

Enclosure 2: Review table for the Waterloo Airport Runway Project - Initial Project Description (IPD)

IPD submitted March 9, 2021 by the Region of Waterloo International Airport (the Proponent)

Please use this document to provide comments on the Waterloo Airport Runway Project (the Project). The document consists of two tables.

Table 1 will enable you to describe potential project effects.¹ The Impact Assessment Agency of Canada (the Agency) requires detailed advice to inform the Summary of Issues provided to the proponent pursuant to subsection 14(1) of the *Impact Assessment Act* (IAA). Please refer to prompts in the table to guide your responses.

Table 2 will facilitate the collection of general or editorial comments.

Table 1. Description of the potential effects of the Project – Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) Comments

| Comment ID | Document Reference | Valued Component | Project Component | Description of the Potential Effect (Context and Rationale) | Powers, Duties and Functions | Risk Characterization Rating | Instructions to the Proponent | Summary of the Issue |
|--|---|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| Please identify comments by organization and comment number. | If the comment is related to a specific section of the documentation, please provide a reference (e.g. title, section, subheading, page number). You may also choose to copy the relevant text here. | Identify the valued component(s)—within the mandate of your department, ministry or agency—to which the effect applies. This may include components of the environment, health, social or economic conditions. | If applicable, please indicate the project component that could cause the described effect. If the effect is linked to a power, duty or function, please identify the project component that would be regulated, monitored, or enabled by the power duty or function. | For each effect within your mandate (one effect per row), please provide the context and rationale. In your response, please respond to following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe whether the proponent has adequately articulated the effect. Provide rationale. If the proponent’s description is inadequate, please provide a detailed description of the effect, including the effects pathway from the project component to the valued component. Describe whether the proponent has identified and adequately articulated mitigation and/or monitoring measures to address the potential effect. Provide rationale. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> If the proponent has identified mitigation measures, provide your expert opinion of the proposed measures; indicate whether these mitigation measures are well understood and of proven effectiveness. If not, provide advice on how the effect could be managed through well-understood mitigation measures, and identify such measures. Describe whether the proponent has adequately articulated the potential for residual effects after mitigation has been applied. Provide a rationale. If the proponent’s description is inadequate, provide advice on the potential for residual effects. | Does your department, ministry or agency have powers, duties or functions associated with this effect? If yes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify the act and associated power, duty or function. Indicate whether the exercise of the associated power, duty or function would <u>mitigate, manage or set conditions</u> that would address the effect If applicable, ensure that mechanisms for consultation and engagement related to the power duty or function are included in Enclosure 1. | Based on the information that you have provided, please characterize the risk by selecting a rating (from [1] to [6]) for the effect (See Enclosure 3 for definitions) | Provide a specific, actionable request for the proponent Where applicable, provide instructions for how the proponent would build confidence in the Detailed Project Description and Response to the Summary of Issues to support or confirm the risk rating selected at left. | Where potential effects have been overlooked or are missing or could be better described and presented by the proponent, provide a concise synopsis for the Summary of Issues. Please, where possible, use simple (lay) language in your summary. |
| MECP-SW # 1 | Section 14 (Physical & Biological Environment), and Section 19 (Changes to the Environment) | Receiving surface water (Randall Drain and the Grand River) | Site stormwater management | The report identified that a stormwater management strategy will be developed to ensure that changes to surface water flow, groundwater and surface water quality are minimized. Details are yet to be described at the later stage of the project. | To protect the receiving waters an Environmental compliance approval (ECA) for stormwater system may be required from MECP under <i>Ontario Water Resources Act</i> . | 3 | Stormwater management strategy should detail existing stormwater management controls and assess any proposed changes and additions. The stormwater management strategy should be completed in accordance with the MECP document “Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual, March 2003.” The proposed works in the stormwater management strategy will | Site stormwater management strategies and spill managements should be discussed in detail to protect the receiving environment. An ECA may be required from the |

¹ effects in this context means changes to the environment or to health, social or economic conditions and the positive and negative consequences of these changes.

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| | | | | | | | likely require an Environmental Compliance Approval. Road salt is not used for winter de-icing; however, urea and potassium acetate are used on access roads within the airport. However, runway and plane de-icing activities were not identified. Onsite spill managements are not clearly articulated. The existing and proposed de-icing activities plan and control measures for all airport operations and spill managements to protect the receiving surface water quality should be detailed. | MECP for the proposed stormwater works. Currently a stormwater ECA for an Oil Grit Separator exits to manage stormwater from the Combined Services Facility at the airport (ECA # 3583-88EJWM, issued on August 30, 2010) |
| MECP-SW # 2 | Section 14 (Physical & Biological Environment) and Section 19 (Changes to the Environment) | Receiving surface water (Randall and Breslau Drains) | Construction dewatering of the proposed civil work | Baseflow of Randall and Breslau Drains may be impacted due to construction dewatering, both drains support several fish species along with other aquatic life. | A PTTW under <i>Ontario Water Resources Act</i> may be required depending on the rate and volume of water takings. | 3 | Effects of construction dewatering on Randall and Breslau Drains should be discussed; dewatering should be at a rate not to adversely impact baseflow of the drains. | Construction dewatering and its effects on the baseflow of Randal and Breslau Drains |
| MECP-SW # 3 | Section 14 (Physical & Biological Environment) , and Section 19 (Changes to the Environment) | Receiving surface waters (Randall Drain and the Grand River) | Construction dewatering of the proposed civil work | Potential quality of the construction dewatering waters was not identified, which may impact the receiving environment if discharged untreated. | An environmental compliance approval (ECA) for discharging of construction dewatering water may be required under <i>Ontario Water Resources Act</i> , depending on the quality of the discharge. | 3 | Quality of construction dewatering water should be analyzed to evaluate if a treatment would be required before its discharge to the natural environment. | Quality of construction dewatering water and its discharge to the natural environment. |
| MECP-Noise #1 | Section 15.3 Noise | 16 / NEF Contours, Planning, MECP NPC-300 | Stationary Sources | Please note that some facilities / activities supporting the airport operations may be considered stationary sources, in which case the hourly Leq sound level limits of NPC-300 would apply, rather than NEF sound level limits. | | 6 | Please identify any plans for such facilities, but this would be addressed as required. | |
| MECP-Noise #2 | Appendix E, Health and Social Analysis – Section 5.0 Impacts Assessment | 13, 14/ Construction Noise | Multiple mentions of the potential for construction noise. | Please note MECP documents NPC-115, NPC-118 related to construction equipment noise. | | 3 | The documents can be referred to for guidance in addition to the requirements of municipal and other jurisdictions regarding construction noise. | |
| MECP-Noise #3 | Sound Level Increases | 14 | Noise – All | Please see comments provided for Initial Project Description dated June 5, 2020., Point #3 | | 3 | Please see summary in the next column. | For noise-sensitive uses that experience an increase in sound levels, but are still |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | below the NEF-30 limit, are changes considered noticeable? |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Table 1: General and editorial comments - include comments such as formatting, layout or grammar

| Comment ID | Document Reference | Context and Background | Instructions to Proponent |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|
| <i>Example:</i> TC-01 | <i>Example:</i> Initial Project Description Part D, section 17 Pg. 11 | <i>Example:</i> The proponent has identified the Navigation Protection Act under the list of federal powers, duties, or function; however, the section appears to be consistent with changes to the legislation introduced in 2019. | <i>Example:</i> In 2019, the Navigation Protection Act was amended and renamed the Canadian Navigable Waters Act please ensure that the correct title is used. |
| N/A | | | |