



Meeting Report

300 Water Street, Whitby ON, L1N 9J2
Tel (905) 668 – 9363 ■ Fax (905) 668 – 0221 ■ tsh@tsh.ca

Project:	<u>407 East Environmental Assessment & Preliminary Design RAG #10</u>	Meeting Report No.:	10
TSH No.:	42-80390	Meeting Date:	February 21, 2008
Recorder:	E. Docherty	Meeting Time:	9.30 am
		Report Date:	March 29, 2008

Note: If any of the contents of this meeting report differ in any respect from your own recollection of the points discussed or decisions reached, please notify us immediately. In the meantime, we will proceed in accordance with the understanding described herein.

Note: Comments and or questions put forth by members of RAG are in italics with the response directly below.

Location: TSH Whitby North Office - Main Boardroom

Present: Warren May, MNR
Bohdan Kowalyk, MNR
Perry Sisson, CLOCA
Chris Strand, DFO
Anthony DiPietro, Durham Region Health Department
Mike Sone, GO Transit
Bob Letts, OPP, 407 Detachment
Dale Leadbeater, GLL
Blair Shoniker, GLL
Gillie Thompson, Ecoplans
Dan Remollino, MTO
Natalie Rouskov, MTO
Darlene Proudfoot, MTO
Dean Kemper, MTO
Sabina Merey, MTO
Rita Venneri, MTO
Doug Allingham, TSH
Emma Docherty, TSH

Regrets: Steve Strong, MNR
Laura Delguidice, Dena Lewis, Laura James & Don Haley, TRCA
Rob Hersey, CLOCA
Gemma Connelly, MOE
Melanie Schade & Mike Kim, OGS – MPIR
Jim Chan, CEAA
Mike Shaw & John Fischer, Environment Canada
Kitty Ma, Health Canada
Jennifer Hughes, Transport Canada
Mark Peacock, GRCA

Purpose: To provide RAG members with a status update on the Study's recent work; to provide and overview of the comments received from agencies, municipalities and the public and to provide RAG members with an overview of the work that would be completed during preliminary design.

Item No.	Description	Action By
<u>1.0</u>	<u>Introductions</u>	

Item No.	Description	Action By
<u>2.0</u>	<u>Status Update</u>	INFO
	▪D. Allingham generally summarised the major tasks undertaken by the Project Team since the presentation of the Technically Recommended Route (TRR) at PIC #3. These tasks included: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Distribution of the Alternatives Methods Report (August 2007)• Council Presentations throughout the Region to present the TRR• October 2007 meetings with Advisory Groups to review the Alternative Methods Report and the evaluation process• November 2007 mailing to directly impacted property owners and initiation of Preliminary Design• December 2007 initiation of field work to support Preliminary Design and preparation of PIC #3 responses	INFO
<u>3.0</u>	<u>PIC #3 Comments Received</u>	
<u>3.1</u>	<u>Public Comments</u>	
	▪D. Allingham proceeded to highlight the comments typically received from members of the public and the responses the Project Team had developed. D. Allingham noted that as is expected, a majority of the comments were in reference to property impacts, next steps with regard to property purchase and why one route was chosen over others.	INFO
	▪D. Remollino noted that approximately 150 public comments had been received and responses were being finalised to prepare for distribution. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Were any of the public comments in reference to natural environment features?</i>• Yes though in a more general nature than those provided by agencies and municipal staff. They are available on the Study's website under the Public Meetings section.	INFO
<u>3.2</u>	<u>Agency Comments</u>	
	▪D. Allingham noted that agency comments received to date had focussed on a number of the key natural environment features within the Study Area that were adjacent to or directly impacted by the TRR. Specifically, the features noted by agency comments included: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provincially Significant Wetland Complexes / Lake Iroquois Shoreline• Solina Bog• Butternut Trees (protected)• Water – surface / ground / stormwater management and the need for more detail surrounding the mitigation / compensation measures planned to minimize impacts to recharge / discharge areas.	INFO

Item No.	Description	Action By
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪D. Allingham also noted comments had been received from a number of agencies who requested more detailed information regarding the Project Teams field work which substantiated the route alternative evaluation. 	INFO
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪It was noted that a Field Investigations Report would be distributed to the regulatory agencies for their information and review / comment. 	PT
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪D. Allingham noted that comments were also received requesting more specific information with respect to the impacts. 	INFO
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪It was noted that details of this level and nature will be provided through the Impact Assessment Reports to be generated through the Preliminary Design phase. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>When can we expect to receive the Field Investigations Report?</i> • Shortly. It's with MTO for final review and will be distributed as soon as possible. A review period will be allowed. • <i>When can we expect to receive the Impact Assessment Report for review?</i> • In the fall of 2008. This report is being generated through the Preliminary Design phase to document impacts for the entire corridor. 	INFO
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪Lastly, D. Allingham noted that a number of agencies had commented on the need to explore alternatives to the east Durham link, e.g. upgrading of Highway 35/115. 	INFO
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪It was summarised that alternatives to the east Durham link had been explored during previous phases of the EA and this link had been included as part of the TRR and is a key component of the optimal network. It was also noted that exclusion of the east Durham link would result in other considerable impacts as improvements to the local network would be required; Highway 35/115 would require significant upgrades impacting communities and greenbelt area along the existing corridor; congestion of Highway 401 would not be alleviated; and there may be increased traffic on the west Durham link. 	INFO
3.3	<u>Municipal Comments</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪D. Allingham highlighted typical comments received from municipal staff including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of additional interchange locations • Consideration of future plans for local/regional roads as expressed in Official Plans • Consideration of agricultural operations • Inclusion of the Lake Ridge Road and Highway 401 widening within the 407 East EA • Consideration of future potential transit connections • Consideration of a strategy to deal with remnant parcels which would be created. 	INFO

Item No.	Description	Action By
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪D. Allingham noted that traffic analysis was being undertaken to support interchange locations and the previous work and that alternative interchange configurations would be reviewed where appropriate and feasible. 	INFO
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪D. Allingham also noted the Project Team generally agreed with the municipal comments and would be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring they did not preclude future local road crossings and / or interchanges where expressed as future local planning projects in Official Plans • Giving consideration to agricultural operations in determining grade separations and local road treatments • Considering potential future transit connections would not be precluded • Giving further thought to the issue of remnant parcels 	INFO
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪In response to the enquiry regarding the inclusion of Lake Ridge Road and the Highway 401 widening D. Allingham noted that the 407 design work to date and to be completed would be compatible with implementation of these projects in the future. Also noted was that though the evaluation of alternative routes had included the footprints of these projects, they would not be part of the 407 implementation. The Preliminary Design work will ensure they are operationally compatible but the 407 EA will not be seeking approval for these projects and they would be subject to separate studies in the future. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>What are the property acquisition policies?</i> • A property purchased through the advanced purchase process can be purchased in full if the direct impacts warrant. Through expropriation, only the portion of the land that is required for implementation can be purchased. • <i>If surplus lands are acquired, will they be sold by MTO or has consideration been given to using them for mitigation / compensation / enhancement purposes?</i> • Once the land has been acquired we can determine opportunities for mitigation, etc. Such opportunities cannot be explored at this time because we do not know how much land we will own through the advanced purchase process. • <i>Can mapping of MTO owned properties be provided to the agencies so we could look at and comment on opportunities for species recovery, compensation etc.</i> • Yes we can provide mapping of properties MTO currently owns. 	INFO
<u>4.0</u>	<u>Preliminary Design</u>	
<u>4.1</u>	<u>Key Activities</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪D. Allingham highlighted the key activities that would be undertaken during preliminary design including review of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Horizontal and vertical profiles (highway and crossing roads) • Right-of-way width and cross section • Interchange locations and configurations 	INFO

Item No.	Description	Action By
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Transitway corridor and station locations• Local road realignments associated with the 407 corridor• Mitigation measures, including noise attenuation, landscaping etc	INFO	
<u>4.2</u> <u>Route Refinements</u>		
▪D. Allingham highlighted general areas where the Project Team were exploring route refinements to further mitigate or avoid impacts.	INFO	
▪It was noted that the results of these refinements would be documented and shared with regulatory agencies as the process continued and the Project Team completed their work.	INFO	
<u>4.3</u> <u>Preliminary Design Alternatives</u>		
▪D. Allingham noted that alternative preliminary designs would be generated, assessed and comparatively evaluated where feasible and warranted. D. Allingham noted that alternative preliminary designs may be considered to reduce impacts via alternative:	INFO	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Vertical alignments of the corridor and crossing roads• Interchange locations and configurations• Crossing road treatments (over, under, close)• Local road realignments• Transitway station locations / car pool lots• Commercial Vehicle Inspection Stations (CVIS)• Patrol / maintenance yards (highway and transitway facilities)• Stormwater management ponds• Watercourse crossing treatments		
<u>5.0</u> <u>EA Study Schedule</u>		
<u>5.1</u> <u>Community Value Plan</u>		
▪D. Allingham provided some background information on the Community Value Plan (CVP) and emphasised that the Workshops would not be route planning activities and that the CVP is being established to identify opportunities to retain the character, history and culture of communities surrounding the TRR by enhancing aspects of the 407 corridor.	INFO	
▪D. Allingham noted that people would be invited to participate via the Study website and the next Newsletter but that logistics with regards to the number of people, the locations and timing were to be determined once the level of interest to participate had been defined.	INFO	
<u>5.2</u> <u>EA Study Schedule</u>		
▪The general Study Schedule was displayed and D. Allingham highlighted the time and tasks the Project Team were currently working in to achieve PIC #4 scheduled for late Spring 2008.	INFO	
<u>6.0</u> <u>Next Steps</u>		
▪D. Allingham noted that the next steps for the 407 Project Team involved proceeding with Preliminary Design tasks in preparation for PIC #4. The tasks to be undertaken were highlighted as: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Issuing response letters to PIC #3 comments	INFO	

Item No.	Description	Action By
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Distributing Newsletter Issue 5• Evaluating TRR refinements in comparison to the TRR presented at PIC #3 to further reduce impacts• Preparing for PIC #4 by:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Generating, assessing and comparatively evaluating Preliminary Design Alternatives• Continuing field investigations and data collection• Developing and initiating the Community Value Plan• Confirming the Technically Recommended Route	INFO

7.0

Questions / Comments

- *What cross-section are you protecting for?*
- We anticipate protection of an open median cross section for protection of future needs to expand. Also, the cross section will protect for implementation of HOV lanes with a median width of 33m. This is still to be vetted and confirmed through MTO Senior Management and subject to further discussions.
- *How many lanes are being considered for the TRR?*
- Initial implementation we are seeking approval for 8 lanes from Brock Road to Ashburn Road; 6 lanes from Ashburn to the east Durham link 4 lanes for the east mainline (from the east Durham link to Highway 35/115) and for each of the north-south links.
- Ultimate protection would be for 10 lanes Brock Road to Ashburn; 8 lanes Ashburn Road to the east Durham link and 6 lanes for the two links and the eastern mainline from the east link to Highway 35/115.
- *Has it been decided who will build it yet? Will the route be tolled?*
- Those are implementation issues that are yet to be determined but which does not influence this EA.
- *Where will the median width be 33m?*
- Where 4 lanes are proposed the median width will be 4 lanes allowing expansion to the ultimate condition and further if required to occur within the median.
- *What were the specifics of the FLOW announcement?*
- There is a Provincial/Federal agreement to provide funding for transit projects in the Greater Toronto Area (GTA). As part of the agreement 3 key highway projects were noted for completion; Highway 7 widening (Brock Rd to Brock St), Highway 404 extension completion by 2012 and 407 extension into Durham completion by 2013. No funding was provided for this highway project.
- There was no money announced for the 407 extension, either as contributions for EA completion or as part of a construction budget.

Item No.

Description

Action By

**The meeting adjourned at approximately 12:30pm
END OF MEETING RECORD.**

Distribution: Attendee's
File