

Meeting Minutes

Project Name:	GTA West Transportation Corridor Planning and Environmental Assessment Study, Stage 2	Meeting:	Community Advisory Group Meeting #2
Assignment No.	2013-E-008	Date:	May 7, 2015
		Time:	6:30 pm – 9:00 pm
Location:	Element Vaughan Southwest, Oak Room		
Independent Facilitator:	Glenn Pothier	GLPi	
Project Team Attendees:	Natalie Rouskov	MTO	
	Chris Barber	MTO	
	Sarah Merriam	MTO	
	Neil Ahmed	MMM	
	Sandy Nairn	MMM	
	Jim Dowell	MMM	
	Brenda Jamieson	AECOM	
	Tim Sorochinsky	AECOM	
	Patrick Puccini	AECOM	
	Britta Patkowski	AECOM	
	Melissa Raffoul	AECOM	
CAG Members:	Removed in accordance with the <i>Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act</i>		
Legend:	Q: Question		
	R: Response		
	C: Comment		

1. Opening Remarks and Introductions

G. Pothier, the Independent Facilitator, called the meeting to order, welcomed and thanked all participants for attending, introduced the project team, and encouraged the stakeholders to take the opportunity to participate fully in the meeting. G. Pothier highlighted four objectives of the meeting:

- Affirm the role of the CAG and its relationship to the project;
- Provide an overview of the study and work completed since Public Information Centre #1;
- Review and discuss the evaluation methodology for the short list of route alternatives, and obtain input on the importance of each of the evaluation factors; and
- Review the key issues and trade-offs the project team has identified in the west, central and east sections of the GTA West study area, and obtain input on the key issues and trade-offs.

Each attendee was provided with the meeting materials, including:

- The introductory presentation - study overview, and update on project activities since Public Information Centre (PIC) #1;
- Session 1 presentation - the evaluation methodology for the short list of route alternatives;
- Session 2 presentation - key issues and trade-offs the project team has identified in the west, central and east sections of the GTA West study area; and
- Summary of Evaluation Factors and Criteria for Alternative Methods (Draft May 2015).

2. Review of Purpose, Roles and Responsibilities of the CAG

G. Pothier highlighted the guiding principles the CAG:

- The CAG is not a decision making body, but will provide advice to the project team;
- All CAG members are expected to contribute constructively regardless of level of support for the proposed new GTA West transportation corridor;
- Membership in the CAG is fluid. Some people may leave as their interest in the project is diminished, and new people may join. However, members are encouraged to stay involved for the duration of the study;
- The project team attends meetings to listen, consider member ideas, observe and inform members, and clarify issues;
- The CAG has been formed to help the project team address challenges and realize opportunities; act as a conduit between constituents with whom members may have relationships and the project team; and facilitate a high quality outcome; and
- In the interest of transparency and openness, general members of the public are permitted to attend CAG meetings as observers.

G. Pothier presented the expectations for CAG members and guidelines for the meeting. Highlights included:

- Respect the confidentiality of material that is presented, since it is in progress and subject to change prior to public release;
- Sending substitutes is acceptable, although the substitute is expected to be familiar with the project and issues;
- There is no designated spokesperson for the CAG;
- Come to meetings prepared to discuss the issues constructively;
- Declare any conflicts of interest for the subject being discussed; and
- Names of attendees will be made public to facilitate openness and transparency.

3. Study Overview and Update on Project Activities Since Public Information Centre (PIC) #1

N. Ahmed provided an overview of the recommendations from Stage 1 of the GTA West Study along with the focus of Stage 2, the elements of the new transportation corridor, the study process, a summary of the feedback received from PIC #1 and how the project team incorporated feedback into the study. N. Ahmed also presented the refined short list of route alternatives and potential interchange locations, the refined focused analysis area, an overview of the spring/summer 2015 field investigation program and the consultation program, and next steps in the study. G. Pothier invited questions and general comments from the CAG before moving forward with the agenda.

C: Economic studies should be conducted to identify impacts on businesses.

Q: Are studies being done to identify impacts to heritage buildings and sites?

R: Yes, we have archaeological and built heritage staff on the project team and they are gathering information related to built heritage and cultural heritage landscapes, and will contribute to the evaluation of alternatives.

4. Approach for Evaluating the Short List of Route Alternatives

P. Puccini provided an overview of the purpose and structure of an evaluation and the two methodologies being used by the project team to evaluate the short list of route alternatives. The two methods include the reasoned argument method as the primary method, and the arithmetic method as the secondary tool to test the results of the reasoned argument method. P. Puccini also provided an overview of the evaluation factors being used, and how the project team will use the results of the two evaluation methodologies to select a preferred alternative for the GTA West transportation corridor. P. Puccini asked the CAG if the presentation of the evaluation methodologies was understandable and whether it would be appropriate for the Community Workshops in June 2015. P. Puccini also inquired what evaluation factors were important to the CAG and why.

Q: When do you assign impact? Today or 50 years from now?

R: We look at impacts based on what is here today, but we also consider approved development and land use changes. Land use impacts assess existing land use and approved planned future land use.

Q: How does the GTA West Study relate to the coordinated review of plans like the Growth Plan and the Greenbelt Plan?

R: The coordinated review of plans like the Growth Plan and the Greenbelt Plan are currently under public review. The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing is on the GTA West contact list and we are liaising with them. This study is working within the existing policy framework, and if that changes, we will adapt to it so that we align with the new policies. The Greenbelt Guideline developed during Stage 1 of the study is a guiding document taking us in to Stage 2 of the study.

Q: What level of importance are you assigning to creeks and tributaries?

R: The project team hasn't determined their weighting scheme yet. We are in the process of getting input from stakeholders. As mentioned, we will be running evaluation scenarios based on the weightings provided by different stakeholder groups (e.g. CAG, GTAG, etc.).

Q: What happens if you end up with a northern route preferred in one section and a southern route in the adjacent section?

R: This may happen and we will go through an exercise to make connections between those preferred segments. There may also be a situation in which one segment is preferred but both adjacent sections don't connect to it, and another segment may have to be chosen for that middle section.

C: In your presentation, labelling the hypothetical routes as A and B is confusing as people may think you are referring to real route alternatives. Suggest using Route X and Route Y.

Q: If you just add up weighting you may not get the best overall solution. The project team needs to provide the right rationale so that people understand how the solution was reached.

- R: The reasoned argument method allows the project team to build in rationale for why we are subjectively giving more weight to one factor. Ultimately we use both the reasoned argument method and the arithmetic method to make sure that we are considering all perspectives.
- Q: How do you define agriculture / specialty crop?
- R: Specialty crop is defined by municipal land use. We will provide a definition for specialty crop with the minutes of the meeting.
- Post meeting note: the term specialty crop is defined in the Provincial Policy Statement (2014) as “areas designated using guidelines developed by the Province, as amended from time to time. In these areas, specialty crops are predominantly grown such as tender fruits (peaches, cherries, plums), grapes, other fruit crops, vegetable crops, greenhouse crops, and crops from agriculturally developed organic soil, usually resulting from: a) soils that have suitability to produce specialty crops, or lands that are subject to special climatic conditions, or a combination of both; b) farmers skilled in the production of specialty crops; and c) a long-term investment of capital in areas such as crops, drainage, infrastructure and related facilities and services to produce, store, or process specialty crops”.*
- Q: When you design bridges over watercourses, how do you evaluate where the best crossing is?
- R: We look at all aspects when designing bridges. For example, longer bridges may have less impact on the valley, may be more costly, and have different aesthetic impacts than shorter bridges. We also look at adjacent land use impacts. We look at each crossing alternative in terms of impacts to the natural, land use/socio-economic, cultural, and transportation environments.
- Q: How is capital cost incorporated?
- R: The project team includes capital cost under the transportation category.
- Q: Some route alternatives double back on themselves. How do you weight those additional impacts (e.g. extra mileage, air quality impacts, etc.)?
- R: We look at out-of-way travel and delay under the transportation category. We look at how the route will operate and the efficiency of moving people and goods.
- Q: Are you going to evaluate the design of the highway (e.g. whether the transitway will be on one side of the highway or in the median) or are we locked in?
- R: The transitway is going to be on one side of the highway or the other. It is a dedicated roadway that needs access to transit stations. The location of the transitway within the corridor will be determined during preliminary design, with stakeholder input.
- C: Agriculture is an important evaluation factor.
- C: Concerned that the project team does not know which agricultural properties are linked or owned by the same owner.
- C: Weightings should change depending on whether you are evaluating a rural or urban area.
- C: There should be different weightings for different timeframes. Current land use should be evaluated using a different weighting than future land use.

5. Specific Issues and Trade-Offs in the Study Area

T. Soroichinsky, B. Jamieson and J. Dowell reviewed the key issues and trade-offs in the west, central and east sections of the study area respectively. The three design leads sought input from the CAG on the key issues and trade-offs identified and any additional ones that the project team should emphasize in the evaluation of the short listed alternatives.

West Section (Highway 401/407 ETR Interchange to Mississauga Road)

- Q: Is the project team consulting with municipalities about emergency service access?
- R: Yes, we are consulting with them about existing and future land use and emergency service access.
- C: Prefer the south crossing of the Credit River as it is closer to the TransCanada Pipeline crossing.
- C: Prefer the north crossing of the Credit River.
- C: The Norval by-pass should not be tied to this transportation corridor since the Town of Halton Hills and Halton Region will be going forward with it anyway.
- C: There should be an interchange at Mississauga Road north of Mayfield Road. There is already too much traffic on Mayfield Road.
- C: The interchange should be on Mayfield Road because the traffic is already there and growth is coming to the area. The land in this area is also flatter so it would be less costly to build at Mayfield Road.
- C: Pick either Mayfield Road or Mississauga Road as an interchange location but do not preclude the other as a future opportunity.
- C: Concern about impacts to the school being built in the area of the Mississauga Road interchange.
- Q: What is the footprint of a typical arterial road interchange?
- R: A typical arterial road interchange could fit within a circle with a 500-600m diameter.
- C: There should be an interchange at Winston Churchill Boulevard due to the volume of use. It would also accommodate north-south traffic flow.

Central Section (Mississauga Road to Highway 50)

- Q: Will you need land beyond the 170m right-of-way to accommodate interchanges?
- R: Yes. The footprint required for each interchange will vary but it will generally go beyond the 170m. We will assess impacts in each quadrant of an interchange.
- Q: Do the potential impacts to the Brampton – Caledon Airport trigger a federal environmental assessment?
- R: No, we are not directly impacting the airport. We are however doing a federal environmental assessment for this study because the transportation corridor is longer than 50km.

- Q: If there is a new direct connection of Highway 410, what happens to the interchange at Dixie Road?
- R: There would be a freeway-to-freeway interchange at the Highway 410 extension with the GTA West transportation corridor and there would also be an arterial road interchange at Hurontario Street. An interchange could not be provided at Dixie Road in this case.
- Q: What is happening in the Coleraine Drive area?
- R: Coleraine Drive is too close to the Highway 427 alternatives to provide a standard full move interchange. We are in discussion with municipalities to identify opportunities for an interchange generally in this area (some options being considered include a realignment of Coleraine Drive). We could also consider a new north-south connection just west of Coleraine Drive and then integrate that with the Highway 427 extension.
- C: It makes a difference who owns the land – farmers or developers. You need to understand ownership in order to properly evaluate the route alternatives.
- Q: Is the transitway component going to be included in the Highway 410 extension if you use existing Highway 10/410?
- R: It is challenging with using existing Highway 10/410, so we will look at options including having the transitway the entire length or just only after the built-up area ends.

East Section (Highway 50 to Highway 400)

- C: A Highway 50 connection to Highway 427 could be located south of the freeway-to-freeway interchange.
- C: There is no infrastructure on Pine Valley Drive and it starts and stops again. It makes no sense to have an interchange at Pine Valley Drive. Weston Road is a better opportunity.
- C: Bolton needs quick access to and from the GTA West transportation corridor.
- Q: Is the transportation corridor going to be tolled?
- R: No decisions regarding tolling have been made and they will not be made by the project team.
- C: A north crossing of the Humber River is preferred. We understand that TRCA prefers this crossing as well.
- C: The Tim Hortons in the Highway 50 area is the busiest in the chain. This tells you how busy this area is and that this area needs good access to and from the GTA West transportation corridor.
- Q: What is the timing for construction? Are you going to start at the east or west end?
- R: There is no set time for construction as there is no approval yet and no funding yet. We have not determined construction phasing yet.
- C: Request for larger scale mapping of the revised short list of route alternatives and potential interchange locations.

6. Next Steps and 7. Open Forum

G. Pothier provided an overview of next steps in the study and N. Rouskov mentioned the upcoming Community Workshops in June 2015.

8. Closing Remarks

G. Pothier and N. Rouskov provided closing remarks, and thanked all participants for taking the time to provide their input.

Submitted by: B. Patkowski, AECOM

Distribution: Attendees, Regrets

Attachments: Larger scale mapping of the revised short list of route alternatives and potential interchange locations.

Meeting Minutes

Project Name:	GTA West Transportation Corridor Planning and Environmental Assessment Study, Stage 2	Meeting:	Greenbelt Transportation Advisory Group Meeting #2
Project No.	2013-E-0008	Date:	May 7, 2015
Location:	Element Vaughan Southwest, Oak Room	Time:	1:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.
Independent Facilitator:	Glenn Pothier	GLPi	
Project Team Attendees:	Natalie Rouskov	MTO	
	Chris Barber	MTO	
	Sarah Merriam	MTO	
	Neil Ahmed	MMM	
	Sandy Nairn	MMM	
	Jim Dowell	MMM	
	Brenda Jamieson	AECOM	
	Tim Sorochinsky	AECOM	
	Patrick Puccini	AECOM	
	Britta Patkowski	AECOM	
	Melissa Raffoul	AECOM	
GTAG Attendees:	Removed in accordance with the <i>Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act</i>		
Legend:	Q: Question		
	R: Response		
	C: Comment		

1. Opening Remarks and Introductions

G. Pothier, the Independent Facilitator, called the meeting to order, welcomed and thanked all participants for attending, introduced the project team, and encouraged the stakeholders to take the opportunity to participate fully in the meeting. G. Pothier highlighted four objectives of the meeting:

- Affirm the role of the GTAG and its relationship to the project;
- Provide an overview of the study and work completed since Public Information Centre #1;
- Review and discuss the evaluation methodology for the short list of route alternatives, and obtain input on the importance of each of the evaluation factors; and

- Review the key issues and trade-offs the project team has identified in the west, central and east sections of the GTA West study area, and obtain input on the key issues and trade-offs.

Each attendee was provided with the meeting materials, including:

- The introductory presentation - study overview, and update on project activities since Public Information Centre (PIC) #1;
- Session 1 presentation - the evaluation methodology for the short list of route alternatives;
- Session 2 presentation - key issues and trade-offs the project team has identified in the west, central and east sections of the GTA West study area; and
- Summary of Evaluation Factors and Criteria for Alternative Methods (Draft May 2015).

2. Review of Purpose, Roles and Responsibilities of the GTAG

G. Pothier provided an overview of the purpose of the GTAG, and the roles and responsibilities of the members. He emphasized that the GTAG will play an advisory role. G. Pothier noted that, as a general membership rule, members are to keep information confidential when requested, as some project information is previewed at the GTAG and will not be publically released until a later date. However, in the interest of transparency and openness, members of the general public are permitted to attend GTAG meetings as observers and abide by the same confidentiality guidelines as members. There is no spokesperson for the GTAG.

G. Pothier noted that the purpose of the GTAG is not to discuss whether a transportation corridor should be built, as this decision was made during Stage 1 of the study. The GTAG is a forum for discussing how a transportation corridor can be built in the Greenbelt area that respects Greenbelt sensitivities and policies. It was noted that outside of the GTAG meetings, members can express opinions as they please; however, in order to have constructive meetings, members should respect the intent of the GTAG – to share ideas that will assist with wise and informed decision-making.

3. Study Overview and Update on Project Activities Since Public Information Centre (PIC) #1

N. Ahmed provided an overview of the recommendations from Stage 1 of the GTA West Study along with the focus of Stage 2, the elements of the new transportation corridor, the study process, a summary of the feedback received from PIC #1 and how the project team incorporated feedback into the study. N. Ahmed also presented the refined short list of route alternatives and potential interchange locations, the refined focused analysis area, an overview of the spring/summer 2015 field investigation program and the consultation program, and next steps in the study. G. Pothier invited questions and general comments from the GTAG before moving forward with the agenda.

C: People want cycling opportunities and corridors within the GTA West right-of-way.

R: Active transportation will be considered during the preliminary design stage once we know where the bridge crossings will be and what they will look like. MTO has a plan for cycling but 400-series highways do not allow for cycling corridors within the right-of-way due to safety issues. We are however considering localized active transportation opportunities which coordinate with municipal plans.

Q: There is a focus on goods movement. Will this transportation corridor be tolled? The answer is key for goods movement and will impact whether trucks will use the facility or not. Currently trucks pile on to Highway 401 and Highway 400. Highway 407 could be an alternative but trucks

- do not use it because of the cost. You need to make sure that the transportation corridor solves the transportation needs.
- R: The decision about tolling has not been made and this decision will not be made by the project team. Goods movement priority features will be included in the design of the transportation corridor.
- C: Concern that the project team said that the green areas on the Focused Analysis map are being opened up for development. Some of those green areas are in the Greenbelt.
- R: MTO has a reduced interest in properties located in the green areas and is noting that applications can proceed through established municipal development processes in those areas. MTO will continue to review all development applications in the study area, but it is anticipated that applications in the green areas will not be impacted by the GTA West transportation corridor. MTO does not make decisions about land use outside of the right-of-way. The project team will review the wording regarding the purpose of the green areas on the Focused Analysis Area map.
- Q: How does the GTA West Study relate to the review of plans like the Growth Plan and the Greenbelt Plan? It seems like the coordinated review process isn't taking into consideration the GTA West Study.
- R: The coordinated review of plans like the Growth Plan and the Greenbelt Plan are out for public review. We have the Ministry for Municipal Affairs and Housing on the GTA West contact list and we are liaising with them. This study is working within the existing policy framework, and if that changes, we will adapt to it so that we align with the new policies. The Greenbelt Guideline developed during Stage 1 of the study is a guiding document taking us in to Stage 2 of the study.
- Q: Where is the need for the GTA West transportation corridor documented? The project team needs to explain that the Growth Plan is driving this study.
- R: The Transportation Development Strategy is available for download on the Archive page of the project website (www.gta-west.com).
- Q: How much opposition was received at PIC #1?
- R: The project team received both opposition and support for the need for the GTA West transportation corridor, and support and opposition for various route alternatives.
- Q: Have studies been conducted to date with respect to existing topography and groundwater conditions? Past developments didn't realize there was a high water table until it was too late, resulting in design changes and a higher cost. These issues need to be explored early on in a study.
- R: We have high level information from our secondary source reviews, which we considered in the screening of the long list of alternatives. Once we are in the preliminary design phase of the project we will look at the localized geology of the preferred plan. The 250m band of the recommended plan gives us room to move the corridor to avoid sensitive areas. We will look at groundwater recharge and discharge areas.
- C: The project team should consult with transit operators to understand what you are integrating with.

- Q: There is an understanding that the Growth Plan was intended for urban areas only, so how does this apply to the GTA West Study?
- R: The Growth Plan allocates growth to 2031 and that is the growth scenario that the project team is using to forecast travel demand and access needs. Some existing rural areas are designated for future urban growth. We are working with the future visions that the municipalities have outlined based on the Growth Plan. The GTA West transportation corridor will go through some areas of the Greenbelt in order to connect urban growth areas.

4. Approach for Evaluating the Short List of Route Alternatives

P. Puccini provided an overview of the purpose and structure of an evaluation and the two methodologies being used by the project team to evaluate the short list of route alternatives. The two methods include the reasoned argument method as the primary method, and the arithmetic method as the secondary tool to test the results of the reasoned argument method. P. Puccini also provided an overview of the evaluation factors being used, and how the project team will use the results of the two evaluation methodologies to select a preferred alternative for the GTA West transportation corridor. P. Puccini inquired if the presentation of the evaluation methodologies was understandable and whether it would be appropriate for the Community Workshops in June 2015. P. Puccini also inquired what evaluation factors were important to the GTAG and why.

- Q: Please confirm that weighting is subjective and that the project team will develop their weighting scheme based on input and information received?
- R: Yes that is correct. We are going to consider all input and revise the trade-offs we have made based on that input. The importance of a factor may also change in different areas of the study area. The benefit of the arithmetic method is that we get to ask you how important different factors are to you and then we can compare those evaluation results against what the project team and other stakeholders developed.
- Q: Still confused about the need for this study. Is a new highway needed to take traffic off of existing highways or is a new highway needed to support future growth?
- R: The project team conducted a needs assessment study within the current policy framework like the Growth Plan and the Greenbelt Plan, and the traffic modelling suggested that based on the input from municipalities, and population and employment growth forecasts, that there is need for additional transportation capacity beyond what is already planned.
- C: Some concern was expressed about the ability of members of the public to digest all of the information that will come out of the evaluation of the short listed alternatives. Comments were also made that the project team should provide a high level overview of the results of the evaluation and what the recommended plan is, and interested people can delve into the details of the evaluation if they are interested.
- C: Agricultural lands and operations/businesses are a sub category under land use. This factor disappears under land use and should be given more importance in the evaluation.

- C: Members of the public need to hear that the project team is not being unduly influenced by one stakeholder group or type of land use (e.g. development, agriculture, Greenbelt). The perception must be that you are not caving into the desires of one group or land use type. People may not agree with the answer, but they should be happy with the process used to get the answer.
- C: More importance needs to be given to agriculture.
- Q: How does cost get factored into the evaluation?
R: Capital cost is considered under the transportation category.
- C: The transportation corridor will be a major intrusion on peoples' lives so you need to make sure there are no unintended consequences. You also do not want to disconnect the urban area from the rural area. It seems that Brampton will be split from Caledon.
- C: Population allocations have been made to 2031 but the general public does not understand what this means and how dense some areas will actually become. There will be very little green space in some areas, and there will be impacts to air quality and water. Therefore, the natural environment needs to be given a high priority in the evaluation.
- Q: Is the project team taking into consideration ecological goods and services?
R: Yes, we are considering ecological goods and services. We have looked at how this criteria has been applied in other jurisdictions and we are integrating those as a comparison between different land use types. We have evaluation criteria for ecological goods and services.
- C: It is offensive to see pictures in your presentation of natural areas and agricultural lands when these lands will be covered up by the transportation corridor. I would rather see what the future roadway will look like.
R: Not all natural or agricultural areas will be impacted by the transportation corridor and we have not yet determined the location of the corridor. We will take your comment into consideration.

5. Specific Issues and Trade-Offs in the Study Area

T. Sorochinsky, B. Jamieson and J. Dowell reviewed the key issues and trade-offs in the west, central and east sections of the study area respectively. The three design leads sought input from the GTAG on the key issues and trade-offs identified and any additional ones that the project team should emphasize in the evaluation of the short listed alternatives.

West Section (Highway 401/407 ETR Interchange to Mississauga Road)

- C: The TransCanada pipeline already crosses on the south side of the Credit River. Do not introduce a new crossing, so the south crossing is preferred.
- C: Place the Credit River crossing where it is the cheapest to build the bridge and where less wooded area would be impacted.
- C: The south crossing of the Credit River is preferred because it is farther from Belfountain.

- C: The Sant Nirankari Mission and the Jehovah Witness temple are impacted by Alternative 2A1. These should be avoided. St. Elias Church burnt down and the community is going through the expense and effort of rebuilding the church. They should not be impacted again.
- C: The project team needs to consider the proximity to residential areas. Downwind areas will experience more noise and air pollution. Keep these sensitive land uses upwind.
- C: North-south transportation flow needs to be considered. Ensure all arterial roads have at least underpasses or overpasses, if not interchanges.
- C: Mayfield Road is a better interchange location than Mississauga Road as there will be future growth along Mayfield Road.

Central Section (Mississauga Road to Highway 50)

- C: Commuter traffic goes north-south through Caledon so all regional roads should have access to the GTA West transportation corridor. Key farm businesses in Caledon also seem to be directly impacted by some of the freeway-to-freeway interchanges. These farm businesses are home bases for the extended farming operation. Alternative 5D appears to impact at least 2 of these key farm operations.
- C: When the transportation corridor is built, development will spread northerly to it. You should follow the southern routes. Keeping the transportation corridor as far south as possible preserves farmland.
- C: The Peel Plain is the third most fertile land in Canada. The transportation corridor needs to avoid these lands. Cater to farmers. We need to eat.
- C: Highway 50 is a highway with a lot of truck traffic on it and yet there is not a full interchange identified at that location. The project team needs to service that need.
- R: The challenge with putting in an interchange at Highway 50 is its close proximity to the Highway 427 extension alternatives. We are investigating if we can provide some ramps to Highway 50 but it may not be a full interchange.
- C: We appreciate that you cannot put a full interchange everywhere, but you need to connect all of the major roads and consider non-typical interchange configurations.

East Section (Highway 50 to Highway 400)

- C: The issue with an interchange at Pine Valley Drive is that it takes you right into the Greenbelt. We do not want development opened up in those areas. Preference is for Weston Road as a full interchange even if it's close to Highway 400. Partial interchanges create more traffic on other roads.
- C: If an interchange is built at Pine Valley Drive, then a link has to be opened up to the 407 ETR to the south, and a link to the north has to be opened up.

- C: Request for larger scale mapping of the short listed route alternatives.
R: Larger scale mapping will be provided with the minutes of the GTAG meeting.
- C: In the United States, there are parkways with landscaped areas and lots of trees. It creates a very relaxing drive. The 407 ETR is not a relaxing drive and this mistake should not be repeated on the GTA West transportation corridor.
- C: You should use a different weighting scheme for rural and urban areas.
R: Yes, we will be doing that and are in fact asking for your weighting on both a rural and an urban scenario.
- C: Do not create dead end roads at the transportation corridor. You need north-south connectivity.
- C: Consider environmentally friendly ways of constructing bridges over valleys – to reduce the impacts underneath.
- C: When you are located close to a highway, everything becomes a backdrop to the noise. Consider noise mitigation measures in natural areas so that the noise does not overwhelm the area (berms, see-through noise walls, etc.).
- C: Consider dark sky lighting in natural and residential areas.
- C: Consider the proximity to residential areas in terms of noise impacts.
- Q: Has any thought been given to heavy rail?
R: Heavy rail cannot be accommodated and wouldn't address the transportation needs identified in Stage 1. Furthermore, heavy rail is best-suited for long-haul trips.

6. Next Steps and 7. Open Forum

G. Pothier provided an overview of next steps in the study and N. Rouskov mentioned the upcoming Community Workshops in June 2015.

8. Closing Remarks

G. Pothier and N. Rouskov provided closing remarks, and thanked all participants for taking the time to provide their input.

Submitted by: B. Patkowski, AECOM

Distribution: Attendees, Regrets

Attachments: Larger scale mapping of the revised short listed route alternatives and potential interchange locations.

Meeting Minutes

Project Name:	GTA West Transportation Corridor Planning and Environmental Assessment Study, Stage 2	Meeting:	Municipal Advisory Group / Regulatory Agency Advisory Group Meeting #3
Project No.	2013-E-0008	Date:	May 11, 2015
Location:	Courtyard by Marriott Brampton	Time:	2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Independent Facilitator:	Glenn Pothier		GLPi
Project Team Attendees:	Natalie Rouskov		MTO
	Chris Barber		MTO
	Sarah Merriam		MTO
	Adrian Firmani		MTO
	Neil Ahmed		MMM
	Sandy Nairn		MMM
	Jim Dowell		MMM
	Brenda Jamieson		AECOM
	Tim Soroichinsky		AECOM
	Patrick Puccini		AECOM
	Benjamin Loucks		AECOM
	Britta Patkowski		AECOM
	Melissa Raffoul		AECOM
	Jim Dymont		MHBC
MAG/RAAG Attendees:	Steve Mota		Region of York
	Dave Mitchell		York Regional Police
	Damian Albanese		Region of Peel
	Tom Slomke		Region of Peel
	Sabbir Saiyed		Region of Peel
	Gary Kocialek		Region of Peel
	Alejandro Cifuentes		Region of Peel
	Norman Baxter		Peel Fibre
	James Adams		Peel Regional Police
	Ron Glenn		Halton Region
	Karyn Poad		Halton Region
	Jeffrey Reid		Halton Region
	Dan Tovey		Halton Region

Alicia Jakaitis	Halton Region
Clement Chong	City of Vaughan
Selma Hubjer	City of Vaughan
Paul Jankowski	City of Vaughan
Andrew D. Pearce	City of Vaughan
Roy McQuillin	City of Vaughan
David Waters	City of Brampton
Henrik Zbogar	City of Brampton
Allan Sharpe	Brampton Hydro One Networks Inc.
Rob Agostini	Brampton Hydro Networks Inc.
Kara Ferreira	Brampton Fire and Emergency Services
Kant Chawla	Town of Caledon
Kathie Kurtz	Town of Caledon
David Loveridge	Town of Caledon
Dean McMillan	Town of Caledon
Haiqing Xu	Town of Caledon
Maureen Van Ravens	Town of Halton Hills
Doug Penrice	Town of Halton Hills
Daniel Ridgway	Town of Halton Hills
Joe Perrotta	City of Mississauga
Stephen Kitchen	Township of King
Ray Bacquie	407 ETR
Dan Beare	Metrolinx / GO Transit
Anthony Caruso	Metrolinx
Nelson Jalotjot	TransCanda Pipelines
Sam Karian	TransCanada Pipelines
Yus San Ong	Hydro One
Dhvani Shah	Hydro One
Jennifer Stewart	Hydro One
Bing Young	Hydro One
Adam Sheldon	TransCanada Pipelines
Jacques Otis	TransCanada Energy
Richard Wang	Powerstream Inc.
Kim Barrett	Conservation Halton
Amy Mayes	Conservation Halton
Sharon Lingertat	Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
Liam Marray	Credit Valley Conservation Authority
Caroline Polgrabia	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport
Rosi Zirger	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport
Nisha Shirali	Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change
Jackie Van de Valk	Ministry of Agriculture, Food & Rural Affairs

Legend: Q: Question
R: Response
C: Comment

1. Opening Remarks and Introductions

G. Pothier, the Independent Facilitator, called the meeting to order, welcomed and thanked all participants for attending, and encouraged the stakeholders to take the opportunity to participate fully in the meeting. G. Pothier highlighted the objectives of the meeting:

- Provide an overview of the study and work completed since Public Information Centre #1;
- Review and discuss the evaluation methodology for the short list of route alternatives, and obtain input on the importance of each of the evaluation factors; and
- Seek input on the key issues and trade-offs the project team has identified in the west, central and east sections of the GTA West study area.

2. Study Overview and Update on Project Activities Since Public Information Centre (PIC) #1

N. Ahmed provided an overview of the recommendations from Stage 1 of the GTA West Study along with the focus of Stage 2, the elements of the new transportation corridor, the study process, a summary of the feedback received from PIC #1 and how the project team incorporated feedback into the study. N. Ahmed also presented the refined short list of route alternatives and potential interchange locations, the refined focused analysis area, an overview of the spring/summer 2015 field investigation program and the consultation program, and next steps in the study. G. Pothier invited questions and general comments from the MAG/RAAG before moving forward with the agenda.

C: We would appreciate being e-mailed the presentations from today's meeting, the comment sheet, and evaluation factors.

Q: When does the preliminary preferred plan become the official preferred plan? Will the project team refine the route planning study area once the preferred plan has been confirmed? Suggest an interim communication to let stakeholders know when the preferred plan has been confirmed post PIC #2.

R: There is no specific milestone for confirming the preferred plan post PIC #2. We will not be refining the limits of the route planning study area, but we will refine the Focused Analysis Area based on the preliminary preferred plan. We will consider the need for an interim communication.

3. Approach for Evaluating the Short List of Route Alternatives

P. Puccini provided an overview of the purpose and structure of an evaluation and the two methodologies being used by the project team to evaluate the short list of route alternatives. The two methods include the reasoned argument method as the primary method, and the arithmetic method as the secondary tool to test the results of the reasoned argument method. P. Puccini also provided an overview of the evaluation factors being used, and how the project team will use the results of the two evaluation methodologies to select a preferred alternative for the GTA West transportation corridor. P. Puccini inquired if the presentation of the evaluation methodologies was understandable and whether it would be appropriate for the Community Workshops in June 2015. P. Puccini also inquired what evaluation factors were important to the MAG/RAAG and why.

C: The freeway-to-freeway interchanges should be evaluated independently of adjacent route sections. It may also be appropriate to have different weighting scenarios for the interchanges than the routes.

- Q: Is the project team going to give more emphasis to some stakeholder group input than others? Municipal Council input should be given more weight than other stakeholder groups.
- R: For the reasoned argument method, the project team will consider and identify key sources of input as appropriate. For the arithmetic method, input from each stakeholder group will be considered equally, but each evaluation weighting scenario is a sensitivity test on its own that can be compared to the results of the reasoned argument method. The reasoned argument method is the primary tool for selecting the preferred route.
- Q: Where is cost considered?
- R: Capital cost is considered under the transportation factor.
- C: Different weightings should be used in different areas. The natural environment is more important in some areas.
- C: Some existing rural areas will be urban in the future. If you are only looking at existing land use then you may not capture the future condition.
- R: Land use impacts consider existing land use and approved planned future land use.
- C: The natural environment should be protected first and foremost.
- Q: Is the project team going to be dividing the factor weightings to allot a percentage to each sub-factor?
- R: Yes. We will do this based on stakeholder input, secondary source information, results from field investigations, and professional expertise.
- C: Transportation should be given priority followed by land use, and then the natural environment and community fabric.

4. Specific Issues and Trade-Offs in the Study Area

T. Soroichinsky, B. Jamieson and J. Dowell reviewed the key issues and trade-offs in the west, central and east sections of the study area respectively. The three design leads sought input from the MAG/RAAG on the key issues and trade-offs identified and any additional ones that the project team should emphasize in the evaluation of the short listed alternatives.

West Section (Highway 401/407 ETR Interchange to Mississauga Road)

- C: The City of Brampton prefers the southerly crossing of the Credit River based on previous information from the Transportation Master Plan. Brampton is trying to accommodate east-west movement.
- C: More information should be provided regarding the level of analysis that went into dismissing the proposed hybrid alternative that connects between Alternatives 1C and 1E south of the Credit River.
- C: The Town of Halton Hills prefers the northerly crossing of the Credit River, as the transportation issues in and around Norval need to be addressed.

- C: It is difficult to say a preference for the crossing location of the Credit River until the project team comments on the design of the different crossings.
- C: Peel Region prefers an interchange at Mayfield road as it will serve the Heritage Heights community better and provide better east-west connectivity.
- C: Town of Halton Hills noted agreement with an interchange at Mayfield Road as it will benefit the Town of Halton Hills in the long run.
- Q: The Town of Halton Hills asked if the proposed interchange with realigned Winston Churchill Boulevard on Alternative 1A (discussed at the municipal interchange meeting) is no longer being considered.
- R: That option is not off the table, but the maps have not been updated to incorporate all the feedback received from recent meetings.

Central Section (Mississauga Road to Highway 50)

- Q: Why did the project team not carry forward an interchange at Bramalea Road as was shown at PIC #1?
- R: The location is too close to Highway 410 and Dixie Road. We can further investigate the feasibility of an interchange at Bramalea Road if you are interested.
- C: Interchange locations will directly impact future development in the Town of Caledon. We understand that your traffic modelling is going to be done to 2031 but you need to consider the life of the transportation corridor beyond that timeframe to ensure that there is enough capacity for the future.
- R: We are looking to provide good levels of service beyond 2031. We are not going to build interchanges that will be at capacity in 2031. For example, the Parclo A4 design provides the greatest capacity so those configurations are preferred barring other constraints but other configurations may be considered as needed.
- C: Stakeholders need to be provided with the rationale on why some interchanges are carried forward and others are not.
- R: The screening from the long list to the short list is already available. We are currently going through an iterative process with municipalities regarding interchange locations and more information will be provided as we proceed. Documentation of the screening process for interchange locations will be presented at PIC #2.
- C: Prefer the direct Highway 410 connection because it results in less out-of-way travel, emissions, etc. compared to using the existing 410/upgrading Hurontario Street.
- C: The direct Highway 410 connection would result in greater impacts to the Heart Lake Wetland Complex and other ecological functions. These impacts would be compounded on the impacts from the earlier decision to shift Highway 410 west to Hurontario Street.

East Section (Highway 50 to Highway 400)

C: Protect for both a Weston Road and Pine Valley Drive interchange.

R: We are aiming not to preclude one or the other.

Q: Will the project team develop functional designs for route alternatives so municipalities can provide informed input to the project team?

R: The project team is doing enough design to get us through the evaluation process. For example, we are developing freeway-to-freeway configurations but will not be developing configurations for arterial interchanges with the associated road realignments.

C: Request the shape files of short listed route alternatives.

Post Meeting Note: Now that the revised short listed route alternatives have been reviewed and confirmed, the GTA West Project Team will release the GIS shape files of the short listed route alternatives to municipal and agency partners upon request to the project team. A License to Use Agreement will be required from any government agency or utility company to ensure files are used for intended purposes only.

Q: Will another MAG/RAAG meeting be held before PIC#2?

R: We will hold a MAG/RAAG meeting around PIC #2.

Q: Has anyone complained about the quality of the mapping on the website?

R: If anyone has any issues regarding mapping or wants additional mapping, we are working with them on a case-by-case basis.

Q: Will preferred interchange configurations be presented at PIC #2?

R: We will be showing footprints for interchanges but we will not be showing configurations. Stakeholders can comment on configurations post PIC #2.

5. Next Steps and 6. Open Forum

G. Pothier provided an overview of next steps in the study and N. Rouskov mentioned the upcoming Community Workshops in June 2015.

7. Closing Remarks

G. Pothier and N. Rouskov provided closing remarks, and thanked all participants for taking the time to provide their input.

Submitted by: B. Patkowski, AECOM

Distribution: Attendees, Regrets
