods evaluation phase because detail could not be measured at this time 3.1.14 Included in indicator 3.1.3 3.1.15 Included in indicator 3.1.3 3.1.16 Effects on water wells included in indicator 2.3.3 3.1.17 Included in indicator 3.1.3 3.1.18 Included in new criterion 3.5 (Potential effects on existing community character and sustainability) 3.1.19 Included in indicator 3.1.3 3.1.20 Moved to 3.1.5 3.1.21 Included in indicators 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 3.1.22 Moved to 3.1.6
3.2. Potential effects on approved/proposed land uses 3.2.1. Impacts to approved/proposed development plans 3.2.2. Impacts to land use designations	3.2 Potential effects on approved/proposed land uses 3.2.1. Effects on approved/proposed development plans	3.2 No rationale needed 3.2.1 Minor rewording to clarify indicator 3.2.2 Included in criterion 3.3 (Potential for conforming with approved local, regional, and provincial plans and policies)
3.3. Potential for conforming with approved local, regional and provincial plans and policies (such as City and Regional Official Plans, ORMA, York Region's Greenland System, PPS, Growth Plans, Greenbelt legislation etc.) 3.3.1. Conflicts with identified goals/objectives	3.3 Potential for conforming with approved local, regional and provincial plans and policies (City and Regional Official Plans, PPS, Growth Plan, Greenbelt Plan) 3.3.1. Conformance with local plans and/or policies 3.3.2. Conformance with regional plans and/or policies 3.3.3. Conformance with provincial plans and/or policies	3.3 Reworded to match other criteria 3.3.1 Revised application from conflicts to conformance 3.3.2 New indicator to focus on regional plans and policies 3.3.3 New indicator to focus on provincial plans and policies
3.4. Potential approval requirements 3.4.1. Need for local, regional, provincial, and/or federal approvals/permits	3.4 Moved to Transportation category	3.4 Criterion moved to transportation category 3.4.1 Moved to transportation category
	3.5 Potential effects on existing community character and sustainability 3.5.1. Change in the perception of the community as a place to live, work or do business	3.5 Moved from criteria 3.1 3.5.1 Included to show importance of perception of the community
4. Cultural Environment		
4.1. Potential effects on archaeological resources 4.1.1. Alteration or loss of known and not yet known archaeological sites	4.1 No Change 4.1.1 Loss or disturbance of known archaeological sites 4.1.2 Loss or disturbance of lands with potential for archaeological sites	4.1 No rationale needed 4.1.1 Original indicator split into effects on known sites and potential sites to capture broader range of effects (4.1.1 and 4.1.2)
4.2. Potential effects to cultural/heritage resources 4.2.1. Disruption or removal of built heritage features 4.2.2. Disruption or removal of cultural landscape units 4.2.3. Impacts to cemeteries	4.2 Potential effects on cultural/heritage resources 4.2.1 Disturbance or removal of built heritage features 4.2.2 Disturbance or removal of cultural landscape units 4.2.3 Disturbance or removal of cemeteries	4.2 No rationale needed 4.2.1 Minor rewording to clarify indicator 4.2.2 Minor rewording to clarify indicator 4.2.3 Minor rewording to clarify indicator
5. Cost/ Financial		
5.1. Potential implementation costs 5.1.1. Capital costs 5.1.2. Land acquisition costs 5.1.3. Annual operating and maintenance costs	5.1 Potential Implementation Costs 5.1.1 No Change 5.1.2 No Change 5.1.3 No Change	5.1 No rationale needed 5.1.1 No rationale needed 5.1.2 No rationale needed 5.1.3 No rationale needed