

## Community Advisory Group (CAG) – Meeting #3 Minutes

**Date of Meeting**

Thursday, November 14, 2019 **Time** 6:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.

**Project Name**

GTA West Transportation Corridor Route Planning and Environmental Assessment Study, Stage 2

**Location**

Element Vaughan Southwest, Oak Room  
 6170 Highway 7, Vaughan, ON L4H 0R2

**Attendees**

Lukasz Grobel,	MTO
Fahmi Choudhury,	MTO
Chris Barber,	MTO
Keith Cherneski,	MTO
Prashanth Selvakumar,	MTO
Jim Dowell,	WSP
Sandy Nairn,	WSP
Catherine Gentile,	WSP
Tim Sorochinsky,	AECOM
Britta Patkowski,	AECOM
Christine Green,	AECOM
Saeideh Rasouli,	AECOM
Glenn Pothier,	GLPi

CAG Members removed in accordance with the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*

**Distribution**

Attendees, Regrets and Project Team

**Minutes By**

Christine Green

PLEASE NOTE: If this report does not agree with your records of the meeting, or if there are any omissions, please advise, otherwise we will assume the contents to be correct.

**1. Introductions**

- G. Pothier (GLPi) welcomed all to the meeting and facilitated introductions.
- G. Pothier (GLPi) reviewed the purpose, roles and responsibilities of the CAG and presented an overview of the minutes from CAG Meeting #2.

**2. Study Overview**

- The Project Team provided an overview of the study, including a short history of the GTA West Study (chronology), updates on project activities since study suspension in December 2015 and updates to the study schedule.

**3. Debrief on Public Information Centre #2**

- The Project Team presented a summary of what the Project Team heard from stakeholders at Public Information Centre #2 (PIC #2).
- The Project Team noted that there was a mixture of support and opposition for the draft Technically Preferred Route. Many stakeholders had route specific comments, however, most stakeholders were supportive of the multimodal transportation corridor.
- The Project Team also noted that they received a high number of advisory group application forms and Community Value Plan Team application forms.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Project Team discussed next steps in consultation, including upcoming municipal Council meetings and PIC #3.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4. Session 1 – Overview of the evaluation of the short-listed route and interchange location alternatives, Draft Technically Preferred Route and Draft 2019 Focused Analysis Area (FAA)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Project Team presented the rationale for the draft Technically Preferred Route by section, as well as the rationale for the preferred interchange locations.</li> <li>The Project Team presented the draft 2019 FAA.</li> <li>The Project Team explained that the draft Technically Preferred Route and draft 2019 FAA are not final and will be potentially revised following a review of stakeholder feedback collected since PIC #2. The Preferred Route and 2020 FAA are expected to be confirmed in Spring 2020.</li> <li>It was also noted that MTO will continue to review development applications within the green areas on the draft 2019 FAA map, but it is anticipated that properties in these areas will not be impacted by the GTA West multimodal transportation corridor.</li> <li>G. Pothier (GLPi) invited questions and general comments from the CAG members before moving forward with the agenda. The following questions and comments were received:</li> <li><b>Question:</b> Where will the corridor for the Northwest GTA Transmission Corridor Identification Study be constructed in relation to the GTA West multimodal transportation corridor? During PIC #2, a spokesperson for the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) noted that their transmission corridor will be piggybacking on the GTA West corridor. Has there been ongoing discussion between the two project teams to ensure this coordination?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Response:</b> The Ministry of Energy, Northern Development and Mines (ENDM) and IESO have initiated the transmission corridor as a separate study. The Northwest GTA Transmission Corridor Identification Study will be undertaken to identify an appropriate corridor of land adjacent to the future GTA West multimodal transportation corridor. The environmental assessment for the GTA West Study is being undertaken from a highway and transportation perspective. We are sharing information with ENDM and IESO as required and they have also been consulting with us through the Regulatory Agency Advisory Group (RAAG). It is still too early in our study timeline to discuss specific construction locations.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Question:</b> Are the highway and transitway on separate timelines? Are they considered separate projects?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Response:</b> Although the transitway will be developed as a separate right-of-way, both the transitway and transportation corridor are being evaluated under the GTA West Study.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Question:</b> Where can I find the environmental reports for review? Will they be available at a public location, such as a library? I cannot find any environmental assessments on the project website.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Response:</b> Once our Individual Environmental Assessment is completed, the report will be posted at several public locations for your review, such as community centres and/or libraries as well as on the project website. We are approximately 2 years away from that report being posted for review.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Currently, we do have PIC #1 and #2 materials, as well as other technical documentation, available for review on the project website. If you have any comments, you can send those to our Project Team email or call the toll-free line where they will be documented. [*Post Meeting Note: following the meeting, B. Patkowski navigated this stakeholder through the GTA West project website to ensure he could find the materials available for download*].

- **Question:** Will the transitway include rail or just buses?
  - **Response:** Initially, the transitway will be used for bus rapid transit. However, the alignment of the transitway will be adaptable for light rail transit in the future. It is a function of the demand and the number of people that they will be moving.
- **Question:** Why was the GTA West Study suspended?
  - **Response:** The study was suspended by the former government in December 2015 and in Spring 2016, an independent Advisory Panel was asked to assess the GTA West Study considering changes in government policies since 2008 and new transportation technologies being introduced. The independent Advisory Panel Report was released in February 2018 and the former government decided not to proceed with the GTA West Study. At the same time the MTO and IESO initiated a new study called the Northwest GTA Corridor Identification Study to identify a protected corridor in the GTA West Study Area for future infrastructure needs (transportation and/or utilities).
- **Question:** Did the Project Team receive any feedback from the City of Brampton on the draft Technically Preferred Route? I am specifically wondering about their feedback on the Coleraine Drive interchange location.
  - **Response:** The GTA West Project Team has been working closely with municipalities through the Municipal Advisory Group (MAG), Municipal Executive Advisory Group (MEAG) and through presentations to Councils. The feedback we receive at these meetings will be considered when we finalize the Preferred Route and move on to preliminary design. As noted previously, the interchange at Coleraine Drive conflicts with approved developments and alternative options for this interchange are being considered. Our Technically Preferred Route and 2019 Focused Analysis Area are draft for this reason.
- **Comment:** The Brampton Board of Trade is frustrated with the lack of communication between different levels of government. We are requesting that the MTO communicate more thoroughly with municipalities and other provincial and federal agencies and present projects together.
- **Question:** Is the preferred route in Section 3 similar to the Northwest GTA Corridor Identification Study alignment?
  - **Response:** The corridors for the two studies are similar but vary slightly due to the requirements for the different types of infrastructure considered in the Northwest GTA Corridor Identification Study.
- **Question:** Why was an interchange at Mayfield Road chosen? There is concern from residents in Georgetown about the amount of traffic that will be traveling west

from the highway into the town. There should be more communication with residents in Georgetown.

- **Response:** That location was identified by municipalities as a major east/west corridor. We received input from the Town of Halton Hills at PIC #2 regarding the use of River Road. The Town noted concern that if an interchange is at Mayfield Road, traffic may increase on River Road, which may not be able to handle the increase in traffic. Going forward, the Project Team will look at traffic impacts at a micro level, including operations on the municipal road network on either side of an interchange.
- **Question:** You referred to a Norval Bypass, where would that be located?
  - **Response:** We have heard from the municipalities about a future Norval Bypass. The Project Team has not seen a physical plan for construction at this time but have seen general study areas previously considered. We do not anticipate the GTA West multimodal transportation corridor precluding a Norval Bypass.
- **Question:** Will the highway be constructed at grade or below grade?
  - **Response:** The main transportation corridor will be predominately at grade, with approximately ½ metre to 1 metre cuts and fills. These details will be determined during preliminary design. We have not examined cross-sections at crossing roads yet and this will be considered during the preliminary design phase.
- **Comment:** Concern about proposed developments (e.g. proposed Catholic Cemetery) shifting the draft Technically Preferred Route and draft 2019 FAA. This creates uncertainty and will cost taxpayers more money.
  - **Response:** The draft Technically Preferred Route is currently wider than it will need to be, and the draft 2019 FAA is wide enough at this point to allow tweaks to the Preferred Route during preliminary design to minimize impacts, without drastically changing the Preferred Route or going outside of the 2019 FAA.
- **Question:** Has the Ministry considered extending Highway 410 to Orangeville?
  - **Response:** Our study area does not include this extension, but it does not preclude the opportunity for a future environmental assessment to extend Highway 410 to Orangeville.
- **Question:** What will happen to the current Highway 410 freeway?
  - **Response:** At this time, there has not been any decision made. This will be an ongoing discussion with the municipalities.
- **Question:** Why do you have an interchange so close to Old School Road? If you move the interchange north (refer to S5-10), you could avoid the wetlands and forest.
  - **Response:** Thank you for your comment, we will consider this.
- **Question:** Why was the alternative to the west of Heart Lake Road not carried forward as part of the draft Technically Preferred Route?
  - **Response:** The preferred alternative route to the east of Heart Lake Road minimizes impacts to fish and fish habitat and wetlands, and minimizes impacts to future urban development.

- **Question/Comment:** I suggest moving the interchange at Coleraine Drive to the Major Mackenzie Drive extension. If the interchange is moved from Coleraine Drive, will there still be connections there?
  - **Response:** The Major Mackenzie Drive extension is a municipal initiative. We did consider alternative routes that would potentially connect into it. To answer your question, no there would not be a connection to Coleraine Drive if the interchange is moved. We are continuing to look at alternatives for the interchange in this area.
- **Question:** Will the highway corridor remain the same, even with the new interchange?
  - **Response:** The Project Team is unable to confirm at this time since interchange alternatives are still being developed but we anticipate that the modifications will fit within the draft 2019 FAA.
- **Comment:** Traffic is extremely bad in the Coleraine Drive area. There is a Canadian Tire Distribution Centre there and many other large businesses.
  - **Response:** Yes, we are aware of this area having significant truck usage. The municipalities have identified this to us.
- **Question:** If the new Coleraine Drive interchange is shifted westerly, won't it impact the interchange at Gore Road?
  - **Response:** The spacing between the interchanges has been considered and is not anticipated to be an issue.
- **Question:** At one point in the study the Project Team was looking at extending Highway 427 northerly to a route farther north of draft Technically Preferred Route S8-3. Why wasn't that carried forward?
  - **Response:** You are referring to Route S8-1. That alternative route was included as part of our evaluation process. The northerly route has significant environment impacts, including impacts to the Greenbelt. The crossing at Humber River would also be expansive with that route. We are selecting a route that will minimize or avoid us having to place fill in the Humber River valley, has less impacts on the Greenbelt and stream crossings.
- **Question:** Are you considering a connection to Highway 50?
  - **Response:** No because Highway 50 is too close to the Highway 427 interchange.
- **Question:** How will people on Highway 427 access Highway 50?
  - **Response:** They would have to get off at Major Mackenzie Drive and connect to Highway 50.
- **Question:** Why was an interchange at Highway 50 not considered?
  - **Response:** It was precluded due to the spacing to the freeway to freeway interchange at Highway 427. One of our main criteria in selecting interchange locations was spacing, and Highway 50 did not meet the criteria.
- **Question:** What interchange would residents use to get to Bolton?
  - **Response:** They would get off at the Coleraine Drive interchange and make their way to Bolton.
- **Comment:** Our land is currently underneath S8-3. We have made comments in writing that the ratepayers and the City of Vaughan want S8-1 instead. The cost of

expropriation for S8-3 will be higher than with S8-1. We think you should take that into account.

- **Response:** Thank you for your comment, it will be considered as we finalize the Preferred Route.
- **Comment:** The bottleneck at Highway 400 and King/Vaughan is bad. You're going to have to extend the corridor to the north and hook in with the Bradford Bypass extension. Everything south of Kirby Road is owned by developers. The residents in our area are concerned with putting another interchange so close to Highway 400. Weston Road is backed up with traffic already.
  - **Response:** Traffic on the highway and surrounding municipal roads will be looked at more closely during preliminary design. Going forward, the Project Team will look at traffic impacts at a micro level, including operations on the municipal road network on either side of an interchange
- **Comment:** We should be staggering industry hours to control the number of cars and trucks using the highway. At some point we need to work through this, we can't just keep building more roads.
  - **Response:** What you are referring to is called 'Traffic Demand Management' and it can get to be complicated when you are dealing with hundreds of employers. Optimizing the use of the existing transportation infrastructure was factored into the traffic model used in Stage 1 of the study, and the results show that there is still a shortfall in the system. A new corridor is still required to meet future transportation demand.
- **Question:** How has the Project Team considered urban sprawl in this study? Are there discussions regarding this subject? We should be avoiding impacts on agricultural land.
  - **Response:** The Project Team has been tasked with meeting the demands of the increase in population/employment lands of the future. Impacts on agricultural land have been avoided where possible.
- **Question:** How wide is the draft 2019 Focused Analysis Area around the interchange locations?
  - **Response:** Approximately 1 km around the interchanges. [*Post Meeting Note: width varies between 780 m and 3.9 km (maximum widths at Highway 401/407 and Highway 400 freeway to freeway interchanges)*].
- **Question:** Has the released area of the draft 2019 Focused Analysis Area been made publicly available?
  - **Response:** It is anticipated that in Spring 2020, the Preferred Route will be confirmed. Once confirmed, the lands outside of the 2020 FAA will be of reduced interest and development applications can proceed through the municipal planning process. MTO will continue to review development applications within the study area but it is anticipated that lands outside of the 2019 FAA will not be impacted by the GTA West multimodal transportation corridor.
- **Question:** When you must cross valleys, can you use a narrowed right-of-way?
  - **Response:** That consideration and others, like building two smaller structures across valleys versus one larger structure, will be considered during the preliminary design stage to reduce impacts to the environment.
- **Question:** Can you add the hydro corridor to the protected FAA?

- **Response:** No, the electricity transmission corridor is a separate project being undertaken with a different scope and process. The electricity transmission corridor is anticipated to run parallel to the GTA West transportation corridor. If you would like to contact their study team with your questions, we can provide you with their contact information.

**5. Session 2: Issues to inform the preliminary design of the Preferred Route**

- G. Pothier (GLPi) initiated a group activity, where members of the CAG were asked to provide their feedback on the following three questions. The responses are listed below each question.
- **Question 1:** Provide feedback on the evaluation outcomes. What was the most surprising or concerning to you?
- **Question 1 Responses:**
  - Is IESO a private organization?
  - There is an increase in the demand for hydro with an increase in land use.
  - Concern with aligning the GTA West Study with planned municipal development (i.e. concern about fragmentation, land locked properties, movement of agricultural vehicles). These issues could be solved through discussions with the municipalities.
  - The Project Team should look at heritage properties along the corridor and how they will be assessed and impacted.
  - Are interchanges too close? (not according to technical standards).
  - What input have Indigenous Communities provided to the Project Team?
  - Concerns about where the highway ties in at Highway 400.
  - Surprised to see an interchange planned at Mayfield Road – is this needed? It will create more traffic for Georgetown and there is currently nothing at that interchange location.
  - Consider adding an interchange at Countryside Drive.
  - Concerned that the cost of land acquisition was not included in the evaluation process for the Technically Preferred Route.
- **Question 2:** What has changed or is changing that should inform the design of the Preferred Route?
- **Question 2 Responses:**
  - Need innovative solutions.
  - Where will electrical stations be located? This will require coordination with municipalities.
  - The highway is needed much further north because of the population and employment growth occurring in Bradford and Innisfil.
  - Consider an interchange at Dixie Road.
  - Re-evaluate S5-9 from an environmental perspective.
  - Municipal council resolutions regarding the draft Technically Preferred Route should be considered.
- **Question 3:** What are the hot button topics that the Project Team will need to address? What are you hearing from your community?

• **Question 3 Responses:**

- Provide responses to the community ASAP.
- How will this impact land use planning north and south of the corridor?
- Concerns about traffic increasing on Highway 401 once the GTA West highway is constructed.
- Consider building the entire corridor and transitway at one time instead of in stages.
- Reduce the road classification of existing Highway 410.
- Concern for private wells and impacts to aquifers during construction (i.e. Hornby had similar issues during highway construction).
- Consider a heavy rail corridor along the transitway as an alternative to light rail. Heavy rail would permit expanded GO Service on the Milton Line and connects CP Rail directly to their Vaughan Terminal.
- Consider the transitway on the south side through Caledon and the hydro corridor on the north side of the corridor.
- Complete the environmental assessment ASAP and unfreeze the lands that are not needed for the study.
- King Township is concerned about the traffic congestion that the new highway will create.
- If a Norval Bypass is not constructed, the level of service on Bovaird Drive will decrease.
- Ensure that Coleraine Drive is a full interchange.
- Reconsider an interchange at Highway 50.
- Consider the traffic impacts at the corridor endpoints.
- Consider extending Highway 410 to the north now.
- Reduce impacts to woodlands and wetlands (specifically in Section 5).
- Consider building the transportation corridor below grade to reduce noise impacts to future developments.
- Concern about impacts to employment lands (i.e. bisecting properties, removal and reduction of lands).
- Impact on existing local communities (i.e. Kleinburg).

**6. Next Steps and Schedule**

- The Project Team reviewed the next steps of the project. Next steps include:
  - Reviewing feedback received at PIC #2 and through the Advisory Group Meetings.
  - Confirming the Preferred Route and 2020 Focused Analysis Area.
  - Developing Community Value Plans.
  - Presenting the preliminary design of the Preferred Route at PIC #3.

**7. Open Forum and Closing Remarks**

- G. Pothier (GLPi) asked the CAG if there were any further questions or comments for the Project Team. No further feedback was provided.
- G. Pothier (GLPi) and the Project Team provided closing remarks and thanked all participants for taking time to attend the meeting.
- Meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.