

---

---

## 407 East Individual Environmental Assessment Community Advisory Group (CAG)

---

---

### MEETING NOTES

#### CAG Member Attendees:

Jim Bate  
Elizabeth Scumovich  
Phil Brown  
Linda Gasser  
Kim Murray  
Libby Racansky  
Adrian Lambert  
Shannon Okeefe-Circelli  
Jeanette Wiles

### CAG Meeting #13

#### Project Team Attendees:

Dan Remollino	MTO
Darlene Proudfoot	MTO
Blair Shoniker	GLL
Brenda Jamieson	TSH
Emma Docherty	TSH

Date: February 20, 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](http://www.407eastea.com)*

## Handouts

- CAG Meeting # 10 Summary
- CAG Meeting # 11 Summary
- CAG Meeting # 12 Summary
- CAG Meeting #13 Presentation Slides

### Slide 3: Planned Agenda

- 1 Status Update
- 2 Comments Received
  - a. Public Comments
  - b. Agency Comments
  - c. Municipal Comments
- 3 Preliminary Design
- 4 EA Study and Schedule
- 5 Next Steps
- 6 Questions / Comments

### Slides 4: Status Update

- B. Jamieson 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:
  - 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 preparation of PIC #3 responses and initiation of field work to support Preliminary Design

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

### Slides 5/6: Public Comments

- B. Jamieson proceeded to highlight the comments typically received from members of the public and the responses the Project Team had developed. B. Jamieson noted that 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.
- D. Remollino noted that approximately 150 public comments had been received and responses were being finalised for distribution.

### Questions/Issues are as follows:

- Are properties impacted by local road realignments and interchanges considered for advanced purchase? How does MTO determine if a property is to be a full purchase?

CAG Meeting #13 – February 20, 2008 – Meeting Notes

- a. Yes. Properties impacted by realignments and interchanges are able to apply for advanced purchase.
  - b. Full acquisitions are typically recommended when a parcel is substantially impacted (considerable amount of property is impacted; where buildings are impacted and entrance is impacted).
  - c. During expropriation MTO can only purchase the land that is needed.
- If a person disagrees with the appraisal of their property what are their options?
    - a. A person who disagrees can get their own appraisal done. If a resolution is not reached then the process would wait until the expropriation process began.
  - The wording within the Property Fact Sheet and the letter sent in November makes the process sound flawed because of the statement ‘an independent appraiser, hired by the Ministry’. Does the Ministry influence the appraisers, isn’t that a conflict of interests?
    - a. The wording was meant to relay that the Ministry would pay the fees of the appraiser. The Ministry does not influence the process followed by the appraiser; each is independent and must complete their work to regulations determined by their qualifying body.
    - b. Ultimately, they are also responsible for defending their work at OMB hearing, if required.
    - c. The Ministry has no influence and only pays the fees.
  - The perception and wording of the letter is important. I know of many people who believe MTO will offer less than market value and this wording doesn’t help that misconception. Also, it is important the appraiser be from or knowledgeable about the area in which they are doing appraisals. Is it possible that people can choose the appraiser from those MTO has on ‘hand’ to help diminish the misconception?
    - a. There is a process that has to be followed with respect to property purchase. MTO will discuss the opportunity for a landowner to ‘choose’ an appraiser with their Property Section. We’ll look to revise wording in the future to remove the misconception – thanks for raising the point.
  - Has any property been purchased?
    - a. Approximately 50 properties were bought based on the Previously Preferred Route of the 1990’s.
    - b. Based on this EA’s Technically Recommended Route approximately 50 properties have applied for advanced purchase.
  - Why is Highway 35/115 not going to be part of the TRR anymore and will the portion of it to be used for the 407 be tolled?
    - a. The 407 extension does not now include upgrades to Highway 35/115 because on the basis of the preliminary design work undertaken to-date it could not be done within the footprint we’d previously shown. To replace it outside of that footprint would have resulted in access issues and created two parallel facilities within the Greenbelt and Oak Ridges Moraine.
    - b. The portion of Highway 35/115 which is being used for 407 is unlikely to be tolled should the decision be made to toll the extension.
  - Through property acquisition and surplus land can MTO create a ‘buffer’ between adjacent land uses and the corridor and is there any opportunity to provide enhancement and compensation to natural features?

- a. Surplus land is typically sold after construction. There may be opportunities to use surplus lands in the ways noted. This will be reviewed/determined through the Impact Assessment report.
- What types of mitigation does MTO typically use?
  - a. Air – Walls and separation
  - b. Noise – walls and plantings
  - c. Light – shields which result in no light trespass
  - d. Stormwater Management – ponds
  - e. The Impact Assessment report will fully document the mitigation to be employed.

### **Slide 7/8/9: Agency Comments**

- B. Jamieson 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:
  - Provincially Significant Wetland Complexes / Lake Iroquois Shoreline
  - Solina Bog
  - Butternut Trees
  - Water – surface / ground / stormwater management and the need for more detail surrounding the mitigation / compensation measures planned to minimize impacts to recharge / discharge areas.
- B. Jamieson also noted comments had been received from a number of agencies who requested more detailed information regarding the Project Team's field work which substantiated the route alternative evaluation.
- B. Jamieson noted that comments were also received requesting more specific information with respect to the impacts.
- 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.
- Lastly, B. Jamieson 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.
- 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 increased traffic on the West Durham Link could result in the need for additional lanes.

### **Questions/Issues are as follows:**

- Agency and municipal comments emphasized the East link and a preference to remove it. How will politics and money be shown as having been irrelevant within the evaluation and that public interest is being put first? Values change (transportation choices etc), the link may be built and then never used.
  - a. The Project Team completed a full evaluation of the 'solution' during the 'Alternatives To' phase. The East link is needed as part of the optimal network for long term planning.

- Is it possible you can get EA approval for the link but recommend it is delayed until necessary and/or new technology is available?
  - a. The EA will include a number of commitments, one of which could be wording to ensure the link is implemented through the best and / or most innovative technology.

### **Slide 10/11/12: Municipal Comments**

- B. Jamieson highlighted typical comments received from municipal staff including:
  - 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.
- B. Jamieson 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.
- B. Jamieson also noted the Project Team agreed generally with the municipal comments and would be:
  - 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
  - Ensuring potential future transit connections would not be precluded
  - Giving further thought to the issue of remnant parcels
- In response to the enquiry regarding the inclusion of Lake Ridge Road and the Highway 401 widening B. Jamieson noted that the 407 design work to date and to be completed would be compatible with implementation of these projects in the future.
- The Highway 401 interchange with Lake Ridge Road and the realignment of Highway 401 associated with the West Durham Link Interchange, including any required auxiliary lanes, are part of the Technically Recommended Route for the 407 East EA. The widening of Highway 401 beyond that required to support the connection of the West Durham Link and Lake Ridge Road Interchanges is not part of the current EA Study.

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

### **Slide 13: Preliminary Design**

- B. Jamieson highlighted the key activities that would be undertaken during preliminary design including review of:
  - Horizontal and vertical profiles (highway and crossing roads)
  - Right-of-way width and cross section
  - Interchange locations and configurations
  - Local road realignments associated with the 407 corridor
  - Mitigation measures, including noise attenuation, landscaping etc

**Questions/Issues are as follows:**

- Transit should be noted in the list of items.
  - a. Thank you. We will be identifying station locations at the next PIC and protecting property for them through this process. However, at this time we don't have a cross-section for the transitway and that will be subject to another preliminary design exercise.
- Will the cross-section for the highway allow for HOV lanes?
  - a. HOV will be recommended to MTO Senior Management and we hope to protect and implement the cross-sections necessary for HOV.
- Will a crossing of 407 at Pebblestone Road be protected for?
  - a. No. There is no approval for a Pebblestone Road extension therefore we will not be protecting for it. It won't be precluded though.

**Slide 14: Route Refinements**

- B. Jamieson highlighted general areas where the Project Team were exploring route refinements to further mitigate or avoid impacts.
- Results of these refinements would be documented and shared with advisory groups as the process continued and the Project Team completed their work.

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

**Slide 15: Preliminary Design Alternatives**

- B. Jamieson noted that alternative preliminary designs would be generated, assessed and comparatively evaluated where feasible and warranted. B. Jamieson noted that alternative preliminary designs may be considered to reduce impacts via alternative:
  - Vertical alignments of the corridor and crossing roads
  - Interchange locations and configurations
  - Crossing road treatments (over, under, close)
  - Local road realignments

**Questions/Issues are as follows:**

- It should be noted that preliminary design will include the development of mitigation (etc) measures.
- Transit station locations / car pool lots; Commercial Vehicle Inspection Stations (CVIS); Patrol / maintenance yards (highway and transitway facilities); Stormwater management ponds; Watercourse crossing treatments should all be noted in the list of items. Will service centres be looked at?
  - a. Thank you. Service centres will not be looked at.
- Will the transitway be high speed rail?
  - a. We will not be looking at the transit type to make use of the transitway. We are protecting enough property to facilitate higher order transit, such as light rail to be implemented in the future.

### **Slide 16: Community Value Plan (CVP)**

- B. Jamieson 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.
- B. Jamieson 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. The Project Team anticipates the first session to be held late March or early April.

### **Questions/Issues are as follows:**

- There was a lot of discussion surrounding the CVP with a lot of beneficial comments and feedback provided by the CAG members. In agreement with the CAG comments, the Project Team will be delaying the initial session regarding the CVP until immediately before or immediately after the PICs scheduled for late Spring.

### **Slide 17: EA Study Schedule**

- The general Study Schedule was displayed and B. Jamieson highlighted the time and tasks the Project Team were currently working in to achieve PIC #4 scheduled for late Spring 2008.

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

### **Slide 18: Next Steps**

- B. Jamieson 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:
  - Issuing response letters to PIC #3 comments
  - 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:
    - 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

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

**Slide 19: Question / Comments**

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

**Adjourn – 9:00 PM**