



Project:	<u>407 East Environmental Assessment & Preliminary Design</u>	Meeting Report No.:	12
	<u>Joint Advisory Group Meeting #12</u>	Meeting Date:	November 19, 2008
TSH No.:	42-80390	Meeting Time:	1:30 PM
Recorder:	E. Docherty	Report Date:	April 15, 2009

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.

Note: Comments and or questions put forth by members of the Advisory Groups are in italics with the response directly below.

Location: Durham Region Headquarters, Lower Level Meeting Room

Present:	<u>Agency Staff</u>	<u>Municipal Staff</u>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Anthony DiPietro, Durham Health Department ▪ Jane Tymoshuk, DFO ▪ Rob Hersey, CLOCA ▪ Leah Chishimba, TRCA ▪ Laura Richards, TRCA ▪ Megan Belore, MNR ▪ Jeff Bateman, GO Transit ▪ Mike Kim, OGS – MPIR (tele) ▪ Mike Shaw, Env. Canada (tele) ▪ Steve Strong, MNR ▪ Jim Chan, CEAA ▪ Greg Wells, GRCA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Angela Gibson, Ajax ▪ Larry Cavanagh, Whitby ▪ Greg Hardy, Whitby ▪ Ed Belsey, Whitby ▪ Evan Rodgers, Oshawa ▪ Kashif Shaikh, Pickering ▪ Richard Holborn, Pickering ▪ Steve Gaunt, Pickering ▪ Paul Gee, Durham ▪ Chris Leitch, Durham ▪ Amanda Spencer, Durham ▪ Steve Mayhew, Durham ▪ Paul Acquah, Dillon on behalf of Clarington ▪ Janice Szwarc, Clarington
407 Project Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Dan Remollino, MTO ▪ Dean Kemper, MTO ▪ Sabina Mérey, MTO ▪ Rita Venneri, MTO ▪ Darlene Proudfoot, MTO 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Blair Shoniker, GLL ▪ Karen Cooper, URS ▪ Brent Gotts, MRC ▪ Brenda Jamieson, TSH ▪ Emma Docherty, TSH

Purpose: To provide both Advisory Groups with a status update on the Study's recent work and schedule in preparation for Public Information Centre #5, scheduled for the end of January/beginning of February.

**Comments and questions asked during the presentation are noted in italics with Project Team responses immediately below.*

Item No.	Description	Action By
<u>1.0</u>	<u>Introductions</u>	
<u>2.0</u>	<u>Agenda & Status Update</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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) 	Info

Item No.	Description	Action By																				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contacted and offered to meet with all directly impacted property owner (November 2008) and issued Newsletter #7 to provide an update on the Study 																					
3.0	<u>PIC #4 Summary</u>																					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Brenda noted that the JAG 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 indicated 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. 	Info																				
4.0	<u>Technically Preferred Route (TPR) / Crossing Road Summary</u>																					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Brenda provided a 'key facts' summary of the crossing road recommendations for the 407 corridor, notably; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of Crossing Roads: <table data-bbox="548 846 951 961"> <tr><td>MTO Jurisdiction</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>Regional Jurisdiction</td><td>13</td></tr> <tr><td>Local Jurisdiction</td><td>48</td></tr> <tr><td>Total</td><td>65</td></tr> </table> • Number of Arterial Road Interchanges: <table data-bbox="548 999 951 1056"> <tr><td>West/Central sections</td><td>15</td></tr> <tr><td>East section</td><td>4</td></tr> </table> • Number of Overpasses/Underpasses: <table data-bbox="548 1094 951 1150"> <tr><td>West/Central sections</td><td>16</td></tr> <tr><td>East section</td><td>15</td></tr> </table> • Number of Road Closures: <table data-bbox="548 1188 951 1245"> <tr><td>West/Central sections</td><td>8</td></tr> <tr><td>East section</td><td>7</td></tr> </table> 	MTO Jurisdiction	4	Regional Jurisdiction	13	Local Jurisdiction	48	Total	65	West/Central sections	15	East section	4	West/Central sections	16	East section	15	West/Central sections	8	East section	7	Info
MTO Jurisdiction	4																					
Regional Jurisdiction	13																					
Local Jurisdiction	48																					
Total	65																					
West/Central sections	15																					
East section	4																					
West/Central sections	16																					
East section	15																					
West/Central sections	8																					
East section	7																					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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: 	Info																				
4.1	<u>West Mainline</u>	Info																				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corridor shifted south just east of Brock Road to reduce business impacts • Crossing at Sideline 14 added • Alternate site for maintenance facility under review in area of Salem Road • Transitway maintenance facility confirmed in south-west quadrant at Lake Ridge Road • Crossing at Kinsale Road added • Ashburn Road and Coronation Road now cross 407 on existing alignments 																					
	<p><i>Are two maintenance facilities for the transitway needed?</i> Yes, during implementation if there is a need for one then only one will be used. Based on existing knowledge at this time, two are preferred.</p>																					
4.2	<u>Central Mainline</u>	Info																				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interchange at Thornton Road added • Transitway maintenance yard sited in south-east quadrant at Simcoe Street 																					

Item No.	Description	Action By
4.3	<u>East Mainline</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Realignment to the west of Solina Road• Highway maintenance yard sited in north-west quadrant at Regional Road 57• Refined ramp and transitway station configuration at Regional Road 57• Commercial vehicle Inspection Facility (CVIF) located on north side of corridor near Acres Road• Alternative access for land locked parcels on north side of the corridor under review	Info
4.4	<u>West Durham Link</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Minor northern shift of Commercial vehicle Lay-bys• Coronation Road realignment defined (subject to review by the Town)	Info
4.5	<u>East Durham Link</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Improved definition of Commercial Vehicle Lay-by and associated land requirements• Improved (direct) access to Holt Road from the East Durham Link – interchange upgrading discussions involving OPG and MTO ongoing. <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ 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 already in place. <i>Would the cheapest option be to realign the CP rail line?</i> We couldn't say. The existing rail lines work with the freeway-to freeway interchange we have proposed. <i>Will commuter parking lots also be added to the corridor?</i> Commuter parking is included within the station footprints we have identified. There will likely be an opportunity to use stations for commuter parking only or as an interface with GO/local transit until the transitway is implemented.	Info
5.0	<u>Property Requirements / Acquisition Process</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ 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. <i>Have you identified where signalised interchanges will be required yet?</i> Not yet though it will be done. We anticipate that certain 'triggers' will highlight where signals are obviously going to be required and others we will work through. We anticipate that signals are going to be required in larger numbers through the west and central portions of the study area.	Info
6.0	<u>Watercourse Crossings / Impact Assessment</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ 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. <i>How are you dealing with tenants on private land?</i> We have encountered tenants only when conducting fieldwork, we are dealing primarily with the property owners and cannot ensure they inform tenants of the Study.	Info

Item No.	Description	Action By
----------	-------------	-----------

Have you reviewed valley features and the access requirements/restrictions for construction?

We are working through determining where access may be obtained and identifying the impacts on the feature and the surrounding lands. Further review will be completed in a 'constructability' review.

Is each watercourse report being approved by the agencies?

Each watercourse is being documented and includes information on the hydrotechnical, geomorphology, fisheries, natural features, wildlife, recreational trails etc. We are not looking for approval for each document; rather we're hoping to get a blanket approval for the approach and recommendations we are making. More work will be required in subsequent phases of design, for example HADD's will require permits.

- 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 corridor. Blair outlined 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.

7.0

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). Info
- 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. Info
- 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.

How will the displacement of federal lands be accounted for?

We are still working through the process of the Impact Assessment but the taking of federal lands will be captured much in the same way as municipal land displacement was captured in the Alternative Methods evaluation. We're aware of the impacts to federal lands and the additional impacts to Pickering's plans for a recreational area and this will be captured and mitigated in the Impact Assessment details.

Will operational effects, e.g. salt spraying, be captured in the evaluation?

If the effects fall within the study areas identified for the federal purpose then the impacts will be documented for information but for those types of operational effects, there are guidelines in place to ensure there are no effects.

Is a separate CEAA report being prepared?

Yes a separate CEAA Screening Report is being prepared which will rely / refer to the Provincial EA report where there is duplication. Complete and thorough sections will be drafted for the CEAA Screening Report for federal requirements unique to that process.

Item No.	Description	Action By
8.0	<p data-bbox="347 281 699 310"><u>Community Value Plan (CVP)</u></p> <ul data-bbox="347 321 1258 659" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="347 321 1258 380">▪ Brenda provided an overview of the CVP process, noting that approximately 40 people attended each workshop and that the process generally had included:<ul data-bbox="375 384 1224 569" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="375 384 1224 443">• Workshop # 1 – identification of community values and the features which reflected these values<li data-bbox="375 447 1224 506">• Workshop #2 – initial mitigation / enhancement measures to the features / values to retain them (straw models)<li data-bbox="375 510 1224 569">• Workshop #3 - the recommended CVP to be presented at PIC #5 for review and comment.<li data-bbox="347 573 1258 659">▪ The process was implemented using a number of visualisations of the methods (straw models) and resulting mitigation / enhancement measures developed through the CVP process. <p data-bbox="347 663 911 693"><i>Is there still an opportunity to comment on the CVP?</i></p> <p data-bbox="347 697 1258 751">Yes. The CVP will be presented as part of the PIC #5 materials for review and comment.</p> <p data-bbox="347 756 1258 810"><i>Was representation even throughout the study area? There seem to be no focused 'straw models' for the Pickering area.</i></p> <p data-bbox="347 814 1258 903">Though measures aren't identified specifically for the Pickering area, the measures that were identified can be applied at various locations along the corridor. The workshop summaries and presentations are available on the project website.</p> <p data-bbox="347 907 862 936"><i>Will the CVP measures be presented to council?</i></p> <p data-bbox="347 940 1258 995">We will be working with municipal staff for the most part but when we present to council, after the PICs, the CVP measures will be included in that material.</p> <p data-bbox="347 999 888 1029"><i>Was anything extraordinary or strange suggested?</i></p> <p data-bbox="347 1033 1258 1121">Not CVP measure related, there were some suggestions regarding users of the highway, only allowing hybrids or free travel for some types of vehicles and though those are valid suggestions the difficulty with them is implementation.</p> <p data-bbox="347 1125 997 1155"><i>Will colour be used for some of the architectural treatments?</i></p> <p data-bbox="347 1159 1258 1213">Potentially at some locations though consideration of climate and operations will be needed.</p> <p data-bbox="347 1218 1258 1272"><i>Will MTO determine the locations and will it be the responsibility of the municipalities to build them?</i></p> <p data-bbox="347 1276 1258 1390">The measures will be built as part of the 407 corridor and in consultation with municipal staff. We will be discussing the measures later in the Study and during subsequent phases of design with respect to needed regarding maintenance, cost sharing etc.</p> <p data-bbox="347 1394 1203 1423"><i>Have noise walls been recommended as a mitigation measure through the CVP?</i></p> <p data-bbox="347 1428 1182 1482">Noise walls have been recommended at a few key locations based on the noise impact assessment work.</p> <p data-bbox="347 1486 1218 1541"><i>What happens if development is planned beside the corridor and no measures are recommended?</i></p> <p data-bbox="347 1545 1221 1600">If development is to occur on land beside the corridor the developer is responsible for providing mitigation for that piece of land.</p> <p data-bbox="347 1604 1078 1633"><i>Will the transitway be landscaped or enhanced with CVP measures?</i></p> <p data-bbox="347 1638 1250 1694">Landscaping and mitigation for the transitway will be determined during preliminary design for that piece of the corridor.</p>	Info

9.0

Study Schedule and Next Steps

Info

- Brenda noted that the next JAG 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

Has a traffic impact study been done?

Details regarding traffic for opening day (2013) and 2031 have been prepared and shared with municipalities. Some more detailed work is ongoing and will be available for review in December.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:30pm

END OF MEETING RECORD.

Distribution Attendees
: Regrets
File