



Project: 407 East Individual EA Study

TSH No. 42-80390

Meeting Date: November 14th 2006

Meeting Time: 1:30 pm

Report Date: December 7th 2006

Recorder: S. Khokhar

Page 1 of 5

RAG MEETING

MEETING RECORD NO. 6

Note: Comments and or questions put forth by members of RAG are in italic with the response directly below.

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.

LOCATION: Durham Region Headquarters, Meeting Room 1A

PRESENT:

Dan Remollino	MTO Project Manager
Linda Fischer	MTO – Planning & Environmental
Perry Sisson	CLOCA
Rob Hersey	CLOCA
Laura James	TRCA
Dena Lewis	TRCA
Don Haley	TRCA
Jenny L.	GRCA
Mike Kim	MPIR
Darla Cameron	CEAA
Steven Strong	MNR
Mike Shaw	EC
Mike Sone	GO Transit
Kitty Ma	Health Canada
Doug Allingham	TSH – Project Manager
Mike Delsey	TSH – Deputy Project Manager
Sabeen Khokhar	TSH – Project Coordinator
Michael Roy	GLL – Biologist

PURPOSE: RAG Meeting #6 to consider the results of the Route Alternatives Screening.

Action By

1.0 Introductions

1.1 D. Allingham noted that the process for the Route Alternatives has been broken down into two stages: 1) Develop a long list of route alternatives; and 2) evaluate the short list of route alternatives. Info

2.0 Presentation

2.1 **‘Environmental Fieldwork’:**
Over the last 6 months the Project Team attempted to acquire Permission to Enter from the approximately 1200 properties within the preliminary Study Area to go out and complete fieldwork. Info

It was noted that no one contacted TRCA for data. Ecoplans contacted but said that they didn’t need it. ELC Community Series Layer should be obtained.
M. Roy stated that it wasn’t good late for that data and that it can still be used. TSH

		Action By
2.5	‘Short List of Route Alternatives / Study Area’: The Study Area provides the possibility for adjustment or refinement of an alignment. The Study Area is 1000 m ±, however in some areas we have not shown a larger Study Area because this is not possible. Holes in the Study Area are the result of development and hamlets. If needed, it may be possible to look outside this Study Area.	Info
2.6	‘Short List of Route Alternatives – Highlights’: <i>What are others – the public?</i> Others include alternatives that came out of other studies and were found to be feasible options to consider. The screening results will be placed on a panel at the PIC.	Info
2.7	‘Lane Requirements’: <i>Is this 10 lanes requirement based on what the existing 407ETR will be? i.e. will 407ETR be 10 lanes at its current terminus? Do they recommend or identify 10 lanes as their ultimate build out?</i> The Team has asked for ETR’s lane requirements based on their numbers. The assumption would be that the existing 407ETR would be 10 lanes at the Brock Road interchange at some time in the future <i>The public will ask if the 407ETR will be 10 lanes. There should be a note indicating ‘lane requirements pending 407ETR’.</i> M. Delsey noted that the 407 mainline is pending many decisions including the growth numbers. A transitway will not appear right away but will be protected for.	Info Info
2.8	‘PICs’: Panels and posters will also be placed in Pickering.	Info
2.9	‘Evaluation Phase’: The last study was not understood as the evaluation was done without explanation on how it was carried out. A workshop early in the New Year to discuss the evaluation and criteria will be held. The public will also be asked at the PIC to provide input on weightings. <i>When doing the evaluation, you should consider that it isn’t just 170m ROW. You need to also consider Stormwater Management, transitway stations, interchange footprints, elevations etc.</i> Noted.	Info Info
<u>3.0</u>	<u>Route Alternatives and Constrain Mapping – Other Questions, Comments and Answers</u>	

		Action By
3.1	<p><i>Please provide an update on the Aboriginal Consultation.</i></p> <p>MTO had identified 5 or 6 interested First Nations groups. From those 5 or 6 groups only one group wanted a presentation. Letters and follow up letters and phone calls were made to the groups. Invites to the PICs were sent. The offer for presentations will be made during this round of PICs also. Charlton Carscallen of MTO keeps a record of First Nations Consultation.</p>	Info
3.2	<p><i>It would be beneficial to know sources of fieldwork and who did what in order to aid the Team in determining gaps.</i></p> <p>This will be compiled and provided to the Agencies by the Team.</p>	GLL/TSH
3.3	<p><i>Is there mapping to show the extent of the surveys done?</i></p> <p>Mapping has been done to show the extent of the fieldwork, fieldwork that was done, where it was done and to show where we could extrapolate data.</p> <p>Follow up: <i>This should be shown at the PICs to show the public what and where collected.</i></p>	Info TSH
3.4	<p><i>Floodplain mapping would show archaeological findings that could be found on top of terraces and on top of the elevated valley (using DEM Models this can be seen).</i></p> <p>Comment noted.</p>	Info
3.5	<p><i>The previous Study had issues with valleys and crossings. Crossings of valleys were angled and although were feasible from a hydraulic standpoint, could not provide sufficient wildlife corridors. The aim is to have the 407 not have the same impacts as the 401.</i></p> <p>Agreed. This will be monitored.</p>	Info
3.5.1	<p><i>With the opening of the 407 there was an increase in ATV use on unrecognized trails that are bad for the ecological systems. This is an impact that was not anticipated.</i></p> <p><i>Should consider the impacts in your analysis and it influences the size of your crossings. Need to consider when making a crossing that you not only think about the meander belt and wildlife corridors but also that it will also be used for public access. There is no room for both public access and wildlife corridors.</i></p>	Info
3.6	<p><i>Why was the Lake Ridge Road alternative carried forward? Is it more trouble than its worth? Converting, replacing and moving Lake Ridge Road?</i></p> <p>It wasn't determined to have a fatal flaw. Was considered and promoted in the past. It would be a controlled access. Public always says go with the Lake Ridge Road. It cannot be determined at this time whether or not the Lake Ridge Road option would be the preferred. The impacts need to be assessed. Capacity and function would have to be looked at. The function of the arterial roadway would be lost and need to look at the impacts of the replacements. There would be requirements for changes in access and realignments.</p>	Info

		Action By
3.7	<i>Need to consider how you will summarize this for the public. You need to say why a route was eliminated. If a route was eliminated based on a physical impediment (particularly in the West Durham Link) this is how it will be summarized.</i>	Info/TSH
3.8	<i>Do not present the materials as final. Agreed. The Project Team will add 'recommended' to all maps and exhibits.</i>	TSH
3.9	<i>TRCA will provide the requested data (ELC Community Series Level, Flora/Fauna, ELC, and Cultural Heritage point data and polygons). Should also speak with Chris Darling of Durham Region.</i>	TRCA/ TSH
3.10	<i>TRCA will want to hear how and what will be done to compensate for impacts to the system as well as how to 'avoid' and / or 'mitigate' impacts by particular alternatives.</i>	Info
4.0	<u>Community Value Plan (CVP)</u>	
4.1	<p>MTO is doing background work on who may be impacted for the CVP and to identify communities who are affected by the mainline and links. This will not include setting up a new group to go over the evaluation of Routes but to discuss impacts and mitigation and preferences for mitigation. Those values which will be gathered will be incorporated into the Concept Design. The Community Value Plan workshops will be held in concert with other workshops. The background study will be completed in January 2007.</p> <p>D. Remollino noted to MTAG that TSH will to obtain input and ideas for representatives for the communities once determined. TRCA could be a part of the CVP.</p> <p><i>Suggest talk to those in Brougham. There are task forces in place that could get involved.</i></p> <p>The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:30pm</p>	Info
		TRCA
		MTO

END OF MEETING RECORD.

-SK

Distribution:

PT
RAG
File

K:\PROJECTS\42-80___\80390 407 East\1_Correspondence\Agencies\RAG\Mtg_6 November 14 2006\RAG Meeting #6 Minutes
14.11.2006 v.2.doc