
407 East Individual Environmental Assessment Community Advisory Group (CAG)

MEETING NOTES

CAG Member Attendees:

Adrian Lambert
Ralph McKay
Raymond Minard
Shannon Okeefe-Circelli
Libby Racansky
Elizabeth Shumovich
Bradford Soles
Mike Wilson
Kim Murray
Ted Watson – DAAC

CAG Meeting #15

Project Team Attendees:

Dan Remollino MTO
Darlene Proudfoot MTO
Dean Kemper MTO
Blair Shoniker GLL
Brenda Jamieson TSH
Doug Allingham TSH
Emma Docherty TSH

Date: November 19, 2008
Location: TSH Whitby
Cafeteria
Time: 7:00 – 9:00 PM

The presentation made by the Project Team is available for download at www.407eastea.com

Handouts

- CAG Meeting #14 Summary
- CAG Meeting #15 Agenda
- CAG Meeting #15 Presentation Slides

Slide 2 - 4: Agenda and Study Update

- B. Jamieson reviewed the meeting agenda and provided a quick overview of the recent and upcoming tasks associated with the Study.
- Recent and upcoming activities were noted as:
 - Initiation of preliminary design for the Technically Preferred Route (TPR) (June/July 2008) and fieldwork to support the preliminary design and upcoming impact assessment work
 - Identification, assessment and evaluation of Preliminary Design refinements and alternatives (February through June 2008)
 - Presentation of Technically Preferred Route (TPR) at PIC #4 (June/July 2008)
 - Contacted and offered to meet with all directly impacted property owner (November 2008) and issued Newsletter #7 to provide an update on the Study

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

Slides 5 - 17: PIC #4 / Technically Preferred Route (TPR) / Crossing Road Summary

- Brenda noted that the CAG had not met since before PIC #4 and presented a brief overview of the PICs noting that they had been held at the typical 5 locations throughout Durham; that approximately 700 people attended and roughly 90 individual comments were submitted.
- Brenda commented that a majority of the comments that had been submitted were focused on individual property impacts, concerns/comments regarding the proposed road closures and a variety of positive comments on the material and personnel who'd attended on behalf of the Project Team. Brenda also noted that a number of people had requested more information and/or consideration of wildlife crossings.
- Brenda provided a 'key facts' summary of the crossing road recommendations for the 407 corridor, notably;
 - Number of Crossing Roads:

MTO Jurisdiction	4
Regional Jurisdiction	13
Local Jurisdiction	48
Total	65
 - Number of Arterial Road Interchanges:

West/Central sections	15
East section	4
 - Number of Overpasses/Underpasses:

West/Central sections	16
East section	15

- Number of Road Closures:

West/Central sections	8
East section	7

- An overview of the TPR in greater detail was provided, highlighting areas where changes had been made in response to comments received through PIC #4. Specifically Brenda noted changes to:
 - West Mainline
 1. Corridor shifted south just east of Brock Road to reduce business impacts
 2. Crossing at Sideline 14 added
 3. Alternate site for maintenance facility under review in area of Salem Road
 4. Transitway maintenance facility confirmed in south-west quadrant at Lake Ridge Road
 5. Crossing at Kinsale Road added
 6. Ashburn Road and Coronation Road now cross 407 on existing alignments

 - Central Mainline
 1. Interchange at Thornton Road added
 2. Transitway maintenance yard sited in south-east quadrant at Simcoe Street

 - East Mainline
 1. Realignment to the west of Solina Road
 2. Highway maintenance yard sited in north-west quadrant at Regional Road 57
 3. Refined ramp and transitway station configuration at Regional Road 57
 4. Commercial vehicle Inspection Facility (CVIF) located on north side of corridor near Acres Road
 5. Alternative access for land locked parcels on north side of the corridor under review

 - West Durham Link
 1. Minor northern shift of Commercial vehicle Lay-bys
 2. Coronation Road realignment defined (subject to review by the Town)

 - East Durham Link
 1. Improved definition of Commercial Vehicle Lay-by and associated land requirements
 2. Improved (direct) access to Holt Road from the East Durham Link – interchange upgrading discussions involving OPG and MTO ongoing

- Brenda also noted that GO Transit were undertaking a feasibility study to determine if improved service to the Bowmanville area could be provided on the CP or CN lines within the Study Area.

- Lastly, Brenda pointed out that stormwater management ponds were still to be identified. It was noted that ponds would be included within the right-of-way where possible but in some locations would result in increased property requirements.

Questions/Issues are as follows:

- What does protect mean? As in, protection for a transitway station?
 - a. Protection means we will be seeking EA Approval for it and purchasing the land. Transitway stations for example would be included in the right-of-way we seek to get approval for; the land would be purchased by MTO and it would then be protected and available for future use (when needed). Similarly the highway corridor will be protected for 10 lanes in the west section but 10 lanes may not be needed until 2021. With what we are seeking for EA approval, the land for 10 lanes will be protected.

Slide 18: Property Requirements / Acquisition Process

- Brenda noted that Property Owner Information Sessions, similar to those held previously in May of 2008, were scheduled for November 24 and 27. Brenda highlighted the intent of the meetings was to ensure people were accurately informed about direct impacts to property and options including the amicable purchase process.

Questions/Issues are as follows:

- How many MTO owned properties are there?
 - a. About 60/70 properties were owned by MTO at the start of the Study. Approximately 100 property owners have agreed to the amicable purchase process.
- Are there people who don't want to talk to MTO about this, and have come out and said so?
 - a. Yes there are a few people who have returned / declined our mailings and or have indicated they have no desire to speak with us.

Slide 19 - 21: Watercourse Crossings / Impact Assessment

- Brenda provided a brief overview of the number of watercourse crossings and noted that through monthly meetings with MNR, DFO and the Conservation Authorities, the Project team was identifying the requirements at each crossing (bridge versus culvert and appropriate size).
- Blair Shoniker then spoke to the Impact Assessment work that was to be undertaken highlighting that each discipline would prepare a report to document the impacts of the TPR, the mitigation measures to be applied and the residual effects of the opf the corridor. Blair touched on some other materials that would be included within the Impact Assessment reports and then detailed how the disciplines would structure the reports so as to compliment the 'factor areas' of evaluation used during the Alternative Methods phase.

Questions/Issues are as follows:

- The agencies previously raised a number of comments on how the impacts of the TPR were documented – does the Impact Assessment work include their comments?
 - a. Yes – those comments will be taken into consideration during the Impact Assessment reporting. Those comments were related to previous phases of

work and the agencies desire to see the material which documented the impacts of the corridor which the Impact Assessment work will do.

- How much fieldwork has been done?
 - a. Fieldwork was undertaken from 2005 to 2008 during different seasons.
- I saw somewhere that 52 wells may be impacted by the proximity of the TPR – what will happen to those / how will you make sure they are not impacted and fixed if they are?
 - a. A monitoring program will be implemented (and committed to within the EA) which will monitor a number of wells before, during and after construction. If it is found that the TPR impacts those wells, then a mitigation (typically compensation/relocation) plan will be determined.

Slide 22 – 25: CEAA Process

- Blair noted that the 407 Study would be proceeding as a Screening level assessment within the CEAA Process because of the scope of the project, as determined by the responsible authorities (RAs).
- Blair also noted that the Notice of Commencement was posted on the CEAA Registry which highlighted the scope of assessment for the CEAA process as:
 - Federal Lands
 - Navigable Waters and HADDs (Harmful Alteration, Disturbance or Destruction of fish habitat)
- Blair highlighted the Impact Assessment reports again and noted that the assessment needed for the CEAA process would be documented in these reports as well as incorporated into a separate CEAA Screening Report.
- Blair outlined the requirements of the CEAA process highlighting that a cumulative effects assessment would be completed:
 - On a watershed basis
 - On both renewable and non-renewable resources
 - To include consideration of other projects in the broader study area
- Lastly, Blair highlighted the various projects (as defined by the scope of assessment under CEAA) explaining that each project was focused on federal interests in the broader Study Area mainly occurring in areas of potential HADDs and navigable waters.

Questions/Issues are as follows:

- How can cumulative effects assessment be completed on a watershed basis if no watershed plan has been created?
 - a. The assessment doesn't require a watershed plan. The assessment will be based on expert analysis of the watershed, other projects in the area and the federal requirements / criteria. The Cumulative effects are based specifically on federal interests like navigable waters, HADDs and federal land.

Slide 26 - 33: Community Value Plan (CVP)

- Brenda provided an overview of the CVP process, noting that approximately 40 people attended each workshop and that the process generally had included:

- Workshop # 1 – identification of community values and the features which reflected these values
- Workshop #2 – initial mitigation / enhancement measures to the features / values to retain them (straw models)
- Workshop #3 - the recommended CVP to be presented at PIC #5 for review and comment.
- The CVP process was implemented using a number of visualisations of the methods (straw models) and resulting mitigation / enhancement measures developed through the CVP process.

Questions/Issues are as follows:

- Why is agriculture not listed as a feature?
 - a. The CVP process is not particularly applicable to agriculture. We had information sessions and other opportunities to speak with the agricultural community to identify mitigation / enhancement measures and the concerns raised during these times would not have been mitigated or enhanced through the CVP.
- Will agriculture be added to this process when used in the future (for other projects)?
 - a. The process has recognized the impacts to agriculture and has used other means to try and address those impacts where possible. There will be future consideration for the use of remnant parcels by agricultural operations yet that is also difficult to ‘apply’ within the CVP process.
- The process should be used at the beginning of a Study and not the end.
 - a. Comment noted.
- Will the EA include a commitment for the measures recommended through the CVP?
 - a. Yes, the EA will include a commitment for the measures recommended and where the measures are recommended.
- Will the EA include a commitment for the transitway?
 - a. The EA will seek protection for the transitway, it will not include a commitment for when the transitway would be implemented as that is unknown. Commitments will be included recognizing opportunities to use parts of the transitway for commuter lots, GO interfacing etc.
- Only 3 wildlife crossings have been recommended for the whole corridor?
 - a. Three wildlife crossings have been recommended specifically as CVP measures. There are 82 other crossings of watercourses, most of which allow wildlife passage.

Slide 34 - 35: Study Schedule and Next Steps

- Brenda noted that the next CAG meeting could be held as a walkabout session with attendees able to review the PIC #5 materials, including the Preliminary Design plans and Recommended Community Value Plan (participants were in agreement with this approach).
- Brenda also touched on the next steps for the Project Team indicating that a number of activities would be completed in time for the approaching PIC (#5 in January) including:

- Proceed with preliminary design activities for Technically Preferred Route (TPR)
- Meet with directly impacted property owners
- Continue to consult with stakeholders including Municipal staff and the public
- Finalize the Technically Preferred Route and the location of support facilities, including transitway stations, maintenance/patrol yards and commercial vehicle inspection facilities
- Complete the impact assessment for the Recommended Design
- Identify mitigation and compensation measures for the Recommended Design
- Meet with Advisory Groups, communities, other stakeholders, etc.
- Prepare for the next round of PICs
- Anticipated EA submission June 2009
- Continue with Federal (CEAA) process; concurrently with provincial EA

Questions/Issues are as follows:

- Will there be any CAG meetings or involvement after PIC #5?
 - a. We may hold a meeting after PIC #5 to summarize that round, it depends on the comments we receive and how they influence the Study. Otherwise we are planning on having meetings when the pre-submission / draft EA report is prepared to get your feedback on the material.
- Can a CEAA representative attend the next CAG meeting?
 - a. We will ask if anyone can attend on behalf of the federal team. Representatives of the federal team will be attending the PICs to answer any CEAA related questions.

Adjourn – 9:00 PM