
**407 East Individual Environmental Assessment
& Preliminary Design Study**

Community Value Plan (CVP)

**Workshop #3
Recommended Community Value Plan**

Summary

Date: November 15, 2008
Location: St George's Heritage Building
38 Lviv Boulevard, Oshawa

Workshop #3 Attendees (9:30 am – 12:00 pm)

<i>Murray & Anne Ball</i>	<i>Susan Bullard</i>
<i>Jean-Maurice Cormier</i>	<i>Dan Dzikewicz</i>
<i>Linda Gasser</i>	<i>David Horbay</i>
<i>Syd Howes</i>	<i>Ruth McCurdy</i>
<i>Joanne McFarland</i>	<i>John & Barbara Montague</i>
<i>Stan Norrish</i>	<i>Ed Oegema</i>
<i>Trudy Paashuis</i>	<i>Pat Johnston</i>
<i>Bill Paterson</i>	<i>Libby Racansky</i>
<i>Susanne Richards</i>	<i>Lisa Robinson</i>
<i>Cindy Shaddy</i>	<i>Oleh & Roberta Stasyszyn</i>
<i>Diane Stephen</i>	<i>Jim Sullivan</i>
<i>Victor Suppan</i>	

Questions raised during the workshop that were general in nature and not specific to the CVP Workshop / process are documented at the end of this summary.

Project Team Attendees:

<i>Dan Remollino – MTO</i>	<i>Ian Dobrindt – AECOM</i>
<i>Dean Kemper – MTO</i>	<i>Brent Gotts – MRC</i>
<i>Rita Venneri – MTO</i>	<i>Jim Dowell - MRC</i>
<i>Sabina Mérey - MTO</i>	<i>Shannon Baker – Ecoplans</i>
<i>Darlene Proudfoot – MTO</i>	<i>Doug Allingham – AECOM</i>
<i>Heide Garbot - MTO</i>	<i>Brenda Jamieson – AECOM</i>
<i>Natalie Roskouv – MTO</i>	<i>Mike Hubicki - AECOM</i>
<i>Blair Shoniker – AECOM</i>	<i>Emma Docherty – AECOM</i>

Facilitated by Glenn Pothier, GLPi

After a quick round of introductions, Glenn provided an overview of his role as facilitator and Workshop # 3 agenda.

Agenda – Session Overview (Slide 2)

Mike Hubicki began the presentation, highlighting the agenda to be covered and noting that a majority of the workshop would be undertaken as a walkabout session where participants could provide feedback with respect to the Community Value Plan (CVP) measures developed thus far.

Mike noted that the agenda included a general overview of the previous Workshops and the information obtained at those workshops. Mike then highlighted that the CVP measures developed to date were examples of the measures to be recommended at applicable locations generated through previous workshops.

Identified Community Values & Features (Slides 3 & 4)

At workshop # 1 it was noted that participants were asked to identify their community values. Mike gave a quick overview of the values that were identified, touching on a number of the values listed below.

- The features which reflect these values
- Rural Living / Character
- Green Spaces / Open Spaces / Parks
- Accessibility
 - Pedestrian Access (to / between communities)
 - Auto & Equipment Access
 - Access to Highway
- Recreational Opportunities (trails / paths)
- History, Tradition & the Past
- Small Town / Close Knit Feel
- Places of Personal / Historical Significance
- Aesthetics / Views - the landscape generally
- Wildlife & Nature
- Air Quality
- Human Health
- Water Quality / Wells
- Agriculture
- Safety
- Tranquility / Peace & Quiet

A number of features were key to the community and had also been identified with regards to retaining the previously mentioned values. Mike highlighted these features (as listed below) and reminded participants how these features had been recorded directly to mapping of the Technically Preferred Route (TPR) for documentation and inclusion in the CVP process.

- Visual Impacts
- Wildlife Corridors, Crossings & Habitat
- Recreational Trails
- Oak Ridges Moraine
- Flooding, Snow Drifts & Fog
- Community / Agricultural Access
- Lighting
- Groundwater
- Water Protection / Wells / Salt Impacts
- Heritage & Historic Buildings / Features
- Incorporation / Preservation of Community Character
- Air / Noise

Workshop #2 Highlights (Slides 5 - 9)

In identifying these values and features, a number of common geographical areas of interest had emerged. Mike reminded participants of the purpose of Workshop #2 and highlighted the ‘straw models’ that had been generated using the ‘tool kit’ of enhancement measures.

Mitigation / Enhancement Measures (Slide 10)

Mike explained how the Project Team had used the information that was shared with them at the first two Workshops to develop mitigation and enhancement measures based on a number of ‘themes’ (listed below).

- Universal Measures
- Landscape Screening
- Gateway
- Architecture
- Local Heritage
- Wildlife Crossings
- Wetland Restoration

Mike indicated that the renderings and details of each themed measure were available for review during the walkabout session. In addition, the measures that had been generated could be applied to all applicable geographic areas where a feature / value had been identified.

Universal Measures (Slides 11 – 13)

Mike highlighted the comments and feedback participants had provided and presented how the project team’s expertise had been applied to the values and features and enhancement / mitigation measures that were developed.

For Universal measures, a variety of values / features could be maintained along the entire TPR by applying simple measures such as planting and slope grading which can result in improvements to snow drifting, noise attenuation, visual buffering, etc.

Landscape Screening (Slide 14)

Using the Almond Village location, it was demonstrated how landscaping can be used to provide a screening effect for aesthetics as well as provide sound and visual mitigation.

Gateway, Architecture & Local Heritage Treatments (Slides 15 - 19)

The Brooklin area was one example where the gateway, architecture and local heritage treatments could be used. Mike noted how the heritage of a community could be applied to infrastructure. Gateway treatments could include plantings to screen neighbouring lands and structures could be enhanced to reflect the character of a community.

Another example was the Hampton Area and the crossing of Old Scugog Road by the TPR. Measures had been developed to protect, incorporate or buffer existing heritage features. Also there was potential to incorporate the theme of a heritage feature within the TPR and associated infrastructure and within other enhancement measures, e.g. gateway treatments.

Wildlife Crossing & Wetland Restoration (Slides 20 – 24)

Throughout the transportation corridor, structures are being designed to facilitate wildlife movement at the watercourse crossings. At other locations, structures have been proposed to accommodate wildlife passage specifically for that purpose.

Measures such as plantings for food and cover, fencing type and edge management were developed to improve wildlife movement.

Areas for wetland restoration will be considered in appropriate areas depending on the availability of surplus land and in consultation with regulatory agencies. Where such opportunities may occur, restoration would be recommended in consideration of agricultural uses, using salt tolerant species to buffer wetland areas, possible recreational uses and development of natural succession.

Walkabout Rotations

After the presentation, participants were given the opportunity to ask questions and then were directed to look at the panels and posters displayed around the room. The panels which presented the CVP measures and the site specific examples the project team had generated. Participants were asked to comment on the examples presented and also invited to suggest additional locations where measures could be considered.

Next Steps (Slide 26)

The CVP would then be finalized in consideration of the comments and feedback received through the PICs. The CVP process would be documented and the recommendations incorporated to the Environmental Assessment Report.

Newsletter (Issue #7) would shortly be distributed to all members of the mailing list. Impacted property owners had recently been contacted and invited to meet with the project team to discuss any questions or concerns they may have.

PIC #5 was confirmed for the last week of January 2009 and the first week of February 2009.

Open Forum (Slide 27)

During the open forum, the Project Team requested feedback on the CVP process and approach. Essentially, the Ministry was interested in opinions about how well the process went and if participants felt the process was successful and worthy of being undertaken for future projects. A questionnaire was distributed for people to provide further comments and overall rankings of particular aspects of the process. The results of the questionnaire are documented in Appendix C of this document.

When asked if the process was valuable and should be used on other projects, the clear response from participants was **YES**.

Verbal comments received during the open forum session are noted below.

- I am quite impressed with the input we've been able to give and how it has been used. However, there is one big but in terms of how this CVP process and results will be carried through to construction.
- I appreciated the professionalism, accuracy and honesty that our comments and input have been given.
- I commend the group for the work done through the CVP. You could tell they felt a sense of urgency to get our feedback and incorporate it to their work.
- Can we have some Study Area photographs for our workbook?

Questions are documented in Appendix A, Comments and additional site suggestions are documented in Appendix B. Appendix C presents participant feedback on the CVP process.

Referring specifically to the CVP process, Brenda Jamieson noted that the next steps for the project team would be to develop the recommended CVP and to present it for comment at the upcoming Public Information Centres (PIC #5).

Appendix A
Questions & Comments Raised During Workshop #3

Question 1. The route should be north of Brooklin because of the social impacts (noise, air etc) that will effect residents in south Brooklin. How can I make this comment as I understand it's not an item for CVP meetings?

Response. Comments are encouraged and welcome at any time via mail, comment sheet, phone call, website or email and can be submitted at anytime during the process, right up until the EA report is approved.

Question 2. Will the whole route be lit? Can we influence where lighting will be put in place?

Response. The lighting needs are likely going to be similar to what is in place on the existing 407 highway with lighting initially provided at interchange locations and significant structures only. Lighting requirements are based on a 'warrant' system which takes safety into consideration.

Question 3. What measures will be used to ensure culverts don't flood?

Response. Drainage and hydraulic analysis has been undertaken to ensure that the culverts are sized appropriately for a variety of rainfall/storm events.

Question 4. Why is the East Durham Link and the CVP needed?

Response. There is no connection between the two – the need for the link and the CVP process have no direct correlation. We can discuss the need for the East Durham Link offline if desirable. There are also a number of previously prepared materials on the website which demonstrate and document the need for the East Link.

Question 5. Will poplar trees be used to encourage other trees to grow?

Response. Yes.

Question 6. Why weren't municipal staff invited to participate? Will municipal policies be taken into consideration in the CVP recommendations?

Response. The CVP is intended to be and has been entirely community focused. Municipal staff also have other avenues through which to participate and provide input to the Study in general and the CVP process.

Municipal policies and staff comments and recommendations will be taken into consideration.

Question 7. How will the disparity (\$) and consistency between the municipalities be addressed?

Response. The Ministry will try to ensure fairness and consistency in its CVP recommendations where measures are within the corridor. Measures implemented outside the corridor (on municipal lands etc) will be the responsibility of the municipality or assigned group as the Ministry can't control land use in these areas; hence the need to consult with municipal staff.

Question 8. What does ‘directly impacted’ mean when referring to property and how can I get answers on other issues (outside the CVP)?

Response. Directly impacted refers to a property that is impacted by the technically preferred route right-of-way, either by the need for the ministry to purchase some land or by the property’s access being impacted in some way.

Answers on other issues can be obtained via the Project website, our email address or phone number. We can provide business cards to those who would like them today.

Question 9. What has been MNR’s involvement in this Study? I was commenting on stream crossings with regard to the CVP materials, I would hope MNR would have comments and input to these matters also.

Response. MNR staffs have been involved in the Study from its outset. They are participants in our Regulatory Advisory Group and for the past year we have been meeting with them once a month regarding streams, fisheries, etc. These meetings also involve the Conservation Authorities and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans.

Question 10. We are all aware of the current climate regarding CO2 impacts and efforts to reduce emissions. Would it be possible to restrict use of the extension to vehicles which result in no CO2 emissions? Or, if the road is tolled could a discount be given to those who use these vehicles? Could this be a recommendation within the EA report?

Response. We appreciate your comments. No such recommendations will be made within the EA report. We don’t know if the 407 corridor will be tolled and note that it would be very difficult to implement and enforce this kind of restriction on the highway.

Question 11. Will we receive the results of the CVP and will our comments be documented?

Response. Yes you will see the results. We’re developing a poster to summarise the process and results and will distribute this to participants once the process is complete and the CVP plan is finalised. Comments are being documented in the summaries and will form part of the reference documentation for the EA Report

Appendix B
Themed Enhancement Measures
Walkabout Rotations
COMMENTS

Universal Measures

- In landscaping plans use
 - “Ginko” trees
 - Dogwood Shrubs
- Use moss on structures (abutments, noise walls, etc) for extra greening and colour.
- Avoid swallow-wort; it’s an invasive species already in Clarington’s ditches.
- Use native vines along slopes to prevent erosion.
- Don’t use sycamore species.
- Keep sumacs contained within ramp radius of interchanges.
- Fish habitat – include stream compensation.
- Regenerate habitat for sensitive species.
- Use remnant parcels to contribute to rehabilitation of SARs species.
- Implement a landscape screening plan at Leskard area to protect and replace 20+ years of planting by property owners.
- Use raised berm at above location.
- Implement noise walls at Almond Village and Hancock Road/Nash Road.
- Consider transverse rumble strips for 407 westbound travelers entering the Highway 35/115.
- Consider cat eyes in areas of high fog.

Architecture & Local Heritage

- Consider bridge treatments that reflect local heritage such Solina, Hampton and Leskard – all were ‘mill communities’.
- Consider bridge treatment in Columbus area to reflect reference as ‘English Corners’ and area has 2 heritage cemeteries.
- Several unmarked cemeteries exist (often with a handful of grave sites remaining), make note of these and do not disturb.
- Provide illumination to highlight bridge treatments.
- Consider solar power to energize illumination.
- Incorporate heritage structures at transit stations.
- Consider Bloor Street overpass as location for architectural treatment.
- Include a picnic area near architectural features.
- Hampton cemetery – north edge of property is very wet.

Wetlands & Wildlife

- Emphasis on wetlands and ponds
 - Wilmot Creek
 - Farwell Creek corridor
- Seepage and streams at Bloor Street.
- West Lynde Creek is a wildlife corridor.
- Wildlife crossings at Bloor and Solina – is important wetland area for small wildlife, fox, deer, wolves.
- Wildlife crossing provisions at Almond Village (under the freeway ramps).
- Use 2’ by 6’ “board rail” fencing – horses.

- Rehabilitate marshes along the east link in the area south of Pebblestone
 - Property altered
- Elevate structure from Nash to Pebblestone.
- Mitigate noise pollution, especially around the Leskard area where additional impacts are felt because of the Huntsmens Club.

Gateways

- Like the proposed treatment for Bloor Street.
- Consider including a theme for Durham Region throughout the corridor, perhaps at gateway locations (include Durham 'D')?
- Consider a gateway at beginning of the corridor and at Highway 35/115 as you enter Durham.
- Consider naming corridor the "Pine Ridge" highway.
- All gateway treatments should have the same amount of money spent on it.
- What's planned for the Courtice gateway? Refer to the 2001 Landscape plan for the local municipality for input.
- Consider Almond Village gateway treatment.
- Crossings at Bloor need to be considered for agricultural / farm machinery. Crossings should blend into the flat land to accommodate these vehicles.

Landscape Screening

- West Whitby – maximize landscaping plan to minimize air, noise and aesthetics.
- Implement landscape screening south of the 407 corridor at Leskard Road.

Appendix C
Feedback on the CVP Process
- Questionnaire Responses

Question	Scale of Responses	Number of Responses
How would you rate the Workshops?	1 – Poor	
	2	
	3	6
	4	10
	5 – Excellent	5
How would you describe the relevance of the discussion topics / questions?	1 – Not at all Relevant	
	2	1
	3	5
	4	7
	5 – Very Relevant	8
How do you rate the way the Workshops were Conducted?	1 – Poor	
	2	
	3	1
	4	7
	5 – Excellent	13
How do you rate the opportunities you were given to share your views?	1 – Poor	
	2	1
	3	
	4	8
	5 – Excellent	13
How would you rate the CVP Workbook?	1 – Poor	
	2	1
	3	4
	4	9
	5 – Excellent	6
Additional Comments / Questions		
<p>What if anything did you like best or find most useful?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most useful is the workbook and the study updates • The hands on where people could actually interact with the reps. • MTO appreciation of our concerns. • Staff was knowledgeable and approachable. • Visuals and people present who are actually doing the work. • Ability to talk one on one with EA project team members. • Taking into consideration stakeholder feedback. • Learning what the specific issues were along the corridor beyond my local area. • Networking – obtaining access to info. • Work on maps. • Professionalism. All points of view and concerns taken seriously – respectfully. Feedback and concerns all addressed. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Networking with people in a similar situation. • Access to a wide range of knowledgeable people. • Professionalism, availability of knowledge and information.
<p>If telling a friend / colleague about these Workshop, what would you say?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was worth it, glad I came, learnt a lot • The workshops are good but there is always the thought of: will they actually take the community knowledge and put it into practice or will the government, because of funding or politics, eradicate it! • I do not know yet if our recommendations will be acted on. • Get off your butt and attend the sessions! • Wish there was more community representation. • Informative, open concept, hopefully have an impact on environmental assessment. • Great way to have input / gain other viewpoints. Input was taken respectively, no matter what opinion was. • If all the recommendations are carried forward it will reduce the impact on the communities and environment. • Wish more people have attended – next time perhaps more outreach to engage stakeholders / property owners could be considered – advance planning to advertise required to achieve this. A broader mandate to include human health impact to community. • Networks should have been better attended by the public; should be more integration with municipal groups. • Interesting – but too much talk ‘at’ rather than ‘with’ community members. • All representatives have been very professional in a very difficult process for the community, the individual and from a project standpoint and with regard to environmental aspects. Thank you for allowing community involvement in this process. • Organized. Excellent – Glenn kept things right on track! Well informed speakers. • The workshops are very relevant and effective. I’m still a little ‘cynical’ ... the process timing does not seem to allow residents to be completely invested in the process. It is difficult to consider what plants or architecture would be best when there is no confirmation of what is happening to their property. Please understand that the need for this process is recognized and supported, it’s just hard to concentrate. • Showings informative. • The EA process involves large numbers of ‘consultants’ at considerable cost to taxpayers. • Get involved, attend PIC, voice your concern. 30 people attend is insignificant when you consider the vast area and population affected.
<p>Any other comments?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doing a good job. • The presenters showed professionalism and good initiative. Personally I hope that we will be taken seriously and that our hard work will be put to good use. No info on health impact.

- Be nice if the same process and opportunities could be made available to discuss/influence decisions regarding highway ownership, toll versus non-toll, toll structure, secret contracts etc.
- There should have been greater consideration / comments / discussion / recognition of the negative health impacts caused by a highway / link of this magnitude. It has barely been mentioned throughout the entire EA process.
- Where was MNR, Department of Fisheries in this process? Why did they not want to hear our input? Will we receive the outcome of our ideas?
- Views were not recorded in enough detail.
- The sense of urgency by this group would be well spread to other operations of the MTO.
- There is a huge concern with air quality – CO2 impacts, especially if Courtice link is built and how it will impact on produce grown that we and our children will eat.
- The process to date has been extremely educational to the methodologies followed by governments. The excessive use of consultants appears to take away some of the responsibility and accountability of paid government employees. The focus of some of the discussion dealt with matters that the experts within government should know and will undoubtedly consider, i.e. usage of reflectors on roadways, types/species of trees/vegetation to use. There didn't appear to be any consideration of cost associated with any of the ideas put forth, hopefully when the final implementation is undertaken the financial implications will be a significant part of the discussions.
- The technically Preferred Route hasn't changed substantially since 1954.