



**TSH**  
engineers  
architects  
planners

**Project:** 407 East Individual EA Study

**TSH No.** 42-80390

**Meeting Date:** June 25th 2007

**Meeting Time:** 3:30 pm

**Report Date:** July 10, 2007

**Recorder:** E. Docherty

**Page 1 of** 4

**RAG MEETING**

**MEETING RECORD NO. 8**

**Note: Comments and or questions put forth by members of RAG 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
Perry Sisson	CLOCA
Dena Lewis	TRCA
Laura James	TRCA
Gemma Connolly	MOE
Warren May	MNR
Steven Strong	MNR
Gareth Goodchild	DFO
Melanie Schade	MPIR
John Fischer	EC
Mike Shaw	EC
Mike Sone	GO Transit
Michael Roy	GLL
Gillian Thompson	Ecoplans
Doug Allingham	TSH
Mike Delsey	TSH
Emma Docherty	TSH

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

**Action By**

**1.0      Introductions**

**2.0      Presentation**

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.

		<b>Action By</b>
<b>2.1</b>	<b><u>Section 1 – Brock Road to Sideline 4:</u></b> D. Allingham noted that the screening process presented previously and at PIC #2 resulted in a single route option for this area.	Info
<b>2.2</b>	<b><u>Section 2 – Sideline 4 to Ashburn Road:</u></b> 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"><li>• Minimises effects on sensitive water courses, forested valley habitat, ESA's and other natural features.</li><li>• Impacts fewer residential and business properties.</li><li>• Requires fewer and less significant local road realignments and allows for an interchange with Highway.</li></ul> 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
<b>2.3</b>	<b><u>Section 3 – Ashburn Road to Simcoe Street:</u></b> D. Allingham noted that the screening process presented previously and at PIC #2 resulted in a single route option for this area also. <i>Have dot tables been prepared for the single route options?</i> Dot tables have not been prepared but the net effects have been documented and will be within the Alternative Methods documents. The dot tables are very basic visual representations of the relative differences between the route alternatives; they do not represent good and bad, but best or worse. <i>Could you provide the issues associated with the single options on the panels so we can get an understanding of the impacts?</i> As noted, this information will be available in the full documents and mapping which will be distributed to you for review. For the PIC's the information will be on hand at the specialist stations – there is simply too much information to present it in full.	Info
<b>2.4</b>	<b><u>Section 4 – Simcoe Street to Enfield Road</u></b> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Impacts fewer residential, recreation and business properties.</li><li>• Impacts fewer large and high investment agricultural operations.</li><li>• Significantly less impact on the hydro corridor and requires a much smaller realignment of Winchester Road.</li></ul> <i>Why was the north route not chosen before, the conditions seem to be the same?</i> The change is potentially due to different priorities in place now, more emphasis on agricultural land and a better understanding of the hydro corridor implications too. The conditions have changed somewhat but it would be hard to tell you those without fully reviewing the previous work. We also have a better understanding of the natural features associated with the recreational property impacted by route CM1.	Info

Action By

2.5	<p><b><u>Section 5 – Enfield Road to Highway 35/115</u></b></p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Less significant crossings of vegetation and environmentally significant features.</li><li>• Less impact to fisheries and aquatic habitat.</li><li>• Is least impacting on hydrological features and wetlands.</li><li>• Displaces fewer residential properties.</li><li>• Impacts fewer specialty crop and dairy/livestock operations.</li><li>• Impacts no known archaeological sites.</li></ul> <p>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.</p> <p><i>The interchanges at the 35/115 connection with the 407 seem to be too close together – is there a need for both?</i></p> <p>The interchanges allow for full moves access to the south and the north of the connection and we also have to ensure we provide access to Concession Road 8, that’s why there are two interchanges in such close proximity.</p>	Info
2.6	<p><b><u>Section 6 – West Durham Link</u></b></p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Avoids fragmentation of large habitat areas, retains small good quality terrestrial features and avoids key watercourse confluence zones and forested riparian areas.</li><li>• Fewer residential, business and agricultural properties impacted.</li><li>• Increased compatibility with provincial, regional and municipal approved and planned development strategies.</li><li>• Allows for Lake Ridge Road interchange north of Highway 7/Winchester Road.</li><li>• Interchange with Highway 401 on the east of Lake Ridge Road reduces property impacts, improves interchange spacing and is a better geometric design.</li></ul>	Info
2.7	<p><b><u>Section 7 – East Durham Link</u></b></p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Is least impacting to the natural environment features, wetlands, core wildlife habitat areas, groundwater, vegetation and ESA’s.</li><li>• Impacts fewer residential and business properties.</li><li>• Impacts no known archaeological sites.</li></ul> <p><i>Is this route consistent with previously sent conservation authority comments?</i></p> <p>Yes.</p>	Info

**Action By**

*Can you remove this link and still proceed with the EA?*

Yes – but this would not result in an optimal solution.

*Do you know if the Provincially Significant Wetland legislation has any ‘teeth’ regarding this link location?*

Believe that legislation would have no teeth per se as the Provincial Policy Statement would recognise the linear corridor.

**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.

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.

**The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:00pm**

**END OF MEETING RECORD.**

**-ED**

Distribution:

PT  
RAG  
File

K:\PROJECTS\42-80\_\_\_\80390 407 East\1\_Correspondence\Agencies\RAG\Mtg\_8 June 25, 2007\RAG Meeting #8 Minutes25 June 2007.doc