

Meeting Minutes

Project Name: GTA West Transportation Corridor Planning and Environmental Assessment Study, Stage 2 Meeting: MAG Meeting #2

Assignment No. 2013-E-008 Date: November 7, 2014
Time: 10:00 pm – 12:00 pm

Location: Courtyard by Marriott Brampton (90 Biscayne Crescent, Brampton), Windsor Room B

Independent Facilitator: Glenn Pothier GLPi

Project Team Attendees:

Natalie Rouskov	MTO
Chris Barber	MTO
Neil Ahmed	MMM
Sandy Nairn	MMM
Karin Wall	Aecom
Jim Dymont	MHBC
Patrick Puccini	URS
Britta Patkowski	URS
Benjamin Loucks	URS

MAG Attendees:

Brock Criger	Region of Peel
Damian Albanese	Region of Peel
Gary Kocialek	Region of Peel
Eric Chan	Region of Peel
Lindsay Edwards	Region of Peel
Alejandro Cifuentes	Region of Peel
Eric Flora	Region of Peel
Tina Detaramani	Region of Peel
Lina Ariza	Region of York
Steve Mota	Region of York
Maureen Van Ravens	Region of Halton
Melissa Green-Battistan	Region of Halton
Alicia Jakaitis	Region of Halton
Karyn Poad	Region of Halton
Dan Tovey	Region of Halton
Lisa DeAngelis	Region of Halton
Chris Duyvestyn	City of Brampton
David Waters	City of Brampton
Henrik Zbogor	City of Brampton

Joe Perrotta	City of Mississauga
Roy McQuillin	City of Vaughan
Andrew Pearce	City of Vaughan
Selma Hubjer	City of Vaughan
Stephen Kitchen	Township of King
Ryan Grodecki	Town of Caledon
Kathie Kurtz	Town of Caledon
David Loveridge	Town of Caledon
Kant Chawla	Town of Caledon
Dan Ridgway	Town of Halton Hills
Doug Penrick	Town of Halton Hills
Steve Burke	Town of Halton Hills
John Drummund	Peel Regional Police
Malcolm Mackay	Metrolinx/GO Transit
Dan Beare	Metrolinx/GO Transit
Monisa Nandi	Metrolinx/GO Transit
Paul Kerry	CP Rail
Alexandra Barrett	Ontario Power Authority
Adam Sheldon	TransCanada Pipelines Ltd.
Al Sharpe	Hydro One Brampton
Robert Ferangelista	Hydro One Brampton
Jennifer Stewart	Hydro One
Yu San Ong	Hydro One
Dan Beardsall	Hydro One
Dhvani Shah	Hydro One
George Watt	Hydro One
Meaghan Palynchuk	Bell Canada
Tim Rallis	CanACRE
Dan Babcock	CanACRE

Observers:	Christian Binette	Region of Peel, Co-op Student
	Melanie Zakarian	Region of Peel, Co-op Student

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 two key objectives for the meeting:

- Provide an overview of the study and work completed to date.
- Seek feedback on potential route alternatives and potential interchange locations.

G. Pother noted that the initial MAG meeting was a joint MAG/RAAG meeting, and that the project team is working on the membership for the MAG and RAAG and may consider moving some members (like the utility companies) to the RAAG to balance the membership and align interests.

2. Study Overview and Status Update

P. Puccini provided an overview of the recommendations from Stage 1 of the study and the focus of Stage 2 of the study, what the project team heard at MAG/RAAG Meeting #1, the project schedule, the Stage 2 planning process, and what the new corridor will look like.

3. Overview of the Development and Screening of the Long List of Route Alternatives and Potential Interchange Locations

P. Puccini provided an overview of how potential interchange locations were developed and screened, and what goods movement priority features are being considered. N. Ahmed provided an overview of how route alternatives were developed and screened, described the long list of route alternatives, provided an overview of the key reasons why route alternatives were screened out in the west, central and east sections of the study area, and described the short list of route alternatives.

Q: Are the route alternatives on the map 250m wide?

R: Yes. Although the route alternatives that have been developed are 250 m in width, the actual transportation corridor is generally envisioned to be 170 m wide to accommodate a 110m highway right-of-way and a 60 m transitway. The route alternatives are wider at this stage to allow refinements to be made to the transportation corridor once more details are available with respect to environmental, cultural and community features that may be affected.

Q: Is the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) aware of the process for narrowing the Route Planning Study Area?

R: The project team has met with MOECC and will be meeting with them again shortly to discuss the proposed Focused Analysis Area (FAA) approach. Earlier this year, MOECC provided support for the concept of allowing development to proceed in certain areas, and we will continue to meet with them to discuss the approach for implementation.

Q: What is happening east of Highway 400 and also south of the Highway 401/407 ETR interchanges? Will the project team require lands outside the Route Planning Study Area in these areas? Have interchange concepts been developed yet?

R: The project focus right now is narrowing down the route alternatives and selecting the preferred interchange locations. Interchange development has started but it is in its earliest stages. The conceptual footprints required for these freeway-to-freeway interchanges are shown on the short list of route alternatives map. Further work will occur after Public Information Centre (PIC) #1.

Q: When can the MAG get a copy of the route alternatives? There is not enough time to provide full comments today.

R: Route alternatives will be provided at PIC #1 and will be made available on the project website after PIC #1, and you will have time after PIC #1 to provide full comments. We are seeking preliminary observations today.

Q: Does the 250m corridor width include provision for a hydro corridor? Municipalities must protect for hydro lands as well, and need to know whether the GTA West Study will be protecting for these lands. We understand the hydro corridor requires 40m.

R: No. The 250m is for the GTA West transportation corridor only (including the transitway). At PIC #2, the GTA West Project Team will still be protecting for the 250m for a preferred route. At PIC #3, we will present the preliminary design of the preferred route. If by that time Hydro One has more details about their study and what their property needs are, municipalities can use that information in combination with findings from the GTA West Transportation Corridor Planning and EA Study to understand what the impacts to their municipalities are.

Note: the Ministry of Transportation and Hydro One are each pursuing separate but coordinated Environmental Assessment studies. The GTA West Study is at a later stage of the process, having already developed an EA Terms of Reference which was approved in 2008, and having completed the need and justification phase of the EA (Stage 1) in 2012. In contrast, Hydro One will be starting their EA process with the preparation of a Terms of Reference. The GTA West Study and the Hydro One Study are separate because each has specific needs, issues, processes, consultation requirements and schedules. We will continue to seek opportunities to coordinate with Hydro One throughout this study, but ultimately it is envisioned that the GTA West study will only seek to protect property required for the construction of the transportation corridor, including the proposed transitway.

4. Feedback on the Preliminary Short List of Route Alternatives Within the Greenbelt

G. Pothier led a P.O.W.E.R. exercise for the preliminary short list of route alternatives for the west, central and east sections of the study area. For each section, attendees were asked to comment/share observations about the P – Positives, O – Objections, W – What Else Do You Want To Share?, E – Enhancements, R – Remedies of the preliminary short list of route alternatives. G. Pothier also conducted the P.O.W.E.R. exercise on the Focused Analysis Area.

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

- Like that the route alternatives avoid the most sensitive areas around the Credit River crossings.
- West of Mississauga Road the routes seem very close together. Suggest combining Alternatives 2C and 2D.
- South of the Credit River, develop a connection between Alternative 1E and 1C.
- A connection between Alternative 1E and 1C south of the Credit River provides good east-west connectivity.

Central Section (Mississauga Road to Highway 50)

- Like the fact that the route alternatives minimize impacts to the Mayfield West Phase 1 and 2 developments.
- Like that existing Highway 410 was retained as an alternative.
- Alternative 6D is a concern. It is known that TRCA prefers an alternative that resembles Alternative 7F to the north, so Alternative 6D does not provide an acceptable connection to this alternative.
- Alternatives 10B and 10C restrict development lands. One of these alternatives should be eliminated at this stage.
- Bramalea Road should not be considered as a potential interchange location. Interchanges at Dixie Road and Airport Road are sufficient to support the area.

- Question the elimination of Alternative 10F. This alternative would minimize impacts to development in the area and the terminus presents a better interchange opportunity than some other alternatives.
- Consider creating a partial interchange at Coleraine Drive.
- The identification of interchange locations is premature. Consider leaving the door open to different alternatives.

Q: Will the new Highway 410 extension alternatives and the existing Highway 410 alternative be carried forward at this stage in the study?

R: Yes.

Q: Will the FAA have gaps where there are large gaps between the short list route alternatives?

R: No. These lands will remain part of the FAA at this time.

Q: Does the project team have a preference for either the existing Highway 410 alternative or one of the Highway 410 extension alternatives?

R: No. The project team is still exploring all short listed alternatives.

East Section (Highway 50 to Highway 400)

- Ensure that the freeway-to-freeway interchanges do not preclude a further extension of Highway 427 to the north, or the GTA West transportation corridor to the east of Highway 400.
- Alternative 7D and 7E bisect a future expansion area. Prefer Alternative 7F to the north.
- Consider a partial interchange at Coleraine Drive since adjacent interchanges are in close proximity.
- There should be an interchange at Highway 50.
- It is premature to decide where interchanges should go. Keep options open until more information is known.

Q: What criteria are the project team using to select interchange locations. Municipalities should have an opportunity to comment on the locations.

R: Initially all existing/planned crossing roads and provincial freeways were considered as potential interchange locations. The potential interchange locations were then screened based on the following principles: minimize impacts to significant natural features, functions, systems and communities; minimize impacts to existing and planned (approved under Official Plans) population and employment areas; and efficient and direct and address the transportation problems and opportunities. We currently have identified strong potential locations but have made no decisions. The project team will look to have meetings with municipalities to discuss interchange locations. When evaluating interchange locations, we will look at opportunities and impacts to the natural environment, socio-economic environment, cultural environment, and transportation environment (e.g. interchange spacing, etc.). It is highly unlikely that all of the interchanges identified along a route will end up as locations on the preferred route.

Focused Analysis Area

- Support for the concept of the FAA.

Q: If a development application was submitted in the middle of the FAA where there was no route alternative, would the ministry allow it to proceed? There is currently a development outside of the FAA, but servicing for the development is within the FAA. How would the ministry respond to this application?

R: The ministry would review these applications on a case-by-case basis. In general development cannot proceed within the FAA.

5. Upcoming Public Information Centre: Anticipating Public and Stakeholder Reaction

G. Pothier noted that the project team is aiming to hold a Public Information Centre later this year and asked attendees to provide insight on the following issues - with a view to assisting the project team to best address the concerns and information needs of the public:

1. Are there “hot spots” or “hot topics” you foresee?
 2. What strategies/responses can we provide to address the “hot spots” or “hot topics”?
- Area north of Mayfield Road between Heartlake Road and Dixie Road will be an issue for developers. They will expect these lands to be released by the end of this year.
 - Stakeholders may express concern over Alternative 6D.
 - Concern may be expressed about the upstream crossing of the Credit River and around Heritage Road.
 - You will get positive feedback that the project team is moving forward with routes and are consulting about them.
 - May receive questions about why fieldwork has not been completed yet.
 - The project team is to be commended for meeting its timelines.
 - The project team will need to prepare messaging regarding coordinating with Hydro One and who is protecting for what lands.
 - The Catholic Cemeteries Archdiocese of Toronto will oppose some of the route alternatives. Need to keep them involved in the study.
 - There will be a mix of support and opposition to the transportation corridor in the Town of Caledon. The corridor will be a magnet for development and this can either be an opportunity or an impact.
 - Stakeholders may be opposed to tolling on this facility.
 - Town of Halton Hills Council may be opposed to Alternative 1E.
 - Stakeholders may ask how the project team is going to compensate for impacting the rural character of some areas.
 - Greenbelt areas should be highlighted on the route alternative maps.
 - There will be lots of questions about whether the project team prefers the existing Highway 410 alternative or one of the Highway 410 extension alternatives, and concern that there is no answer
 - Concern about the extension of Highway 427 beyond the GTA West transportation corridor.
 - Need to clarify that the Highway 427 extension will extend to the GTA West transportation corridor.
 - Need to provide clear messaging on when and how lands are to be “released”.

Q: Have you shared these route alternatives with any other stakeholders?

R: The project team shared the same information with the Community Advisory Group (CAG) and the Greenbelt Transportation Advisory Group (GTAG) last week.

Q: Have you met with Regional Councils yet? Councilors will get many questions about the study.

R: Typically the project team would present to the Regional Councils before the PIC; however, given the timing of the election this year, the project team determined that it would be most prudent to meet with the newly elected Regional Councils in the new year.

6. Next Steps

N. Ahmed provided an overview of next steps in the study, and provided the dates and locations of the PIC #1 venues.

7. Open Forum and 8. Closing Remarks

An opportunity was provided for any additional comments/questions/observations. G. Pothier and N. Rouskov provided closing remarks, and thanked all participants for taking the time to provide their input.

Submitted by: B. Patkowski, URS

Distribution: Attendees, Regrets
