

# 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.