



**TSH**  
engineers  
architects  
planners

**Project:** 407 East Individual EA Study

**TSH No.** 42-80390

**Meeting Date:** October 3, 2007

**Meeting Time:** 9:30 am

**Report Date:** November 10, 2007

**Recorder:** E. Docherty

**Page 1 of** 7

**RAG MEETING**

**MEETING RECORD NO. 9**

**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, Meeting Room 1H

**PRESENT:**

|                     |                     |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| Dan Remollino       | MTO Project Manager |
| Rita Venneri        | MTO                 |
| Sabina Meroy        | MTO                 |
| Darlene Proudfoot   | MTO                 |
| Dean Kemper         | MTO                 |
| Cindy Mitton-Wilkie | MTO                 |
| Perry Sisson        | CLOCA               |
| Rob Hersey          | CLOCA               |
| Dena Lewis          | TRCA                |
| Laura James         | TRCA                |
| Gemma Connolly      | MOE                 |
| Dan Forma           | MOE                 |
| Warren May          | MNR                 |
| Steven Strong       | MNR                 |
| Bohdan Kowalyk      | MNR                 |
| Gareth Goodchild    | DFO                 |
| Christopher Strand  | DFO                 |
| Melanie Schade      | MPIR                |
| John Fischer        | EC                  |
| Mike Shaw           | EC                  |
| Mike Sone           | GO Transit          |
| Michael Roy         | GLL                 |
| Gillian Thompson    | Ecoplans            |
| Mike Kim            | OGS                 |
| Jim Chan            | CEEA                |
| Mark Peacock        | GRCA                |
| Gary Wells          | GRCA                |
| Gillian Thompson    | Ecoplans            |
| Geoff Gartshore     | Ecoplans            |
| Anne MacMillan      | Ecoplans            |
| Ian Dobrindt        | GLL                 |
| Blair Shoniker      | GLL                 |
| Dale Leadbeater     | GLL                 |
| Steve Usher         | GLL                 |
| Doug Allingham      | TSH                 |
| Brenda Jamieson     | TSH                 |
| Emma Docherty       | TSH                 |

Action By

**PURPOSE:** RAG Meeting #9 to provide a Project status update and review of the evaluation results of the Technically Recommended Route. Also, to provide opportunity for initial comments and questions on the Alternative Methods Documentation.

Action By

## Introductions

### 1.0 Status Update

1.1 D. Allingham began with a short overview of the PIC #3 attendance figures and key concerns raised by attendees.

1.2 D. Remollino explained the assignment of Preliminary Design assignments over three areas noting that the whole project would continue as one but three teams would be responsible for different areas of the TRR design. Each of these areas would be overseen by an MTO Project Manager as follows: The West Mainline (to Ashburn Road) and West Durham Link would involve URS as the prime design consultant and Sabina Merey as MTO Project Manager.

The Central Mainline (from Ashburn Road to Enfield Road) would be overseen by Rita Venneri as MTO Project Manager and TSH would be the prime design consultant.

The East Mainline (from Enfield Road to Highway 35/115) and the East Durham Link would be overseen by Dean Kemper as MTO Project Manager and MRC would be prime design consultant.

D. Remollino explained that the previous functional planning exercises had been undertaken in the same manner by the consultants (divided into three areas) and that TSH would remain as the prime consultant co-ordinating the whole EA.

D. Remollino noted the Project Team reporting relationship that would be established for the consultant and ministry teams and then gave an overview of the revised schedule for completion of the EA and subsequent phases.

The revised schedule recognizes the target for completion of construction by 2013 as was announced as part of the FLOW transit agreement between the Provincial and Federal governments. D. Remollino noted that the 2013 is a target and is still subject to the necessary approvals / permits and property acquisition. . D. Remollino noted that the schedule did not include the period of time for EA review and approval as this cannot be determined by the 407 Project Team.

*What is the difference between Concept Design (as initially proposed) and Preliminary Design?*

Concept Design (CD) is typically 50-60% of what would be done under Preliminary Design (PD). Through CD, the focus would typically be on areas where a CEAA permit would be required. Through PD, the team will now also look at crossing locations, culvert locations, etc. The Team will also look at geometric details and traffic through PD and the process will help identify the proper requirements for the right of way to a high level of detail.

We will be trying to obtain all information for all areas but if necessary we will focus on the high priority areas.

Action By

**2.0** **Alternative Methods Documentation**

I.Dobrindt highlighted the key components of the Alternative Methods Documentation that was distributed, noting that it reviewed the entire process for determining a technically recommended route from the generation of alternatives through the screening, assessment and evaluation.

I.Dobrindt also explained how the supporting documents and appendices to the Alternative Methods Report fed into the discussion of route alternatives and the results associated with each.

**3.0** **Review of Generation, Assessment and Evaluation Methodology**

**3.a** **Screening of Long List of Route Alternatives**

I.Dobrindt gave a brief refresher of the screening process (presented at PIC #2) and the resultant short list before also recapping the evaluation methodology employed to determine a TRR.

*The Reasoned Argument method indicates that rankings were assigned to each route based on their level of effect – are these rankings absolute across the Study Area or comparative within the smaller sections?*

Comparative within the 7 sections the Project Team broke down the Study Area.

**3.b** **Assessment and Evaluation of Short Listed Route Alternatives**

**3.b.i** **Reasoned Argument Approach**

I.Dobrindt proceeded to ‘walk-through’ an example of the evaluation from the confirmation of criteria, indicator and measures to the selection of a TRR.

Specifically he noted that:

- A Table 2a is completed for each route alternative in an area which in:
- Column 1 identifies potential effects
- Column 2 identifies recommended mitigation/compensation/enhancement measures.
- Column 3 identifies the net effects – upon which the route alternatives were ranked.

*Did the respective specialists converse between one another to agree on the significance of the net effects and the definitions of net effects?*

The rankings were first discussed and determined by the natural environment specialists and then discussed at the full Project Team level.

*Where crossings have been identified have you determined if these will be culverts or spans?*

No, we have assumed the worst case scenario for all impacts, in this case spanning. The approach taken was a highly conservative one – the net effects in most instances have been detailed as ‘remains the same’ because until further detail is known regarding the impacts we cannot be sure that the mitigation/enhancement measures will result in any less impact. For example (slide 16) here we note 1 new crossing; regardless of mitigation the end result (net effect) will remain 1 new crossing. The mitigation/enhancement measures will be further developed during preliminary design.

**Action By**

*Do you expect a HADD? (“Harmful Alteration, Disruption or Destruction” of fish habitat).*

It is likely that a HADD will occur. We will eliminate as many as possible but sometimes it is not possible due to topography of an area.

*Have you determined the crossing that will be used in the west at Highway 7?*

No, another item to be determined during the next phase.

*A significant area of the Study Area is within TRCA jurisdiction where the Highway 7 project is also occurring – is there an opportunity for do these projects together?*

Both those studies are currently at the planning level and not the implementation level. Initially (now) we must deal with both separately but during preliminary design we will be looking at both together to see how we can potentially make them work together.

*The Highway 7 and 407 East projects need to be co-ordinated.*

We can do that but we need to have regulatory agency agreement that we can and we also need to ensure that the 407 EA will not be delayed by the Highway 7 Study.

*The changes to the Short List that was presented at PIC #2 were never made public and explained to them. Is this not an issue especially as parts of the technically recommended route are those which were new to the short list?*

The public and all involved agencies, municipalities etc were notified of the changes to the short list in April of 2007. A map was mailed to every resident within the Study Area for the Short List of Route Alternatives which indicated the refinements.

*This should be documented within the report as part of the evaluation process.*

I.Dobrindt continued his walk through of the reasoned argument evaluation approach ending with a general overview of the Table 3’s which present a comparative evaluation of the route alternatives.

**3.b.ii**

B.Jamieson gave an overview of the arithmetic evaluation process indicating that a ‘function form’ was developed for every indicator which translated in the net effects previously determined being represented as a numerical score. B.Jamieson continued noting that indicator scores were then multiplied by their assigned weights, totalled and generated factor scores. The factor scores were then totalled to identify which route scored best.

B.Jamieson highlighted that using this manner allowed you to see where the route differences were numerically. B.Jamieson also noted that the weightings that were used by the Project Team varied by area of the Study Area and that an initial set of weights was used by the Project Team but that a variety of weightings were used – the key being that regardless of weights, if they were always reasonable, the resulting TRR would be the same (the sensitivity analysis).

Action By

*Did the weightings for criteria vary?*

No, they remained the same basic rationale for the natural environment weighting in all scenarios.

*If an indicator was weighted as 0, why was it kept in the method?*

If the specialist felt (and it was agreed) that an indicator had already been captured within other indicators then we did not to assign it another weighting. We also didn't want to remove it as that indicator may have been weighted differently over the 5 basic Study Areas we established. For example, in this instance (slide 24) we have only two routes and there is no difference in an indicators net effect, then weighting it more, less or not at all would not have changed the result.

*How were the basic weightings assigned?*

100 'points' were assigned over the 5 factor areas; factor 'points' were then distributed over the criteria and criteria points' over the indicators. The initial weights were established based on the Project Team knowledge of an area and the specialist input. MTO and consultant team members were involved and the weightings ranged over the five areas under evaluation. B.Jamieson explained the Sensitivity Analysis table (slide 26) noting that the majority of the weight was assigned to the first three factor areas and the Cultural Environment was typically assigned the lowest weight.

*How do the other weightings change when you change a single factor area?*

Proportionately.

**4.0 Overview of Evaluation Results – By Section**

D.Allingham walked through the remainder of the presentation highlighting the Route Alternatives within each area, the primary reasons a route was deemed the TRR; the Reasoned Argument results and the arithmetic analysis results. This material was presented during the previous meeting and the 'primary reasons' are documented within the minutes of that meeting.

*Slide 33:* There was some discussion regarding the accuracy of results presented in the table of arithmetic assessment for the central mainline (and other areas). It is noted that the rankings within the top half of these tables are factor rankings only with an overall ranking provided in the 8<sup>th</sup> row. The bottom half of the table represents overall rankings based on variations of the factor weights.

*The East Mailine TRR – will Highway 35/115 be upgraded to a controlled access freeway?*

Yes – there will be impacts here too, to residents and businesses which we have included in our evaluation. We will look at maintaining or providing alternate access during preliminary design.

*Whitby was proposing development to the east of the West Durham Link based on the previously recommended route – what type of development was being proposed?*

Mainly residential with some commercial/industrial. We are not aware of their plans now that this Study has identified a technically recommended route.

Action By

**5.0**      **Next Steps**

D. Allingham provided a brief update on the next steps to be completed by the Project Team including:

- Review and respond to comments. All comments due by November 16, 07.
- Contact all directly impacted property owners.
- Initiate Preliminary Design.
- Confirm the Technically Recommended Route.
- Continue field investigations and data collection.
- Continue Community Value Plan development.
- Prepare for the next round of PICs (Spring 2008).

There was some general discussion about various items including the EA Study, areas of the technically recommended route, etc. Comments/questions are provided below in italics.

*How can preliminary design be done with the little fieldwork done so far? We haven't been able to comment on the fieldwork done so far.*

More fieldwork will be done through the preliminary design task and a report will be sent to you shortly for review which will document the fieldwork done to date.

*What sort of comments are you looking for? That the work was done as established in the Terms of Reference; that it is acceptable?*

That is the agencies choice and depends on their mandate and focus.

*Where was land use compatibility evaluated?*

Within the land Use and Economic factor.

*How can you explain the Central Mainline choice where under Greenbelt policy you have to show 'no other reasonable alternative' exists yet a route does exist that doesn't impact the Greenbelt areas?*

The Central Mainline routes are not equal, so even though one impacts the Greenbelt, (minimal impacts to the Greenbelt) the other route is not a reasonable alternative for a large portion of the mainline route. There are no viable options that exist outside of the Greenbelt.

*With regards to the access issues that may arise and the local road realignments (especially on highway 35/115), the more information we can have about those the better understanding we will have and the more accurately we could comment.*

We agree. The general rule is to provide alternate access but obviously in some situations that wont be possible. Unfortunately, this is another item that will be better defined as we proceed with preliminary design and consult further with Regional and Municipal staff.

*Access to Ganaraska Forest (off Wilcox Road) will be impacted.*

We will, as noted, have more information about the provision of access to this area during the design phase.

**Action By**

There was some discussion regarding future meetings of the RAG and how this should occur given the accelerated schedule and 'division' of the Study Area. General consensus was that the meetings would continue as they were so that all groups (regardless of their 'geographical area) would hear the same message and this could reduce concerns as they'd be addressed simultaneously.

**The meeting adjourned at approximately 12:00pm**

**END OF MEETING RECORD.**

**-ED**

Distribution:

PT  
RAG  
File

K:\PROJECTS\42-80\_\_\_\80390 407 East\1\_Correspondence\Agencies\RAG\mtg\_9 October 3 2007\RAG Meeting #9 Minutes Oct 3 2007.doc