

Regional Municipality of York

Appendix 7E

CSAC Meeting Notes



**Western Vaughan Transportation Improvements
Individual Environmental Assessment
Community Stakeholder Advisory Committee (CSAC) Meeting #1
January 22, 2008 - Meeting #1 Notes**

Attendees

CSAC Committee Members

Adam Arnold, Smart Commute
 Tim Arnott, Kleinburg and Area Ratepayers Association
 Joe Chimenti, Citizen
 Frank Greco, Stakeholder
 Len Kozachuk, Sonoma Heights Ratepayers Association

Paul Mantella, Nashville Ratepayers Association
 John McLean, West Humber Naturalists
 Kim Nystrom, Cole Engineering
 Joe Porcelli, Citizen
 Ian Raynor, Vaughan Chamber of Commerce
 Deb Shulte, Friends of Boyd
 David Stewart, TACC

Project Team Members

Arup Mukherjee, York Region
 Steve Hollinger, York Region
 Sue Cumming, Facilitator,
 Cumming+Company

Barry Darch, UMA
 Dick Gordon, UMA
 Ian Dobrindt, GLL
 Mike Poskin, GLL
 Dave Crowley, Halcrow

Item	Description	Action By
<p>Introductions, Welcome and Role of Committee</p>	<p>The meeting called to order by Sue Cumming (Facilitator). Introductions of CSAC and Project Team Members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sue Cumming reviewed the agenda for the first meeting, the role of the Committee, Role of the Facilitator and Discussed Ground Rules for the Committee – hand out provided. These ground rules were accepted by the Committee representatives. (Attachment#1). The ground rules will be reviewed at the beginning of all meetings. ▪ Sue indicated that the agenda for future meetings would be developed so as to have a time for presentation and discussion at each meeting. For future meetings where documents are to be discussed, these would be forwarded two weeks in advance so as to focus discussion on substantive content and not a line by line review. ▪ Meeting notes will be provided. These will not be meeting minutes. The notes will be based on topics of discussion, noting key points, direction and required follow-up. The notes will not indicate who said what except where a response is noted from the project team and follow-up required. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Arup Mukherjee described the project and provided an overview of the process noting the growing area and transportation needs to 2031. He stressed the importance of the project for York Region and appreciation of the role and commitment of the CSAC members. 	
Confirmation of Committee Terms of Reference	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sue Cumming circulated copies of and reviewed the Committee Terms of Reference which was posted on the web site along with the invitation to participate. CSAC members indicated that they understood and were comfortable with their role. There was a discussion pertaining to alternates and it was confirmed that alternates would be identified for organizations, and not for individual residents, being represented. The responsibility of the member is to ensure that the alternate is informed about the process and can participate when they are not able to. 	
Project Overview of Ian Dobrindt Gartner Lee Limited (Pages 10 – 24 on Handout)	<p>Ian Dobrindt presented the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What an Individual Environmental Assessment (IEA) is and how it differs from a Class EA ▪ Project schedule ▪ History Overview with Minister’s amendments ▪ Growth of area by population and employment ▪ What areas are protected and what is left to be developed ▪ Planned infrastructure 	
Discussion	<p>Key Discussion Points Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For future meetings, a minimum of two weeks notice is preferred. Meetings should be held at the same venue each time. If a meeting is called with less than two weeks notice, members would like a phone call. There needs to be care in how notes are reported. ▪ Are there limitations on growth in the area – population and employment growth? <i>Response from Ian Dobrindt: Pages 18 to 22 show the forecasted population and employment growth and overlay of Oak Ridges Moraine and Greenbelt. This shows what areas are to be protected and what area is possible for new population and employment growth.</i> ▪ What is the CSAC involvement in reviewing the evaluation criteria? <i>Response from Ian Dobrindt: The CSAC will have the opportunity to provide input during the study.</i> ▪ Is a bypass still being considered around the northern side of Kleinburg? <i>Response from Ian Dobrindt: It is not in the study area but it could be a possibility. If it is a best alternative, the study area can shift and can include it.</i> ▪ Slide 23 is confusing.. ▪ Why does the slide show the growth in red? <i>Response from Ian Dobrindt: It is showing the worst case scenario if nothing is done. Slide is a high level look at the areas of congestion.</i> ▪ Are other areas being developed in abutting areas in other municipalities? Why does the study area include 	CSAC to input to evaluation criteria at future meetings

	<p>Hwy 50? <i>Response from Arup Mukherjee: We are coordinating this study with Peel and Toronto and using growth numbers and projections for the traffic demand. Peel is involved in study and has a seat on the Review Agency Advisory Committee (RAAC).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why is this study being done by York Region? Will Vaughan be a decision-maker? <i>Response from Arup Mukherjee: The proponent is the Region and the Region is undertaking the study. The City will have input through the RAAC and through the review of study documents.</i> ▪ Will the York Region Politicians then be making decisions on this project? <i>Response from Ian Dobrindt: For this Individual EA the Ontario Ministry of the Environment (MOE) is the decision-maker.</i> ▪ Involvement with Peel Region is critical given the potential for decisions and growth in Peel to impact Nashville. 	
<p>Purpose and Rationale for the Undertaking</p> <p>Dick Gordon UMA/AECOM</p> <p>(Pages 25 – 35 on Handout)</p>	<p>Dick Gordon provided an overview of the project purpose and rationale noted the following key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Description of missing links and how they impact all other areas in the study area ▪ Employment growth by traffic zones overview ▪ Travel forecasting model chart ▪ Overview as to how transportation planners develop the modelling in traffic forecasting ▪ Peak road network congestion through to 2031 ▪ Changes in travel patterns ▪ Forecasting for movement from east to west ▪ More residents are moving through and within the study area and not leaving for Toronto to work ▪ Rationale for the Undertaking ▪ Specific problems within the study area and where they exist ▪ Project schedule. 	
<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Key Discussion Points Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Population Growth slide: What do the numbers reflect? Isn't the City of Vaughan doing a revision of the Official Plan? ▪ Growth in certain areas will be higher than what is shown. Numbers will be revised and changed constantly when data are available. ▪ Growth in the northwest quadrant of Vaughan will be more significant than what the Region is showing on pages 28 and 29. OPA 601 has more residential growth than what is shown here. This new growth needs to be reflected in the transportation analysis. ▪ Will the model take into account other studies ongoing in York? <i>Response from Arup Mukherjee: Yes, the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) for example.</i> ▪ How will the 427 extension be factored into this study? Any more information as to when it will be approved? <i>Response from the Arup Mukherjee: Our study will go ahead as planned and will coordinate with and incorporate</i> 	

	<p><i>the 427 extension. We are meeting with Peel Region and MTO and have been advised that MTO will be having further public meetings this spring.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ On Page 27, Teston Rd is shown as a missing link but it does exist. It should not be shown as a missing link. This slide is misleading. Does it mean that this study will be looking to complete all of these missing pieces because they are missing for reasons that will not change because of this study? <i>Response from Dick Gordon: The modelling showed Teston Road as a discontinuity and that is why it is highlighted. We recognize that these links were not completed because of environmental constraints and other reasons.</i> ▪ What is the nature of employment projected in and around Nashville area? What is the characteristic of this employment local or destination? <i>Response from Dick Gordon: The zones along Hwy 400 are destination employment areas.</i> ▪ What is the supporting evaluation for the modelling? Would like to know when comparing congestion do you consider a lane mile or link mile? How low on the hierarchy for the model is the evaluation of congestion? <i>Response from Dave Crowley: The model looks strictly at arterial roads, talking about congestion, road improvements including widening of 400, 407, 427 and transit.</i> ▪ Chamber of Commerce is concerned with employment in the area – possible loss due to road deficiencies. ▪ This process is good for input and options as to what can be done. How can we manage traffic smarter? Are there limitations for everything or just bus? ▪ Planning and development is in reverse. We struggle to correct this problem all the time. ▪ Existing roads/ missing link slide is a bad slide. ▪ Study is long overdue. There is a need to alleviate congestion. Ongoing link placed on website to look at population forecast is needed. ▪ Would like to know why Nashville Rd. is shown in red. ▪ Would like to know more about how the undertaking is defined in the Terms of Reference. Where can we get the project Terms of Reference? <i>Response from Ian Dobrindt: These are available on the project web site.</i> ▪ Is this study looking at only regional roads improvement or expansion? Are City of Vaughan roads not included? <i>Response from Arup Mukherjee: This is a regional study and we are looking at regional roads. If we identify that City roads could be involved as part of the solution, then the Region will discuss improvements to all roads if needed.</i> ▪ Could a new 407 interchange be developed? <i>Response from Arup Mukherjee: The spacing of existing interchanges makes it difficult to consider a new interchange.</i> ▪ Can we identify the appropriate need for improvement? i.e., get a solid idea on what is improving and the changes to the employment growth? Also, when were studies done and is it up to date? <i>Response from Arup</i> 	<p>Further information at next meeting on Nashville Road (Dick Gordon)</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p><i>Mukherjee: Studies were done in 2001 and updated in 2006. We will continue to update the information to be accurate.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are there opportunities for the GO train to be used? <i>Response from Dick Gordon: Woodbridge and Bolton stations are being developed</i> ▪ Is the flow from Peel into Vaughan being considered? <i>Response from Dave Crowley: Yes it is included in the modelling.</i> ▪ Would like to see the assumptions used in the modeling and approach and rationale. ▪ Facilitator: With the comments and questions that have been raised on the model and the assumptions made, would the committee like to meet again to discuss these issues further? <i>Response from Committee members: Would like the project team to provide the committee with necessary background information and let us digest it and determine if a specific meeting on this topic is needed.</i> ▪ The Region should make sure that the assumptions are shown on any modeling information that is shown to the public at the PCCs. 	<p>Short primer on modeling to be prepared and distributed to the RAAC and CSAC. (Dave Crowley to prepare)</p>
<p>First Round of Public Consultation Centres</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sue Cumming distributed a draft notice for the first round of Public Consultation Centres being held on February 12, 13 and 20th. The format of these is a drop-in open house. The materials to be used at the PCCs would be refined to incorporate the CSAC member comments. All were encouraged to attend one of the sessions. 	
<p>Discussion</p>	<p>CSAC members suggested the following be considered for the public meeting materials:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Show the study area boundary or text box to indicate that it may change with input from the public and stakeholders (i.e., specifically the northern boundary would need to shift if a bypass around Kleinberg were one of the alternatives to be considered). ▪ Show Kleinberg as a Heritage District. ▪ Emphasis that study will focus on regional roads, transit and TDM etc... improvement. ▪ Clearly state purpose of PCC#1 including obtaining comments on the rationale for the undertaking (problem definition), input on study area boundary. ▪ Note that public input will be sought on the draft evaluation criteria and how this will be received. ▪ Be clear on what this study is about – use wording from ToR. People need to know that the Pine Valley Link is off the table and use MOE words. ▪ Have list of other regional studies and who to contact at Region. ▪ How does this tie in with the sustainability objectives of the Region? Need to include text on these objectives and how other York Region initiatives are connected to this – for example the Transportation Master Plan, Pedestrian 	<p>Project Team to incorporate input to PCC#1 Materials</p>

	<p>and Cycling Master Plan, Sustainability Work, Transit Planning, TDM, initiatives to change travel behavior.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Show other considerations – more than roads solutions. ▪ Show more diagrams and fewer words for the transportation side of the presentation. Show methodology with diagrams ▪ Existing roads/ missing link slide should not be used. Missing links in existing slide show Teston Rd as a missing link but it does exist. Should not be shown as a missing link. Page 27 conveys the message that these links may all be completed as part of the project. There are environmental and community reasons why infrastructure was never built in these areas. Word “missing” should not be used and any hatched lines around these areas are misleading. ▪ Show destination of people within the study area and outside area traffic to show more reflective picture of where people are going and coming from. ▪ Acknowledge broader picture with need for changing travel behavior. ▪ List planned assumptions so that people can understand the information with better context. Show assumptions for traffic perspective and improvements that are made. ▪ Better depiction of growth and employment information. ▪ Slide showing growth and planned improvements is confusing and raises lots of questions. Suggestion to delete it and use pictures or words to convey same information. ▪ Show growth for Peel Region and City of Toronto. ▪ How does the population growth slide account for the City of Vaughan Official Plan review and OPAs that will be higher in growth? ▪ Create story boards to describe the overall community planning perspective. These could include text to indicate the nature of employment growth (i.e. destination or more local particularly for the Nashville Area, destination for areas along Hwy 400). 	
Meeting Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CSAC members were encouraged to liaise with Arup Mukherjee and consultants with any ongoing comments and discussions. ▪ The next meeting of the CSAC would be held in the spring. ▪ CSAC members confirmed that their names could be posted on the project web site. ▪ The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m. 	



**Western Vaughan Transportation Improvements
Individual Environmental Assessment
Community Stakeholder Advisory Committee (CSAC) Meeting #2
June 17, 2008 - Meeting #2 Notes**

Attendees

CSAC Committee Members

Leo Angelantoni, Citizen
Adam Arnold, Smart Commute
Kim Nystrom, Cole Engineering
Tim Arnott, Kleinburg Area Ratepayers Association

Paul Mantella, Nashville Ratepayers Association
Joanne Nonnekes, Friends of Boyd
Kevin Shackleton, West Humber Naturalists

Project Team Members

Arup Mukherjee, York Region
Steve Hollinger, York Region
Sue Cumming, Facilitator, Cumming+Company
Barry Darch, UMA
Dick Gordon, UMA

Ian Dobrindt, Gartner Lee Limited (GLL)
Marc Rose, GLL
Mike Poskin, GLL
Dave Crowley, Halcrow

Item	Description
Welcome, Introductions and Meeting Overview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meeting called to order by Sue Cumming (Facilitator). Introductions of CSAC and Project Team Members. Overview of Meeting expectations, Ground Rules for Facilitator and CSAC, Agenda. ▪ Meeting notes to be provided, not meeting minutes. Notes will be based on topics of discussion, noting key points, direction and required follow-up. ▪ Meeting agendas are scheduled to allow time for discussion at each meeting. For future meetings where documents are to be discussed, these will continue to be forwarded two weeks in advance so as to focus discussion on substantive content and not a line-by-line review. Confirmation of importance of CSAC to the overall project and opportunity for creative solutions. ▪ No objections to previous meeting notes. ▪ Arup Mukherjee stressed the importance of the project for York Region and appreciation of the role and commitment of the CSAC members.
Project Update Ian Dobrindt Gartner Lee Limited (Pages 3 – 6 on handout)	<p>Ian Dobrindt presented the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Where we are in the Individual Environmental Assessment (IEA) process ▪ Consultation activities to date ▪ Key comments and responses received ▪ Expansion of Study Area ▪ Existing environmental conditions and features in the Study Area (maps also shown)
Discussion	<p>Key Discussion Points Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What does extending the Study Area north do to improve traffic congestion? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is trying to bypass Kleinburg area to address traffic congestion in the northern portion of the Study Area.

Item	Description
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Study Area should be extended to Kirby Road to avoid impacts to Kleinburg and Nashville. ▪ Study Area is different on these maps as opposed to what is shown on the presentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Study Area in the presentation includes the proposed extension northward. The existing conditions mapping in the handouts is based on the original Study Area. The final existing conditions mapping will reflect the proposed extension northward. ▪ Is consideration given for the protection of naturalized areas, even those that are not designated? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, we are collecting existing conditions through secondary sources for the entire Study Area to determine the significance of all natural features. Effects on natural features will be assessed in detail when the Alternatives to the Undertaking are evaluated and compared. ▪ Is there any way to overlay development areas over the map to show natural history and what is left to be protected? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, we can overlay that information once the existing conditions have been documented. ▪ Is this study focused on regional or local road improvements? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The focus is on regional road improvements.
<p>Alternatives to the Undertaking and Approved Screening/Evaluation Methodology Process</p> <p>Dick Gordon UMA/AECOM</p> <p>Ian Dobrindt Gartner Lee Limited</p> <p>Pages 6 to 11 of handout</p>	<p>Dick Gordon presented the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Alternatives to the Undertaking (shown on maps and presented with detail) ▪ Purpose of the Undertaking ▪ Congestion in the Study Area in 2031 ▪ Screening Criterion ▪ Volume/Capacity ratios <p>Ian Dobrindt presented the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Approved screening/evaluation methodology process flow chart ▪ Evaluation factors, criteria, indicators, and measures ▪ Example criteria application
<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Key Discussion Points Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How is this study being coordinated with other studies in the area? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ongoing meetings are being held with the Ministry of Transportation and Peel Region. ▪ Are you looking into bicycle-to-work initiatives? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cycling is part of the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) initiatives. ▪ It is good to see mixed travel modes and it would be even better to see cycling shown as a separate alternative and how that would change the modeling results. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Should TDM be carried forward as part of the preferred alternative, the details of how it will be implemented and its effect on congestion will be described. ▪ Are you looking for an alternative that is not all roads and reflects the increasing cost of oil? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Several alternatives being considered as part of the screening, such as TDM, TSM, and Public Transit Improvements, do not include any road improvements. However, our screening results indicate that these alternatives do not sufficiently address traffic

Item	Description
	<p style="text-align: center;">congestion on their own. We have seen no evidence to suggest that travel patterns will change so dramatically as a result of the cost of oil that alternatives without any road improvements will fully address the purpose of the undertaking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How is this study intending to reflect the outcome of the City of Vaughan's Official Plan review? Discussions as part of the OP review have suggested increasing the density of residential development. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This study is using the population and employment growth numbers that have been developed by the Region based on <i>Places to Grow</i>. The study must continue in parallel with the Official Plan review and use the best numbers that are available to us at the time. ▪ Are we really providing input into this study? Is it possible to change what you recommend? How can we protect the natural features in the Study Area? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Advisory Committees have been established so that stakeholders have input into the evaluation process and the evaluation results before any decisions are made. In terms of protecting natural features, this study will aim to avoid natural features as a first step, and to minimize any impacts if avoidance is not possible. In that event, the Region will also consider compensation for any long-term effects on natural features. ▪ You need to look at what is going to happen in the short term as well as long term. ▪ Take the bypass off of the map. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We will revise the map to show a conceptual location for any alternative north of Teston Road. ▪ What is going on with the Highway 427 extension? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MTO has selected a preliminary preferred route. ▪ Are these evaluation measures standard? How do they get weighted? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ These evaluation measures are similar to other studies of this type. There is no weighting proposed at this point in accordance with Minister approved Terms of Reference in the IEA. ▪ Make sure that TDM is assessed with transit initiatives as improvements to transit service could influence how much cycling is done in the area (e.g., bike racks on the front of buses). ▪ What timeline is reflected in the screening? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The screening reflects traffic conditions from now until 2031. ▪ Spring peepers must be protected and therefore the Region must make sure that road improvements do not affect the peeper pond at Pine Valley Drive and Teston Road. You need to pay attention to natural areas that are of great importance to the area.

Item	Description
<p>Project Schedule and Upcoming Activities</p> <p>Ian Dobrindt Gartner Lee Limited (Pages 14 – 15 on handout)</p>	<p>Ian Dobrindt presented the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of project Schedule ▪ Upcoming Project Activities ▪ Contact Information <p>The meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.</p>



**Western Vaughan Transportation Improvements
Individual Environmental Assessment
Community Stakeholder Advisory Committee (CSAC) Meeting #3
October 21, 2008 - Meeting #3 Notes**

Attendees

CSAC Committee Members

Leo Angelantoni, Citizen	Paul Mantella, Nashville Ratepayers Association
Adam Arnold, Smart Commute	Deb Schulte, Friends of Boyd
Kim Nystrom, Cole Engineering	Kevin Shackleton, West Humber Naturalists
Tim Arnott, Kleinburg Area Ratepayers Association	David Stewart, TACC
Frank Greco, Property Manager	Joe Chimenti, Citizen

Project Team Members

Arup Mukherjee, York Region	Ian Dobrindt, AECOM
Steve Hollinger, York Region	Marc Rose, AECOM
Sue Cumming, Facilitator, Cumming+Company	Mike Poskin, AECOM
Barry Darch, AECOM	Dave Crowley, Halcrow
Dick Gordon, AECOM	

Item	Description
Welcome, Introductions and Meeting Overview	<p>Meeting called to order by Sue Cumming (Facilitator). Introductions of CSAC and Project Team Members. Overview of Meeting expectations, Ground Rules for Facilitator and CSAC, Agenda.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meeting notes to be provided, not meeting minutes. Notes will be based on topics of discussion, noting key points, direction and required follow-up. ▪ Meeting agendas are scheduled to allow time for discussion at each meeting. For future meetings where documents are to be discussed, these will continue to be forwarded two weeks in advance so as to focus discussion on substantive content and not a line-by-line review. Confirmation of importance of CSAC to the overall project and opportunity for creative solutions. ▪ Previous meeting notes prepared on August 1, 2008 accepted with no changes. ▪ Arup Mukherjee stressed the importance of the project for York Region and appreciation of the role and commitment of the CSAC members.
Project Review Ian Dobrindt AECOM	<p>Ian Dobrindt presented the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Where we are in the Individual Environmental Assessment (IEA) process ▪ Response to comments received at previous Advisory Committee results ▪ Additional careening criteria and results ▪ Identification of the "Short List" of Alternatives to the Undertaking"

Item	Description
Discussion	<p>Key Discussion Points Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If bypass is still on map, then we still have a chance to have traffic go around Kleinburg. ▪ We are not carrying forward the idea and it will not be a part of our process. The public can address this issue through the City's OP process. ▪ Major Mackenzie is spelled as one word on the maps. ▪ The differences between alts 6 and 8 are the road improvements along Teston. ▪ Is there still a jog at Pine Valley Drive and Teston? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If this is improved, the jog would likely be eliminated ▪ There is a significant wetland on the northern corner of the jog. ▪ How real is the GO rail station at Bolton? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ GO is under a feasibility study for this station. It will be shown this way in all scenarios. This will be discussed at later stages. We can only go by what information is being provided to us. We are only showing what we can assume from the information. ▪ Is there a jog elimination of Major Mackenzie on all of the alternatives? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes. It is only shown with a circle on alt 8 but will be changed to show consistency with the other alternatives. ▪ Alternative 8 does not show Teston Road as being widened, why? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Benefits of widening Teston Road in comparison to other impacts. Alternative 8 is really about the TMP and then looking at other transit improvements. ▪ All improvements needed to support current improvements.
<p>Evaluation Process/ Evaluation Results</p> <p>Ian Dobrindt AECOM</p> <p>Dick Gordon AECOM</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Overview of approved ToR Screening/Evaluation Methodology ▪ Overview of Net Effects Analysis Process ▪ Overview of Comparative Evaluation Process ▪ Overview of criteria and factor ranking and overall ranking of Short-Listed Alternatives
Discussion	<p>Key Discussion Points Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How does the screening criteria correlate to the overall evaluation? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is not the same application and therefore has no impact on the outcome of the evaluation ▪ What is the critical path schedule? Will the HOV lanes really work? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Early next year is when you will see more detailed information and the critical path. Construction time lines will not be known until the study is complete. ○ HOV lanes will work and studies have shown them to be more efficient. These will not be the standard type of HOV lanes, they can be transit dedicated. ▪ Teston Road - 4 lane road ending at a 2 lane country road will cause problems and should be reconsidered. Why is Huntington Road left out of the improvements? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lane transitions and continuity will be designed to match 4 and 2 lane road sections. Huntington is not a Regional Road ▪ Is York Region in contact with Peel Region on the Highway 50 improvements? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes.

Item	Description
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Will the TMP hold true with this study? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Still will feed future studies. We are prioritizing and recommending through this study. ▪ Is it possible to downgrade the improvements in the TMP? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When specific projects are planned, further study is undertaken. At this point, we are carrying through with the study of improvements planned for in the TMP, there is currently nothing that is showing us that these should be downgraded. ▪ Road improvements in alts 8 and 9 are the same, how can we build 8 into the submission so that it is going to go forward? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It can be done and we may look at that if there is a need to do so. ▪ Several committee members requested further information on the criteria review. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consulting team will provide to members upon request.
<p>Project Schedule and Upcoming Activities</p> <p>Ian Dobrindt AECOM</p>	<p>Ian Dobrindt presented the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Overview of project schedule ▪ Upcoming project activities <p>The meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.</p>



**Western Vaughan Transportation Improvements
Individual Environmental Assessment
Community Stakeholder Advisory Committee (CSAC) Meeting #4
June 11, 2009 - Meeting #4 Notes**

Attendees

CSAC Members

Kim Nystrom, Cole Engineering
David Stewart, TACC
Kevin Shackleton, West Humber Naturalists
Paul Mantella, Nashville Ratepayers Association
Frank Greco, Property Manager

Deb Schulte, Friends of Boyd
Adam Arnold, Smart Commute
Joe Chimenti, Citizen

Project Team Members

Arup Mukherjee, York Region
Sue Cumming, Facilitator, Cumming+Company
Barry Darch, AECOM
Dick Gordon, AECOM
Greg Smith, AECOM

Jeff Atherton, AECOM
Marc Rose, AECOM
Dan Minkin, AECOM
Dave Crowley, Halcrow

Item	Description
Welcome, Introductions and Meeting Overview Sue Cumming Cumming+Company	The meeting called to order at 6:30 pm by Sue Cumming (Facilitator). CSAC and Project Team Members introduced themselves. Sue provided an overview of meeting expectations, ground rules, and the agenda.
Project Review Arup Mukherjee York Region	Arup Mukherjee presented: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The screening process for identifying a short list of Alternatives to the Undertaking ▪ The evaluation process for identifying Alternative 8 as the recommended Alternative to the Undertaking ▪ The general response received from the public at Public Consultation Centre #2 ▪ An overview of the proposed criteria for evaluating alternative methods ▪ The next steps in the process, and their timelines
Discussion	Key Discussion Points Noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In the six-lane cross-section, will the centre median also be used for left-turn lanes, and does the HOV lane count as one of the lanes? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, the centre median will be narrowed at intersections to allow for left-turn lanes, and yes, the HOV lanes do count among the 6 lanes. They will be dedicated for busses and carpools. There will be no additional lanes as right-turn lanes. ▪ Are the proposed enhancements on Teston Road still relevant, given the Province's plans for 400-series highways under the GTA West Corridor plan? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are no proposed enhancements to Teston Road in Alternative 8.

Item	Description
<p>Potential Alignments for Road Improvements in Alternative 8</p> <p>Greg Smith AECOM</p> <p>Jeff Atherton AECOM</p>	<p>Greg Smith and Jeff Atherton presented a Google Earth “fly-by” of each of the roads identified for improvement in Alternative 8, showing potential alignments.</p>
<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Key Discussion Points Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What will happen to Huntington Road when the extended Highway 427 meets Major Mackenzie Drive right at Huntington Road? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ According to MTO’s plans for Highway 427, Huntington Road will become discontinuous, terminating north and south of the interchange. ▪ I’m concerned about the communities that use the road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There will be other road connections serving these communities. ○ <i>(Note: In an email after the meeting, the Nashville Area Ratepayers’ Association reiterated its position that Huntington Road should have its continuity preserved across Major Mackenzie Drive.)</i> ▪ It seems that where the Major Mackenzie Drive alignment descends into the Humber Valley from the west, it goes over the highest-profile point on the ridge, so you’d be cutting a lot. ▪ What would happen to the old alignment of Major Mackenzie Drive just west of Highway 27? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We would keep that road to service the homes along the road and to provide a “relief valve” in case Major Mackenzie Drive backs up at Highway 27. We might curve the road to the south at its western terminus to meet Major Mackenzie Drive at a wider angle. ▪ The East Humber Valley is an important wildlife corridor, so I would think we would want a high bridge. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are a number of factors to consider in terms of the height of the bridge, including hydraulics. ▪ How would lighting work in a non-urban 6-lane context such as in the Humber Valley? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lighting is generally for pedestrians, not drivers. Curves are designed so that headlights provide sufficient illumination. Therefore, it may be possible to design non-urban sections of roadway without lighting. ▪ Have you dealt with the guy who built the bridge on Rutherford Road over the East Humber River? It took him months to drive the piles because of the way the river snakes and the groundwater. It was much more complicated than expected. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If it takes more boreholes to understand the geotechnical conditions, then that is what York Region will do. ▪ William Ranger Greenway, a day-use trail, currently stops at Rutherford Road because the Rutherford bridge wasn’t designed for an underpass, but now there is money to construct one and it will eventually go from Kleinburg to Woodbridge along the East Humber – please keep it in mind. It is a valuable asset to the community. ▪ There is a lot of wildlife traffic across Pine Valley Drive, between

Item	Description
	<p>the forest tracts just north of Rutherford Road: three woodlots on the east side of Pine Valley Drive are part of a provincially significant ANSI, and the west side of Pine Valley Drive is forested TRCA property. It's important not to chop up that area of woodland</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It's already chopped up by Pine Valley Drive. ○ Yes, but a two-lane road isn't a large traffic load compared to a four-lane road. ○ What kind of wildlife are we talking about? ○ Beavers and coyotes, the "big stuff" – but also rarities like flying squirrels. That's what makes it an ANSI. ○ Is Pine Valley Drive level with the surrounding lands? ○ The woodlands are more or less level with the road. It would be great if we could do wildlife underpasses or something but the topography doesn't lend itself to it. We could do a site visit. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Do the four lanes on Pine Valley Drive include a bus lane? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No, bus lanes will only be added when a road is expanded from four to six lanes. We are looking at ways of enhancing the four-lane concept, like off-road bike paths. ▪ The TRCA needs to attract people to Kortright, but it's currently limited to drivers. It would be great to get a bus stop there, but I don't know if they'd want to send a bus up and down the driveway. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ With a four-lane road, a bus wouldn't have a problem. ▪ What does this study offer by way of improvements to the Highway 50 and Rutherford Road intersection, because it's a disaster? The turning lanes don't work. The intersection isn't designed to accommodate the major facility that exists there, and the cost of accommodating it would be negligible compared to the traffic disaster that exists. We accommodate Peel Region but Peel Region doesn't let trucks cross over from York Region. Don't we share management of the boundary roads? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ With Highway 50, there's an agreement that Peel Region manages it. It's a valid point about that intersection. There are issues with trucks there, but it will get better when we extend Highway 427. The idea is that southbound trucks would leave the facility from the north end and proceed south on Highway 427. This was a large part of the reason for the extension. ▪ There is a property owner on Major Mackenzie Drive trying to reduce his setback as part of a plan of subdivision. How will York Region ensure that it acquires the right-of-way required as part of the recommended Alternative? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ York Region won't approve the application if it interferes with the right-of-way we require. ▪ There is a small wetland on the east side of Highway 27 just north of Rutherford Road. According to the TRCA, there is some significant flora there. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Would it work as a mitigation measure to relocate the vulnerable plant species to a larger wetland where they'd have a better chance of survival? ○ Perhaps. There is a larger wetland being constructed farther north called Elders Mills Nature Reserve. York Region was involved in the funding.

Item	Description
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is there an assessment being carried out to identify all these natural features, rather than just pick them up piecemeal? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ That's what the field work is for. They take existing data and supplement it with field visits. The public input is part of this. ▪ Do you have to use the existing road elevations? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No. Usually you would, especially on flat grades, because of connecting driveways and stuff. But we can cut and fill if there is a benefit to it. ▪ Implementing all these improvements looks expensive. Is Highway 27 really a priority? There isn't a traffic problem in that area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We are basing this plan not on present conditions, but on projected traffic patterns for 2031. ○ So some of these improvements will be scheduled for further in the future? ○ Yes. They will be prioritized according to when the improvements will be needed.
<p>Project Schedule and Upcoming Activities</p> <p>Arup Mukherjee York Region</p>	<p>Arup Mukherjee gave an overview of upcoming meetings, particularly the Public Consultation Centre (PCC) scheduled for June 23 and 24, and technical work.</p> <p>Jeff Atherton will distribute the Google Earth files, together with a description of how to use them, by email.</p>
<p>Discussion</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The preferred alternative has been selected, so would that actually change based on public input at the PCC? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We're going before the public to say this is our recommendation, but if there was something everyone really didn't like about it we'd have to consider that. ▪ Have you already started to take proposed road widenings into account in development applications? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes. We will keep what we need to finish the road widening. The rest is by negotiation, or, failing that, expropriation.



Western Vaughan Transportation Improvements
Individual Environmental Assessment
Community Stakeholder Advisory Committee (CSAC)
Meeting #5 - October 27, 2009
Meeting Notes

Attendees

CSAC Members

Kim Nystrom, Cole Engineering
David Stewart, TACC
Paul Mantella, Nashville Ratepayers Association
Deb Schulte, Friends of Boyd

Joe Chimenti, Citizen
Claudio Traverso, Kleinburg and Area
Ratepayers Association

Project Team Members

Arup Mukherjee, York Region
Sue Cumming, Facilitator, Cumming+Company
Barry Darch, AECOM
Greg Smith, AECOM
Ian Dobrindt, AECOM

Marc Rose, AECOM
Dan Minkin, AECOM
Dave Crowley, Halcrow

Item	Description
<p>Welcome, Introductions and Meeting Overview</p> <p>Sue Cumming Cumming+Company</p>	<p>The meeting called to order at 6:30 pm by Sue Cumming (Facilitator). CSAC and Project Team Members introduced themselves. Sue provided an overview of meeting expectations, ground rules, and the agenda.</p>
<p>Project Review</p> <p>Arup Mukherjee York Region</p>	<p>Arup Mukherjee presented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The purpose and rationale for the project ▪ The process by which Alternative 8 was identified as the recommended Alternative to the Undertaking ▪ The results of the corridor optimization study, namely the removal of Pine Valley Drive between Rutherford Road and Major Mackenzie Drive from the IEA study
<p>Assessment and Evaluation of Alternative Alignments for Road Improvements in Alternative 8</p> <p>Marc Rose AECOM</p>	<p>Marc Rose explained the methods used in evaluating alternative alignments for road improvements during the Alternative Methods stage of the EA. He showed in detail the various alternatives considered for segments MM-2 and MM-4, and how they were evaluated. The results of the evaluation of alternative alignments were presented: MM-2B, MM-4B, RR-2A, and RR-4B were shown as recommended alternatives.</p>
<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Key Discussion Points Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The comparative evaluation results for MM-2 seem to indicate that you put equal weighting on each factor-level preference. Is this the case? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No, the results are displayed here in simplified terms. We had to consider tradeoffs. But the only drawback to MM-2B was from the cultural environment factor, and it was a very small effect – a corner of a heritage property would be impacted. ▪ Has the planned residential community to the north of MM-2 been

Item	Description
	<p>approved? Because having a major road adjacent to it would change the nature of the development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is draft approved, with the understanding that these improvements are being considered. We have considered access issues. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I agree with the selection of MM-2B. It doesn't affect Stevenson Road, does it? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is no effect on Stevenson Road. Stevenson Road is not part of this EA. ▪ What would happen with the old Major Mackenzie Drive alignment in the MM-2 area? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It could be used for additional access to residential developments located there. ▪ How steep would the grading be on Major Mackenzie Drive? The existing topography is undulating. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No more than 5%. ▪ What is the effect on TRCA property in the Humber Valley associated with the proposed alignments for MM-2? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It's across from the existing T intersection where Major Mackenzie Drive terminates at Highway 27. The TRCA knew all along that we wanted to align Major Mackenzie through this property, and they are aware of the options we are considering. ▪ When will the roads actually be designed? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We are filing the EA next year. Detailed design will take place in 2011 at the earliest. The timeline for construction remains unclear. ▪ Would the construction take place all at once, or piecemeal? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We would likely break the construction contract into phases. ▪ What is the status of the 427 extension project? How would a delay in the 427 project affect this project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ They will file the EA in a month or two. If there was a major delay, we would have to re-assess which improvements are necessary. ▪ There seems to be very little difference between RR-2A and RR-2B, and very limited tradeoffs. Can't we just combine the two alternatives into an optimized alignment based on the preferred RR-2A? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We will consider that approach. ▪ There is interest in the community about having a trail along the Humber River. Can you rebuild the bridge at Rutherford Road to allow for pedestrian and wildlife movement? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We will look into whether that is feasible during preliminary design. ▪ Do you consider phasing in the effects assessment? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We do not have any information yet on phasing. ▪ There is a steep slope down the north side of segment RR-4. So there would be a lot of fill. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We will do a detailed impact assessment to deal with that. It is likely better to fill on the north side than to cut on the south side. ▪ Is the curve of RR-4 not a safety hazard? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The curve is there already. We will apply the applicable standards for an unlit road appropriate to the horizontal and vertical curves.

Item	Description
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Please show the typical cross-sections at the upcoming public meetings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We will show this information at the Public Consultation Centres in a format that is understandable to the layperson. ▪ What is the impact of the GTA West on the proposed improvements? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We have included the GTA West in our modelling of future traffic and have confirmed that there is no effect on the roads in Western Vaughan. ▪ How can you be sure that the termination of 427 at Major Mackenzie Drive will work? There are already issues at the existing Highway 7 terminus. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is the Ministry's responsibility to ensure that the intersection functions appropriately.
<p>Project Schedule and Upcoming Activities</p> <p>Arup Mukherjee York Region</p>	<p>Arup Mukherjee gave an overview of upcoming meetings, particularly the Public Consultation Centres (PCCs) scheduled for December 2009 (note: the PCCs have subsequently been delayed until February 2010).</p> <p>The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 pm.</p>



**Western Vaughan Transportation Improvements
Individual Environmental Assessment
Community Stakeholders Advisory Committee (CSAC)
Meeting #6 – July 13, 2010
Meeting Notes**

Attendees

CSAC Members

Deborah Schulte, Friends of Boyd
Adam Arnold, Smart Commute Vaughan
Len Kozachuk, Sonoma Heights Ratepayers
Association
Aaron Hershoff, TACC

Paul Mantella, Nashville Ratepayers Association
David Brand, Kleinburg and Area Ratepayers
Association
Joe Chimenti, citizen

Project Team Members

Arup Mukherjee, York Region
Barry Darch, AECOM
Ian Dobrindt, AECOM
Greg Smith, AECOM
Jeff Atherton, AECOM
Marc Rose, AECOM
Loren Polonsky, AECOM

Dan Minkin, AECOM
Dick Gordon, AECOM
Hossein Zarei, AECOM
Alain Carriere, RWDI
Jason Tsang, RWDI
Dave Crowley, Halcrow

Item	Description
Welcome, Introductions and Meeting Overview Loren Polonsky AECOM	The meeting was called to order at 6:30 pm by Loren Polonsky (Facilitator). CSAC and Project Team Members introduced themselves. Loren provided an overview of the purpose of the meeting, ground rules, and the agenda.
Project Review Marc Rose AECOM	Marc Rose presented: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Where we are in the environmental assessment process ▪ Technical work completed since the previous AC meeting ▪ Consultation undertaken since the previous AC meeting
Overview of Preliminary Designs – Five Roadway Corridors Greg Smith AECOM	Greg Smith presented the preliminary design for the transportation improvements along Major Mackenzie Drive using a computer animation. Key Discussion Points Noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There have been some suggestions that bicycle lanes in the road right-of-way are a safety hazard to the cyclists. Are there opportunities to develop off-road bicycle lanes parallel to the roadways? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ That could be considered on a case-by-case basis, for example on Highway 27, where space permits. ▪ On Major Mackenzie Drive, east of Islington Avenue, is that a bridge or a raised platform? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A bridge – the road deck would remain at the same elevation as it is currently, but the bridge is changing from two to four spans.

Item	Description
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How big are the wildlife crossings being shown? Has the TRCA agreed with the designs? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The wildlife crossing culverts are 4 metres wide by 2 metres high, which exceeds the minimum openness ratio (OR) required for smaller animal species. We have been in consultation with the TRCA on this matter. ▪ How will Major Mackenzie Drive be connected to Highway 27, and will it accommodate northbound Highway 27 traffic turning onto Major Mackenzie Drive to access Highway 427? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This would continue to be an at-grade intersection, and would accommodate the proper radius for turning trucks. ▪ How will impacts to the property on the north side of Major Mackenzie Drive east of Highway 27 be addressed? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We have had previous discussions with the landowner about the design and the likely need to acquire property and he has not raised any issues. ▪ There is a dog park on the south side of Major Mackenzie Drive, east of Highway 27. Are there ways of making it more accessible? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ That would be a very fine level of detail in terms of design. Future planners can consider that.
<p>Assessing the Effects of the Proposed Improvements: Impacts and Mitigations</p> <p>Marc Rose AECOM</p>	<p>Marc presented the process by which potential environmental effects associated with the preliminary designs were identified and mitigation measures developed to determine net effects. He gave an overview of the key potential effects identified during this stage of the study, and their mitigation measures.</p> <p>Key Discussion Points Noted:</p> <p><i>On Natural Environment Effects</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are there really Redside Dace in the Humber River? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Humber River is managed for Redside Dace based on records existing for the species. ▪ Who is being affected by dewatering? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We have identified 50 wells that could be affected, but the well mapping is only accurate to 300 metres, so really the wells are just in the vicinity of the stars on the map. ○ The water supply pipeline to be constructed up Huntington Road will eliminate the need for wells in Kleinburg long before the transportation improvements are built. <p><i>On Noise Effects</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What does the size of the circles on the noise impacts slide reflect? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The size of the circles corresponds to the approximate number of properties affected. ▪ How many houses on Rutherford Road would experience noise increases above 60 dB? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We don't know the exact number of properties, but we know the areas affected. Modeling is not done for individual houses, but for areas of similar exposure; we put noise walls where both of the following criteria are met: increase to above 60 dB and potential for at least a 6 dB reduction in noise as a result of the construction of noise walls. The noise team tested 42 receptors initially, and then additional ones after meeting with residents on Rutherford Road; the range

Item	Description
	<p>was 56 to 61 dB.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For information purposes, you should show which houses would experience noise levels above 60 dB but would not qualify for noise walls. ▪ Did the noise model include the assumption that there would be buses closer to the curb due to the HOV lanes? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The noise model did not break out individual lanes; the proximity of the buses makes less than 1 dB of difference. ▪ So then the model also doesn't account for the fact that trucks will not be in the curb lane? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Correct, which makes this a conservative prediction. ▪ Does the modeling account for traffic increases, or just widening of roads? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Traffic increases over various time periods are considered in the model. ▪ Then the modeling counts traffic increases, but the trigger for noise walls doesn't? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Not exactly; the >60 dB trigger is traffic dependent. ▪ Would there be any noise mitigation for schools? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We don't know yet. The 6 dB relief threshold was a difficult policy decision but we need to stick by it. ▪ What is proposed to mitigate property impacts to houses along Rutherford Road west of Highway 27 (The Snowman Factory, etc)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There will be retaining walls extending east and west beyond the CP Rail underpass structure on both the north and south sides of Rutherford Road. We are currently reviewing the best location for a detour road to accommodate traffic during construction of the underpass. This detour road will also provide access to the properties. We will also have to design service roads to provide access to the properties where their current driveway is cut off by the retaining walls. If we cannot provide driveway access, the Region will have to acquire the whole property. ▪ How are you fitting six lanes on Rutherford Road through the centre of Elder Mill's, where there is a school house and a cemetery across the road from each other? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We've narrowed the median in that section to avoid impacting the features. <p><i>On Access to Proposed Land Uses</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How will U-turns be accommodated to mitigate right-in/right-out only access restrictions? Would extra lanes be implemented? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Not extra lanes, but possibly a signalization phase. U-turns are legal at intersections unless otherwise signed. <p><i>On Existing Land Uses</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Vaughan Official Plan calls for increased connectivity between local and regional roads; the median is not consistent with that goal. And it looks like on Major Mackenzie Drive there is no opportunity for a left turn between Highway 50 and Highway 27. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It's not a blanket effect; there will be intersections with median breaks at local roads. Many of these median breaks will be signalized. The question of connectivity with local roads is one of the tougher issues on the project, but if you constantly break up the median you defeat the purpose. We are in consultation with the

Item	Description
	<p>City of Vaughan on these issues, and we are aware of planned local collectors, such as the planned north-south collector that will supplement Huntington Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How will the median affect emergency services? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There would be median breaks in long sections of road without intersections for the purpose of accommodating emergency vehicles. ▪ Highway 27 south of Rutherford Road is an evolving part of town, with businesses moving there. Perhaps median breaks and signalization should be considered for this area. ▪ Will information on community character be presented at the PCC? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, information on changes to community character will be presented.
<p>Project Schedule and Upcoming Activities</p> <p>Marc Rose AECOM</p>	<p>Marc Rose gave an overview of the remaining steps in the EA process, including the upcoming PCCs on July 21 and 27, 2010, and the preparation and submission of the EA report.</p> <p>Key Discussion Points Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What is the relationship between the York Region Transportation Master Plan (TMP) and this Study? Because Commissioner Lewellyn-Thomas said in a document presented to York Regional Council that there could be a Highway 427 interchange at Nashville Road, once Highway 427 is extended further north beyond the current terminal point (Major Mackenzie Drive). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The TMP provides guidance to this process. Any change to the proposed Highway 427 extension would have to be dealt with in a separate EA study. In summary, the MTO's Highway 427 study ends at Major Mackenzie Drive. ▪ The lack of a buffer between the sidewalk and the road is problematic. Is there an opportunity to implement a buffer, or is the design set in stone once the EA is approved? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The EA is not a detailed design exercise; the Region will deal with issues such as this after EA approval is received from the MOE. But property acquisition would take place after approval based on the EA. ▪ So could we at that point look at reducing the median width to establish boulevards, or building sidewalks outside of the road right-of-way? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, but there are other constraints: space is needed for utilities, snow clearance, etc. ▪ Why do we need to have a median? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The median was mandated by Regional Council for all six-lane roads, except where serious constraints exist. ▪ There are no dimensions on the conceptual cross-section design. Can we therefore tighten the cross-section to have larger boulevards? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We would look at that during detailed design (after MOE has approved the EA Report for the project), but there may not be space in many areas. The EA process has identified the need for six lanes; York Region policy dictates what they'll look like. Council has approved the conceptual design, not exact widths of facilities. ▪ On-street bicycle lanes are not safe for children. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The lower-tier municipalities are more involved in recreational bicycle facilities. York Region is interested in providing connectivity for commuting cyclists. ▪ The York Region six lane cross-section makes sense in a lot of cases,

Item	Description
	<p>but in areas where children are coming out of their communities and travelling by bicycle to school or other destinations, it isn't safe. Can we implement an off-road bicycle path on one side of the street only, by shifting the road to the other side?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We've examined the opportunity for an off-road bicycle path on Rutherford Road near the Emily Carr Secondary School, and have determined that there is sufficient room in the boulevard for an off-road path, should the City of Vaughan wish to build one. The City can build additional facilities, but we have to take direction from Regional Council. <p>The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 pm.</p>