

Region of Waterloo
SCHEIFELE BRIDGE REPLACEMENT
Northfield Drive (Regional Road 22)
Township of Woolwich

Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Study
November 2023

Addendum to the Environmental Study Report
January 2024

1.0 Addendum Background:

The Notice of Completion, along with the final Environmental Study Report (ESR) for the Scheifele Bridge Replacement, were filed on November 20, 2023, by the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, for a mandatory 30-day public review period in accordance with the Ontario Municipal Class EA Planning and Design process. In addition to filing the ESR on the Region's Engage.ca website, written notification of the Notice of Completion was forwarded to local public stakeholders, various government agencies, and Indigenous Communities.

Following the ESR filing and during the 30-day public review period, comments by email correspondence were provided from The Six Nations of The Grand River Elected Council between November 29th, 2023 and December 19th, 2023, for which written responses were provided by the Region of Waterloo.

Written comments were also received from The Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) on December 20th, 2023, The Ontario Ministry of the Environment Conservation and Parks (MECP) on January 4th, 2024 and The Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) on January 8th, 2024.

Based on the comments received from these agencies, the Region of Waterloo concluded that an "Addendum to the original Environmental Study Report" would be prepared, providing an official and documented response to various issues. In addition to circulation of this addendum to the concerned agencies, it will be filed on the Region's Engage.ca website at <https://www.engagewr.ca/scheifele-bridge-superstructure-replacement> for other interested stakeholders to review.

The content of the following addendum has been prepared, on behalf of the Region of Waterloo, by environmental specialists who worked on the Scheifele Bridge Class EA Study, thereby providing continuity to the agency responses. Finally, for simplicity, the below addendum has been grouped according to each agency, with each agency letter / email provided in the Appendices.

2.0 Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks:

The following provides a response to the questions and / or issues raised by the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks:

2.1 General:

- *The Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) has returned to their MTCS title, and no longer use the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI) title. Please correct all references to MHSTCI in the ESR accordingly.*

- *It is recommended to update supporting technical reports in draft included in Appendix D with their final version.*

Response:

The Scheifele Bridge Project Team acknowledges the return of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) title to the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM). Updating the supporting technical reports is impractical so this addendum provides formal notice of this acknowledgement.

2.2 Evaluation of Alternatives:

- *The preferred design Alternative 5 is highlighted in the Table for the “Alternative Bridge Cross Section Concepts Evaluation Matrix” in Appendix F of the ESR. However, the preferred design alternative in the Table for the “Preliminary Alternative Alignment Design Concepts Evaluation Matrix” is not highlighted. Based on Section 7.2.2 on page 98 of the ESR, “Alternative Northfield Drive Alignment Design Concept 2: West Side Staged Construction” is the recommended preferred alignment alternative. It is recommended that the preferred alternative also be highlighted in this Table to provide more clarity.*

Response:

In the “Preliminary Alternative Alignment Design Concepts Evaluation Matrix”, there were four alternatives evaluated for the replacement of the Scheifele Bridge on four different alignments, with the evaluation including one bridge cross section (widest structure). After the preferred design alignment was confirmed (Alternative 2: Staged Construction West Side), the Project Team proceeded to evaluate five alternative bridge design options, as described in the “Alternative Bridge Cross Section Concepts Evaluation Matrix”.

Section 7.2.2 describes the Recommended Preferred Design Concept for the Northfield Drive realignment, while Section 7.2.1 describes the Recommended Preferred Design Concept for the Scheifele Bridge Deck Cross Section.

No changes to the Environmental Study Report or the Evaluation Matrices are warranted.

2.3 Indigenous Consultation:

- *The ministry recommends that proponents include a summary of questions, comments and concerns raised by communities, and how they have been or will be addressed. If none were received, then this should be documented in the Report. Please make sure that all records are included in the record of consultation, and that it is organized to be readily navigated by the reader (e. g. by community).*

Response:

Over the course of the Scheifele Bridge Environmental Assessment study, Indigenous communities were copied with all notices, including the Notice of Study Commencement, Notice of Public Consultation Centre meetings (3), and the Notice of Study Completion.

At no time was feedback received from any local indigenous community, until after completion and filing of the Environmental Study Report on the public record. An email response was received on November 29, 2023, from the Six Nations of the Grand River Elected Council, authored by Mr. Peter Graham, Consultation Supervisor. The Region of Waterloo consulted with Six Nations of the Grand River through several follow-up emails.

The formal response to the Six Nations of the Grand River is included in Section 4.0 of this Addendum.

2.4 Air Quality and Odour:

- *Please note that the Ministry recommends that non-chloride dust suppressants be applied during construction.*

Response:

The contract for replacement of the Scheifele Bridge and reconstruction of Northfield Drive will include Special Provisions that include the use of non-chloride dust suppressants.

2.5 Climate Change:

- *Climate change considerations have not been documented in the ESR. The document "Considering Climate Change in the Environmental Assessment Process" (Guide) (www.ontario.ca/page/considering-climate-change-environmental-assessment-process) is now a part of the EA program's Guides and Codes of Practice. The Guide sets out the ministry's expectation for considering climate change in the preparation, execution and documentation of environmental assessment studies and processes. The guide provides examples, approaches, resources, and references to assist proponents with consideration of climate change in EA. The proponent should review this Guide in detail. The ministry expects proponents of Class EA projects to a) Consider the project's expected production of greenhouse gas emissions and impacts on carbon sinks (climate change mitigation), as well as resilience or vulnerability of the undertaking to changing climatic conditions (climate change adaptation). b) Include a discrete section in the ESR detailing how climate change was considered in the EA. How climate change is considered can be qualitative or quantitative in nature and should be scaled to the project's level of environmental effect. In all instances, both a project's impacts on climate change (mitigation) and impacts of climate change on a project (adaptation) should be considered.*

Response:

A Climate Change Memo will be prepared to address climate change considerations of the Project. The Climate Change Memo will include:

- A climate change mitigation assessment, including a quantitative assessment of greenhouse gas emissions and impacts on climate sinks, over the Project's lifetime.
- A climate change adaptation assessment, including a risk assessment of the Project's infrastructure to changing climate conditions.

Both parts of the Climate Change Memo will be conducted using guidance in the MECP document, "Considering Climate Change in the Environmental Assessment Process". The assessments will be based on data expected in 2024 upon receipt of detailed design information.

2.6 Source Water Protection:

- *In October 2015 the Municipal Class EA parent document was amended to include reference to the Clean Water Act in section A.2.10.6, which indicates that proponents of a Class EA project must identify early in their process whether a project is or could potentially be occurring within a vulnerable area. Further to the discussion of geotechnical conditions in Appendix D of the ESR, the ministry recommends that the proponent include a section on source water protection in the main body of the Report, to clearly document how the proximity of the project to any delineated vulnerable areas was considered and assessed. For further information about the source protection plan and assistance in identifying all applicable policies and their requirements, proponents should contact source protection program manager for the applicable source protection region (resources available online: <https://conservationontario.ca/conservation-authorities/source-water-protection/source-protection-plans-and-resources/>).*

Response:

According to GRCA Source Protection Policy Mapping (Accessed January 15, 2024: <https://maps.grandriver.ca/swp-policymapping/>), the Study Area does not overlap with an area where source protection policies apply.

During construction, measures will be implemented to protect vulnerable areas of the river environment, and its aquatic habitat, from disturbance, where possible and practical. Section 7.4 of the Environmental Impact Study (EIS) outlines standard mitigation measures for construction to reduce inadvertent encroachment of heavy equipment, siltation and/or spills of deleterious substances, noise, and dust migration into natural features, including the Conestoga River and associated wetlands.

2.7 Species at Risk:

- *Please note the Ministry released a new regulation under the Endangered Species Act titled Species Subject to Species Conservation Charges (O. Reg. 830/21), which includes butternut trees in Ontario. 9. Please note that it is the responsibility of the proponent to ensure that Species at Risk (SAR) are not killed, harmed, or harassed, and that their habitat is not damaged or destroyed through the proposed activities to be carried out on the site. If the proposed activities cannot avoid impacting protected species and their habitats, then the proponent will need to apply for an authorization under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). As is noted in the Report, if the proponent believes that their proposed activities are going to have an impact or are uncertain about the impacts, they should contact SAROntario@ontario.ca to undergo a formal review under the ESA.*

Response:

Section 8.3 of the EIS summarizes ESA authorization requirements for bat SAR, Silver Shiner, Black Redhorse, and Wavy-rayed Lampmussel. Butternut and habitat for Eastern Meadowlark were also identified in the Study Area, but outside the Project Area. Additional authorizations may be required if the Project Area changes during later design stages and encroaches into habitat for butternut and Eastern Meadowlark.

Section 8.3.1 of the EIS outlines that although no suitable bat trees were documented in Project Area, there is potential for bat SAR in the Study Area, and suitability of trees can change over time. If removal of large diameter trees is required, targeted surveys are recommended to determine if bat SAR are present. If bat SAR are determined to be present, MECP should be consulted prior to tree removal (i.e., submission of an Information Gathering Form) to determine authorization and mitigation requirements under the ESA.

The presence, or potential presence of Silver Shiner, Black Redhorse, and Wavy-rayed Lampmussel and their habitat in the Study Area will require consultation with MECP to determine the required course of action for approvals for construction. This is facilitated by the submission of an IGF to MECP. The requirement for a permit under the ESA will be determined following a review of the IGF by MECP.

3.0 Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism:

The following provides a response to the questions and / or issues raised by the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism:

3.1 Archaeological Resources:

- *A Stage 1 archaeological assessment and report (under Project Information Form (PIF) number P256-0611-2020 – included in Appendix D) has been entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports maintained by MCM. The Stage 1 AA report recommends Stage 2 archaeological assessment.*
- *MCM recommends that the Stage 2 AA and any further recommended AA (e.g., Stage 3 and 4) be undertaken by a licensed archaeologist as early as possible during detailed design and prior to any ground disturbing activities.*
- *Please note archaeological concerns have not been addressed until reports have been entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports where those reports recommend that:*
 1. *the archaeological assessment of the project area is complete and*
 2. *all archaeological sites identified by the assessment are either of no further cultural heritage*

value or interest (as per Section 48(3) of the Ontario Heritage Act) or that mitigation of impacts has been accomplished through excavation or an avoidance and protection strategy.

- *Approval authorities and proponents should wait to receive the ministry's review letter for an archaeological assessment report before issuing a decision on the application as it can be used, for example, to document that due diligence has been undertaken.*

Response:

A Stage 1 archaeological assessment (AA), under Project Information Form (PIF) number P256-0611-2020, was undertaken on February 8, 2021, by Stantec Consulting Ltd. for the study area. The Stage 1 AA consisted of a review of geographic, land use, and historical information for the site and the relevant surrounding area and included contact with the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) to find out whether, or not, there are any registered archaeological sites on or near the site. The purpose of the Stage 1 AA was to identify areas of archaeological potential within the study area and provide recommendations for further archaeological assessment (e.g., Stage 2, 3 and/or 4) as necessary.

The Stage 1 AA study determined that a portion of the study area, approximately 53.6%, retains potential for the identification and documentation of archaeological resources. In accordance with Section 1.3.1 and Section 7.7.4 of the MCM's 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011), a Stage 2 AA is required for any portion of the project's anticipated construction which impacts an area of archaeological potential. Therefore, a Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment will be completed as early as possible in the detailed design phase of the Scheifele Bridge project and prior to any ground disturbing activities. Further recommended archaeological assessments (e.g., Stage 3 and/or 4) will be completed as early as possible in the detailed design phase, where warranted upon completion of the Stage 2 AA study.

In addition to the above, the portion of the study area containing the Conestogo River retains potential for the identification of marine archaeological resources. The recent completion of the MCM's "*Criteria for Evaluating Marine Archaeological Potential Checklist*" confirmed that a Marine Archaeological Assessment is warranted for the site. Therefore, a Marine Archaeological Impact Assessment (MAIA), which includes an in-water survey, will be completed during the design phase.

3.2 Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes:

- *A Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) and Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA): Scheifele Bridge (dated September 29, 2022 and prepared by Stantec Consulting Ltd. - included in Appendix D) was completed. The CHER determined that the Scheifele Bridge is not of cultural heritage value or interest (CHVI). However, a potential cultural heritage landscape, identified to the west of the Scheifele Bridge, was confirmed to be of CHVI.*

We have reviewed the above referenced Cultural Heritage Report and recommend the following edits to assist with due diligence documentation:

- *Section 2.0 (Environmental Assessment Framework) - A copy of the completed Municipal Class EA's associated checklist for municipal bridges ([Municipal Heritage Bridges Cultural, Heritage and Archaeological Resources Assessment Checklist Revised April 11, 2014](#)) should be appended.*
- *Consultation - A new report section should be included entitled 'Community Engagement', which provides a brief summary of the groups and individuals who were engaged, how and when community engagement was undertaken and the results of the engagement, including responses, comments or concerns expressed and how these were considered (a detailed summary can be attached as an appendix).*
Please clarify whether Indigenous communities and/or heritage organizations were (or will be) contacted. Cultural heritage resources are often of importance to Indigenous communities. Indigenous communities may have knowledge that can contribute to the identification of cultural heritage resources, and we suggest that any engagement with Indigenous communities includes a discussion about known or potential cultural heritage resources that are of value to them.
- *Section 6.0 (Cultural heritage Value or Interest) – Further community input should be sought*

to support the evaluation under O. Reg. 9/06 (Ontario Heritage Act). We recommend a providing the draft CHER/HIA to the Region of Waterloo and Woolwich Heritage Committees for review and comment, if you haven't done already.

- *Section 8 (Recommendations) – This section of the CHER may need to be revised based on the above results of community engagement.*

Response:

A copy of the [Municipal Heritage Bridges Cultural, Heritage and Archaeological Resources Assessment Checklist Revised April 11, 2014](#) (the Checklist) is included in the Appendices of this Addendum. During the Class EA study, the Municipal Engineers Association (MEA) proposed changes to the Checklist. While it was anticipated that the revised Checklist would be in effect at some point during the project, it is noted that the revisions were not put into effect. Therefore, we have completed a Checklist retroactively.

Regarding consultation, documents prepared for the Environmental Study Report will not be altered at this time (i.e.: the CHER/HIA). However, the Project Team conducted extensive public consultation during the Class EA study. The findings of the CHER were included in PCC #1 and findings of the HIA included in PCC #2. From the public engagement, there were no comments received regarding previously identified, or unrecognized, cultural heritage value or interest. Additionally, there were no comments received regarding the candidate cultural heritage landscape where CHVI was identified, although it was noted during the public presentations by the Project Team.

With regards to consultation with Indigenous communities, please see Section 2.3 and Section 4 of this Addendum for further information. Engagement with Indigenous communities began early in the Project and is ongoing. To date, there have been no previously identified or potential built heritage resources or cultural heritage landscapes identified by Indigenous communities and comments were not received related to the CHVI of the Scheifele Bridge.

A copy of the Draft CHER was provided to Ken Brisbois, Project Manager – Design & Construction with the Region of Waterloo on December 2, 2020, for distribution to staff and the Region of Waterloo Heritage Planning Advisory Committee (HPAC). Comments received in January 2021 related to process and timeline for preparation of an HIA. Stantec clarified the timing of the HIA and revised the recommendations related to additional work in the form of an HIA. The HIA, including the evaluation of CHVI which indicated that the Scheifele Bridge was determined not to contain CHVI, was prepared in draft for review and finalized, following feedback from the Region, in September 2022.

4.0 Six Nations of the Grand River Elected Council:

The following provides a response to the questions and / or issues raised by the Six Nations of the Grand River Elected Council:

4.1 Dialogue:

4.1.1 November 29, 2023

- *We're concerned about likely impacts to the environment, as well as Aboriginal and treaty rights, and have some questions. Please be advised we have the right to capacity funding for EA activities.*
- *Can you quantify anticipated damage to the environment vs. replacing the bridge within the current alignment? There appears to be cumulative effects from repeatedly placing new bridges at new locations within this area and doesn't appear to be much mitigation beyond standard construction safety measures. We would like compensation habitat to be provided.*
- *What is the status of amphibian/turtle surveys? What will the total sizes of wetlands MAMM1-3, MASM1-1 and MASM1-14 be after anticipated removals? \$70,000 has been allocated to tree removals, but I can't find any reference to an arborist report or removal numbers. How many trees may be removed?*

Response (December 11, 2023):

As part of this Environmental Assessment, the Project Team initially developed 5 alternative alignments for the structure at Conestogo River which included and were presented at Public Consultation Centre #1 (PCC#1):

- Option 1 - Do Nothing – which is not an option given the age and deteriorated state of the current bridge.
- Option 2 - A new bridge completely offset west of the existing alignment.
- Option 3- A staged construction partially offset west of the existing alignment.
- Option 4- A staged construction partially offset east of the existing alignment; and
- Option 5 - A new bridge on the existing alignment.

These alternative alignments are captured in the attached pdf entitled – “Scheifele Bridge Alignment Evaluation - April 8, 2021” which looks at various impacts of the alternative alignments.

Constructing a new bridge on the existing alignment would require the long-term closure of Northfield Drive (2+ years). After PCC#1, the general consensus, from the public, was a need to keep Northfield Drive open given there is no other direct means for travel between north Waterloo/Kitchener to the Village of Conestoga and surrounding area.

After review of the 5 initial alignment alternatives and taking into consideration the comments received during PCC#1, the Project Team removed options 1&5 and completed a revised alignment comparison table attached and entitled “Scheifele Bridge Alignment Evaluation – REVISED”. This revised table compared:

- Option 1 - A new bridge completely offset west of the existing alignment.
- Option 2- A staged construction partially offset west of the existing alignment.
- Option 3- A staged construction partially offset east of the existing alignment.

Of the 3 remaining options, the project team recommended that Option 2 (staged construction partially offset west of the existing alignment) be chosen as the preferred alternative. Although this option has more impacts to the surrounding environment then constructing on the existing alignment it is the least impactful of the other 2 remaining options.

Details of aquatic and other amphibian habitat impacts, and proposed mitigative measures during and post-construction, are outlined in Stantec's “Scheifele Bridge Improvements: Environmental Impact Study (EIS)” report, dated October 14, 2022. This report is provided in Appendix D of the Environmental Study Report (ESR) and is also attached to this email. It presents a comprehensive summary of the study results and recommendations related to habitat protection and restoration.

In Section 5.1 of the above noted EIA report, it is noted that “there are no mapped significant wetlands in the Study Area”, however, in conjunction with the GRCA, the wetland limits in the study area were delineated, field flagged, surveyed, and “mapped” in June 2022. Site specific impacts and mitigative strategies are discussed for the wetland limits in Section 7.0, Impact Assessment and Mitigation.

Wetland Areas MAMM1-3, MASM1-1 and MASM1-14 will be affected with the chosen alignment and preliminary loss of area can be found in Table 7.1 of the EIS as well is summarized in the table below:

Wetland Name	Original Area (m ²)	Area Loss (m ²)	Remaining Area (m ²)
MAMM1-3	2407	357	2050
MASM1-1	6746	73	6673
MASM1-14	1926	174	1752

Section 7.2.2 of the EIA report specifically comments on the reduction of bridge piers from 3 to 2 as a “positive impact” to the aquatic species and habitat, and that “removal of the existing in-channel piers will result in a gain of habitat”. As detail design progresses limits will be refined and the project team when able will investigate further means to help reduce impacts to the wetland areas.

Estimates for tree removals are preliminary and a specific tree inventory has not been completed by an arborist although potential nesting areas and conditions of trees in these instances have been preliminarily noted. During detailed design when exact limits of impacts can be determined an arborist will be engaged to complete a thorough inventory and assessment of the surrounding trees as well as develop a design plan to reintroduce new trees and vegetation in equal or greater numbers than those removed. Further information on the Region of Waterloo Official Plan criteria for woodland significance can be found in Section 5.2 of the EIS while re-vegetation strategies can be found in Section 7.4.1.

4.1.2 December 12, 2023:

- *I appreciate nearby residents preferring a new alignment, but the result is the elimination of the most ecologically sensitive alternative. I'd like to know why targeting amphibian breeding surveys were not conducted, especially because some loss of habitat is expected. I am particularly concerned about wetland losses. While MASM1-1's reduction is relatively modest, it's a confirmed overwintering area, and its reduction pushes it closer to the far side of GRCA's 1.24-acre protection threshold. We would like the Region to commit to (1) the creation of new wetland habitat at a 2-1 ratio and (2) replacing any removed trees at a 10-1 ratio.*

Response (December 18, 2023):

Our environmental consultant provided the following regarding the amphibian survey:

As documented in Section 3.2 and Appendix C of the EIS, an EIS Terms of Reference (ToR) and data requests were submitted to the Region, GRCA and MNRF. Amphibian surveys were not required as an outcome of this consultation. Regardless, the EIS proposes mitigation measures for amphibians, including barrier fencing and wildlife rescues under the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act (see Section 7.2.1.2). Should the team determine that amphibian surveys are required to support detail design, amphibian call surveys could be implemented between April and June.

Regarding the wetland replacements, our environmental consultant noted the following:

Total anticipated wetland loss is very small (<0.07 ha) when compared to the riparian wetlands along the Conestogo River; therefore, the EIS did not recommend compensation. The requirement for wetland compensation will be determined through the GRCA permitting process.

For both the wetland and tree impacts, the Region will plan on reinstating wetlands and replacing trees to the greatest extent possible within the areas that need to be disturbed for construction. We will have a better understanding of the specific areas available once the detailed design for the bridge has progressed further.

4.1.3 December 18, 2023:

- *Thank you for the additional comments. Is there no need for amphibian surveys from the environmental consultant's perspective? If so, can they elaborate? Because this project will negatively impact Aboriginal and treaty rights, we are seeking mitigation beyond what may be required by GRCA or the Region.*

Response (December 19, 2023):

Our environmental consultant is noting that amphibian surveys can be completed, though the surveys are not likely to change the recommendations that were provided in the EIS. Nonetheless, the Region is willing to proceed with the surveys as requested – they would occur between April and June of this coming year.

5.0 Grand River Conservation Authority:

The following provides a response to the questions and / or issues raised by the Grand River Conservation Authority:

5.1 Hydraulic Modelling:

- *GRCA staff reviewed hydraulic modelling for the bridge replacement through November and December 2022, and agreed that no significant floodplain impacts would occur. As part of detailed design and a GRCA permit, please revise the modelling, if required, and verify there are still no floodplain impacts.*

Response:

Stantec's Water Resources team will carry out supplementary hydraulic modelling in conjunction with fluvial restoration design along the north and south riverbanks, in areas affected by the new bridge construction. Previous modelling will be reviewed and updated, as required, to account for any modifications to the riverbanks. In addition to hydraulic modelling reviews to reflect fluvial design improvements, an analysis will be completed to confirm the desirable gradation of aggregate backfill in the voids left from removal of the existing bridge piers.

The above details will be reflected in future GRCA Permit Approval applications.

5.2 Wetland Impacts:

- *The environmental impact study (EIS) identifies direct loss of wetlands will occur, and that GRCA policy 8.4.6 requires restoration and enhancement of features / functions. As per GRCA policy 8.4.7, we will request that the EIS is revised for a GRCA permit application to identify direct / indirect / induced impacts to the wetland, and the exact methods to restore and enhance features / functions.*

Response:

Direct loss of wetlands is 604m² (5.5% of the wetland habitat in the Study Area).

As outlined in Section 7.1 of the EIS, direct loss to vegetation communities will occur along the edge of the existing road, and there will be no new fragmentation effects; however, newly created edges may expose features to increased sunlight penetration, susceptibility to windthrow, desiccation, and possibly road salt, and create new pathways for invasive species. Wetlands may be particularly sensitive to these changes. Standard mitigation strategies are available to prevent inadvertent encroachment into natural areas during construction, protect features including wetlands from sedimentation, and re-vegetation disturbed areas once work is completed.

As per GRCA (2015) policy 8.4.6, remedial measures must also enhance features and functions. The re-vegetation strategies include methods to plant and "seal" the newly exposed wetland edges. Site-specific mitigation measures (including reinstating wetlands and replacing trees) will be provided once the detailed design progresses further. A wetland enhancement planting plan will be prepared as part of detailed design to specify the location of plantings, including woody material and seed mixes where appropriate. The planting plans will be designed to enhance native species biodiversity using only native species that are suitable to the site conditions. Plantings will occur within areas that are disturbed by construction, and in other areas to enhance the existing features, where appropriate, as determined during detailed design. The detailed design plans are required to determine the precise limits of disturbance before the planting plan can be finalized.

Wetland Name	Original Area (m ²)	Area Loss (m ²)	Remaining Area (m ²)
MAMM1-3	2407	357	2050

MASM1-1	6746	73	6673
MASM1-14	1926	174	1752
Total	11078	604	10475

5.3 Construction Staging, Erosion Control:

- *As part of a GRCA permit, we will require plans that show construction staging, erosion and sediment controls, and temporary works (e. g. isolation / dewatering). This should include:*
 - o *Stabilization work on the northern bank.*
 - o *Removal of old piers / abutments and construction of new ones.*

Response:

As noted in Section 5.1 above, Stantec's geomorphological-fluvial design team will provide restoration / stabilization designs for the north and south riverbanks, in areas affected by the new bridge construction. In addition, the composition and gradation of aggregate backfill, to voids left by removal of the existing bridge piers, will be confirmed in conjunction with supplementary hydraulic analysis.

Special Provisions and Drawings will be included in the future bridge contract showing details of construction staging, erosion and sediment controls, and any temporary works needed to protect the Conestoga River, and its environmental habitats, from significant impacts. Any mitigative measures will be clearly outlined based on recommendations from Stantec's aquatic and natural environmental specialists.

The above details will be reflected in future GRCA Permit Approval applications.

5.4 Cofferdam Construction:

- *Cofferdams must be designed to hold back flows from the 2-year flood event with some freeboard. If a significant portion of the channel will be obstructed resulting in increased flood elevations to design storms, it should be included in the hydraulic analysis and the cofferdam height adjusted accordingly.*

Response:

In conjunction with the design of the Scheifele Bridge, contract drawings will be provided to assist the contractor in preparing shop drawings for a temporary "cofferdam / river access system" that will allow installation of piling, new bridge piers, and removal of existing bridge substructure components that are currently within the Conestoga River. The bridge design team will work with Stantec's Water Resources team in confirming any potential design modifications to deal with possible increased flooding by the proposed cofferdams.

The above details will be reflected in future GRCA Permit Approval applications.

5.5 Construction Site Contacts and Scheduling:

- *Please note that this bridge is downstream of our Conestogo Dam. Prior to construction, we will request site contacts and construction scheduling to notify personnel of significant outflows and forecasted flooding. We will also request a contingency plan or appropriate notes for personnel / equipment in or near the water.*

Response:

Once the Scheifele Bridge contract is awarded and the Pre-Construction / Startup Meeting is convened, a list of all personnel and agency contacts will be prepared and circulated, along with

the Contractor's Project Schedule. Staff of the GRCA, and other interested agencies, are welcome to attend the startup and any subsequent Site Meeting, where deemed appropriate in addressing any construction issues or concerns.

5.6 Advisory Comment:

- *Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) has identified Critical Habitat within the proposed work zone for federally Threatened Silver Shiner and Black Redhorse, which may be a change from when the Class EA was initiated. This will require consultation and compliance with the federal Fisheries Act and the Species at Risk Act.*

Response:

As outlined in Section 8.1 of the EIS, a determination will be made following guidance and criteria provided on DFO's website regarding whether the in or near water work will require DFO review. If it is determined that DFO review is required, DFO's Request for Review Form will be submitted and a decision on the approvals approach will be administered by DFO. Based on Stantec's experience, projects of this nature typically require the submission of a Request for Review.

As outlined in Section 8.2 of the EIS, Species at Risk permits for Silver Shiner, Black Redhorse, and Wavy-rayed Lampmussel may be required by DFO for in-water works and/or potentially handling these species during fish and mussel rescues and relocations. A project Request for Review will be submitted to DFO and will determine the course of action required for dealing with SAR.

END OF ADDENDUM

ADDENDUM APPENDICES

1. Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks:
Letter dated January 4, 2024
2. Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism:
Letter dated December 20, 2023
3. Six Nations of the Grand River Elected Council:
Various emails from November 29 to December 18, 2023
4. Grand River Conservation Authority:
Letter dated January 8, 2024
5. Municipal Heritage Bridges Cultural, Heritage and
Archaeological Resources Assessment Checklist, Revised April
11, 2014

Appendix 1

Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks Letter

January 4, 2024

**Ministry of the Environment,
Conservation and Parks**

**Ministère de l'Environnement, de la
Protection de la nature et des Parcs**



Environmental Assessment
Branch

Direction des évaluations
environnementales

7th Floor
135 St. Clair Avenue W
Toronto ON M4V 1P5
Tel.: 416 314-8001
Fax.: 416 314-8452

7ème étage
135, avenue St. Clair Ouest
Toronto ON M4V 1P5
Tél. : 416 314-8001
Télec. : 416 314-8452

Via E-mail Only

January 4, 2024

Ken Brisbois
Project Manager
Regional Municipality of Waterloo
kbrisbois@regionofwaterloo.ca

**Re: Scheifele Bridge Superstructure Replacement
Regional Municipality of Waterloo
Municipal Class Environmental Assessment – Schedule C
Project Review Unit Comments – Final Environmental Study Report**

Dear Ken Brisbois,

Thank you for providing the ministry with an opportunity to comment on the final Environmental Study Report (ESR) for the above noted Class Environmental Assessment (EA) project. Our understanding is that in order to accommodate future traffic volumes within the Region of Waterloo, and enhance pedestrian, buggy and cycling facilities, the Regional Municipality of Waterloo (the proponent) has determined that the preferred alternative solution is the replacement of the Scheifele Bridge on Regional Road 22 (Northfield Drive) with a new Symmetrical 3-Span Haunched Steel Plate Girder Bridge which will be located partially offset of Northfield Drive to the West of the existing structure. The Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (ministry) provides the following comments for your consideration.

General

1. The Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) has returned to their MTCS title, and no longer use the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI) title. Please correct all references to MHSTCI in the ESR accordingly.

2. It is recommended to update supporting technical reports in draft included in Appendix D with their final version.

Evaluation of Alternatives

3. The preferred design Alternative 5 is highlighted in the Table for the “Alternative Bridge Cross Section Concepts Evaluation Matrix” in Appendix F of the ESR. However, the preferred design alternative in the Table for the “Preliminary Alternative Alignment Design Concepts Evaluation Matrix” is not highlighted. Based on Section 7.2.2 on page 98 of the ESR, “*Alternative Northfield Drive Alignment Design Concept 2: West Side Staged Construction*” is the recommended preferred alignment alternative. It is recommended that the preferred alternative also be highlighted in this Table to provide more clarity.

Indigenous Consultation

4. The ministry recommends that proponents include a summary of questions, comments and concerns raised by communities, and how they have been or will be addressed. If none were received, then this should be documented in the Report. Please make sure that all records are included in the record of consultation, and that it is organized to be readily navigated by the reader (e.g. by community).

Air Quality and Odour

5. Please note that the Ministry recommends that non-chloride dust suppressants be applied during construction.

Climate Change

6. Climate change considerations have not been documented in the ESR. The document "Considering Climate Change in the Environmental Assessment Process" (Guide) (www.ontario.ca/page/considering-climate-change-environmental-assessment-process) is now a part of the EA program's Guides and Codes of Practice. The Guide sets out the ministry's expectation for considering climate change in the preparation, execution and documentation of environmental assessment studies and processes. The guide provides examples, approaches, resources, and references to assist proponents with consideration of climate change in EA. The proponent should review this Guide in detail. The ministry expects proponents of Class EA projects to:
 - a) Consider the project's expected production of greenhouse gas emissions and impacts on carbon sinks (climate change mitigation), as well as resilience or vulnerability of the undertaking to changing climatic conditions (climate change adaptation).
 - b) Include a discrete section in the ESR detailing how climate change was considered in the EA.

How climate change is considered can be qualitative or quantitative in nature and should be scaled to the project's level of environmental effect. In all instances, both a project's

impacts on climate change (mitigation) and impacts of climate change on a project (adaptation) should be considered.

Source Water Protection

7. In October 2015 the Municipal Class EA parent document was amended to include reference to the *Clean Water Act* in section A.2.10.6, which indicates that proponents of a Class EA project must identify early in their process whether a project is or could potentially be occurring within a vulnerable area. Further to the discussion of geotechnical conditions in Appendix D of the ESR, the ministry recommends that the proponent include a section on source water protection in the main body of the Report in order to clearly document how the proximity of the project to any delineated vulnerable areas was considered and assessed.

For further information about the source protection plan and assistance in identifying all applicable policies and their requirements, proponents should contact source protection program manager for the applicable source protection region (resources available online: <https://conservationontario.ca/conservation-authorities/source-water-protection/source-protection-plans-and-resources/>).

Species at Risk

8. Please note the Ministry released a new regulation under the Endangered Species Act titled *Species Subject to Species Conservation Charges* (O. Reg. 830/21), which includes butternut trees in Ontario.
9. Please note that it is the responsibility of the proponent to ensure that Species at Risk (SAR) are not killed, harmed, or harassed, and that their habitat is not damaged or destroyed through the proposed activities to be carried out on the site. If the proposed activities cannot avoid impacting protected species and their habitats, then the proponent will need to apply for an authorization under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). As is noted in the Report, if the proponent believes that their proposed activities are going to have an impact or are uncertain about the impacts, they should contact SAROntario@ontario.ca to undergo a formal review under the ESA.

Thank you for circulating this Report for the ministry's consideration. Please document the receipt of this Project Review Unit Comments letter in the final report. We look forward to receiving a written response from the Region of Waterloo to address our comments provided above. Any other notices should be sent to the ministry's West Central Region EA notification email account (eanotification.wcregion@ontario.ca).

Should you or any members of your project team have any questions regarding the material above, please contact me at Joan.DelVillarCuicas@ontario.ca.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Joan Del Villar Cuicas". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Joan Del Villar Cuicas
Regional Environmental Planner
Project Review Unit, Environmental Assessment Branch
Ontario Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks

cc Garry Leveck, Senior Project Manager, Stantec Consulting Ltd.

Appendix 2

Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism Letter

December 20, 2023

**Ministry of Citizenship
and Multiculturalism**

Heritage Planning Unit
Heritage Branch
Citizenship, Inclusion and
Heritage Division
5th Flr, 400 University Ave
Tel.: 613.242.3743

**Ministère des Affaires civiques
et du Multiculturalisme**

Unité de la planification relative au
patrimoine
Direction du patrimoine
Division des affaires civiques, de
l'inclusion et du patrimoine
Tél.: 613.242.3743



December 20, 2023

EMAIL ONLY

Garry E. Leveck, P. Eng.
Senior Project Manager
Stantec Consulting Ltd.
100-300 Hagey Boulevard
Waterloo, ON N2L 0A4
garry.levack@stantec.com

MCM File : 0012401
Proponent : Region of Waterloo
Subject : Municipal Class Environmental Assessment – Schedule C – Notice of Completion
Project : Scheifele Bridge Replacement
Location : Regional Road 22 (Northfield Drive), Township of Woolwich, Region of Waterloo

Dear Garry E. Leveck:

Thank you for providing the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) with the Notice of Completion for the above-referenced project and making the Environmental Study Report (ESR): *Scheifele Bridge Replacement Northfield Drive Regional Road 22, Township of Woolwich, Region of Waterloo Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Study* (dated, November 2023 and prepared by Stantec) available for our review and comment.

MCM's interest in this project relates to its mandate of conserving Ontario's cultural heritage.

Project Summary

The Region of Waterloo has undertaken a planning study for Scheifele Bridge in accordance with the *Ontario Environmental Assessment Act* following the approved process for Schedule 'C' projects under the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment. This project addresses the deteriorated condition of Scheifele Bridge while accommodating the current and future needs of the bridge and roadway.

The recommended design alternative is to replace the existing bridge with a new bridge with the following features:

- Three-span haunched steel plate girder structure with a total length of 117 meters and width of 14.55 metres
- Two 3.35 metre-wide traffic lanes

- Two 2.45 metre-wide paved shared-use shoulders for buggies and cyclists
- A 1.8 m wide pedestrian sidewalk on the east side only, protected from traffic by a concrete barrier wall
- A decorative pedestrian handrail alongside the sidewalk
- A protective barrier wall on the west side of the structure
- Reconstruction of Northfield Drive at each end of the bridge
- Four stages during the bridge replacement so traffic is maintained on Northfield Drive during construction

Comments

We have reviewed the above referenced ESR and have the following observations and comments:

Archaeological Resources

A Stage 1 archaeological assessment and report (under Project Information Form (PIF) number P256-0611-2020 – included in Appendix D) has been entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports maintained by MCM. The Stage 1 AA report recommends Stage 2 archaeological assessment.

MCM recommends that the Stage 2 AA and any further recommended AA (e.g., Stage 3 and 4) be undertaken by a licensed archaeologist as early as possible during detailed design and prior to any ground disturbing activities.

Please note archaeological concerns have not been addressed until reports have been entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports where those reports recommend that:

1. the archaeological assessment of the project area is complete and
2. all archaeological sites identified by the assessment are either of no further cultural heritage value or interest (as per Section 48(3) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*) or that mitigation of impacts has been accomplished through excavation or an avoidance and protection strategy.

Approval authorities and proponents should wait to receive the ministry's review letter for an archaeological assessment report before issuing a decision on the application as it can be used, for example, to document that due diligence has been undertaken.

Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes

A *Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) and Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA): Scheifele Bridge* (dated September 29, 2022 and prepared by Stantec Consulting Ltd. - included in Appendix D) was completed. The CHER determined that the Scheifele Bridge is not of cultural heritage value or interest (CHVI). However, a potential cultural heritage landscape, identified to the west of the Scheifele Bridge, was confirmed to be of CHVI.

We have reviewed the above referenced Cultural Heritage Report and recommend the following edits to assist with due diligence documentation:

- Section 2.0 (Environmental Assessment Framework) - A copy of the completed Municipal Class EA's associated checklist for municipal bridges ([Municipal Heritage Bridges Cultural, Heritage and Archaeological Resources Assessment Checklist Revised April 11, 2014](#)) should be appended.
- Consultation - A new report section should be included entitled 'Community Engagement' which provides a brief summary of the groups and individuals who were engaged, how and when community engagement was undertaken and the results of the engagement,

including responses, comments or concerns expressed and how these were considered (a detailed summary can be attached as an appendix).

Please clarify whether Indigenous communities and/or heritage organizations were (or will be) contacted. Cultural heritage resources are often of importance to Indigenous communities. Indigenous communities may have knowledge that can contribute to the identification of cultural heritage resources, and we suggest that any engagement with Indigenous communities includes a discussion about known or potential cultural heritage resources that are of value to them.

- Section 6.0 (Cultural heritage Value or Interest) – Further community input should be sought to support the evaluation under O. Reg. 9/06 (*Ontario Heritage Act*). We recommend a providing the draft CHER/HIA to the Region of Waterloo and Woolwich Heritage Committees for review and comment, if you haven't done already.
- Section 8 (Recommendations) – This section of the CHER may need to be revised based on the above results of community engagement.

More detailed comments and recommendations in the attached table to support due diligence documentation and alignment with current legislative framework.

Please note that the responsibility for administration of the *Ontario Heritage Act* and matters related to cultural heritage have been transferred from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) to the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM). Individual staff roles and contact information remain unchanged. Please remove James Hamilton and Katherine Capella from future circulation and continue to send any notices, report and/or documentation electronically to both Karla Barboza and myself.

- Karla Barboza, Team Lead - Heritage | Heritage Planning Unit (Citizenship and Multiculturalism) | 416-660-1027 | karla.barboza@ontario.ca
- Joseph Harvey, Heritage Planner | Heritage Planning Unit (Citizenship and Multiculturalism) | 613-242-3743 | joseph.harvey@ontario.ca

Thank you for making the ESR available for our review and comment. If you have any questions or require clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Joseph Harvey
Heritage Planner
Heritage Planning Unit
joseph.harvey@ontario.ca

Copied to: Ken Brisbois, Transportation Project Manager, Regional Municipality of Waterloo
EA Notices to West Central Region, MECP

Joan Del Villar Cuicas, Environmental Resource Planner & EA Coordinator, MECP

It is the sole responsibility of proponents to ensure that any information and documentation submitted as part of their EA report or file is accurate. The Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) makes no representation or warranty as to the completeness, accuracy or quality of the any checklists, reports or supporting documentation submitted as part of the EA process, and in no way shall MCM be liable for any harm, damages, costs, expenses, losses, claims or actions that may result if any checklists, reports or supporting documents are discovered to be inaccurate, incomplete, misleading or fraudulent.

Should previously undocumented archaeological resources be discovered, they may be a new archaeological site and therefore subject to Section 48(1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The proponent or person discovering the archaeological resources must cease alteration of the site immediately and engage a licensed consultant archaeologist to carry out an archaeological assessment, in compliance with Section 48(1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

The *Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002, S.O. 2002, c.33* requires that any person discovering human remains must cease all activities immediately and notify the police or coroner. If the coroner does not suspect foul play in the disposition of the remains, in accordance with *Ontario Regulation 30/11* the coroner shall notify the Registrar, Ontario Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery, which administers provisions of that Act related to burial sites. In situations where human remains are associated with archaeological resources, the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism should also be notified (at archaeology@ontario.ca) to ensure that the archaeological site is not subject to unlicensed alterations which would be a contravention of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

Item	Document Section	Given Text	MCM Comments
1.	4.3 (Cultural Heritage Environmental Conditions) p. 54-57 [PDF 60]	4.3.1 Cultural Heritage Environmental Report (CHER) and Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) Report: A Cultural Heritage Environmental Report (CHER) was completed in the early stages of the Scheifele Bridge Class Environmental Assessment Study, and highlighted the following conditions: ... 4.3.2 Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment A stage 1 Archaeological Assessment was completed in accordance with the Standards and Guidelines established by the ministry of Heritage, sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI), with the following conclusions and recommendations presented: ○ ... ○	We recommend revising section 4.3 of the ESR to align with current legislation and terminology. <i>See new text underlined and text to be removed crossed out.</i> 4.3 (Cultural Heritage Environmental Conditions) <u>Section 4.3 describes the cultural heritage component of the environment, which includes archaeological resources, built heritage resources-and cultural heritage landscapes.</u> <u>4.3.1 Archaeological Resources Cultural Heritage Environmental Report (CHER) and Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) Report:</u> A stage 1 Archaeological Assessment was completed in accordance with the Standards and Guidelines established by the ministry of Heritage, sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI), with the following conclusions and recommendations presented: ○ ... ○ ... <u>A Stage 1 archaeological assessment (AA) (under Project Information Form number (PIF) P256-0611-2020) was undertaken on February 8, 2021, by Stantec consulting Ltd. for the study area. A Stage 1 AA consists of a review of geographic, land use and historical information for the property and the relevant surrounding area, and contacting MCM to find out whether, or not, there are any known archaeological sites on or near the property. Its purpose is to identify areas of archaeological potential and further archaeological assessment (e.g., Stage 2-4) as necessary. The Stage 1 AA report is included in Appendix D.</u> [Then include the outcomes and recommendations of the report, as is in the Executive Summary – just copy and paste, don't summarize]

Item	Document Section	Given Text	MCM Comments
			<u>Further recommended assessment (e.g., Stage 2-4) will be completed as early as possible in the detailed design phase and prior to any ground disturbing activities.</u> 4.3.2 Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment <u>Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes</u> <u>[Insert current text included under current ESR section 4.3.1 (Cultural Heritage Environmental Report (CHER) and Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) Report):]</u> [See also comments in the cover letter.]
2.	8.3 (External Agencies) p. 115-116 [PDF 122-123]	Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI) Issues and Concerns • While some cultural heritage resources may have already been formally identified, others may be identified through screening and evaluation. ... • ... • ... • If in-water construction is required for the replacement of the Scheifele Bridge, MHSTCI requests that a marine archaeological study be completed during the detailed design phase. • ... Mitigation and Response • A Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) was completed in November 2020, in accordance with MHSTCI requirements as well as the Region of Waterloo's Draft Implementation Guideline for Cultural	We recommend revising section 8.3 of the ESR to align with current legislation and terminology. <i>See new text underlined and text to be removed crossed out.</i> Ministry of <u>Citizenship and Multiculturalism</u> Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI) Issues and Concerns • While some cultural heritage resources may have already been formally identified, others may be identified through screening and evaluation. ... • ... • ... • If in-water construction is required for the replacement of the Scheifele Bridge, a marine archaeological assessment may be required as early as possible during the detailed design phase. This will depend on the preferred design concept and subject to clarification from MCM. • ... Mitigation and Response • A Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) was completed in November 2020, <u>prepared by Stantec Consulting Ltd.</u>, in accordance with MCMHSTCI requirements as well as the Region of Waterloo's Draft Implementation Guideline for Cultural Heritage

Item	Document Section	Given Text	MCM Comments
		Heritage Landscape Conservation (2018). The CHER report was updated in September 2022 to include an evaluation of impacts and mitigative measures associated with the recommended preferred design concepts. The updated CHER report was renamed the CHER/HIA report in recognition of the completion of the Heritage Impact assessment component of the study. - As part of the Class EA process, Municipal Heritage Bridges Cultural, Heritage and Archaeological Resources Assessment Checklists were completed and included in the study documentation. - The 2021 Scheifele Bridge archaeological study acknowledged that a Marine Archaeological Study is to be completed during the detailed design phase. - The 2021 Scheifele Bridge archaeological study included the riverbank areas in the overall assessment. Conclusions and recommendations are provided in the 2021 report included with the ESR. - The 2021 Scheifele Bridge archaeological study was formally reviewed and entered by MHSTCI into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports in March 2021. - The requirements for a Stage 2 archaeological study will be reviewed during detailed design, and a subsequent stage 2 study commissioned if required.	Landscape Conservation (2018). The CHER report was updated in September 2022 to include an evaluation of impacts and mitigative measures associated with the recommended preferred design concepts. The updated CHER report was renamed the CHER/HIA report in recognition of the completion of the Heritage Impact assessment component of the study. [please included the CHER/HIA's recommendations. Copy and paste do not summarize. See CHER/HIA section 8 and ESR section 4.3] As part of the Class EA process, Municipal Heritage Bridges Cultural, Heritage and Archaeological Resources Assessment Checklists were completed and included in the study documentation. The 2021 Scheifele Bridge archaeological study acknowledged that a Marine Archaeological Study is to be completed during the detailed design phase. The 2021 Scheifele Bridge archaeological study included the riverbank areas in the overall assessment. Conclusions and recommendations are provided in the 2021 report included with the ESR. The 2021 Scheifele Bridge archaeological study was formally reviewed and entered by MHSTCI into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports in March 2021. The requirements for a Stage 2 archaeological study will be reviewed during detailed design, and a subsequent stage 2 study commissioned if required. <u>Follow the recommendations of the Stage 1 archaeological assessment (AA).</u> <u>If in-water construction is required for the bridge replacement, complete the MCM's Criteria for Evaluating Marine Archaeological Potential and follow its recommendations.</u> <u>The Stage 2 AA and any further recommended AA (e.g., marine, Stage 3 and 4) will be undertaken by a licensed archaeologist as early as possible during detailed design and prior to any ground disturbing activities.</u> <u>Should previously undocumented archaeological resources be discovered, they may be a new archaeological site and therefore subject to Section 48(1) of the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i>. The proponent or person discovering the archaeological resources must cease alteration of the site immediately and engage a licensed consultant archaeologist to carry out an archaeological assessment, in compliance with Section 48(1) of the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i>.</u> <u>The <i>Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act</i>, 2002, S.O. 2002, c.33 requires that any person discovering human remains must cease all activities immediately and</u>

Item	Document Section	Given Text	MCM Comments
			<u>notify the police or coroner. If the coroner does not suspect foul play in the disposition of the remains, in accordance with Ontario Regulation 30/11 the coroner shall notify the Registrar, Ontario Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery, which administers provisions of that Act related to burial sites. In situations where human remains are associated with archaeological resources, the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism should also be notified (at archaeology@ontario.ca) to ensure that the archaeological site is not subject to unlicensed alterations which would be a contravention of the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i>.</u>
3.	10.0 (Study Summary and Recommendations) p. 136 [PDF 142]	... The following summarizes the final recommendations of this Environmental Assessment: 1. ... 9. It is recommended that further engineering and environmental studies be initiated by the Region of Waterloo in conjunction with the detailed design phase, including a Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Study, a supplemental Geotechnical and Foundation Investigation Study, a Marine Archaeological Assessment Study and protection of the existing Cultural Heritage Landscape (CHL) feature (circa 1861, remnant bridge abutments and roadway) in the southwest quadrant of the study area. Applications for final agency approvals should be submitted as soon as possible in the design process.	We recommend revising section 10.0 of the ESR to align with current legislation and terminology. <i>See new text underlined and text to be removed crossed out.</i> ... The following summarizes the final recommendations of this Environmental Assessment: 1. ... 9. It is recommended that further engineering and environmental studies be initiated by the Region of Waterloo in conjunction with the detailed design phase, including a Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Study, a supplemental Geotechnical and Foundation Investigation Study, a Marine Archaeological Assessment study <u>(if required)</u> and protection of the existing Cultural Heritage Landscape (CHL) feature (circa 1861, remnant bridge abutments and roadway) in the southwest quadrant of the study area <u>(in accordance with the recommendations of the CHER/HIA)</u> . Applications for final agency approvals should be submitted as soon as possible in the design process.

Item	Document Section	Given Text	MCM Comments
4.	Appendix F (Evaluation Matrices) Table - Scheifele Bridge Class Environmental Assessment: Preliminary Alternative Alignment Design Concepts Evaluation Matrix [PDF 1446]	2) Natural Environment Design Concept Description - Archaeological Evaluation Criteria - How does the design alternative impact potential archaeological resources, as observed in the Stage 1 study? “Do Nothing” Design Alternative - No impact Design Alternative [See also 2,3,4] - ... - A Stage 2 assessment will be required along with a potential marine review ... - ... 3) Cultural and Social Environments Design Concept Description - Cultural Heritage Evaluation Criteria - How does the design alternative impact on Cultural Heritage Landscape (CHL) in the study area? “Do Nothing” Design Alternative - No impact Design Alternative [See also 2,3,4] - Alignment avoids impacting remnant County Road and bridge abutments (circa 1861 and early 1900s) which are deemed CHL	Please note that “archaeological resources” are considered part of the cultural environment which also includes “built heritage resources” and “cultural heritage landscapes”. The row addressing archaeological resources should be included under the table subsection “Cultural and Social Environments”. Please revise the table in the following manner to align with current legislation and our suggested edits to section 4.3 above: <i>See new text underlined and text to be removed crossed out.</i> 2) Natural Environment Design Concept Description — Archaeological Evaluation Criteria — How does the design alternative impact potential archaeological resources, as observed in the Stage 1 study? “Do Nothing” Design Alternative — No impact Design Alternative [See also 2,3,4] — ... — A stage 2 assessment will be required along with a potential marine review — ... 3) Cultural and Social Environments Design Concept Description - Archaeological <u>Resources</u> Evaluation Criteria - How does the design alternative impact potential archaeological resources, as observed in the Stage 1 study? <u>archaeological sites and areas of archaeological potential.</u> “Do Nothing” Design Alternative - No impact

Item	Document Section	Given Text	MCM Comments
		candidates, located on the West side of the site. - Existing Scheifele Bridge has no cultural heritage value or interest (CHVI) and has a low rating under the Ontario Heritage Bridge Guidelines. - Overall impact rating: low	Design Alternative [See also 2,3,4] - ... - A Stage 2 <u>archaeological assessment (AA)</u> and any further recommended AA (e.g., Marine AA, Stage 3 and 4) will be required along with a potential marine review <u>as early as possible during detailed design and prior to any ground disturbing activities.</u> ... - ... Design Concept Description - <u>Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage landscapes</u> Evaluation Criteria - How does the design alternative impact <u>known or potential</u> on <u>Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscape (CHL)</u> <u>within or adjacent to the study area?</u> “Do Nothing” Design Alternative - No impact Design Alternative [See also 2,3,4] - Alignment avoids <u>direct impacts to the potential Cultural Heritage Landscape west of the Scheifele Bridge in remnant County Road and bridge abutments (circa 1861 and early 1900s) which are deemed CHL candidates, located on the West side of the site.</u> - Existing Scheifele Bridge has no cultural heritage value or interest (CHVI) and has a low rating under the Ontario Heritage Bridge Guidelines. - Overall impact rating: low

Appendix 3

Six Nations of the Grand River Elected Council Various emails

November 29 to December 18, 2023

Ken Brisbois

From: Ken Brisbois
Sent: December 19, 2023 3:04 PM
To: 'Peter Graham'
Cc: Leveck, Garry; Skylar Van Kruistum
Subject: RE: Scheifele Bridge Superstructure Replacement Class Environmental Assessment Study - Notice of Completion

Good afternoon Peter,

Our environmental consultant is noting that amphibian surveys can be completed, though the surveys are not likely to change the recommendations that were provided in the EIS. Nonetheless, the Region is willing to proceed with the surveys as requested – they would occur between April and June of this coming year.

Thanks,

Ken

Ken Brisbois
Project Manager – Design & Construction
Engineering & Environmental Services

Regional Municipality of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street
Kitchener ON N2G 4J3
519-240-2995 (Cell)
kbrisbois@regionofwaterloo.ca

This email correspondence (including any attachments) may contain information which is confidential and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law and is intended only for the use of the designated recipient(s) listed above. Any unauthorized use or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, or have otherwise received this message by mistake, please notify the sender by replying via email and destroy all copies of this original correspondence (including any attachments). Thank you for your cooperation.

From: Peter Graham <LRCS@sixnations.ca>
Sent: December 18, 2023 2:28 PM
To: Ken Brisbois <KBrisbois@regionofwaterloo.ca>
Cc: 'Leveck, Garry' <Garry.Leveck@stantec.com>
Subject: RE: Scheifele Bridge Superstructure Replacement Class Environmental Assessment Study - Notice of Completion

****EXTERNAL ALERT** This email originated from outside the Region of Waterloo.**

Hi Ken,

Thank you for the additional comments. Is there no need for amphibian surveys from the environmental consultant's perspective? If so, can they elaborate? Because this project will negatively impact Aboriginal and treaty rights, we are seeking mitigation beyond what may be required by GRCA or the Region.

Best, Peter

From: Ken Brisbois <KBrisbois@regionofwaterloo.ca>
Sent: Monday, December 18, 2023 1:07 PM

To: Peter Graham <LRCS@sixnations.ca>

Cc: 'Leveck, Garry' <Garry.Leveck@stantec.com>

Subject: [External] RE: Scheifele Bridge Superstructure Replacement Class Environmental Assessment Study - Notice of Completion

Hello Peter,

Thank you for the response.

Our environmental consultant provided the following regarding the amphibian survey:

As documented in Section 3.2 and Appendix C of the EIS, an EIS Terms of Reference (ToR) and data requests were submitted to the Region, GRCA and MNRF. Amphibian surveys were not required as an outcome of this consultation. Regardless, the EIS proposes mitigation measures for amphibians, including barrier fencing and wildlife rescues under the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act (see Section [7.2.1.2](#)). Should the team determine that amphibian surveys are required to support detail design, amphibian call surveys could be implemented between April and June.

Regarding the wetland replacements, our environmental consultant noted the following:

Total anticipated wetland loss is very small (<0.07 ha) when compared to the riparian wetlands along the Conostogo River; therefore, the EIS did not recommend compensation. The requirement for wetland compensation will be determined through the GRCA permitting process.

For both the wetland and tree impacts, the Region will plan on reinstating wetlands and replacing trees to the greatest extent possible within the areas that need to be disturbed for construction. We will have a better understanding of the specific areas available once the detailed design for the bridge has progressed further.

Thanks,

Ken

Ken Brisbois
Project Manager – Design & Construction
Engineering & Environmental Services

Regional Municipality of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street
Kitchener ON N2G 4J3
519-240-2995 (Cell)
kbrisbois@regionofwaterloo.ca

This email correspondence (including any attachments) may contain information which is confidential and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law and is intended only for the use of the designated recipient(s) listed above. Any unauthorized use or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, or have otherwise received this message by mistake, please notify the sender by replying via email and destroy all copies of this original correspondence (including any attachments). Thank you for your cooperation.

From: Peter Graham <LRCS@sixnations.ca>

Sent: December 12, 2023 10:42 AM

To: Ken Brisbois <KBrisbois@regionofwaterloo.ca>

Cc: 'Leveck, Garry' <Garry.Leveck@stantec.com>

Subject: RE: Scheifele Bridge Superstructure Replacement Class Environmental Assessment Study - Notice of Completion

****EXTERNAL ALERT** This email originated from outside the Region of Waterloo.**

Hi Ken,

Thank you for the additional information.

I appreciate nearby residents preferring a new alignment, but the result is the elimination of the most ecologically sensitive alternative. I'd like to know why targeting amphibian breeding surveys were not conducted, especially because some loss of habitat is expected. I am particularly concerned about wetland losses. While MASM1-1's reduction is relatively modest, it's a confirmed overwintering area, and its reduction pushes it closer to the far side of GRCA's 1.24 acre protection threshold. We would like the Region to commit to (1) the creation of new wetland habitat at a 2-1 ratio and (2) replacing any removed trees at a 10-1 ratio.

Best, Peter

From: Ken Brisbois <KBrisbois@regionofwaterloo.ca>

Sent: Monday, December 11, 2023 3:53 PM

To: Peter Graham <LRCS@sixnations.ca>

Cc: 'Leveck, Garry' <Garry.Leveck@stantec.com>

Subject: [External] RE: Scheifele Bridge Superstructure Replacement Class Environmental Assessment Study - Notice of Completion

Hello Mr. Graham,

Thank you for reaching out with your questions/concerns regarding the Scheifele Bridge Replacement Project.

As part of this Environmental Assessment, the Project Team initially developed 5 alternative alignments for the structure at Conestogo River which included and were presented at Public Consultation Centre #1 (PCC#1):

- Option 1 - Do Nothing – which is not an option given the age and deteriorated state of the current bridge;
- Option 2 - A new bridge completely offset west of the existing alignment;
- Option 3- A staged construction partially offset west of the existing alignment;
- Option 4- A staged construction partially offset east of the existing alignment; and
- Option 5 - A new bridge on the existing alignment.

These alternative alignments are captured in the attached pdf entitled – “Scheifele Bridge Alignment Evaluation - April 8, 2021” which looks at various impacts of the alternative alignments.

Constructing a new bridge on the existing alignment would require the long term closure of Northfield Drive (2+ years). After PCC#1, the general consensus from the public was a need to keep Northfield Drive open given there is no other direct means for travel between north Waterloo/Kitchener to the Village of Conestoga and surrounding area.

After review of the 5 initial alignment alternatives and taking into consideration the comments received during PCC#1, the Project Team removed options 1&5 and completed a revised alignment comparison table attached and entitled “Scheifele Bridge Alignment Evaluation – REVISED”. This revised table compared:

- Option 1 - A new bridge completely offset west of the existing alignment;
- Option 2- A staged construction partially offset west of the existing alignment;
- Option 3- A staged construction partially offset east of the existing alignment; and

Of the 3 remaining options, the project team recommended that Option 2 (staged construction partially offset west of the existing alignment) be chosen as the preferred alternative. Although this option has more impacts to the surrounding environment then constructing on the existing alignment it is the least impactful of the other 2 remaining options.

Details of aquatic and other amphibian habitat impacts, and proposed mitigative measures during and post-construction, are outlined in Stantec's “Scheifele Bridge Improvements: Environmental Impact Study (EIS)” report, dated October 14, 2022. This

report is provided in Appendix D of the Environmental Study Report (ESR), and is also attached to this email. It presents a comprehensive summary of the study results and recommendations related to habitat protection and restoration.

In Section 5.1 of the above noted EIA report, it is noted that “there are no mapped significant wetlands in the Study Area”, however, in conjunction with the GRCA, the wetland limits in the study area were delineated, field flagged, surveyed and “mapped” in June 2022. Site specific impacts and mitigative strategies are discussed for the wetland limits in Section 7.0, Impact Assessment and Mitigation.

Wetland Areas MAMM1-3, MASM1-1 and MASM1-14 will be affected with the chosen alignment and preliminary loss of area can be found in Table 7.1 of the EIS as well is summarized in the table below:

Wetland Name	Original Area (m ²)	Area Loss (m ²)	Remaining Area (m ²)
MAMM1-3	2407	357	2050
MASM1-1	6746	73	6673
MASM1-14	1926	174	1752

Section 7.2.2 of the EIA report specifically comments on the reduction of bridge piers from 3 to 2 as a “positive impact” to the aquatic species and habitat, and that “removal of the existing in-channel piers will result in a gain of habitat”. As detail design progresses limits will be refined and the project team when able will investigate further means to help reduce impacts to the wetland areas.

Estimates for tree removals are preliminary and a specific tree inventory has not been completed by an arborist although potential nesting areas and conditions of trees in these instances have been preliminarily noted. During detailed design when exact limits of impacts can be determined an arborist will be engaged to complete a thorough inventory and assessment of the surrounding trees as well as develop a design plan to reintroduce new trees and vegetation in equal or greater numbers than those removed. Further information on the Region of Waterloo Official Plan criteria for woodland significance can be found in Section 5.2 of the EIS while re-vegetation strategies can be found in Section 7.4.1.

I hope that the above information provides some clarity and if you have further questions please feel free to reach out.

Thanks,

Ken

Ken Brisbois
Project Manager – Design & Construction
Engineering & Environmental Services

Regional Municipality of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street
Kitchener ON N2G 4J3
519-240-2995 (Cell)
kbrisbois@regionofwaterloo.ca

This email correspondence (including any attachments) may contain information which is confidential and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law and is intended only for the use of the designated recipient(s) listed above. Any unauthorized use or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, or have otherwise received this message by mistake, please notify the sender by replying via email and destroy all copies of this original correspondence (including any attachments). Thank you for your cooperation.

From: Peter Graham <LRCS@sixnations.ca>

Sent: November 29, 2023 10:15 AM

To: Ken Brisbois <KBrisbois@regionofwaterloo.ca>

Subject: RE: Scheifele Bridge Superstructure Replacement Class Environmental Assessment Study - Notice of Completion

****EXTERNAL ALERT** This email originated from outside the Region of Waterloo.**

Good morning Ken,

We're concerned about likely impacts to the environment, as well as Aboriginal and treaty rights, and have some questions. Please be advised we have the right to capacity funding for EA activities.

Can you quantify anticipated damage to the environment vs. replacing the bridge within the current alignment? There appears to be cumulative effects from repeatedly placing new bridges at new locations within this area and doesn't appear to be much mitigation beyond standard construction safety measures. We would like compensation habitat to be provided.

What is the status of amphibian/turtle surveys? What will the total sizes of wetlands MAMM1-3, MASM1-1 and MASM1-14 be after anticipated removals? \$70,000 has been allocated to tree removals, but I can't find any reference to an arborist report or removal numbers. How many trees may be removed?

Thank you,

Peter Graham
Consultation Supervisor
Six Nations of the Grand River Elected Council

From: Tayler Hill <tayler.hill@sixnations.ca>
Sent: Wednesday, November 29, 2023 8:36 AM
To: Daylon Gee <lruo2@sixnations.ca>; Peter Graham <LRCS@sixnations.ca>; Lauren Jones <laurenjones@sixnations.ca>
Subject: Fw: Scheifele Bridge Superstructure Replacement Class Environmental Assessment Study - Notice of Completion

From: Sherri-Lyn Hill <SNGR.Chief@sixnations.ca>
Sent: 28 November 2023 12:56
To: Tayler Hill <tayler.hill@sixnations.ca>
Subject: FW: Scheifele Bridge Superstructure Replacement Class Environmental Assessment Study - Notice of Completion

Nya:weh/Thank you,

Chief Sherri-Lyn Hill
Six Nations of the Grand River
P.O. Box 5000
1695 Chiefswood Road
Ohsweken, ON
NOA 1M0
Telephone: [519-445-2201](tel:519-445-2201)
Sngr.chief@sixnations.ca



From: Ken Brisbois <KBrisbois@regionofwaterloo.ca>

Sent: Monday, November 20, 2023 7:31 AM

Subject: [External] RE: Scheifele Bridge Superstructure Replacement Class Environmental Assessment Study - Notice of Completion

Hello,

Please find the Notice of Completion for Scheifele Bridge Superstructure Replacement over the Conestogo River in the Township of Woolwich

<https://www.engagewr.ca/scheifele-bridge-superstructure-replacement>

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Regards,

Ken

Ken Brisbois
Project Manager - Transportation Engineering
Design & Construction Division of Transportation & Environmental Services

Regional Municipality of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street
Kitchener ON N2G 4J3
[519-575-4606](tel:519-575-4606) (Desk)
[519-240-2995](tel:519-240-2995) (Cell)
kbrisbois@regionofwaterloo.ca

This email correspondence (including any attachments) may contain information which is confidential and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law and is intended only for the use of the designated recipient(s) listed above. Any unauthorized use or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, or have otherwise received this message by mistake, please notify the sender by replying via email and destroy all copies of this original correspondence (including any attachments). Thank you for your cooperation.

Caution: This email originated from outside of Stantec. Please take extra precaution.

Attention: Ce courriel provient de l'extérieur de Stantec. Veuillez prendre des précautions supplémentaires.

Atención: Este correo electrónico proviene de fuera de Stantec. Por favor, tome precauciones adicionales.

Appendix 4
Grand River Conservation Authority Letter
January 8, 2024



January 8, 2024

Ken Brisbois
Region of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 6th Floor
Kitchener ON N2G 4J3
kbrisbois@regionofwaterloo.ca

**Re: Municipal Class Environmental Assessment – Schiefele Bridge
Northfield Drive East and Conestogo River, Conestogo
Township of Woolwich**

Dear Mr. Brisbois,

The Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) has received the final Environmental Study Report (ESR) for the above-noted Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA).

Following our previous comments dated May 31, 2022, we have reviewed the proposed bridge replacement, and wish to provide the following comments.

1. GRCA staff reviewed hydraulic modelling for the bridge replacement through November and December 2022, and agreed that no significant floodplain impacts would occur. As part of detailed design and a GRCA permit, please revise the modelling, if required, and verify there are still no floodplain impacts.
2. The environmental impact study (EIS) identifies direct loss of wetlands will occur, and that GRCA policy 8.4.6 requires restoration and enhancement of features / functions. As per GRCA policy 8.4.7, we will request that the EIS is revised for a GRCA permit application to identify direct / indirect / induced impacts to the wetland, and the exact methods to restore and enhance features / functions.

3. As part of a GRCA permit, we will require plans that show construction staging, erosion and sediment controls, and temporary works (e.g. isolation / dewatering). This should include:
 - a. Stabilization work on the northern bank.
 - b. Removal of old piers / abutments and construction of new ones.
4. Cofferdams must be designed to hold back flows from the 2 year flood event with some freeboard. If a significant portion of the channel will be obstructed resulting in increased flood elevations to design storms, it should be included in the hydraulic analysis and the cofferdam height adjusted accordingly.
5. Please note that this bridge is downstream of our Conestogo Dam. Prior to construction, we will request site contacts and construction scheduling to notify personnel of significant outflows and forecasted flooding. We will also request a contingency plan or appropriate notes for personnel / equipment in or near the water.

Advisory Comments

- A. Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) has identified Critical Habitat within the proposed work zone for federally Threatened Silver Shiner and Black Redhorse, which may be a change from when the Class EA was initiated. This will require consultation and compliance with the federal Fisheries Act and the Species at Risk Act.

We look forward to receiving a GRCA permit application in advance of construction. If you have any questions or require additional information prior to submission, please don't hesitate to contact me at 519-621-2763 ext. 2292 or theywood@grandriver.ca.

Sincerely,



Trevor Heywood
Resource Planner
Grand River Conservation Authority

Municipal Heritage Bridges Cultural
Heritage and Archaeological Resources Assessment Checklist
Revised April 11, 2014

Municipal Heritage Bridges Cultural, Heritage and Archaeological Resources Assessment Checklist Revised April 11, 2014

This checklist was prepared in March 2013 by the Municipal Engineers Association to assist with determining the requirements to comply with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment. View all 4 parts of the module on Structures Over 40 Years at www.municipalclassea.ca to assist with completing the checklist.

Project Name: Scheifele Bridge Replacement - Class Environmental Assessment

Location: Regional Road 22 (Northfield Drive) at Conestogo River, Township of Woolwich

Municipality: Region of Waterloo

Project Engineer: Ken Brisbois, Project Manager - Design & Construction, Region of Waterloo and Garry Leveck, Senior Project Manager, Stantec

Checklist completed by: Meaghan Rivard, MA, CAHP, Senior Heritage Consultant, Stantec

Date: January 2024

NOTE: Complete all sections of Checklist. Both Cultural Heritage and Archaeological Sections must be satisfied before proceeding.

Part A - Municipal Class EA Activity Selection

Description	Yes	No
Will the proposed project involve or result in construction of new water crossings? This includes ferry docks.	☒ Schedule B or C	☐ Next
Will the proposed project involve or result in construction of new grade separation?	☐ Schedule B or C	☒ Next
Will the proposed project involve or result in construction of new underpasses or overpasses for pedestrian recreational or agricultural use?	☐ Schedule B or C	☒ Next
Will the proposed project involve or result in construction of new interchanges between any two roadways, including a grade separation and ramps to connect the two roadways?	☐ Schedule B or C	☒ Next

Description	Yes	No
Will the proposed project involve or result in reconstruction of a water crossing where the structure is less than 40 years old and the reconstructed facility will be for the same purpose, use, capacity and at the same location? (Capacity refers to either hydraulic or road capacity.) This include ferry docks.	☐ Schedule A+	☒ Next
Will the proposed project involve or result in reconstruction of a water crossing, where the reconstructed facility will not be for the same purpose, use, capacity or at the same location? (Capacity refers to either hydraulic or road capacity). This includes ferry docks.	☐ Schedule B or C	☒ Next
Will the proposed project involve or result in reconstruction or alteration of a structure or the grading adjacent to it when the structure is over 40 years old where the proposed work will alter the basic structural system, overall configuration or appearance of the structure?	☒ Next	☐ Assess Archaeological Resources

Part B - Cultural Heritage Assessment

Description	Yes	No
Does the proposed project involve a bridge construction in or after 1956?	☒ Next	☐ Prepare CHER Undertake HIA
Does the project involve one of these four bridge types?	☐ Rigid frame Next ☐ Precast with Concrete Deck Next ☐ Culvert or Simple Span Next ☐ Steel Beam/Concrete Deck Next	☒ Prepare CHER Undertake HIA

Description	Yes	No
Does the bridge or study area contain a parcel of land that is subject of a covenant or agreement between the owner of the property and a conservation body or level of government?	☐ Prepare CHER Undertake HIA	☒ Next
Does the bridge or study area contain a parcel of land that is listed on a register or inventory of heritage properties maintained by the municipality?	☐ Prepare CHER Undertake HIA	☒ Next
Does the bridge or study area contain a parcel of land that is designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act?	☐ Prepare CHER Undertake HIA	☒ Next
Does the bridge or study area contain a parcel of land that is subject to a notice of intention to designate issued by a municipality?	☐ Prepare CHER Undertake HIA	☒ Next
Does the bridge or study area contain a parcel of land that is located within a designated Heritage Conservation District?	☐ Prepare CHER Undertake HIA	☒ Next
Does the bridge or study area contain a parcel of land that is subject to a Heritage Conservation District study area by-law?	☐ Prepare CHER Undertake HIA	☒ Next
Does the bridge or study area contain a parcel of land that is included in the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's list of provincial heritage properties?	☐ Prepare CHER Undertake HIA	☒ Next
Does the bridge or study area contain a parcel of land that is part of a National Historic Site?	☐ Prepare CHER Undertake HIA	☒ Next
Does the bridge or study area contain a parcel of land that is part of a United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Heritage Site?	☐ Prepare CHER Undertake HIA	☒ Next

Description	Yes	No
Does the bridge or study area contain a parcel of land that is designated under the Heritage Railway Station Protection Act?	☐ Prepare CHER Undertake HIA	☒ Next
Does the bridge or study area contain a parcel of land that is identified as a Federal Heritage Building by the Federal Heritage Building Review Office (FHBRO)	☐ Prepare CHER Undertake HIA	☒ Next
Does the bridge or study area contain a parcel of land that is the subject of a municipal, provincial or federal commemorative or interpretive plaque that speaks to the Historical significance of the bridge?	☐ Prepare CHER Undertake HIA	☒ Next
Does the bridge or study area contain a parcel of land that is in a Canadian Heritage River watershed?	☒ Prepare CHER Undertake HIA	☐ Next
Will the project impact any structures or sites (not bridges) that are over forty years old, or are important to defining the character of the area or that are considered a landmark in the local community?	☐ Prepare CHER Undertake HIA	☒ Next
Is the bridge or study area adjacent to a known burial site and/or cemetery?	☐ Prepare CHER Undertake HIA	☒ Next
Is the bridge considered a landmark or have a special association with a community, person or historical event in the local community?	☐ Prepare CHER Undertake HIA	☒ Next
Does the bridge or study area contain or is it part of a cultural heritage landscape?	☒ Prepare Cher Undertake HIA	☐ Assess Archaeological Resources

PART C - HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Description	Yes	No
Does the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report identify any Heritage Features on the project?	☒ Undertake HIA	☐ Part D - Archaeological Resources
Does the Heritage Impact Assessment determine that the proposed project will impact any of the Heritage Features that have been identified?	☐ Schedule B or C	☒ Part D - Archaeological Resources

PART D - ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES ASSESSMENT

Description	Yes	No
Will any activity, related to the project, result in land impacts/significant ground disturbance?	☐ Next	☐ Schedule A - proceed
Have all areas, to be impacted by ground disturbing activities, been subjected to recent extensive and intensive disturbances and to depths greater than the depths of the proposed activities?	☐ Schedule A - proceed	☐ Next
Has an archaeological assessment previously been carried out that includes all of the areas to be impacted by this project?	☐ Next	☐ Archaeological Assessment
Does the report on that previous archaeological assessment recommend that no further archaeological assessment is required within the limits of the project for which that assessment was undertaken, and has a letter been issued by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport stating that the report has been entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports?	☐ Schedule A - proceed	☐ Obtain satisfaction letter - proceed

**** Include Documentation Summary in Project File****