

MTAG MEETING SUMMARY NO. 3

Project: 407 East Individual Environmental Assessment
Meeting Date: January 17, 2006
Meeting Time: 9:00 am to 11:00 am
Report Date: January 18, 2006
 (Revised March 8th, 2006)
Recorder: S. Khokhar
Page 1 of 8

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.

This summary report contains the questions, comments and responses that were put forth during the third meeting of the Municipal Technical Advisory Group (Individual Environmental Assessment phase). The questions asked, and comments made by attendees are noted in italics. The response is written below each question or comment.

LOCATION: Durham Region Headquarters – Meeting Room 1A

PRESENT:

Richard Holborn	City of Pickering	Ken Hetherington	City of Peterborough – Planning
Kevin Heritage	Town of Ajax	Brian Weir	County of Peterborough - Planning
Steven Rowe	Town of Ajax (Consultant)	Chris Bradley	County of Peterborough – Works
Larry Cavanagh	Town of Whitby – Planning		
Suzanne Beale	Town of Whitby – Public Works	Dan Remollino	MTO Project Manager – IEA
Janice Szwarz	Municipality of Clarington – Planning	Rita Venneri	MTO Engineer in Training
Steve Mayhew	Region of Durham – Works	Mike Delsey	TSH - Deputy Project Manager
Paul Gee	Region of Durham - Works	Sabeen Khokhar	TSH - Environmental Planner
Ramesh Jagannathan	Region of Durham – Planning	Paul Bumstead	TSH – Transportation Planner
Nestor Chornobay	Region of Durham - Planning	Ian Dobrindt	GLL – Environmental Lead

PURPOSE: Municipal Technical Advisory Group – Meeting #3

		Action By
1.0	<u>Introductions</u>	
	M. Delsey welcomed the group and asked all meeting attendees to introduce themselves.	Info
2.0	<u>Agenda</u>	
	M. Delsey reviewed the agenda for the meeting.	Info
	It was noted that some members had a previous draft of the minutes. It was noted that the meeting summaries are available online. S. Khokhar to email the latest version to L. Cavanagh <i>[Note: all members of MTAG were re-sent the final meeting Summary for meeting #2 on January 18, 2006].</i>	Info TSH (re-send summary)
3.0	<u>Proactive Involvement Plan</u>	
	M. Delsey went over slides 4-8 of the presentation. See Attached.	Info
3.1	<u>Comments on the PIP</u>	
	<i>It was noted that the Region’s comments had been forwarded to S. Khokhar. The Region’s comments focussed on the fact that the PIP should elaborate on the type of media used to contact the public. Often projects are criticized due to the outreach and effectiveness of their public involvement. Region questions whether it would be possible to conduct a poll to determine the success of the outreach. For example, research the number of people who were aware of the PIC as opposed to the number of people that showed up. Region feels that</i>	

Action By

because of the magnitude of this project, we should obtain a measure of the effectiveness of the outreach program (regardless of the interest in attending working groups or PIC's).

M. Delsey noted that although this is a good idea, providing such a measure is difficult. D. Remollino indicated that the drawback to this suggestion is that it may not measure the true effectiveness of the program, because although people may be informed, or have been notified, they may choose not to become involved. The suggestion is noted and will be considered further.

TSH
(Consider polling techniques)

Often times the notices do not get to the correct property owners (i.e. different residents at the property). It is important that all property owners (owners, tenants, residents, businesses, and landlords) be contacted.

Comment noted. Our contact list primarily consists of people who have contacted the Project Team and been placed on the list (may be owner or tenant).

Info

Property owners receive written notices. The PIP was slanted to include residents and not property owners. There are often absentee landlords.

This is considered a valid point. When the project team gets to the route planning phase, we will identify and contact all property owners and residents along that route.

Info
TSH/MTO

How many Public Information Centres will be held, what locations, and what other details can we be told about them?

Over a two week period, there will be four Public Information Centres held mid-week in various locations throughout Durham Region. During the ToR phase, a comment was received that the PIC held at TSH Whitby was not centrally located for residents of Brooklin, making it difficult for those residents to attend. Project Team will consider central locations for PIC's.

Info

4.0 Transportation Planning and Problem Definition (Problems and Opportunities)

M. Delsey reviewed the purpose of the Problems and Opportunity Report (Slide 11).

Info

It was noted that the report which was sent out to Members and Representatives did not include the Appendices. P. Bumstead indicated that the information for appendix material is available but has not been prepared formally. They were not included with the Draft document as the graphic material is extensive and would contribute to an already large document. The material for the Appendix primarily expands on information summarized in the report, i.e. Population and Employment density information and a detailed listing of road improvements included in the long term horizon year. P. Bumstead indicated that the Appendix material will be printed in adobe format and distributed to members shortly.

TSH
(Appendices to Report)

M. Delsey reviewed slides 12-32 of the Presentation. See attached.

Action By

4.1 Comments on the Problems and Opportunities (P&O) Report

4.1.1. PUBLIC COMPREHENSION

The P&O Report is a very technical report that may be difficult to understand by the general public. Perhaps a summary can be provided.

Agreed. D. Remollino proposed that an Executive Summary in less technical terms be prepared for inclusion in the document. It was also noted that the Problems will be summarized within the Executive Summary

TSH
(Executive
Summary)
(Summarize
Problems/
Opportunities)

4.1.2 LIVE TO WORK RATIO

Are the Problems and Opportunities based on a 3:1 Live to Work Ratio or a 2:1 Live to Work Ratio? The Region suggests that if based on a 3:1 ratio, the need for a new corridor would be accelerated. The Region would like some sensitivity statement with respect to the need for corridor if 2:1 ratio achieved

P. Bumstead confirmed that the Problems and Opportunities were based on a 3:1 Ratio. The Project Team has compared the most recent forecasting results with the work performed previously for the EA, which was based a 2:1 ratio. The resulting forecasts do differ in terms of trip distribution for trips within and outside of Durham but the results in terms of screenline deficiencies were not considered significant

Info

Follow up: The differences on the analysis between the 2:1 live to work ratio and the 3:1 live to work ratio are not different, can this analysis be responded to as a statement in the P&O?

It was agreed that an additional section in the report would be included to provide some sensitivity analysis on the differences related to the population and employment assumptions

TSH
(Live:Work
Ratio
comparison)

Follow Up: What did the sensitivity analysis for the 2:1 and the 3:1 ratios reveal?

M. Delsey indicated that it changed the 'out-commute'. P. Bumstead explained that overall trip making by Durham residents did not change in magnitude but that the distribution of trips changed, resulting in increased north-south travel on Durham Region arterial roads. It is fair to say that the difference in the resulting forecasts based on the different ratios is not significant in terms of the identification of capacity deficiencies in the Region. A summary of this analysis will be added to the report.

TSH
(Live:Work
Ratio
comparison)

Follow Up: Can the Sensitivity Analysis for the Live to Work ratio be dealt with in terms of timing of need?

M. Delsey indicated that we are assessing 2021 and 2031 horizons to examine the need for capacity on the network and it is not the scope of the need component of the study to determine the timing of the need in terms of exact dates. The issue of timing and phasing of requirements will be dealt with in the development of the recommended/preferred alternative.

TSH
(Horizon dates)

Action By

4.1.3 PICKERING AIRPORT

The P&O Report does not take the Pickering Airport into consideration. A statement is required to clarify how the issue of the Airport has been addressed. A concern was raised that without the West Durham Link in the network, congestion could occur on north-south regional roads as a result of the Airport.

P. Bumstead indicated that the status of the Pickering Airport is prefaced in the report and that it was not included in the report as it has not been approved. Other issues could arise if the Airport is put in the report without its approval. Detailed analysis of the operational details of the proposed airport and its impact on traffic has been performed by the GTAA. The analysis suggests that the airport will not open as an international facility until 2021, and further the peak generating conditions of the airport will not coincide with the average p.m. peak hour assessed as part of the needs statement.

Info

Follow up: Perhaps the Airport could be covered in Sensitivity Analysis which would strengthen the analysis.

It was agreed that a qualitative assessment or statement is required to identify the role and impact of the facility. This assessment will also be incorporated into the new section describing sensitivity testing performed as part of the problem and opportunities.

It was noted that the Region will have the reallocated population and employment forecasts for the Seaton/Airport area before a decision on the Airport is finalized, whether or not the Places to Grow and the Official Plan are completed at separate times. D. Remollino noted that the Official Plan policies will have to conform to the Provincial Policies and that the most up to date policies are being used. It was noted that from the Region's perspective the employment figures are more significant than the population.

Info

4.1.4 TOLLING

Was tolling assumed (in the analysis)?

Tolling was not assumed in the analysis as the Highway 407 extension has not been evaluated yet. Tolling is an alternative implementation strategy for potential design alternatives and will be considered in the future assessment of alternatives.

Info

Follow Up: What was assumed for Existing Highway 407?

The current toll rate was used for both the existing and future years. Over time the toll rate will increase, as will the user's value of time. Both are assumed to increase at the same rate (inflation) and therefore the current relationship of tolls to users' value of time reflect the appropriate diversion curve for existing and future years

Info

4.1.5 POPULATION DISTRIBUTION

Action By

The difference between table 8 and 9 and the distribution of population is not clear. The Places to Grow does not currently include the municipal distribution (it is estimated to be completed in one year). If this municipal analysis hasn't been done, how was the population distributed?

The mandate of the Project Team is not to perform land use planning work. However, we do not have a formal position from the province on the population and employment allocation to the Regional Sub-Areas. In order to estimate the municipal and traffic zone forecasts the population and employment forecasts developed during the 2003 Development Charges work performed by the Region was used as a surrogate for the zonal distribution of the regional area forecasts. The allocation was reviewed by the Region and by MPIR and was confirmed as a reasonable approach.

Info

Follow Up: These assumptions may impact the sensitivity of future values?

D. Remollino indicated that the project team has to move forward with the analysis without waiting for the official numbers. Frequent discussions have been held with representatives of MPIR and they agree in principal that the method used for distribution was sufficient.

Info

Follow Up: Were the assumptions based on 40% allocation?

P. Bumstead indicated that the project team reviewed the final population and employment allocation and confirmed that the Places to Grow objectives had been met. Existing Built Up Areas reflected over 40% of the population growth in the area and that over 50% of that growth occurred in the Future Urban Centres.

Info

4.1.6 CONSTRUCTION

What is the timing of the improvements? Will the EA not indicate who will carry out the construction or improvements as well as the financial plan for this EA?

D. Remollino indicated that we can estimate the timing of need, but cannot definitely identify a construction program. The goal of the EA is to obtain the environmental approvals to protect a corridor.

Info

What does protection of a corridor mean to local and regional municipalities? Will land be purchased, applied for etc?

M. Delsey noted that if the preferred alternative to the undertaking is Highway 407 transitway, then it is MTO's responsibility to protect the corridor.

Info

4.1.7 APPENDICES

A breakdown of the footnotes within the report is important for the municipalities and readers to have more clarification and understanding of what information / method was used.

The footnotes will be broken down to include more clarification, and the information will be provided in the appendices.

Info

TSH
(Footnotes)

		Action By
	<p><i>The Region would also like the 40% allocation analysis in the appendices.</i></p> <p>Agreed. TSH will include the reports with the findings in the appendices of the P&O Report. It will be made clear in the appendices how the population and employment numbers were broken down among the sub-areas.</p>	TSH (Reports in appendices) Info
5.0	<p><u>Corridor Management Guideline</u></p> <p>A draft Corridor Management Guideline was provided at the last MTAG meeting. Comments were received from the Region, and a response was sent on January 16th 2006. The Guideline has been updated to reflect the Region's comments. TSH will distribute the updated document to members of MTAG and RAG. [Note: the CMO Guideline was emailed with the Final MTAG Minutes]</p>	Info TSH (Dist updated Guideline)
5.1	<p>Comments on the Corridor Management Guideline</p> <p><i>Do the applications only go to the Region or the Province? Will the Region see all the applications?</i></p> <p>The intent is for both the Province and the Region to see the applications. Normal corridor management distribution procedures apply as specified in the Guideline.</p> <p><i>How is this defined with respect to the Study Area?</i></p> <p>The Study Area has not yet been identified. A corridor management area has been defined based on the previous route for corridor management purpose only.</p> <p><i>Should this Guideline be passed through Council?</i></p> <p>No, we made the assumption that MTAG reps might pass the Guideline on internally. The Project Team is not looking for that level of approval. However, we can pass it on to individual Councils as required. Some discretion has to be used because we are looking at applications which impact the previous route.</p> <p><i>We have no formal Study Area, but we are to make the assumption of applications within that Corridor Management Area.</i></p>	TSH (Dist to Advisory Groups) Info Info TSH (Dist) Info
6.0	<p><u>Alternatives to the Undertaking:</u></p> <p>M. Delsey provided an overview of the Four Alternatives and provided an overview of the factor areas.</p>	Info
6.1	<p>Comments on the Alternatives to the Undertaking</p> <p><i>Wording change: "Business as Planned" versus "Business as Usual".</i></p> <p>Comment Noted.</p>	TSH

	Action By
D. Remollino provided an overview of the Workshop on February 4 th , 2006 from 9am to 1pm. He indicated that a public forum was considered but was rejected as the subject matter was deemed too technical for the general public. Members of MTAG were invited to participate. S. Khokhar to send out an email with the Workshop details. <i>[Note: S. Khokhar sent out an invite on Wednesday January 18th, 2006.]</i>	Info TSH (Invite)
<i>Is the workshop to be a weighting and ranking exercise for the Criteria and Factors?</i> There will be no weighting of the Alternatives. The intent is for the Workshop members to provide input on the process and methodology.	Info
<i>Some modes from the ToR (Road, Air travel etc) are not included in factors in this list.</i> The alternatives from the ToR form the basis for building the comprehensive list. The Project Team would like to meet with the Region with respect to the network consideration.	Info PT (Meeting)
7.0 Existing Conditions and Work Plans M. Delsey provided a status update and indicated that we are working on finalizing these reports. Distribution will take place close to the First PIC.	Info PT (Distribution)
8.0 Project Schedule	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • End of Feb/March – Next Round of Meetings – Will avoid March Break • Alts To table distributed prior to the next meeting • Finalize Table • Evaluation will take place • PICs in late Spring, 2006 • Field Investigations will take place this Spring • Note: After the PIC the Project Team will consider comments received before moving to the next phase of the study • Route planning will take place by the end of the year – it is a 1.5 year process with 2 PICs. 	Info Info/TSH Info/PT Info/PT Info/PT Info/GLL Info Info
<i>Municipal elections will occur in November. Must be cognizant that formal comments will be difficult to receive during this time as the summer will be recessed and October will be dedicated to the election preparation.</i> Comment noted.	Info

Action By

Any errors or omissions with respect to the content of the meeting, and the representation thereof in these minutes, should be reported to the undersigned.

END OF MEETING REPORT.
Sabeen Khokhar

K:\PROJECTS\42-80___\80390 407 East\1_Correspondence\Municipalities\MTAG\Mtg_3 January 17 2006\MTAG Mtg #3_FINAL Draft Meeting Summary.doc