

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

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.

Please insert additional rows as necessary.

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.

Table 2: General and editorial comments - include comments such as formatting, layout or grammar

Comment ID	Document Reference	Context and Background	Instructions to Proponent
Example: TC-01	Example: Initial Project Description Part D, section 17 Pg. 11	Example: 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.	Example: In 2019, the Navigation Protection Act was amended and renamed the Canadian Navigable Waters Act please ensure that the correct title is used.
OMAFRA-01	Agricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) – Appendix I - Page 17	Section 4.2 of the AIA describes that the subject lands are not identified as ‘prime agricultural area’ in the provincial mapping of the Agricultural System for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH). A cursory review of the provincial mapping appears to show that the proposed expansion area of runway 14 (and other areas on the subject lands) has been identified as ‘prime agricultural area’ in the Agricultural System. For context, the mapping methodology of the provincial Agricultural System did exclude the boundaries of the existing airport (i.e. federally regulated portions of aerodromes).	If the project team is planning to update the IPD, it is recommended that the Agricultural System references in the AIA be reviewed against the provincial mapping of the system.
OMAFRA-02	AIA – Appendix I – Page 12	Section 4.1 notes that the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) ‘encourages’ municipalities to designate prime agricultural areas. For clarification, PPS Policy 2.3.2 directs that planning authorities ‘shall’ designate prime agricultural areas in accordance with guidelines developed by the Province, as amended from time to time.	If the project team is planning to update the IPD, it is recommended that the provincial land use planning policy references in the AIA (e.g. PPS Policy 2.3.2) be reviewed to ensure they reflect the direction/requirements provided in the PPS and the Growth Plan.
OMAFRA-03	AIA – Appendix I – Page 21 and 24 (Table) and Initial Project Description (IPD) – Page 104	Sections 5.1 and 5.2 provide some information on the reduction/loss and fragmentation of agricultural land related to the proposed expansion footprint (e.g. approximately 2 ha) of runway 14. The AIA however does not appear to comment on the remaining agricultural uses on the subject lands, which are east/north of the proposed expansion of the runway. For example, the AIA does not appear to address if the construction (e.g. timing), infrastructure, operations, and/or security measures (e.g. fencing) associated with the proposed expansion of runway 14 may indirectly impact these remaining agricultural uses from continuing. Table 6.0 in the AIA (and Table 15.8.1 in the IPD) also does not appear to reference the remaining areas of the subject lands that are in an agricultural use, and whether these uses will continue during and post-construction.	If the project team is planning to update the IPD, it is recommended that the reporting would benefit from including some discussion on the remaining areas of the subject lands that are in an agricultural use.
OMAFRA-04	AIA – Appendix I – Page 24 (Table) and IPD – Page 104	Table 6 (minimizing the loss of agricultural land) describes that the proposed runway expansion lands are not utilized for agricultural production. It appears that the proposed expansion of runway 14 is, in-part, in an agricultural use (i.e. IPD Page 102 and AIA Figure 3 – Agricultural Land Uses). This description in the AIA is also carried over into Table 15.8.1 in the IPD on Page 104.	If the project team is planning to update the IPD, it is recommended that the descriptions in Table 15.8.1 (IPD) and Table 6 (AIA) be reviewed for consistency with the reporting. It may also be beneficial for the reporting to differentiate, where appropriate, between the impacts and mitigation measures associated with runways 14 and 32 in the summary tables (e.g. land removed from agricultural use).
OMAFRA-05	AIA – Appendix I – Page 27	Section 7.0 describes that the subject lands will no longer be designated as prime agricultural area following the completion of the Regional Official Plan Five-Year Review. It is unclear if this reference in the AIA is intended to address only the areas affected by the proposed expansion of runway 14, or the entire area of the ‘subject lands’ shown on Figure 2 in the AIA. It is also unclear how this may fit within any proposed refinements to the provincial Agricultural System during the Region’s MCR work.	It is recommended that the project team review this position/reference in the AIA with Waterloo Region planning staff.

Please insert additional rows as necessary.