



GTA West Corridor Environmental Assessment Planning and Environmental Assessment Study – Stage 1

Public Information Centre #3 Consultation Record

March 2010

| <u>TABLE OF CONTENTS</u> | PAGE |
|---|-------------|
| 1. INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| 2. CONSULTATION OVERVIEW | 2 |
| 3. PUBLIC CONSULTATION DURING PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #3..... | 3 |
| 3.1 Project Website | 3 |
| 3.2 Newspaper Notifications..... | 3 |
| 3.3 Mailing List and E-mails / Letters..... | 4 |
| 3.4 Public Information Centre #3..... | 4 |
| 3.4.1 Display Panels..... | 5 |
| 3.4.2 Study Documents, Reference Materials and Handouts..... | 7 |
| 3.4.3 Attendance / Summary of Comments..... | 8 |
| 3.5 Consultation with the Community Advisory Group | 12 |
| 4. CONSULTATION WITH MUNICIPALITIES AND AGENCIES DURING PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #3 | 16 |
| 4.1 Municipal Advisory Group | 16 |
| 4.2 Regulatory Agency Advisory Group | 16 |
| 4.3 Presentations to Upper-Tier Municipal Councils and Committees | 16 |
| 4.4 Other Meetings..... | 17 |
| 5. CONSULTATION WITH FIRST NATIONS..... | 19 |

APPENDICES

| | |
|------------|---|
| Appendix A | Stakeholders Consulted – Mailing Lists |
| Appendix B | Responses to Public / Interest Group Comments - Key Themes |
| Appendix C | Current Content of the Project Website |
| Appendix D | Newspaper Notifications |
| Appendix E | Release of Problems and Opportunities Report Notification Materials |
| Appendix F | Public Information Centre #3 Notification Materials |
| Appendix G | Public Information Centre #3 Display Panels |
| Appendix H | Public Information Centre #3 Study Brochure and Factsheets |
| Appendix I | Community Advisory Group Meeting #4 and #5 Summary Notes |
| Appendix J | Municipal Advisory Group Meeting #3 and #4 Presentation and Summary Notes |
| Appendix K | Regulatory Agency Advisory Group Meeting #3 and #4 Presentation and Summary Notes |
| Appendix L | Upper-tier Municipal and Committee Meeting Summary Notes |
| Appendix M | York Region Planning and Economic Development Committee Letter |
| Appendix N | First Nations Public Information Centre #3 Notification Materials |

1. INTRODUCTION

The Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO) is working to provide for the efficient movement of people and goods within the context of the province's *Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe*. To support the policy directions in the *Growth Plan*, MTO has commenced the formal environmental assessment (EA) process for the GTA West Corridor. The purpose of this Study is to examine long-term transportation problems and opportunities and consider alternative solutions to provide better linkages between *Urban Growth Centres* within the GTA West Corridor Preliminary Study Area, such as Downtown Milton, Brampton City Centre, Vaughan Corporate Centre and Downtown Guelph.

The Study is being undertaken as an Individual EA in accordance with the *Ontario Environmental Assessment Act* (the Act). The GTA West Corridor Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference was submitted to the Ontario Ministry of the Environment on July 15, 2007 and was approved on March 4, 2008.

Since the commencement of the study in January 2007, the following tasks have been completed:

- Development of the Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference;
- Development of two draft existing conditions reports: "Overview of Transportation & Economic Conditions" and "Overview of Environmental Conditions and Constraints" – released in July 2008 for public review and comment;
- Development of draft "Transportation System Problems and Opportunities Report" for public review – released in July 2009 for public review and comment; and
- Conducted extensive stakeholder consultation and held three rounds of Public Information Centres.

A first round of Public Information Centres (PICs) was held in April/May 2007 in order to provide the public with an opportunity to review the draft ToR, provide comments and discuss issues with representatives of the Project Team.

A second round of PICs was held in March 2009 in order to present the public with an update on the Study progress and to provide the opportunity for the public to comment on maps and displays depicting the problems and opportunities identified within the GTA West Corridor Preliminary Study Area.

A third round of PICs was held in November/December 2009 to present alternatives that were developed to address the problems and opportunities presented at the second round of PICs, provide a high level assessment of the alternatives, and receive public input prior to the evaluation of the alternatives. This Report outlines the results of the third round of PICs and all of the consultation events that occurred in advance of the PICs (since the second round of PICs held in March 2009).

2. CONSULTATION OVERVIEW

The focus of the third round of Public Information Centres (PICs) was to:

- Present transportation alternatives that were developed to address the problems and opportunities presented at PIC #2 (March 2009);
- Provide a high-level assessment of the transportation alternatives; and
- Receive public input on the transportation alternatives prior to the evaluation and selection of a preferred alternative(s).

The third round of PICs was held at 4 venues within the Preliminary Study Area between November 30th and December 10th, 2009.

Prior to the PICs, meetings were held with the GTA West Regulatory Agency Advisory Group (RAAG), Municipal Advisory Group (MAG) and the Community Advisory Group (CAG). These meetings served a similar purpose – to receive feedback on the proposed process to generate and evaluate alternatives, the types of alternatives that should be considered, the generated transportation system improvement alternatives and the preliminary high-level assessment conducted. The Project Team also met with upper-tier municipalities and committees, and other stakeholders.

All comments received during the third round of PICs from the general public, interest groups, agencies and municipalities were considered by the Project Team. The upcoming release of the Draft Area Transportation System Alternatives Report in March 2010 will be a reflection of this consultation effort.

A list of stakeholders contacted during the third round of PICs is included in **Appendix A**. Consistent with the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, public lists developed as part of this study have not been included.

Public and interest group comments submitted, summarized and organized by theme, are included in **Appendix B**, with the corresponding response that was generally provided. All public comments submitted to which a reply was requested, received a response from the Project Team. These comments and responses are compiled under separate cover.

3. PUBLIC CONSULTATION DURING PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #3

3.1 Project Website

The GTA West project website (www.gta-west.com) was updated to include the dates, times and locations of the PICs, as well as a link to an electronic copy of the Ontario Government Notice on November 16, 2009. In addition, the PIC display material package and study brochure were made available for the public to download on November 30, 2009.

A copy of the current content of the project website is included in **Appendix C**.

3.2 Newspaper Notifications

A notice was published in 17 newspapers with circulation across the Preliminary Study Area. The notices provided an overview of the key steps involved in EA Stage 1, notification of the third round of PICs, a key map for Study context and contact information for key Project Team members. A copy of the newspaper notice is included in **Appendix D** and was published as outlined below.

Notice of Public Information Centre #3

A notice announcing the third round of PICs was published in the following list of newspapers on the specified dates. The notice was also posted on the project website.

DAILY NEWSPAPERS

- | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Toronto Star | Sat November 21, 2009 | |
| 2. The Guelph Mercury | Sat November 21, 2009 | Sat November 28, 2009 |

TRI-WEEKLY NEWSPAPERS

- | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 3. Mississauga News | Sun November 22, 2009 | Fri November 27, 2009 |
| 4. Brampton Guardian | Wed November 18, 2009 | Wed November 25, 2009 |

BI-WEEKLY NEWSPAPERS

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 5. Caledon Enterprise | Sat November 21, 2009 | Sat November 28, 2009 |
| 6. Vaughan Citizen | Thurs November 19, 2009 | Thurs November 26, 2009 |
| 7. Guelph Tribune | Fri November 20, 2009 | Fri November 27, 2009 |
| 8. Georgetown Acton Independent | Wed November 18, 2009 | Fri November 27, 2009 |
| 9. Milton – The Canadian Champion | Fri November 20, 2009 | Wed November 25, 2009 |
| 10. Wellington Advertiser | Fri November 20, 2009 | Fri November 27, 2009 |

WEEKLY NEWSPAPERS

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 11. Caledon Citizen | Thurs November 19, 2009 | Thurs November 26, 2009 |
| 12. King Township Sentinel | Wed November 18, 2009 | Wed November 25, 2009 |
| 13. The Erin Advocate | Wed November 18, 2009 | Wed November 25, 2009 |
| 14. Le Metropolitain (French) | Wed November 18, 2009 | Wed November 25, 2009 |
| 15. Turtle Island News | Wed November 18, 2009 | Wed November 25, 2009 |
| 16. Tekawennake New Credit Reporter | Wed November 18, 2009 | Wed November 25, 2009 |
| 17. The Halton Compass | Thurs November 19, 2009 | Thurs November 26, 2009 |

3.3 Mailing List and E-mails / Letters

Study Mailing List

A GTA West Study mailing list was developed following the first PIC which includes interested stakeholders that submitted requests through the project website (webform), e-mail, fax, phone or letter. This list is constantly updated. Those who signed in at the first and second PICs have been added to the study mailing list. Once stakeholders are added to the mailing list they received subsequent notifications of the Study milestones outlined below through their preferred method of contact (e-mail / letter). In addition, a list of area interest groups (ratepayers associations, environmental groups, agricultural groups, etc.) was developed in consultation with local municipalities.

The current public mailing list includes approximately 650 names and the interest group mailing list includes approximately 160 groups.

E-mail / Letter Notification of the Release of the Draft Area Transportation System Problems and Opportunities Report

On July 31, 2009, individuals on the Study mailing list were notified by e-mail / letter (depending on their preferred method of contact) of the release of the Draft Area Transportation System Problems & Opportunities Report. The GTA West project website (www.gta-west.com) was updated to include the report on July 31, 2009.

Copies of the Draft Problems and Opportunities Report release notification materials are included in **Appendix E**.

E-mail / Letter Notification of Public Information Centre #3

On November 13 and 17, 2009, PIC #3 notification emails / letters were sent directly to individuals on the Project Team's External Agency mailing list (including representatives of the Municipal Advisory Group and Regulatory Agency Advisory Group) and to approximately 160 interest groups. MPP's within the Preliminary Study Area were notified via mail on November 9, 2009.

Individuals on the Study mailing list, including those who requested to be added to the Study mailing list through webform, e-mail, fax, telephone or letter, were also sent a letter / email on November 13 and 17, 2009, depending on the preferred method of contact. The public mailing list currently includes approximately 650 people. Copies of the PIC #3 notification materials are included in **Appendix F**.

3.4 Public Information Centre #3

The third round of Public Information Centres (PICs) was held to present alternatives that were developed to address the problems and opportunities presented at the second round of PICs, provide a high level assessment of the alternatives, and receive public input prior to the evaluation of the alternatives.

Ministry of Transportation (MTO) and Consultant representatives of the Project Team attended. The PICs were held as drop-in centres with display panels presenting maps and displays illustrating the problems and opportunities and information for providing

comments. The Project Team participated in discussions with attendees to address any questions or concerns.

The PICs were held as follows:

| Monday November 30, 2009 | Thursday December 3, 2009 |
|---|--|
| River Run Centre Canada Company Hall 35 Woolwich Street Guelph, ON | Mold Master Sportsplex Alcott Hall 221 Guelph Street Georgetown, ON |
| 4:00 to 8:00 p.m. | 4:00 to 8:00 p.m. |

| Tuesday December 8, 2009 | Thursday December 10, 2009 |
|---|--|
| Brampton Fairgrounds Hall 12942 Heart Lake Road Brampton, ON | Le Jardin Special Events Centre Le Parisien Room 8440 Highway 27 Woodbridge, ON |
| 4:00 to 8:00 p.m. | 4:00 to 8:00 p.m. |

3.4.1 Display Panels

The display panels presented at the Public Information Centre were organized into groupings in the following order:

GROUP 1

PIC #3 Summary

- Background
- Process Framework and Previous Consultation
- Individual Mode Alternatives
- Group of Modal Improvement Alternatives
- Next Steps

GROUP 2

Background

- Study Purpose, Process and Schedule
- Policy Context
- Summary of Problems from PIC #2
- Transportation Opportunities
- Many Improvements Have Already Been Planned

GROUP 3

Process Framework and Previous Consultation

- Process Framework
- Previous Consultation
- First Nation Involvement

GROUP 4
Individual Mode Alternatives

- Introduction
- Transportation Demand Management (TDM) / Transportation System Management (TSM)
- Transit
- Goods Movement
- Freight Rail
- Intermodal
- Air
- Marine
- Our Assessment

GROUP 5
Groups of Modal Improvement Alternatives

- Process
- Group #1: Optimize Existing Network
- Group #2: New/Improved Non-Roadway Infrastructure
- Findings from Group #1 and Group #2
- Group #3: Widen/Improve Existing Roads
 - Group #3-1
 - Group #3-2
 - Group #3-3
 - Group #3: Summary of Our Assessment
- Group #4: New Transportation Corridors
 - Group #4-1
 - Group #4-2
 - Group #4-3
 - Group #4-4
 - Group #4-5
 - Group #4: Summary of Our Assessment

GROUP 6
Next Steps

- Evaluation
- Factors and Criteria to be Used in the Assessment of Alternatives
- PIC #4 and Beyond
- Consultation and Outreach

Refer to **Appendix G** for copies of the display panels presented at the PICs. The project website was updated to include copies of the display panels on November 30, 2009.

3.4.2 Study Documents, Reference Materials and Handouts

Copies of readily available GTA West Corridor Environmental Assessment Study documents and other materials were made available for reference at the PICs, such as:

- *GTA West Corridor EA Terms of Reference* (Amended July 2007)
- *Draft GTA West Corridor EA Overview of Transportation & Economic Conditions* (July 2008)
- *Draft GTA West Corridor EA Draft Overview of Environmental Conditions and Constraints* (July 2008)
- *GTA West Corridor EA Goals and Objectives* (January 2009)
- *Draft GTA West Corridor EA Overview of Corridor Protection and Development Issues Paper* (June 2009)
- *Draft GTA West Corridor EA Area Transportation System Problems and Opportunities Report* (July 2009)
- *Draft GTA West Corridor EA Overview of Forecasting Demand Analysis Report* (July 2009)
- *Draft GTA West Corridor EA "Long List" of Transportation Alternatives* (November 2009)
- *GTA West Corridor EA Land Use Compilation Map* (December 2009)
- *The Big Move - Metrolinx Regional Transportation Plan* (November 2008)
- *GO 2020 Strategic Plan* (December 2008)
- *Brampton Züm Phase 1 and Phase 2 Maps* (September 2009)
- *York Viva Next System Map* (As of November 2009)
- *Provincial Policy Statement* (MMAH, 2005)
- *Places to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe* (MPIR, 2006)
- *Greenbelt Plan* (MMAH, 2005)
- *Niagara Escarpment Plan* (MNR, 2005)
- *Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan* (MMAH, 2002)
- *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* (CEAA, 2004)
- *The Ontario Environmental Assessment Act* (MOE, 1990)
- *The Environmental Bill of Rights* (2006)
- *MTO Environmental Reference for Highway Design* (October 2006)

Copies of draft GTA West Corridor Environmental Assessment Study documents were made available for temporary reference at the PICs, such as:

- *Draft GTA West Corridor EA High Level Evaluation of "Modal Transportation Alternatives"* (November 2009)
- *Draft GTA West Corridor EA Individual Mode Discussion Papers* (November 2009)

A Study brochure and several factsheet hand-outs were also made available to all attendees. The factsheets explained such topics as:

- The Ontario Environmental Assessment Process;

- The Canadian Environmental Assessment Process;
- The Greenbelt Plan;
- The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe;
- The Niagara Escarpment Plan;
- The Oak Ridges Moraine;
- The GTA West Study Area – Economic Context; and
- The GTA West Study Area – Transportation Profile.

Copies of the Study brochure and factsheets are included in **Appendix H**.

3.4.3 Attendance / Summary of Comments

A total of 312 members of the public signed the Visitor's Register for the four Public Information Centres.

In addition to verbal comments, Project Team representatives encouraged visitors to submit written comments regarding the information presented. Comment sheets were available for members of the public to fill out at the PIC or to send in by the comment deadline (January 15, 2010) by e-mail, fax or mail to the Project Team.

At the PICs, 29 written comment sheets were collected. In addition, 26 comments were received via webform (6), e-mail (10), fax (3), mail (3) and the toll-free number (4) by the comment deadline. The following is a breakdown of attendance and the number of comments submitted by PIC date/venue:

| Date / Location | Recorded Attendance | Written Comments Received |
|---|---------------------|---------------------------|
| November 30, 2009, Guelph | 88 | 17 |
| December 3, 2009, Georgetown | 106 | 6 |
| December 8, 2009, Caledon | 77 | 3 |
| December 11, 2009, Woodbridge | 41 | 3 |
| Total Comment Forms Received at the PIC | | 29 |
| Total Comment Forms / Comments received via fax, mail, e-mail, webform or the toll-free number | | 26 |
| Total | 312 | 55 |

Public and interest group comments submitted, summarized and organized by theme, are included in **Appendix B**, with the corresponding response that was generally provided. All public comments submitted to which a reply was requested, received a response from the Project Team. These comments and responses are bound under separate cover. All personal information has been removed consistent with the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*.

The following tables summarize the key written and verbal comments, issues and concerns raised during the third round of PICs:

| Summary of Written Comments Submitted | # |
|---|----------|
| Preliminary Study Area | |
| • Extend the Preliminary Study Area boundaries to include Waterloo Region | 1 |
| Timeframe / Scope of the Study | |
| • The study is too GTA-centric and should further study the transportation needs of residents in Guelph/Georgetown travelling to Hamilton/Niagara/USA | 1 |
| • Is there a proposed highway route? | 1 |
| Transportation Problems and Opportunities | |
| • Congestion is prevalent, time consuming and frustrating, particularly on Highway 401 | 2 |
| • Too many trucks, particularly on Highway 401 | 2 |
| • Roads are in poor condition, particularly Winston Churchill Blvd | 1 |
| • General complaints about Trafalgar Rd (speed limit, poorly timed traffic lights, poor interchange design at Highway 401, etc.) | 1 |
| • GO Transit bus service shouldn't be confused with GO Transit rail service. The presence of rail service can shape and change behaviour/locational choices, while the presence of buses only addresses travel options for existing markets | 1 |
| Travel Demand Analysis / Modelling | |
| • Consider current economic situation and peak oil in data/modelling | 1 |
| Alternatives | |
| • Need to build/expand rail/transit/freight infrastructure, particularly before considering road/highway works | 10 |
| • New transportation infrastructure should parallel existing corridors, ex. New highways or new GO Transit corridors should follow the Highway 401 and/or Highway 400 corridors | 6 |
| • Like Alternative 4-2 (Link from Highway 400 to Highway 401 is more direct, economic benefits, add link to Milton along Steeles Ave) | 6 |
| • Don't like Alternative 4-4 (property impacts, will damage escarpment lands and destroy valuable farm land) | 6 |
| • Don't like Group 4/new corridor alternatives (too expensive, not best use of taxpayer money, negative environmental and community effects, encourage car/truck traffic, may not be needed in the future due to peak oil) | 5 |
| • Like Alternative 4-3 (Reduced impact on watershed areas in the north, traffic can bypass the west GTA with minimal impact on natural features) | 5 |
| • Prefer widening alternatives (Group 3) | 4 |
| • Don't like Alternative 4-5 (would also cause too many problems with existing connections to Highway 6 and 401) | 4 |
| • Include more active transportation options (ie. long distance routes adjacent to transitway, more cycling infrastructure, plan for bikes/electric bikes/scooters) | 3 |
| • Should widen Mayfield Road | 3 |
| • Like Group 2 alternatives | 2 |
| • Like the idea of building transitways adjacent/in-between highways | 2 |
| • Like Alternative 4-5 (Reduced impact on watershed areas in the north, provides better linkages to other highways in case of blockage, accommodates South Georgetown, connects with Halton-Peel North-South corridor at Mayfield Rd, will eliminate the need for a future link between the two corridors, has the least environmental constraints) | 2 |
| • Don't like Group 3/widening alternatives (will create more congestion and encourage more single-occupancy vehicle use) | 2 |
| • Should widen Highway 410 | 2 |

| Summary of Written Comments Submitted | # |
|--|---|
| • Return County Road 124 to being a provincial highway, with a bypass to the north of Erin village. | 2 |
| • Create dedicated truck lanes | 2 |
| • Put HOV lanes on all highways, particularly when widening existing highways | 2 |
| • Utilize existing and underused rail lines for passenger rail service, ex. CN north main line, Guelph Junction Railway, Fergus Sub, Highway 410 Rail Corridor | 2 |
| • Need more local transit service that connects to GO Transit service | 2 |
| • Like Group 1 | 1 |
| • Like Group 4 | 1 |
| • Like Alternative 4-1 | 1 |
| • Like Alternative 4-4 (will provide a better connection to the City of Guelph) | 1 |
| • Don't like Alternative 3-3 | 1 |
| • Don't like Alternative 4-2 (would cause even more problems with vehicles than now exist) | 1 |
| • Don't like Alternative 4-3 (bad approach because freeways need to be built in cells with east-west and north-south linkages) | 1 |
| • Don't like proposed upgrades to Highway 7 through Rockwood to 4 lanes | 1 |
| • New highway between Brampton and Caledon will not be useful | 1 |
| • Doubt that encouraging private vehicle use and building new highways will solve the transportation issues in the study area | 1 |
| • Show more realistic potential corridors through Caledon and King/Vaughan to connect to Highway 400. All of the current options go directly through Bolton | 1 |
| • Should widen King Street | 1 |
| • Should widen Highway 427 | 1 |
| • Should widen Highway 50 | 1 |
| • Should widen Highway 9 | 1 |
| • Should widen Winston Churchill Blvd from County 124 south to Olde Baseline Road. Then take the route east to Mississauga Road, then south to link up with the corridor at Mayfield. | 1 |
| • Establish a north-south route between Acton and Ballinafad that would take traffic from County 124 down to Highway 7 | 1 |
| • Establish a new route between Trafalgar Road and Winston Churchill Blvd., then on the Mississauga Road, in the area of the 22nd Sideroad. | 1 |
| • New corridor is needed from Hanlon to Highway 410 at Mayfield Road | 1 |
| • A new corridor would be more appropriate in the Highway 24 area | 1 |
| • Create HOV only highways, ex. Los Angeles | 1 |
| • Review possibility of using hydro corridors for highway right-of-ways | 1 |
| • Improve management of current highway system | 1 |
| • Locate a new corridor in proximity to existing GO Transit rail corridors | 1 |
| • GO Bus service is needed from Brampton to Erin to Orangeville | 1 |
| • GO Transit service is needed in the Gore Rd/Castlemore Area to Union Station and Pearson Airport | 1 |
| • Any GO Transit rail expansion should start with peak period service (minimum 4 trains each way), progress to 6 trains/all-day/express service, and ultimately create two-way service | 1 |
| • Extend GO Transit rail service to Waterloo on the North Mainline | 1 |
| • Extend GO Transit rail service to Cambridge on the CP Mainline | 1 |
| • Provide fare subsidy for transfers from local bus transit to GO Transit bus service | 1 |
| • Need better coordination between bus schedules and rail service | 1 |
| • Create transit connection between Georgetown and Mississauga | 1 |

| Summary of Written Comments Submitted | # |
|--|----------|
| • Create cross-boundary bus service in Highway 7 and Highway 24 corridors | 1 |
| • Link highway carpool lots through public transportation | 1 |
| • Use diesel multiple unit (DMU) technology to link regional centres | 1 |
| • Transit development in Toronto is 30 years behind where it should be | 1 |
| • MTO has presented a highway-based solution since that is their specialty | 1 |
| • Like proposed active transportation improvements to transportation hubs, such as increased bike storage | 1 |
| • Establish major truck routes | 1 |
| • The GTA West Study could be the impetus to start a dialogue on freight rail rationalization, which is especially important as Ontario's economy restructures | 1 |
| • Construction should begin at Highway 400 and proceed west | 1 |
| Environmental Effects / Evaluation of Alternatives | |
| • Protect agricultural lands/ agricultural operations, and the interests of farmers and rural landowners | 9 |
| • Protect features of the natural environment (i.e. air quality, climate change, environmentally sensitive areas) | 4 |
| • Protect features of the socio-economic environment (i.e. human health, established communities, property expropriation) | 3 |
| • Heritage and cultural issues are important to consider | 2 |
| • Consider wildlife/amphibian crossings when widening highways | 2 |
| • Avoid crossing the Niagara Escarpment | 2 |
| • Protect natural recreation areas (i.e. Bruce Trail) | 1 |
| • Protect conservation areas (i.e. the Niagara Escarpment) | 1 |
| • Educate the public on the cost of owning a vehicle vs. taking public transportation | 1 |
| • If the expansion of marine freight is considered, environmental impacts and chance of pollution from shipwrecks should be reviewed | 1 |
| Public Consultation | |
| • PIC displays were well presented and informative; an impressive amount of work has been completed | 9 |
| • Looking forward to results at PIC #4 | 3 |
| • Too much information was presented; overwhelming amount of material | 1 |
| Alterations to / Accuracy of Public Information Centre #2 Display Materials | |
| • Board 20 (Cluster 4 – Freight Rail): CPR on map should be labelled as OBRY | 1 |
| • Board 21 (Cluster 4 – Freight Rail): Photos should be labelled | 1 |
| • Board 30 (Cluster 5 – Group 3-1): Show Mt. Pleasant station along expanded Georgetown Corridor | 1 |
| • Show the Bruce Trail routes on study mapping | 1 |
| Growth Plan | |
| • Benefits to growth are a fallacy | 1 |
| • The GTA West Corridor will encourage sprawl | 1 |
| • Provincial and Federal policies are needed to slow the rate of growth in Southern Ontario | 1 |
| Other Studies/ Resources to Consider | |
| • Like plans for Highway 24 between Guelph and Cambridge | 2 |
| • The connection between the GTA West Project and other projects, like the NGTA Corridor, needs to be better explained | 2 |
| • Consider transportation solutions and case studies from other jurisdictions / internationally | 1 |
| • Like GO 2020 expansion plans | 1 |
| • Is a new GO Transit rail station proposed for Guelph? | 1 |
| • The GTA West Project Team should connect with the NGTA Project Team | 1 |

| Summary of Written Comments Submitted | # |
|--|----------|
| • General questions/issues regarding the Highway 427 Transportation Corridor | 1 |
| • Recommendation and questions regarding plans for Highway 50, from Mayfield Rd and King Rd | 1 |
| • The decision to bring 407ETR to Highway 401 at Trafalgar was wrong | 1 |
| • Continuing 407 ETR east-west through Durham is the right approach, and this should be continued on the west side of the GTA | 1 |
| General | |
| • The Federal Government should look at population growth in a different way and not “pave paradise” | 1 |
| • The GTA West EA is vital to the future economic success of the entire Greater Golden Horseshoe | 1 |
| • York Region has tainted the EA process by presupposing a highway solution in its new Official Plan | 1 |
| Requests for Information | |
| • Requests for PIC #3 display materials. | 7 |
| • Please add me to the mailing list / keep me informed | 4 |
| • Please provide me with a copy of the Consolidated Land Use Map | 1 |
| • Please provide me with a Halton-Peel Boundary Area Transportation Study (HP-BATS) contact name | 1 |
| • Please provide me with hardcopies of the High-level Evaluation Tables and Individual Mode Discussion papers made available at PIC #3 | 1 |
| • Request for PIC #3 comment sheet | 1 |
| Requests for More Information on other MTO Studies | |
| • Is there a GTA East Study? There should be a plan for east of Highway 400 | 1 |
| • Why was Highway 410 extended to Mayfield Rd and beyond? | 1 |
| • Why was Highway 404 extended to Sutton and Highway 427? | 1 |
| • The future of the Highway 7 EA, between Kitchener and Guelph, is unclear | 1 |

| Summary of Verbal Comments Submitted | |
|---|--|
| Alternatives | |
| • General support for Group 3 and 4 alternatives, particularly 4-4 and 4-5. 4-1, 4-2 and 4-3 are too small so why bother? | |
| • General questions about the Group 4 new corridor alternatives –Where is the highway/road going? How wide are the corridors as shown? Will I be affected? How much land will be needed for the right-of-way and interchanges for a new corridor? | |
| • General property concerns – Will a new corridor impact my property? Will a new corridor go through local farms? | |
| • A new corridor would help local farms better move goods. | |
| • A new corridor could have a positive effect on local land values. | |
| • General assumption that a new corridor will be proposed. | |
| • The building of a new corridor should be staged and begin in the east where there is more demand. | |
| • General support for the multi-modal approach used. | |
| • The Project Team should have looked at alternatives north of the Preliminary Study Area around Highway 9. | |
| • Potential conflicts could occur with planned Region of Peel water/wastewater infrastructure. | |
| • There is no need for widenings. Build a new corridor soon. | |
| • A true bypass of the GTA should be built which extends further east than the Preliminary | |

Summary of Verbal Comments Submitted

Study Area's boundaries.

- More north-south links should be considered.
- A new corridor should have connections to Highways 403 and 401.
- King Rd should be considered for widening instead of Kirby Rd due to the environmentally sensitive lands along Kirby Rd and because of the MTO's current work at the King Rd-Highway 400 interchange.
- A truckway should be considered in the GTA West corridor
- Question about the status and alignment of corridor in the Bolton/Mayfield area and MTO property purchase approach.
- General concern that the solution for the area isn't rail-focused. Transit/rail service should be increased before new roads/highways are proposed. Europe should be looked to for examples.
- More transit/rail links are needed from the Guelph/Wellington area to Pearson International Airport.
- An alternative route to Highway 400 is needed.
- Question about widening of Highway 407 and who pays for it.

Transportation

- There is a lot of truck traffic on local roads, particularly on Highway 24 and Trafalgar Road. A new corridor may relieve this.
- Highway 401 is too congested with trucks.
- The current congestion on municipal roads is unacceptable.
- The existing rail system is very Toronto-focused. Existing rail lines should be used more for goods movement between areas outside of Toronto, ex. Guelph to Georgetown.
- General questions about the Metrolinx and GO Transit proposals for the study area.
- Current farming operations are negatively affected by local traffic congestion.
- Why are we planning for a future with cars when we have reached "peak oil" conditions?
- The St. Lawrence Seaway should be better utilized. More freight goods should be moved to ships.
- More goods should be moved to rail.
- There is a lack of useful transit opportunities in rural areas. Often you must drive out of the way to get to transit facilities.
- Improve connections to transit stations.
- Transitways should be built in the middle of roads/highways not adjacent to them.
- The proposed future transit system for north-east Brampton is bleak. More transit routes are needed.
- GO Transit stations do not have adequate parking spaces.

Study Process and Timeframe

- General questions regarding the study timeline - When will the alternatives be evaluated? When will the EA study be finished? When will a decision be made? When will the final transportation development strategy be built?
- The project has good intentions, but it is too late to do anything about the problems. The study should have been conducted years ago.
- Evaluation factors should include cost of accidents.
- Clarification regarding the type of study being conducted (Planning Study, not Detail Design) and why there isn't more detail available for each of the alternatives.
- The study outcome is predetermined, thus poor use of government funds/taxpayer's money for the study.

Policy and Other Studies

- General questions about the Ontario government's land use and transit vision.
- General doubt about the growth projections in the Growth Plan.
- Is there a long range outlook beyond 2031?
- Is the Project Team integrating with the Sustainable Halton and the Halton-Peel BATS

Summary of Verbal Comments Submitted

studies?

- General questions and concerns about the Halton-Peel BATS study.
- A few attendees at the GTA West Georgetown PIC thought the meeting was for the Halton-Peel BATS study due to the appearance of an article regarding the HP-BATS study printed next to the GTA West ad in the Georgetown-Acton Independent.
- There were general questions about the study's relationship to Highway 413/414.
- Roads are needed to accommodate growth however is the growth unsustainable?
- What factors will be used in the evaluation?
- The Highway 10 widening is a mistake. The project should have bypassed Caledon entirely.
- The new interchange at Highway 410 and 10 is poorly designed and many trucks have had problems at the interchange. Signing may improve this issue and MTO should be proactive in addressing this.
- Municipal Transportation Master Plans are not in sync with Provincial Plans.
- General questions about the GTA West land use map and what the designations mean.
- Extension of Hwy 427 to the north to Hwy 9 and Simcoe is long overdue, why is it not identified in the Growth Plan and what was the rationale?
- General questions and concerns about the Highway 427 extension.
- Concerns about the Peel-Brampton Class EA looking to connect Mayfield Rd to Major Mackenzie Drive.
- Questions regarding the status of the New Highway 7 project between Kitchener and Guelph.

Environmental

- Concerns about a potential crossing of the Bruce Trail/Niagara Escarpment. Concerns should be addressed early in the process to avoid confrontation later. Tunnelling, as is done in Europe, should be considered if a new crossing is required.
- If a crossing of the Niagara Escarpment is proposed, it must be thoroughly justified.
- The Bruce Trail is a conservation corridor that should be considered throughout the study process.
- Concerns about potential impacts on agricultural lands.
- The Environmental Conditions and Constraints Report is not up to date.

General

- There was a general understanding of the need for the project.
- Many attendees complimented the Project Team for the amount of work they have completed, however the amount of information at the PIC was found to be overwhelming.
- The Ontario government should stop municipalities from rezoning land where a new corridor is needed so that the land price won't become too expensive to acquire.
- Have municipalities been consulted with?
- A map should be made which displays just the future MTO planned improvements.
- General interest in attending upcoming Community Advisory Group meetings.
- There is intense development pressure in Vaughan.
- Lack of free and available parking near the Guelph PIC venue.

3.5 Consultation with the Community Advisory Group

To assist the Project Team as the Study progresses, a Community Advisory Group (CAG) was formed to provide valuable input on community perspectives. The CAG includes representatives from several stakeholder / interest groups, organizations, and individuals in and around the Preliminary Study Area. The CAG was formed based on applications received during the preparation of the EA Terms of Reference.

On July 14, 2009, the fourth meeting of the CAG was held in order to get feedback on the proposed process to generate and evaluate alternatives and input to the types of alternatives that should be considered.

On November 5, 2009, a fifth CAG meeting was held in order to receive feedback on the generated transportation system improvement alternatives, the preliminary high-level assessment conducted and to discuss the packaging of the material for the third round of consultation.

The summary notes from these meetings are provided in **Appendix I**.

4. CONSULTATION WITH MUNICIPALITIES AND AGENCIES DURING PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #3

4.1 Municipal Advisory Group

A Municipal Advisory Group (MAG) was formed during the Study's commencement based on the geographic context of the Preliminary Study Area and includes representatives from upper and lower tier municipalities in the Preliminary Study Area.

On June 24, 2009, the third meeting of the MAG was held prior to the generation of alternatives in order to get feedback on the proposed process to generate and evaluate alternatives and acquire input to the types of alternatives that should be considered.

On November 3, 2009, the fourth meeting of the MAG was held prior to the third round of PICs in order to receive feedback on the generated alternatives and the assessment process used.

The presentation and summary notes from these meetings are provided in **Appendix J**.

4.2 Regulatory Agency Advisory Group

A Regulatory Agency Advisory Group (RAAG) was formed during the Study's commencement and includes potentially affected federal ministries, provincial ministries, regional agencies (Conservation Authorities) and Transportation Service Providers.

On June 19, 2009, the third meeting of the RAAG was held prior to the generation of alternatives in order to get feedback on the proposed process to generate and evaluate alternatives and acquire input to the types of alternatives that should be considered. This meeting was held as a joint meeting with the Niagara to GTA Corridor Environmental Assessment team.

On November 10, 2009, the fourth meeting of the RAAG was held prior to the third round of PICs in order to receive feedback on the generated alternatives and the assessment process used.

The presentation summary notes from these meetings are provided in **Appendix K**.

4.3 Presentations to Upper-Tier Municipal Councils and Committees

The Project Team gave presentations to upper-tier municipal councils and committees from across the Preliminary Study Area in order to provide an overview of the progress of the Study since PIC #2. Lower-tier municipalities could request presentations by the Project Team however these requests would be entertained if the scheduling was compatible. The Town of Caledon and City of Brampton requested presentations.

The presentations were held as follows:

- Halton Region – Planning and Public Works Committee..... November 12, 2009
- Town of Caledon – Council November 17, 2009
- County of Wellington/City of Guelph* – Council..... November 23, 2009
- Peel Region – General Committee December 3, 2009
- City of Brampton – Council..... January 27, 2010

*The City of Guelph as well as lower-tier municipalities in the County of Wellington were invited to attend the Wellington Council presentation.

The summary notes from these meetings are included in **Appendix L**.

By request of the Commissioner of Transportation and Works and through the Manager of Transportation Planning, the GTA West Project Team delegation scheduled for December 2, 2009 at the York Region Planning and Economic Development Committee was cancelled. The material that was to be presented was forwarded to the Regional Clerk on November 24, 2009 for distribution to Committee members. A copy of the letter sent to the Regional Clerk is enclosed in **Appendix M**.

4.4 Other Meetings

The Project Team conducted extensive consultation with a variety of stakeholders prior to the third round of consultation. The following is a list of these meetings, the date they were held and their overall purpose:

| Date | Meeting | Purpose |
|-------------------|---|--|
| February 23, 2009 | Municipal Workshop – Halton Region | To discuss corridor protection issues, review areas of interest identified by the Project Team, discuss opportunities to refine these areas and identify any additional areas known by municipalities. |
| February 24, 2009 | Municipal Workshop – Peel Region | |
| February 24, 2009 | Municipal Workshop – York Region | |
| March 2, 2009 | Municipal Workshop – Guelph/Wellington | |
| April 24, 2009 | Halton Hills Council Workshop | To discuss corridor protection and development issues related to the areas of interest identified by the Project Team. |
| May 19, 2009 | Conservation Authority Workshop – Conservation Halton/Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC) | To discuss current Conservation Authority/NEC studies and the sensitive environmental features within the Preliminary Study Area. |
| May 20, 2009 | Conservation Authority Workshop – Toronto and Region Conservation Authority | |
| May 20, 2009 | Conservation Authority Workshop – Credit Valley Conservation | |
| May 26, 2009 | Conservation Authority Workshop – Grand River Conservation Authority | |

| | | |
|--------------------|--|---|
| June 8/9, 2009 | Think Tank Session for GTA West and Niagara to GTA Studies | Two-day workshop to generate alternatives. |
| September 25, 2009 | GTA West and Niagara to GTA Provincial Agency Workshop | Workshop to update agency members on the work completed for NGTA and GTA West and to engage agency members in a discussion to encourage the members to provide comments and / or potential policy issues with the preliminary alternatives. |
| September 28, 2009 | Ontario Growth Secretariat | Reviewed purpose of study and addressed questions. |
| October 13, 2009 | Halton Transportation Advisory Committee | Presentation and discussion on the Draft Area Transportation System Problems and Opportunities Report |
| October 14, 2009 | Metrolinx and GO Transit | To provide a study update and present and seek feedback on the group alternatives that had been generated. |
| November 16, 2009 | Meeting with Greenbelt Council | Reviewed how Greenbelt Plan policies will be addressed. |

5. CONSULTATION WITH FIRST NATIONS

Following PIC #2, MTO continued to engage the following First Nations groups / committees: the Six Nations of the Grand River Territory, the Haudenosaunee Confederacy Council, the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation and the Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nations.

A meeting was held with the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation on October 28, 2009 in order to provide a study progress update, present and seek feedback on the process framework for developing & assessing transportation alternatives and to present and seek feedback on the group alternatives that had been generated.

The project team also offered the opportunity to meet with First Nation communities potentially affected by the project at their request.

Letters were sent by MTO to the four groups on November 9, 2009 inviting them to attend PIC #3 in order to review and comment on the materials presented. The invitation letters are included in **Appendix N**.

Notice of PIC #3 was also advertised in the following weekly newspapers:

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Turtle Island News | Wed November 18, 2009 | Wed November 25, 2009 |
| 2. Tekawennake New Credit Reporter | Wed November 18, 2009 | Wed November 25, 2009 |

At PIC #3 two First Nations display panels were presented which outlined the following:

- Six Nations of the Grand River Territory
- Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation
- First Nations Considerations
- Active Land Claims around the Preliminary Study Area (as of September 30, 2008)
- First Nations Engagement

A copy of the display panels is enclosed in **Appendix G**. In addition to the display panels, a video supplied by the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation, "A Sacred Trust: Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation", was played and the report, "Final Report: Mississauga of the New Credit First Nation's Traditional Territory (January 15, 1999, Praxix Research Associates)," was also made available.

MTO is committed to engaging First Nations communities throughout the GTA West Study and will continue discussions with First Nations in a manner appropriate to them.