

# Meeting Minutes

Project Name:	GTA West Transportation Corridor Planning and Environmental Assessment Study, Stage 2	Meeting:	Municipal Advisory Group / Regulatory Agency Advisory Group Meeting #3
Project No.	2013-E-0008	Date:	May 11, 2015
Location:	Courtyard by Marriott Brampton	Time:	2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Independent Facilitator:	Glenn Pothier		GLPi
Project Team Attendees:	Natalie Rouskov		MTO
	Chris Barber		MTO
	Sarah Merriam		MTO
	Adrian Firmani		MTO
	Neil Ahmed		MMM
	Sandy Nairn		MMM
	Jim Dowell		MMM
	Brenda Jamieson		AECOM
	Tim Soroichinsky		AECOM
	Patrick Puccini		AECOM
	Benjamin Loucks		AECOM
	Britta Patkowski		AECOM
	Melissa Raffoul		AECOM
	Jim Dymont		MHBC
MAG/RAAG Attendees:	Steve Mota		Region of York
	Dave Mitchell		York Regional Police
	Damian Albanese		Region of Peel
	Tom Slomke		Region of Peel
	Sabbir Saiyed		Region of Peel
	Gary Kocialek		Region of Peel
	Alejandro Cifuentes		Region of Peel
	Norman Baxter		Peel Fibre
	James Adams		Peel Regional Police
	Ron Glenn		Halton Region
	Karyn Poad		Halton Region
	Jeffrey Reid		Halton Region
	Dan Tovey		Halton Region

Alicia Jakaitis	Halton Region
Clement Chong	City of Vaughan
Selma Hubjer	City of Vaughan
Paul Jankowski	City of Vaughan
Andrew D. Pearce	City of Vaughan
Roy McQuillin	City of Vaughan
David Waters	City of Brampton
Henrik Zbogar	City of Brampton
Allan Sharpe	Brampton Hydro One Networks Inc.
Rob Agostini	Brampton Hydro Networks Inc.
Kara Ferreira	Brampton Fire and Emergency Services
Kant Chawla	Town of Caledon
Kathie Kurtz	Town of Caledon
David Loveridge	Town of Caledon
Dean McMillan	Town of Caledon
Haiqing Xu	Town of Caledon
Maureen Van Ravens	Town of Halton Hills
Doug Penrice	Town of Halton Hills
Daniel Ridgway	Town of Halton Hills
Joe Perrotta	City of Mississauga
Stephen Kitchen	Township of King
Ray Bacquie	407 ETR
Dan Beare	Metrolinx / GO Transit
Anthony Caruso	Metrolinx
Nelson Jalotjot	TransCanda Pipelines
Sam Karian	TransCanada Pipelines
Yus San Ong	Hydro One
Dhvani Shah	Hydro One
Jennifer Stewart	Hydro One
Bing Young	Hydro One
Adam Sheldon	TransCanada Pipelines
Jacques Otis	TransCanada Energy
Richard Wang	Powerstream Inc.
Kim Barrett	Conservation Halton
Amy Mayes	Conservation Halton
Sharon Lingertat	Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
Liam Marray	Credit Valley Conservation Authority
Caroline Polgrabia	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport
Rosi Zirger	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport
Nisha Shirali	Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change
Jackie Van de Valk	Ministry of Agriculture, Food & Rural Affairs

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 the objectives of the meeting:

- Provide an overview of the study and work completed since Public Information Centre #1;
- Review and discuss the evaluation methodology for the short list of route alternatives, and obtain input on the importance of each of the evaluation factors; and
- Seek input on the key issues and trade-offs the project team has identified in the west, central and east sections of the GTA West study area.

### **2. Study Overview and Update on Project Activities Since Public Information Centre (PIC) #1**

N. Ahmed provided an overview of the recommendations from Stage 1 of the GTA West Study along with the focus of Stage 2, the elements of the new transportation corridor, the study process, a summary of the feedback received from PIC #1 and how the project team incorporated feedback into the study. N. Ahmed also presented the refined short list of route alternatives and potential interchange locations, the refined focused analysis area, an overview of the spring/summer 2015 field investigation program and the consultation program, and next steps in the study. G. Pothier invited questions and general comments from the MAG/RAAG before moving forward with the agenda.

C: We would appreciate being e-mailed the presentations from today's meeting, the comment sheet, and evaluation factors.

Q: When does the preliminary preferred plan become the official preferred plan? Will the project team refine the route planning study area once the preferred plan has been confirmed? Suggest an interim communication to let stakeholders know when the preferred plan has been confirmed post PIC #2.

R: There is no specific milestone for confirming the preferred plan post PIC #2. We will not be refining the limits of the route planning study area, but we will refine the Focused Analysis Area based on the preliminary preferred plan. We will consider the need for an interim communication.

### **3. Approach for Evaluating the Short List of Route Alternatives**

P. Puccini provided an overview of the purpose and structure of an evaluation and the two methodologies being used by the project team to evaluate the short list of route alternatives. The two methods include the reasoned argument method as the primary method, and the arithmetic method as the secondary tool to test the results of the reasoned argument method. P. Puccini also provided an overview of the evaluation factors being used, and how the project team will use the results of the two evaluation methodologies to select a preferred alternative for the GTA West transportation corridor. P. Puccini inquired if the presentation of the evaluation methodologies was understandable and whether it would be appropriate for the Community Workshops in June 2015. P. Puccini also inquired what evaluation factors were important to the MAG/RAAG and why.

C: The freeway-to-freeway interchanges should be evaluated independently of adjacent route sections. It may also be appropriate to have different weighting scenarios for the interchanges than the routes.

- Q: Is the project team going to give more emphasis to some stakeholder group input than others? Municipal Council input should be given more weight than other stakeholder groups.
- R: For the reasoned argument method, the project team will consider and identify key sources of input as appropriate. For the arithmetic method, input from each stakeholder group will be considered equally, but each evaluation weighting scenario is a sensitivity test on its own that can be compared to the results of the reasoned argument method. The reasoned argument method is the primary tool for selecting the preferred route.
- Q: Where is cost considered?
- R: Capital cost is considered under the transportation factor.
- C: Different weightings should be used in different areas. The natural environment is more important in some areas.
- C: Some existing rural areas will be urban in the future. If you are only looking at existing land use then you may not capture the future condition.
- R: Land use impacts consider existing land use and approved planned future land use.
- C: The natural environment should be protected first and foremost.
- Q: Is the project team going to be dividing the factor weightings to allot a percentage to each sub-factor?
- R: Yes. We will do this based on stakeholder input, secondary source information, results from field investigations, and professional expertise.
- C: Transportation should be given priority followed by land use, and then the natural environment and community fabric.

#### **4. Specific Issues and Trade-Offs in the Study Area**

T. Sorochinsky, B. Jamieson and J. Dowell reviewed the key issues and trade-offs in the west, central and east sections of the study area respectively. The three design leads sought input from the MAG/RAAG on the key issues and trade-offs identified and any additional ones that the project team should emphasize in the evaluation of the short listed alternatives.

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

- C: The City of Brampton prefers the southerly crossing of the Credit River based on previous information from the Transportation Master Plan. Brampton is trying to accommodate east-west movement.
- C: More information should be provided regarding the level of analysis that went into dismissing the proposed hybrid alternative that connects between Alternatives 1C and 1E south of the Credit River.
- C: The Town of Halton Hills prefers the northerly crossing of the Credit River, as the transportation issues in and around Norval need to be addressed.

- C: It is difficult to say a preference for the crossing location of the Credit River until the project team comments on the design of the different crossings.
- C: Peel Region prefers an interchange at Mayfield road as it will serve the Heritage Heights community better and provide better east-west connectivity.
- C: Town of Halton Hills noted agreement with an interchange at Mayfield Road as it will benefit the Town of Halton Hills in the long run.
- Q: The Town of Halton Hills asked if the proposed interchange with realigned Winston Churchill Boulevard on Alternative 1A (discussed at the municipal interchange meeting) is no longer being considered.
- R: That option is not off the table, but the maps have not been updated to incorporate all the feedback received from recent meetings.

*Central Section (Mississauga Road to Highway 50)*

- Q: Why did the project team not carry forward an interchange at Bramalea Road as was shown at PIC #1?
- R: The location is too close to Highway 410 and Dixie Road. We can further investigate the feasibility of an interchange at Bramalea Road if you are interested.
- C: Interchange locations will directly impact future development in the Town of Caledon. We understand that your traffic modelling is going to be done to 2031 but you need to consider the life of the transportation corridor beyond that timeframe to ensure that there is enough capacity for the future.
- R: We are looking to provide good levels of service beyond 2031. We are not going to build interchanges that will be at capacity in 2031. For example, the Parclo A4 design provides the greatest capacity so those configurations are preferred barring other constraints but other configurations may be considered as needed.
- C: Stakeholders need to be provided with the rationale on why some interchanges are carried forward and others are not.
- R: The screening from the long list to the short list is already available. We are currently going through an iterative process with municipalities regarding interchange locations and more information will be provided as we proceed. Documentation of the screening process for interchange locations will be presented at PIC #2.
- C: Prefer the direct Highway 410 connection because it results in less out-of-way travel, emissions, etc. compared to using the existing 410/upgrading Hurontario Street.
- C: The direct Highway 410 connection would result in greater impacts to the Heart Lake Wetland Complex and other ecological functions. These impacts would be compounded on the impacts from the earlier decision to shift Highway 410 west to Hurontario Street.

*East Section (Highway 50 to Highway 400)*

C: Protect for both a Weston Road and Pine Valley Drive interchange.

R: We are aiming not to preclude one or the other.

Q: Will the project team develop functional designs for route alternatives so municipalities can provide informed input to the project team?

R: The project team is doing enough design to get us through the evaluation process. For example, we are developing freeway-to-freeway configurations but will not be developing configurations for arterial interchanges with the associated road realignments.

C: Request the shape files of short listed route alternatives.

*Post Meeting Note: Now that the revised short listed route alternatives have been reviewed and confirmed, the GTA West Project Team will release the GIS shape files of the short listed route alternatives to municipal and agency partners upon request to the project team. A License to Use Agreement will be required from any government agency or utility company to ensure files are used for intended purposes only.*

Q: Will another MAG/RAAG meeting be held before PIC#2?

R: We will hold a MAG/RAAG meeting around PIC #2.

Q: Has anyone complained about the quality of the mapping on the website?

R: If anyone has any issues regarding mapping or wants additional mapping, we are working with them on a case-by-case basis.

Q: Will preferred interchange configurations be presented at PIC #2?

R: We will be showing footprints for interchanges but we will not be showing configurations. Stakeholders can comment on configurations post PIC #2.

**5. Next Steps and 6. Open Forum**

G. Pothier provided an overview of next steps in the study and N. Rouskov mentioned the upcoming Community Workshops in June 2015.

**7. Closing Remarks**

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

---

Submitted by: B. Patkowski, AECOM

Distribution: Attendees, Regrets

---