



Ministry
of
Transportation

407 East Individual Environmental Assessment

Community Advisory Group (CAG)

MEETING NOTES

CAG MEETING #7

Attendees:

CAG Members:

Ray Minard
Doug McKay
Mike Wilson
Liz Shumovich
Libby Racansky
Adrian Lambert
Jeanette Wiles
Shannon Okeefe Circelli
Jim Bates
Linda Gasser
Rein Westerbaan
Bradford Soles

MTO & Consultant Team:

Dan Remollino
Rita Venneri
Doug Allingham
Emma Docherty
Ian Dobrindt

Date: July 4, 2006
Location: 300 Water Street
Whitby, ON
Time: 7:00 – 9:00pm

Please note the following three things:

1. All colour and graphics have been removed from the CAG summary format
2. The presentation slides are no longer included as Appendix A – they are available for download at www.407eastea.com.
3. Discussions, questions & responses have been provided in bullet points.

Purpose of the meeting

- To update the CAG members about the findings from the 4 rounds of Public Information Centres and how the team is incorporating/addressing these comments in project activities
- To learn about CAG members' ideas and suggestions regarding the results of identification of the Preferred Alternative
- To examine CAG membership as the Team enters the next phase of the EA

Handouts

- Agenda
- Matrix – “Alternatives to” and criteria

Planned Agenda

Time	Topic
6:45PM	Arrival
7:00PM	Agenda overview; Working together, Purposes of the meeting
7:10Pm	Follow up from May 10, 2006 meeting
7:15PM	Summary from Public Information Centres in May/June
7:35PM	Description and discussion of methodology for evaluating “Alternatives to” <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Transportation• Economy
8:00PM	Description and discussion of methodology for evaluating “Alternatives to” <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Land Use• Natural Environment• Social Environment
8:30PM	CAG membership
8:55pm	Next Steps
9:00pm	Adjourn

Please note that the presentation by TSH is available for download at www.407eastea.com

Agenda Overview - Working Together

Purposes of the meeting

Issues:

- CAG members are not receiving information in advance of the meeting. This is an on-going concern.
- Request to TSH to mail all material to CAG 7 to 10 days in advance of the meeting or reschedule it.
- All over-sized material should be provided as such (not reduced to an 8.5 x 11 size).
- The Facilitator's Summary that is provided has too many graphics in it and it is hard on household printers. Request to create a text version for the CAG to review and comment on.
- Another member of the group prefers to leave the summaries as is due to the graphics.

Conclusions:

- TSH has agreed to try and get material to the CAG 7 to 10 days in advance if possible. If a document is not available in "final" form by that time, TSH will make the decision whether to release the document with a certain percent confidence as to its completeness to the group. If material is not available, TSH will consider rescheduling the meeting.
- TSH will try to provide material in hard copy to members in the future.
- All over-sized material will in the future be provided in its original format to the group.
- Two versions of the summary will be created for the CAG. One in the standard format that has been developed that includes graphics, and a text version that is easier to print.

NOTE: TSH provided an e-mail to group members regarding the format of future summaries after the meeting. The email was sent the afternoon of July 11th, 2006 and the format of this summary is a result of this e-mail and discussion with CAG members.

Follow up from May 10, 2006 meeting

Issues:

- A request was made that TSH provide the analysis of impacts using only the new corridor solutions. With MTO having no jurisdiction over regional and local planned road improvements, no guarantee on time frame or occurrence of these improvements is possible. This corridor only analysis would determine how a new corridor would solve the transportation problems defined in the P & O report.

Conclusions:

- TSH will not provide an analysis of the solution without the planned road improvements because it is not a realistic situation, regardless of jurisdiction. It is not feasible or reasonable.
- TSH will ensure that in the documentation, it is clear that MTO does not have jurisdiction over the entire solution i.e. MTO has no control over the regional or local road improvement plans and if they get implemented on time.
- The CAG was satisfied that all other follow-up issues from the May 10th meeting had been addressed.

Summary from Public Information Centres in May / June 2006

Issues:

- A comment was made that attendance at the PICs was low.

Conclusions:

- Though attendance at the PICs was lower than expected, it is anticipated more residents will show up at the meetings when the EA moves to the route selection phase.

Description and discussion of methodology for evaluating “Alternatives to”

Comment from MTO:

The Alternatives To phase has been challenging in terms of making the information understandable, clear and concise. We still have some work to do for the evaluation etc. In terms of working on this with TSH and the others on the consultant team – it is not as straightforward as it seems. There are many ways to look at the alternatives and many opinions. As a team we have discussed those issues and taken a reasonable, conservative approach in terms to rationalizing decisions. We are still looking to improve the matrix before it is finalised. If you have questions about the specifics of the chart, please let us know so we can make sure it is as clear as possible.

- **Transportation**
- **Economy**

Issues: No issues were raised regarding these factor areas.

Description and discussion of methodology for evaluating “Alternatives to”

- **Land Use**
- **Natural Environment**
- **Social Environment**

Issues:

- The justification in assessing Clarington and ‘the rest’ of the Study Area as one body was brought up.
- The identification of “green” in terms of land use in the presentation was questioned because of Clarington’s rural and agricultural land-use and its proximity to urban centres. It was suggested that the 407 through Clarington would promote undesirable land uses (sprawl) and should therefore not be considered an advantage for this solution.
- Will the toll rate as an example change the service delivery options and therefore affect criteria like local infiltration? The sentence should be qualified to recognize that service delivery and residential infiltration improvements can be impacted by the tolling rate / delivery model.
- The impact of relieving congestion as stated in the Transportation Problem and Opportunity report was questioned as the links on the highway/transitway will lead to the south.
- The summary table is inconsistent in the areas of Land Use and Economy. It should be reformatted to determine if it does or does not support policies and objectives.

Conclusions:

- The study area has to be assessed as a whole to determine the cumulative impacts and effects, the areas can’t be separated.
- The corridor is not intended to provide access to urban areas in Clarington. It will facilitate the movement of people and goods.
- TSH will look at the service delivery options in the assessment.
- An alternate east-west route will carry a larger volume of traffic (capacity) than could be serviced by the current or planned improvements to the Regional Road network, therefore removing congestion from regional roads and Urban Growth Centres (UGC’s), supporting live:work ratios and providing a higher level of service for people and goods
- The table will be reworded to read “Partially supports Land Use Policies and Plans” and “Moderately supports Economic Objectives”.

Study Progress – Input from Group Members:

- I am quite happy with the way this [study] is going. I think this could move a little faster.
- I feel the Project Team have done a good job so far – no issues.
- No comment.
- The process so far is a given (it has proven what everyone knew). The next phase will be more important. The people it affects will be interested.

- Keen to know where we are with our scheduling.
- Process a little slow, but coming along.
- Agree with trying to find out if we are on target with the process and where we are heading.

**** No other comments were received or others agreed with previous comments regarding the study's progress.**

Additional Item of Reviewing the Recently Released Growth Plan

Dan Remollino gave a brief overview of the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH)

- Growth Plan for the GGH is available on the Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal (PIR) website
- The Places to Grow received Royal Assent on June 13, 2005 enabling the government to plan for population growth, economic expansion and protection of the environment.
- Legislation allows growth plans in any part of Ontario. This is the first plan and was released on the plan on June 16, 2006.
- The plan requires municipalities review their Official Plans to conform with the policies of the growth plan.
- The Plan is based on are six principles listed below:
 - Build compact, vibrant and complete communities;
 - Plan and manage growth to support a strong and competitive economy;
 - Protect, conserve, enhance and wisely use the valuable natural resources of land, air and water for current and future generations;
 - Optimize the use of existing and new infrastructure to support growth in a compact, efficient form;
 - Provide for different approaches to managing grow that recognize the diversity of communities in the GGH; and
 - Promote collaboration among sectors – government, private and non-profit – and residents to achieve the vision.
- Some of the key areas to the plan are:
 - Transit is the plan's first investment priority for moving people;
 - Economic corridors linking the area to the border will make goods movement easier;
 - The plan has a consistent and coordinated set of population and employment growth forecasts;
 - The plan includes a phased approach to increasing intensification;
 - By 2015, all regions, counties and single-tier municipalities will accommodate a minimum of 40 percent of new residential units within their already built-up urban areas;
 - The plan identifies 25 urban growth centres to be revitalized as community focal points;

- The plan requires municipalities to maintain an adequate supply of employment lands;
 - New development will continue in currently non-urbanized areas, known as designated Greenfield areas. These lands will be planned to create communities that support walking, biking, transit, parks and a mix of housing and job options;
 - The plan strengthens the role of rural communities as centres of economic, cultural and social activity;
 - The plan outlines a process to identify and preserve natural systems and prime agricultural areas and encourage a culture of conservation; and
 - The plan provides the framework for infrastructure investment in the area so that existing and future investments are optimized to serve growth to 2031 and beyond.
- Areas of importance are:
 - focus on transit;
 - implementation on new transportation corridors; and
 - optimize use of existing and new infrastructure.
 - Over the next few years, PIR will be working with the municipalities to allocate the population and employment to sub-areas.

CAG membership

Issues:

- In terms of the length of membership, the question was raised about the term of membership on the CAG.
- Suggestion to request more people from the study area to become part of the CAG.
- New CAG members will not have the same level of knowledge as existing members.
- This issue of “screening” interested members out of the group and how that is done.

Conclusions:

- The project team has not established a time limit for membership. Each assigning group may have different membership lengths.
- The project team will be revisiting the original “interest” list and asking for new members.
- Focused consultation with Study Area residents will occur through dedicated workshops.
- An orientation meeting for new members will be held.
- TSH requests a short resume from interested persons and a description of why they want to be on the CAG. If existing CAG members have suggestions for screening criteria, TSH would welcome them.

Suggestions:

- All Workshop guests could be considered.

Next Steps

Issues:

- Meeting dates are to be scheduled to avoid conflicts with summer holidays and the upcoming municipal election.
- Questions asked regarding the number of CAG meetings to occur in the next year.
- Question asked as to the continued commitment of project team members to the projects duration.
- Determination of the time when PIC Summary comments would be distributed.
- Determination of deadline for comments on the Alternative To the Undertaking work.

Conclusions:

- Summer meetings as well as December meetings will be avoided when possible. The next round of PICs are proposed for the fall, after the municipal elections.
- It is anticipated that there will be 5 to 7 meetings over the next year.
- The project team is designed to allow for staff changes but there are no immediate plans for any of the key project team members to stop working on this project.
- TSH will send out the report of PIC comments and post it to the project web site.
- Comments from the CAG are requested by the end of the summer on the preferred Alternative To the Undertaking.

Adjourn – 9:07pm