



REGULATORY AGENCY GROUP (RAG)

MEETING SUMMARY #5

DRAFT, SUBJECT TO RATIFICATION AT NEXT RAG MEETING

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: Ministry of Transportation, Building "D", 3rd Floor, Downsview

PRESENT:	Gemma Connolly	Ministry of Environment
	Don Wright	CLOCA
	Gareth Goodchild	DFO – Peterborough
	Mike Shaw	Environment Canada
	Chris Strand	DFO – Peterborough
	Margaret Bakelaar	CEAA
	Dena Lewis	TRCA
	Don Haley	TRCA
	Heide Garbot	MTO
	Terry Hilditch	MTO
	Theresa Olender	MTO
	Linda Fischer	MTO
	John Slobodzian	MTO
	Mike Delsey	TSH
	Colleen O'Toole	TSH

This summary report contains the questions, comments and responses that were put forth during the fourth meeting of the Regulatory Agency Group. The questions asked, and comments made by attendees are noted in italics. The response is written below each question or comment. General comments are noted in bold.

PURPOSE: To provide a summary of the May 2004 public consultation and an overview of the revised draft EA Terms of Reference

Action By

1.0 Introductions

Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliation. M. Delsey gave a presentation regarding the May 2004 public consultation undertaken by the Project Team as well as provided an overview of the revised draft EA ToR. M. Delsey also asked that the members of RAG review the meeting minutes from the February 20, 2004 meeting and provide any comments directly to TSH. Following the presentation, RAG members were encouraged to ask questions of clarification.

2.0 Question and Answer Period

Is Concept Design completed for the preferred alternative method?

Yes. Concept Design provides adequate information for federal agencies to make a decision regarding the federal EA process.

Action By

Concern was raised about the public desire that has been heard regarding expediting the process. During the last 407 jobs there were many opposing comments regarding broad issues. These issues included Greenbelt strategies and growth management.

J. Slobodzian replied that these issues do exist, however, the general comments heard at the last meetings were people more concerned with when a highway was coming through Durham. Less comments were received on why (i.e. need) and how (i.e. process).

Members of the public did have concerns regarding the status of alternative solutions that were outside the jurisdiction of MTO.

J. Slobodzian asked the members of RAG to consider what the best forum was to receive information regarding alternative methods. It would be appreciated if this feedback be given over the summer and be available prior to starting the Individual EA. The EA ToR represents the minimum requirements, especially with regards to consultation. As the study progresses, more consultation may be needed to discuss a specific issue or area. The Project Team wants to ensure upfront dialogue and encourages you to respond with any ideas for different forums for consultation.

A specific reference to "Lessons Learned" on past 407 projects should be added to the EA ToR. There were a number of monitoring and mitigation measures learned.

Comment noted.

Has the Transitway been dropped from consideration?

M. Delsey replied that one of the Alternatives to the Undertaking is titled "Roadway/Transitway". A roadway and transitway will be considered together for this project.

What is the proposed schedule for this project?

There is no expected timeline for this project. The EA ToR will be revised over the summer and submitted to MOE by September 2004. A 12-week MOE review period will be undertaken, which includes a 30-day formal public review. It is expected that the Individual EA will commence in January 2005. It is expected that the Individual EA will be completed by the end of 2006. The EA Report will then be submitted to MOE for approval.

How is the Environmental Standards Project being integrated into the EA Process and Concept Design? The best approach would be to ensure integration with this project.

The 407 MTO Project Team is co-ordinating with the MTO Env. Standards Project Team in terms of timelines regarding the development of a concept design. It was stressed that the Env. Standards Project is looking at design and construction and not at operation/maintenance. J. Slobodzian added that commitments are made during the Individual EA and Class EA processes for operations and maintenance.

Action By

The Route Location portion of the EA defines a footprint. This is not enough detail to determine operation/maintenance impacts. More detail is needed to complete the initial evaluation. An example of this is location of the bridge and its associated rain shadow or salt impacts along a highway.

Federal agencies are looking for much more detail on the preferred method. This has implications for what is included in the EA ToR..

More information needs to be gathered on emerging technologies for applications to this project from construction right up to maintenance.

J. Slobodzian added that the EA Report builds in the next phase's requirements. This could include investigating up-to-date construction/operation/maintenance techniques.

A number of issues raised such as staging, timelines and mitigation measures were discussed. These issues will predominantly be addressed during the Class EA process. Many meeting attendees stressed a there is a need for commitments in the Individual EA (or EA ToR) for subsequent phases for such issues.

Supporting documentation comments are appreciated by July 2, 2004, however, they are not approved by the Minister of Environment and will be updated during the Individual EA.

TRCA is interested in providing information regarding background data as well as approach to assessment evaluation/analytical tools.
Comment noted.

The EA ToR should reserve the right to hold joint MTAG-RAG meetings.
Comment noted.

Will RAG members have an opportunity to participate in the weighting/evaluation of the alternative methods?
Yes. The Project Team wants multiple scenarios for evaluating the criteria.

CEAA wants to ensure that enough information is gathered to satisfy federal requirements so that back-tracking does not have to occur.

Will environmental impacts be examined outside of the Study Area?
The Study Area does not preclude where you look at environmental impacts. This will depend on the particular environmental criteria.

Action By

END OF MEETING REPORT

-CO

K:\PROJECTS\42-80__\80227 Hwy 407 East EA1_correspondence\Meetings\RAG\2004-02-20-RAG-4-Mtg-Summary.doc