
**407 East Individual Environmental Assessment
& Preliminary Design Study**

Community Value Plan (CVP)

**INTRODUCTORY SESSION
MEETING SUMMARY**

Date: June 7, 2008
Location: TSH Whitby
Cafeteria
Time: 9:30 – 11:00 AM

Attendees:

Gary & Judy Pereman
Larry & Kathy Sullivan
Pat Johnston
Don Down
Dan Dzikewicz
Danny Stacheruk
Liz Shumovich
Roberta & Oleh Stasyszyn
Dave Horscroft
Yvonne Hoogeveen
James. D. Sturgess
Cindy Shaddy
Dick Christie

Yolanda Paashuis-Lew
Ian MacKinnon
Alison Wheeler
Janice Szwarz
Ed Oegema
Mitch Morawetz
D. Heard
Sue Bullard
Linda Gasser
Dave McCargar
Matt Alexander
Jeanette Wiles

Project Team Attendees:

Dan Remollino – MTO
Dean Kemper - MTO
Rita Venneri – MTO
Darlene Proudfoot – MTO
Ian Dobrindt – GLL
Jen Paterson – GLL

Jim Dowell – MRC
Doug Allingham – TSH
Brenda Jamieson – TSH
Mary Grozdanovski – TSH
Emma Docherty – TSH

Facilitated by Glenn Pothier, GLPi

After a quick round of introductions, Glenn provided an overview of his role for the Introductory Session. He also explained that following the introductory CVP session, a presentation summarizing the results of the wetland workshop held by the 407 East project team in late February would be given. CVP participants were welcome to stay for the wetlands presentation between *11:30 am and 1:00 pm*.

Agenda & CVP Objectives (Slides 2 & 3)

Brenda began the presentation, highlighting the agenda to be covered and the objectives of the session with respect to the Community Value Plan (CVP).

In addition to noting that the agenda included a general overview of the Study's progress and recent activity, Brenda noted that participant input to the CVP and its process were key factors in the future progress of the Plan.

Status Update & Preliminary Design Activities (Slides 4 – 9)

Brenda noted that since the release of the Technically Recommended Route (TRR) at the PICs in June 2007, further analysis has been undertaken and the transportation corridor has been refined to further reduce impacts. Refinements were considered at a number of locations based on stakeholder and agency input. In addition, preliminary design alternatives were considered at a number of locations along the TRR. The route refinements and preliminary design alternatives do result in changed and/or additional impacts in some locations.

On the basis of this work, a Technically Preferred Route has been selected. Preliminary design is being undertaken to better define the footprint of the 407 by developing design components of the corridor in greater detail.

The Technically Preferred Route, including the preliminary design work undertaken to-date, is the subject of PIC #4.

Questions raised are as follows:

- Is the detail to be shown set in stone? Will there be more changes?
 - a. Some refinements may be made based on stakeholder input and comments but more significant changes like those recently assessed and recommended are not anticipated.
- Where is the transitway corridor?
 - a. The (red) route shown on slide 6 includes the transit corridor – it is for both transportation facilities. Mapping at the PICs will distinguish between the two corridors.

- My neighbors did not receive the notice for this meeting and are directly impacted by the 407. Why were they not invited too?
 - a. Invites to today's session were sent to people who had signed up for the CVP process specifically – not to all impacted property owners or everyone on our mailing list. We asked people at PIC #2, PIC #3 and through Newsletter Issue No. 5 to let us know if they'd like to participate in the CVP process, and those people were invited.

Potential Mitigation Strategies (Slides 10 & 11)

Highlighting some examples of potential mitigation strategies employed in other projects, Brenda noted that a number of mitigation measures are legislated requirements which will be included in the Recommended Plan. The intent of the CVP process is to identify opportunities for enhanced mitigation to be implemented, where feasible.

No questions/issues were raised during this portion of the presentation.

CVP Framework, Principles and Objectives (Slides 12 - 20)

Brenda discussed the general approach, principles and objectives the Project Team hoped to achieve through the CVP process, noting that participant input will be a key element of the CVP process.

Referencing the questionnaire participants were given to complete, Brenda noted typical questions the Project Team were posing to gather data for inclusion to the CVP and overviewed key elements that would be employed in the development of the plan.

Questions raised are as follows:

- What will be done with heritage buildings?
 - a. At this point we are not sure. During the summer we will be completing our impact assessment work which will document the mitigation for such features.
- Will the Lake Ridge Road interchange be part of the 407?
 - a. The 407 EA is seeking EA approval for the Lake Ridge Road interchange. The strategy for implementation (construction) of the 407 and the Lake Ridge Road interchange is yet to be determined.
 - b. The interchange and widening of Lake Ridge Road will not change the jurisdiction of the road – it will continue to be a Regional road.
 - c. A previous Study was initiated to determine the need for the Lake Ridge Road interchange, but that Study was 'put on hold' pending the 407 EA.
- Will we be able to have input on the 'criteria being established for decision making'?
 - a. Yes. It will be part of the CVP process.

- Will the evaluation be documented?
 - a. Yes. A CVP Report will be prepared and the results of the CVP process will be documented in the EA Report.
- During and after construction, how will traffic impact the local roads and residents in the area with respect to air, noise, lighting, etc?
 - a. Construction impacts will be mitigated to the extent possible through commitments within the EA Report and subsequent contract documents. Commitments for future work (e.g. monitoring) will also be addressed.
 - b. After construction, lower traffic volumes are predicted on both Highway 401 and parallel local roads based on the traffic assessment work undertaken during the course of the study. Preliminary air and noise investigation results will be available at the PICs. More detailed air and noise analysis will be undertaken as part of the impact assessment work, including the identification of appropriate mitigation measures.

Typical Applications (Slides 21 – 25)

Brenda presented a number of pictures illustrating examples of enhanced mitigation treatments employed on other infrastructure projects.

No questions/issues were raised during this portion of the presentation.

Next Steps & Workshop Logistics (Slides 26 - 28)

Brenda provided an overview of the next steps in the CVP process and highlighted some areas that could be better determined, in terms of logistics, by responses and input being provided by participants.

Questions raised are as follows:

- It is important that consideration be given to the users of the highway and the impacts on adjacent land use when going through this process.
- Will the recommendations that come through the CVP process be commitments within the EA?
 - a. Yes. There will also be recognition of the need to use ‘the best available’ technology when the project is implemented.
- Is the flyover available on the website? Will visual simulations be created for the whole route?
 - a. The flyover is not yet available on the website. We are trying to format it and reduce the size so it can be posted. Visualizations will be created for certain segments of the route to provide representative examples of mitigation/enhancement treatments, structure types, crossing road treatments, etc.

Adjourn – 11:30 AM

Appendix A – Summary of Questionnaire Responses