

Meeting Minutes

Project Name: GTA West Transportation Corridor Planning and Environmental Assessment Study, Stage 2 Meeting: RAAG Meeting #2

Assignment No. 2013-E-008 Date: November 7, 2014

Time: 2:00 pm –3:30pm

Location: Courtyard by Marriott Brampton (90 Biscayne Crescent, Brampton), Windsor Room B

Independent Facilitator: Glenn Pothier GLPi

Project Team Attendees:

Natalie Rouskov	MTO
Chris Barber	MTO
Neil Ahmed	MMM
Sandy Nairn	MMM
Karin Wall	Aecom
Jim Dymont	MHBC
Patrick Puccini	URS
Britta Patkowski	URS
Benjamin Loucks	URS

RAAG Attendees:

Darryl Lyons	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Amanda Graham	Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change
Nisha Shirali	Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change
Steven Strong	Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry
Rosi Zirger	Ministry of Tourism Culture and Sport
Linda Pim	Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs
Sharon Lingertat	Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
Amy Mayes	Conservation Halton
Kim Barrett	Conservation Halton
Samantha Mason	Conservation Halton
Liam Marray	Credit Valley Conservation

Legend: Q: Question
R: Response
C: Comment

1. Opening Remarks and Introductions

G. Pothier, the Independent Facilitator, called the meeting to order, welcomed and thanked all participants for attending, and encouraged the stakeholders to take the opportunity to participate fully in the meeting. G. Pothier highlighted two key objectives for the meeting:

- Provide an overview of the study and work completed to date.
- Seek feedback on potential route alternatives and potential interchange locations.

G. Pothier noted that the initial RAAG meeting was a joint MAG/RAAG meeting, and that the project team is working on the membership for the MAG and RAAG and may consider moving some members (like the utility companies) to the RAAG to balance the membership and align interests.

2. Study Overview and Status Update

P. Puccini provided an overview of the recommendations from Stage 1 of the study and the focus of Stage 2 of the study, what the project team heard at MAG/RAAG Meeting #1, the project schedule, the Stage 2 planning process, and what the new corridor will look like.

3. Overview of the Development and Screening of the Long List of Route Alternatives and Potential Interchange Locations

P. Puccini provided an overview of how potential interchange locations were developed and screened, and what goods movement priority features are being considered. N. Ahmed provided an overview of how route alternatives were developed and screened, described the long list of route alternatives, provided an overview of the key reasons why route alternatives were screened out in the west, central and east sections of the study area, and described the short list of route alternatives.

Q: Will the project team provide a detailed rationale for the screening of the long list of route alternatives?

R: Yes, that is the focus of PIC #1. Assessment tables will be available at the PIC for people to review. Summaries will be provided on display boards.

Q: Did the screening of the long list of route alternatives consider impacts to meander belts?

R: Yes, the screening included the consideration of meander belts and regulatory flood zones. This information is shown on our existing conditions maps.

4. Feedback on the Preliminary Short List of Route Alternatives Within the Greenbelt

G. Pothier led a P.O.W.E.R. exercise for the preliminary short list of route alternatives for the west, central and east sections of the study area. For each section, attendees were asked to comment/share observations about the P – Positives, O – Objections, W – What Else Do You Want To Share?, E – Enhancements, R – Remedies of the preliminary short list of route alternatives.

West Section (Highway 401/407 ETR Interchange to Mississauga Road)

- Support the elimination of Alternative 1F.
- Support for Alternative 1C as it does not cross a tributary of Sixteen Mile Creek.
- Should realign Alternative 1E, as it appears to impact the bank of a watercourse.

Central Section (Mississauga Road to Highway 50)

- Noise and air quality reports should be completed as part of this study.

- Species at risk permits will need to be obtained regarding impacting redbreasted sunfish habitat.
- Request to review the built heritage report prepared for this study.
- Support for the existing Highway 410 alternative. Concern regarding Alternative 10C as it extends through sensitive natural lands.
- In general throughout the entire study area, the southerly routes fragment less agricultural base.

East Section (Highway 50 to Highway 400)

- Pleased to see that an alternative (Alternative 7F) was developed and carried forward that the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority suggested earlier in the study.
- Consider oversizing structures (particularly culverts) to allow for fish passage and natural channel design/function.

5. Upcoming Public Information Centre: Anticipating Public and Stakeholder Reaction

G. Pothier noted that the project team is aiming to hold a Public Information Centre later this year and asked attendees to provide insight on the following issues - with a view to assisting the project team to best address the concerns and information needs of the public:

1. Are there “hot spots” or “hot topics” you foresee?
 2. What strategies/responses can we provide to address the “hot spots” or “hot topics”?
- Concern regarding the length of time it takes to plan and construction such a corridor.
 - Stakeholders may be concerned about traffic delays due to construction.
 - Humber Alliance may be concerned about impacts to trails, watercourses, and the natural environment in general.
 - Stakeholders may be concerned about impacts to historical communities.
 - Questions about the Focused Analysis Area – what is the process to release lands.
 - Stakeholders in the City of Mississauga may have concerns about stormwater management, as they recently experienced some flooding.
 - Consider having maps which allow property owners to see their properties close up.
 - Consider having a digital interface where stakeholders can zoom in and out, turn layers on/off, turn routes on/off, etc.
 - Consider sharing digital files of the route alternatives with regulatory agencies so they can compare impacts and provide more informed commentary on the route alternatives.
 - Make the colouring of the route alternatives more transparent so you can see what is underneath the routes.
 - With respect to stormwater management and water quality, there are low impact development technologies for runoff at watercourses that can remove up to 80 % of total suspended solids. The project team should consider water quality control technologies for stormwater management.

Q: When will maps of the route alternatives be made publically available?

R: Route alternatives will be made available at PIC #1, and on the project website subsequent to PIC #1.

6. Next Steps

N. Ahmed provided an overview of next steps in the study, and provided the dates and locations of the PIC #1 venues.

Q: Have you met with Regional Councils yet?

R: Typically the project team would present to the Regional Councils before the PIC; however, given the timing of the election this year, the project team determined that it would be most prudent to meet with the newly elected Regional Councils in the new year.

7. Open Forum and 8. Closing Remarks

G. Pothier invited additional comments/questions/observations.

Q: Will fieldwork include groundwater investigations at underpass locations? There is an aquifer under pressure in the area of Trafalgar Road and Steeles Avenue.

R: The project team will be assessing groundwater impacts at a high level for the short list of route alternatives based on secondary source data. At the preliminary design stage, this information will be confirmed.

Q: Did the screening of the interchange locations take into account features they would impact outside of the 250m lines?

R: The 250m lines can generally accommodate interchanges, so impacts were accounted for. The conceptual footprints for the larger freeway-to-freeway interchanges are shown as a green dashed line on map of the short list of route alternatives.

C: The Toronto and Region Conservation Authority Executive Committee would like an update once the short list of route alternatives has been confirmed.

C: A species at risk evaluation criteria should be considered under both the aquatic and terrestrial environment.

G. Pothier and N. Rouskov provided closing remarks, and thanked all participants for taking the time to provide their input.

Submitted by: B. Patkowski, URS

Distribution: Attendees, Regrets
