



TSH
engineers
architects
planners

Project: 407 East Individual EA Study

TSH No. 42-80390

Meeting Date: June 25th 2007

Meeting Time: 1:30 pm

Report Date: July 10, 2007

Recorder: E. Docherty

Page 1 of 4

MTAG MEETING

MEETING RECORD NO. 8

Note: Comments and or questions put forth by members of MTAG are in *italic* with the response directly below.

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.

LOCATION: Durham Region Headquarters, Lower Level Meeting Room

PRESENT:

Dan Remollino	MTO Project Manager
Heather Templeton	MTO
Linda Fischer	MTO
Janice Szwarc	Clarington
Richard Holborn	Pickering
Shahid Matloob	Pickering
Larry Cavanagh	Whitby
Ed Belsey	Whitby
Gary Muller	Ajax
Steven Rowe	Ajax
Anglea Gibson	Ajax
Susan Siopsis	Region of Durham
Ramesh Jagannathan	Region of Durham
Paul Gee	Region of Durham
Lori Riviere	Region of Durham
Christine Drimmie	Region of Durham
Bryan Weir	Peterborough County
Ken Hetherington	City of Peterborough
David Bonsall	City of Peterborough
Terrance Edwards	City of Peterborough
Blair Shoniker	GLL
Gillian Thompson	Ecoplans
Doug Allingham	TSH
Mike Delsey	TSH
Emma Docherty	TSH

PURPOSE: MTAG Meeting #8 to provide a preview of the Technically Recommended Route and overview of the evaluation results.

1.0 Introductions

Action By

Action By

2.0	<u>Presentation</u>	D. Allingham began with a short overview of the evaluation processes and the final short list. D. Allingham indicated that the material presented was to be used in the PIC's to present the basic results to the public and that more information would be distributed shortly which would include all the details of the evaluation of route alternatives. D. Allingham proceeded to highlight the seven sections of the 407 extension noting the route alternatives for each section; providing a brief overview of the evaluation results and finally indicating which route the Project team was recommending based on their evaluation.	Info
2.1	<u>Section 1 – Brock Road to Sideline 4:</u>	D. Allingham noted that the screening process presented previously and at PIC #2 resulted in a single route option for this area. <i>How has this Study addressed the Westney Bypass in the area?</i> The Project Team has to use the current alignment as an alternative alignment is not known at this time. We are well aware of the Study but cannot determine the location and so once the EA Study is complete for the bypass we will work with the recommendations of that EA. <i>Were alternatives for the Westney Bypass looked at within your evaluation?</i> No. We cannot presuppose the alternatives that will be within the EA Study. We made assumptions and have used these assumptions in our recommendation of interchange locations and the realignment of Highway 7 in this area. <i>If Westney Road moves at the location the 407 interchange is placed, does the interchange move with it?</i> We would have to review the options of interchange location when the Westney bypass is identified; we may move it, we may not.	Info
2.2	<u>Section 2 – Sideline 4 to Ashburn Road:</u>	D. Allingham indicated the two route alternatives, noting that route WM1 was the previously preferred route for this section. D. Allingham then noted that the evaluation results had clearly identified that route alternative WM1 (the northern route) was recommended for the following primary reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Minimises effects on sensitive water courses, forested valley habitat, ESA's and other natural features.• Impacts fewer residential and business properties.• Requires fewer and less significant local road realignments and allows for an interchange with Highway. D. Allingham noted that simple tables have been created to display the evaluation results to the public and that detailed evaluation information could be found in full in the Alternative Methods documents.	Info
2.3	<u>Section 3 – Ashburn Road to Simcoe Street:</u>	D. Allingham noted that the screening process presented previously and at PIC #2 resulted in a single route option for this area also.	Info
2.4	<u>Section 4 – Simcoe Street to Enfield Road</u>	D. Allingham indicated the two route alternatives, noting that route CM1 was the previously preferred route for this section. D. Allingham then noted that the evaluation results had identified route alternative CM2 (the northern route) as recommended for the following primary reasons:	Info

Action By

- Impacts fewer residential, recreation and business properties.
- Impacts fewer large and high investment agricultural operations.
- Significantly less impact on the hydro corridor and requires a much smaller realignment of Winchester Road.

Will off site impacts be done within this EA or will it become a Regional/municipal responsibility; e.g. widening of local roads etc? How has the Project Team captured the impacts of crossing roads?

Impacts associated with the implementation of the 407 route will be undertaken within this EA and will be a provincial responsibility. If other impacts are identified in the future, the decision of responsibility will have to be discussed at that time.

The 170m right of way we have in this EA allows us space for all crossing roads to go over the 407 highway within the 170m footprint. We have assumed all cross at this time and will better be able to examine this during the next phase.

A realignment of Townline Road is needed without the 407 Highway impacts. What impact does the 407 have on Townline Road? Why was the interchange with Townline Road removed?

At this time we are assuming an overpass of the 407 by Townline Road. Options will be examined during the next design phase of the Study.

The interchange at Townline Road was removed due to spacing issues and operational and safety issues that could result from this spacing. There was some debate as to provision of an interchange at Harmony Road or Townline Road and as Harmony already connects with the 401 and is a major regional corridor, traffic may better be accommodated on Townline Road.

The note at the bottom of your slide/panel indicates the evaluation was done with an interchange at Townline Road – what does this mean as you’ve noted that it can’t be included because of the spacing concern? That it will happen in the future?

It could be included in the future; we wanted to ensure we captured the impacts associated with it but it is not ideal.

Was the Thornton Road interchange included in the evaluation? If it had been would it have generated a different result?

The Thornton Road interchange was removed from the evaluation and would have made no difference as it is within the section of route between Ashburn Road and Simcoe Street where a single option was available.

Does this change in the route (picking the northern route) imply that the urban growth boundary will be expanded?

That decision is beyond the scope of this EA and is a matter of discussion for the municipality and the Ministry of Public Infrastructure and Renewal.

What about the agricultural operations that use land both north and south of the route?

A majority of the agricultural land in this area is owned/operated by one large operation and is to the north of the route. The whole of the Study Area has agricultural operations that may be impacted by division of land. The viability of providing access to both parcels will be examined during the next phase of the EA.

Action By

2.5

Section 5 – Enfield Road to Highway 35/115

Info

D. Allingham indicated the twelve route alternatives, noting that route EM8 was the previously preferred route for this section. D. Allingham then noted that the evaluation results had identified route alternative EM9 as recommended for the following primary reasons:

- Less significant crossings of vegetation and environmentally significant features.
- Less impact to fisheries and aquatic habitat.
- Is least impacting on hydrological features and wetlands.
- Displaces fewer residential properties.
- Impacts fewer specialty crop and dairy/livestock operations.
- Impacts no known archaeological sites.

D. Allingham noted the recommended route is almost identical to the previously preferred route, the exception being the connection to Highway 35/115. D. Allingham noted the impacts to the ORM that potentially had driven this connection.

Is the connecting part of Highway 35/115 to be a full freeway-to-freeway connection? Will it require an additional lane?

The connection will be a full freeway-to-freeway connection and it will not require an additional lane. The 407 in this area will be 4 lanes with ultimate build out to 6 lanes in 2031. At this time, 4 lanes is enough.

Will the section of 35/115 to be used be tolled if the rest of the extension is?

Our recommendation will be no.

2.6

Section 6 – West Durham Link

Info

D. Allingham indicated the nine route alternatives, noting that route WL8 was the previously preferred route for this section. D. Allingham then noted that the evaluation results had identified route alternative WL7 as recommended for the following primary reasons:

- Avoids fragmentation of large habitat areas, retains small good quality terrestrial features and avoids key watercourse confluence zones and forested riparian areas.
- Fewer residential, business and agricultural properties impacted.
- Increased compatibility with provincial, regional and municipal approved and planned development strategies.
- Allows for Lake Ridge Road interchange north of Highway 7/Winchester Road.
- Interchange with Highway 401 on the east of Lake Ridge Road reduces property impacts, improves interchange spacing and is a better geometric design.

Have you accounted for the proximity of the 407 Link interchange and the Lake Ridge Road interchange?

Yes, this will be a basket weave configuration because of the spacing but they will be separate structures.

Is the same true of the northern interchanges with Lake Ridge and the link?

No, the Lake Ridge Road interchange in the north will be a partial interchange only. The link interchange will only allow movement east or west on the 407 Highway, it will not connect to the local road system.

Action By

2.7

Section 7 – East Durham Link

Info

D. Allingham indicated the nine route alternatives, noting that route EL1 was the previously preferred route for this section. D. Allingham then noted that the evaluation results had identified route alternative EL8 as recommended for the following primary reasons:

- Is least impacting to the natural environment features, wetlands, core wildlife habitat areas, groundwater, vegetation and ESA's.
- Impacts fewer residential and business properties.
- Impacts no known archaeological sites.

3.0

Other items

Info

D. Allingham reviewed the cross section drawing that had been established during the previous work and presented at PIC #2 and also reviewed the differences between the current Technically Recommended Route and the previously preferred route.

D. Allingham also noted the interchange and transit station location that was currently proposed by the Project Team but noted this was still to be confirmed based on stakeholder discussion.

Pebblestone Road is not noted as an interchange location – can you explain why?

This EA cannot preclude an EA for this future road extension or its location and so cannot plan for them. An interchange at Pebblestone Road will not be included in this EA.

Why was the Thornton Road interchange removed?

The interchange at Thornton Road was removed due to spacing issues and operational and safety issues that could result from this spacing. Also, there are some technical issues associated with the proximity to the hydro corridor and Winchester Road.

D. Allingham noted the property purchase process that MTO was employing, specifically the willing-seller/willing-buyer basis; that the 'hardship' requirement previously employed would be removed and all questions and requests should be directed to Dan Remollino (MTO Project Manager).

D. Allingham also note the next steps the Project Team would undertake pursuant to the PIC's and the intent of the Project Team to prepare a Community Value Plan and encourage property owners and region residents to get involved in the process.

What exactly will their input be?

One of the items we have to determine with them is the kind of input they would like to have. Obviously there are limitations to what we can do and consider but we would like their input to our design proposals and choices.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:00pm

END OF MEETING RECORD.

-ED

Distribution:

PT
MTAG
File

Action By

| K:\PROJECTS\42-80___\80390 407 East\1_Correspondence\Municipalities\MTAG\Mtg_8 June 25 2007\MTAG Meeting #8 Minutes25 June 2007.doc