

Regional Municipality of York

Appendix 7I

RAAC Meeting Notes



**Western Vaughan Transportation Improvements
Individual Environmental Assessment
Review Agency Advisory Committee (RAAC) Meeting #1
January 22, 2008 - Meeting #1 Notes**

Attendees

RAAC Committee Members

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Solange Desautels, MOE | Andrew Pearce, City of Vaughan |
| Dan Francey, GO Transit | Craig White, 407 ETR |
| Paul Kerry, CP Rail | Gary Wilkins, TRCA |
| Bill Kiru, TRCA | Carolyn Woodland, TRCA |
| Wayne McEachern, City of Vaughan | Dean Kemper, MTO |
| Murray McLeod, Peel Region | Fausto Conforti, 407 ETR |
| June Murphy, TRCA | Selma Hubjer, City of Vaughan |

Project Team Members

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

| Item | Description | Action By |
|---|---|-----------|
| <p>Introductions, Welcome and Role of Committee</p> | <p>Meeting called to order by Sue Cumming (Facilitator). Introductions of RAAC and Project Team Members. Overview of terms of RAAC Terms of Reference, role of Committee, Ground Rules for RAAC – hand out provided.</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 Agenda with reference to importance of having 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. Confirmation of importance of RAAC to the overall project and opportunity for creative solutions. ▪ Arup Mukherjee described the project and overviewed 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 RAAC members. | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Project Overview</p> <p>Ian Dobrindt Gartner Lee Limited (Pages 10 – 24 on handout)</p> | <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 | |
| <p>Discussion</p> | <p>Key Discussion Points Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Committee member raised concerns about the use of slide 23 and whether the land use and growth is shown correctly and what are the infrastructure implications. ▪ Committee member raised a question on how the First Nations Consultation Process is being handled and who is handling it. A discussion ensued on how the process is done and that it is a separate part of the process. Ian Dobrindt advised that First Nations Engineering Services Limited has been retained as part of the project team to lead this part of the consultation. ▪ Committee member asked how the proponent is going to address the City of Vaughan Official Plan noting that the Official Plan review was being undertaken in response to the Places to Grow Growth Plan and the projected population and employment numbers that the Regional planners are using may be different. ▪ A question was posed since the Region is the proponent, would they be dealing with improvements for local Vaughan Roads as well. Arup Mukherjee responded that the study would focus on the Region arterials but would identify if there were resulting local improvements on local arterial roads. ▪ Committee member raised a question on the 427 study and how this study would fit in with the Ministry of Transportation’s 427 EA. It was noted that the Region is coordinating with both MTO and Peel Region and looking at implications for the 427 Extension. Part of the study involves modelling and the assumptions and outputs are being shared between the regions and the Ministry. While the process is separate, there are some reasonable assumptions and technical considerations that will be integrated into the analysis for the Western Vaughan study. | |
| <p>Purpose and Rationale for the Undertaking</p> <p>Dick Gordon UMA/AECOM</p> <p>Pages 25 to 35 of handout</p> | <p>Dick Gordon provided an overview of the project purpose and rationale and 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 modeling in traffic forecasting ▪ Peak road network congestion through to 2031 ▪ Changes in travel patterns ▪ Forecasting for movement from east to west | |

| | | |
|------------|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 overview | |
| Discussion | <p>Key Discussion Points Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comment noted: Important to ensure connectivity with the CP Intermodal terminal at Highway No. 50. Coordination with trucks to rail is key to moving goods from rail to other areas. Connectivity from rail to Hwy 50 is crucial. ▪ Concern about how congestion is being shown on Highway 407 in future. Modelling of 407 is basic and can be addressed in future. Capacity assumptions on 407 and future change is not as bad as is shown. 407 is at a pretty good level of service now and should not be shown as red in the future. ▪ What is the destination of people and how is that addressed? ▪ GO Transit is providing movement through the area. Transit improvements have been assumed – built into modelling. What about planned road improvements. HOV by-law was described to group as any 4 lane road improvement to 6 lanes in York Region will have 2 HOV lanes. 427 extension was assumed. Presentation materials should show pattern of transit growth, destination of people within the study area and where they are going and coming from. Also, show planned assumptions to everyone in the public so that they know what is being shown and where it came from. ▪ Are there other considerations being made than just improving roads? Changing behaviours is needed to really effect change. <i>Response from Arup Mukherjee: Another study is being done to improve and extend bike paths and trails. This study is far enough along to provide feedback to this EA. City of Vaughan is undertaking a pedestrian and bike plan as well.</i> ▪ Should show 427 extension as a dashed line to show that it is a planned route. ▪ How will traffic patterns change when 427 expands? <i>Response from Project Team: Trying to show transportation to 2031 and only assumed a route based on known information but it will be changed. Assumptions made as to where improvements will be made. The arterial road system will be in much worse condition.</i> ▪ Should show assumptions for traffic perspective and improvements that are made. ▪ The bigger study area for this IEA enables the broader community traffic and travelling patterns to be examined. A key question to be addressed is how the pattern of travel and destinations will change. There are changes in destinations because of what is going on now and these patterns will change in the future. What are the drivers to improvements? Show highway congestions and show arterial roads. New subway line to York University will change patterns in area. If you live in Kleinberg today and want to get to York University your route may change based on this improvement. ▪ The City of Vaughan representatives indicated that the future | <p>Less red to be shown for 407 in the future on PCC materials.</p> <p>Share other study info at PCC's</p> <p>Show 427 as dotted or dashed line and reference 427 EA.</p> <p>Show assumptions for modeling.</p> |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>population and employment numbers could be higher in the future.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comment about population and employment numbers being used. City of Vaughan representatives indicated that a new Official Plan is being developed by the City. A Transportation Master Plan will also be done and the City will be generating population and employment numbers and these could be higher than the Region's numbers. ▪ Transit needs to be part of the solution and has an important role for reducing congestion. ▪ Would like to see a focus on a broader community planning approach in the EA. Need to look at sustainability objectives. ▪ Could use more diagrams and fewer words for the transportation side of the presentation. ▪ Would suggest describing the options and what is going to be looked at. ▪ Discussion of how to show congestion on highways followed. If the 407 does get congested as it does on some days now, then this traffic will go somewhere and it spills over to the arterial roads. How are constraints being addressed as far as infiltration into neighborhoods? ▪ Would like to have discussion about the solutions and constraints within the study area. How have travel patterns (from the City of Vaughan) been addressed? Need to understand role of Major Mackenzie. ▪ Kleinburg is a Heritage District and residents will want their roads to remain the same. ▪ Improving transit is imperative. | <p>More discussion about solutions and constraints in study area at subsequent meetings.</p> |
| <p>Overview of First PCCs</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 RAAC member comments. All were encouraged to attend one of the sessions. ▪ RAAC members were encouraged to liaise with Arup Mukherjee and consultants with any ongoing comments and discussions. The next meeting of the RAAC would be held in the spring. ▪ RAAC members confirmed that their names could be posted on the project web site. | |
| <p>Discussion</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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). ▪ Add text boxes to any maps, graphics explaining status of 427 EA and assumptions of Region. Show 427 extension as a dashed line to indicate that it is a planned route. ▪ Continue to show the highways as congested in the future but | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>show without thicker lines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Show more diagrams and fewer words for the transportation side of the presentation. Show methodology with diagrams ▪ When referring to/showing 407ETR care must be given to how it is depicted in the future. Future changes expected to not be as bad as shown on project team's presentation. Representatives indicate that it won't get that congested due to pricing and other strategies. Sixth lane for transitway and HOV should be noted. ▪ Need to reference/locate CP Intermodal terminal. ▪ Show pattern of transit growth including Viva and GO Transit. GO Transit improvements to be noted on presentation boards. Show Bolton and Woodbridge. ▪ 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. | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m. | |



**Western Vaughan Transportation Improvements
Individual Environmental Assessment
Review Agency Advisory Committee (RAAC) Meeting #2
June 17, 2008 - Meeting #2 Notes**

Attendees

RAAC Committee Members

Solange Desautels, MOE
Bert Peverini, GO Transit
Paul Kerry, CP Rail
Bill Kiru, TRCA
Wayne McEachern, City of Vaughan
Eric Chan, Peel Region
June Murphy, TRCA

Andrew Pearce, City of Vaughan
Jim Horton, 407 ETR
Fausto Conforti, 407 ETR
Gary Wilkins, TRCA
Carolyn Woodland, TRCA
Dean Kemper, MTO

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 (GLL)
Marc Rose, GLL
Mike Poskin, GLL
Dave Crowley, Halcrow

| Item | Description |
|---|---|
| Welcome, Introductions and Meeting Overview | <p>Meeting called to order by Sue Cumming (Facilitator). Introductions of RAAC and Project Team Members. Overview of Meeting expectations, Ground Rules for Facilitator and RAAC, 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 RAAC 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 RAAC 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"> ▪ All sensitive natural environment information (i.e., point data |

| Item | Description |
|---|---|
| | <p>regarding species-at-risk, etc.) cannot be shown in maps and can only be described through text descriptions. (Maps 3 and 6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the extension of the study area to the north in conjunction with Peel? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To date, we have not coordinated the extension of the study area with Peel Region's study. ▪ There are a number of development applications for Block 61, along with a possible Official Plan amendment to change the designation from Agricultural to Development Areas, which may make any alternative through this area not feasible. ▪ TRCA would be concerned about the environmental effects of any alternative to the north of Kleinburg. |
| <p>Alternatives to the Undertaking and Approved Screening/Evaluation Methodology Process</p> <p>Dick Gordon UMA/AECOM</p> <p>Pages 6 to 11 of handout</p> | <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>Dick Gordon presented the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Alternatives to the Undertaking were shown by maps and presented with detail ▪ Purpose of the Undertaking ▪ Congestion in the study area in 2031 ▪ Screening Criterion ▪ Volume/Capacity ratios |
| <p>Discussion</p> | <p>Key Discussion Points Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Highway 427 is going to terminate at Major Mackenzie Drive, so why is it assumed to extend to King Road? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Region believes that it is reasonable to assume an extension to King Road by 2031. ▪ Extension to King Road would help with congestion in the area ▪ A transitway will be included along Highway 427, which is not reflected currently. ▪ Is it appropriate to put an extension of Highway 427 north into the Greenbelt when TRCA has a board resolution opposing any additional infrastructure through the Greenbelt? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The analysis has not been done and we are not saying that an extension to King Road is feasible or will happen. However, it is an assumption for traffic modelling and screening purposes. ▪ You may want to consider what will happen to 2031 without including the extension to King Road. ▪ Show the extension of Highway 427 as a broad arrow rather than a specific alignment. ▪ Peel Council is seeking an extension of Highway 427 to Highway 9 ▪ How many alternatives assume that Highway 427 extends beyond Major Mackenzie? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Alternatives #2, 6, 8, 9 ▪ What are the implications to the network numbers if Highway 427 terminates at Major Mackenzie Drive? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ These numbers are reflected in alternatives #3, 4, 5, 7. ▪ What assumption have you made regarding the GTA West corridor? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This proposed highway is not included or considered in this study. |

| Item | Description |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should an alternative be considered with Highway 427 terminating at Major Mackenzie Drive? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is considered in a few of our alternatives already. ▪ What is the maximum width for Rutherford Road? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rutherford Road will match what has been set out by the York Region Master Plan (Confirm width with Dick) in regards to the use of HOV lanes once the road reaches its maximum capacity for widening. The maximum width is 6 lanes. ▪ There needs to be a detailed review of Nashville's heritage characteristics. Major Mackenzie Drive will have to be realigned to connect with Highway 427 around Nashville Road. ▪ Can you clarify the Kleinburg Bypass and Highway 427 extension to Highway 9 shown on Alternative #6? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ That needs to be changed to show it as a possible link ▪ What was the basis of a Kleinburg Bypass? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A comment was received from a CSAC member regarding traffic congestion within Kleinburg and the need to potentially provide a by-pass around it. At this point, we are only looking to see if it is feasible. ▪ How are the combination alternatives being developed? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Terms of Reference (ToR) explains that combination alternatives will be examined. The combinations build on the original 6 alternatives that were described in the ToR. ▪ In terms of presentation, more information regarding the details of each alternative needs to be included when describing the map of each alternative. ▪ All of these alternatives seemed to be based on assumptions - how will they play out if your assumptions are wrong? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The study team needs to make certain assumptions based on the information that is currently available. We will continue to update our assumptions to reflect changes in information. ▪ Why does the screening not reflect environmental criteria? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The focus of the screening process is to determine the ability of alternatives to address the rationale of and purpose for the study in accordance with the Minister approved ToR for this IEA. A detailed assessment of effects on the natural environment, along with other factors, will be completed following the screening. |
| <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 <p>The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.</p> |



**Western Vaughan Transportation Improvements
Individual Environmental Assessment
Review Agency Advisory Committee (RAAC) Meeting #3
October 21, 2008 - Meeting #3 Notes**

Attendees

RAAC Committee Members

Solange Desautels, MOE
Bert Peverini, GO Transit
Bill Kiru, TRCA
June Murphy, TRCA
Wayne McEachern, City of Vaughan
Eric Chan, Peel Region

Murray McLeod, Peel Region
Andrew Pearce, City of Vaughan
Selma Hubjer, City of Vaughan
Jim Horton, 407 ETR
Lola Vaz-Rafearo, MTO
Chris Tschirhart, MTO

Project Team Members

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

Ian Dobrindt, AECOM
Marc Rose, AECOM
Mike Poskin, AECOM
Dave Crowley, Halcrow

| Item | Description |
|---|--|
| Welcome, Introductions and Meeting Overview | <p>Meeting called to order by Sue Cumming (Facilitator). Introductions of RAAC and Project Team Members. Overview of Meeting expectations, Ground Rules for Facilitator and RAAC, 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 RAAC to the overall project and opportunity for creative solutions. ▪ Previous meeting notes dated August 1, 2008 accepted. ▪ Arup Mukherjee stressed the importance of the project for York Region and appreciation of the role and commitment of the RAAC 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 screening criteria and results ▪ Identification of the "Short List" of Alternatives to the Undertaking" |
| Discussion | <p>Key Discussion Points Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What was the reaction to the Kleingburg bypass? What was the |

| Item | Description |
|--|---|
| | <p>scope of assessment?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Initially the environmental features were reviewed and found to be impacted by the construction of a bypass. ▪ Was there an equal weighting applied to the criteria? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes. ▪ Was there any double counting by overlapping screening criteria? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Team was hampered by the available data. Screening criteria 1 & 3 were done on screen lines and screening criterion 2 was done on arterial roads in the study area. ▪ Which alternative finished in first place? 9? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes. ▪ Why aren't alternatives 5 and 8 also ranked in the second screening criteria? They seem to be close. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Has no effect on outcome of short list of alternatives ▪ Alternative 7 should have been carried forward. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The short listed alternatives outweighed alternative 7 because they had more than one top three finishes ▪ How would you characterize alts 8 and 9? Transit vs. roads. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Not much difference. Alt. 9 has more road capacity. ▪ Are the road improvements in 6 and 9 the same? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes. ▪ Widening to 6 or 8 lanes includes HOV or transit? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It includes a high level approach where it is not constrained to one or the other. ▪ Rutherford Road is misspelled on maps. ▪ Show Canada Drive as a 2 lane road because it is going to remain a 2 lane road. ▪ What was assumed by the carpool lot improvements? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We currently aren't at that level of detail. ▪ Why is Major Mackenzie not green all the way to Highway 400? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It should be shown as green to the 400 on the Alternative 8 map. Alternative 6 has Major Mackenzie as blue and Rutherford Road as green. ▪ Bolton GO and 407 intersection should show a station ▪ GO Station will be in Woodbridge but we aren't sure where, it is ok to show it at the current location on this map. ▪ Region of Peel had several questions on implications for Region of Peel. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ York will continue to meet with / review with Peel. |
| <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 |
| <p>Discussion</p> | <p>Key Discussion Points Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What depth of info is provided behind the evaluation? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Existing conditions reports and discussions on what feature is more important with project team ▪ Suggest showing maps of this information as a back up to the public ▪ Do approved / proposed land uses look at regional, provincial and federal approvals? |

| Item | Description |
|------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes. ▪ Cost is important and should be shown with a rationale. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No one factor has a bias and all of the factors are considered equally. ▪ The way the overall ranking is shown is good and should show why each is most, least and moderately preferred. ▪ Why is there no difference between alts 6, 8 and 9 in criteria 3.1, for example? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No difference between the alts at this stage. We can look at impacts again to make sure all are similar. ▪ Tables are consistent and easy to follow along. They are similar to other EA evaluations that are going on. ▪ 427 stops at Major Mackenzie now? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Huntington may be cut off with a new 427 interchange ○ Could knock out all assumptions being made ○ Cannot look at other studies where assumptions are being made. ▪ This study will not look at any City of Vaughan roads for improvements. The Region's TMP has some assumptions made about local roads and we are simply showing these. ▪ Total of three bullets (permits required section) needed for criteria 1.5.1. ▪ What is the correlation between the master plan and this study? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This study goes into a further detailed analysis than the TMP. We should build on what the Master Plan says. ▪ How is HOV modeling done? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The model is not designed at this stage for HOV specific improvements. ▪ The Highway 50 boundary needs to be communicated to Peel Region and what is being suggested. Peel is interested in recommendations. ▪ Are the tables the completed tables? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes. ▪ What are the plans on the air quality side of things? This is important. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This will be addressed in the next phase of the process. ▪ Is the study based on the horizon year of 2031? Are base road maps available? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes. ▪ What is the base road assumption? ▪ Is there a description of the alternative maps? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Map that is missing for all of this information is the "Do Nothing" alternative map. ▪ Possible discussion between City of Vaughan, York Region and project team ▪ Whatever the TMP has assumed is what we have shown. ▪ We will optimize alternative 8 so make sure capacity issues are addressed. ▪ Notes on land use: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Highway 7, Huntington, Langstaff, Highway 27 are all 2/3 built out ○ TPN may change ○ Across from Canada's Wonderland, there will need to be a defined road improvement on how this will continue to change. |

| Item | Description |
|---|--|
| Project Schedule and Upcoming Activities Ian Dobrindt AECOM | Ian Dobrindt presented the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Overview of project schedule▪ Upcoming project activities The meeting adjourned at 2:25 p.m. |



**Western Vaughan Transportation Improvements
Individual Environmental Assessment
Review Agency Advisory Committee (RAAC) Meeting #4
June 11, 2009 - Meeting #4 Notes**

Attendees

RAAC Members

Eric Chan, Peel Region
Murray McLeod, Peel Region
Jonathan Lin, 407 ETR
Lola Vaz-Rafearo, MTO
Paul Kerry, Canadian Pacific
Selma Hubjer, City of Vaughan

Bert Peverini, GO Transit
June Murphy, TRCA
Bill Kiru, TRCA
Carolyn Woodland, TRCA

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 was called to order at 2:30 pm by Sue Cumming (Facilitator). RAAC 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 |
| Potential Alignments for Road Improvements in Alternative 8 Greg Smith / Jeff Atherton AECOM | 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. |
| Discussion | Key Discussion Points Noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are two jog eliminations to be considered on Major Mackenzie Drive, correct? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The main one is at Highway 27. Highway 427 will pass over Major Mackenzie Drive and Major Mackenzie Drive will pass over the CP rail line. ▪ How much clearance will the CP rail line have under Major Mackenzie Drive? |

| Item | Description |
|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We are assuming 1.5 to 2 metres of clearance. ▪ It was noted by certain RAAC members that they had reservations over the amount of filling that would be required along Highway 27 and Major Mackenzie Drive, including areas that do not abut the Kortright Centre. The depth of the fill would probably be about 6 to 8 metres, including heavily vegetated areas. We (York Region) need to speak with TRCA about addressing that. ▪ Part of the Kortright trail system passes near Major Mackenzie Drive in the Humber Valley; people park along the road to use it. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This could be an opportunity to provide more of an opening under Major Mackenzie Drive than exists currently. ○ Providing trails (for human access) dovetails nicely with the objectives in Section 4.3 of the TRCA's Valley and Stream Corridor Management Program. ▪ The south side of Major Mackenzie Drive east of Islington Avenue is mainly completed or in-progress developments. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ York Region would have secured the required right-of-way at the time of approval. ▪ How wide is the right-of-way for a six lane road? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The standard is 42.6 metres, but we have a 36 metre design for when it needs to be squeezed, eg. at bridge crossings. ▪ Is there a way to squeeze the road where it passes Kortright, eg. by forgoing the median? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, we can design it like a bridge crossing. ▪ The Stormwater Management Pond at Rutherford Road and Napa Valley Road overflowed during a storm event last year. Any improvements to Major Mackenzie Drive cannot exacerbate that situation. ▪ Pine Valley Drive should be designed as a road through a park, to recognize that it abuts one of the most important greenspaces in the Toronto Region. Urban features like a median would not be appropriate. A rural cross-section might be better. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Pine Valley Drive is only being widened to four lanes, so there would not be a median. We are looking into how much vertical curve can be maintained to preserve the "rolling hills" terrain of the road. Implementing a rural cross-section would involve ditchlines, widening the right-of-way. ▪ There is a beaver dam by Pine Valley Drive south of the Kortright entrance. ▪ Where does the Highway 27 widening end? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It's going to four lanes as far north as Nashville. ▪ Will the widening of Highway 27 interfere with the planned vegetative buffer for noise abatement? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The City of Vaughan would have looked at the Official Plan for the road. ○ But there is an OMB-approved 20 metre buffer even though the Plan calls for a 30 metre buffer. |
| <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 scheduled for June 23 and 24, and technical work.</p> <p>Jeff Atherton explained how to use Google Earth to view the map file of the alternative alignments.</p> <p>Marc Rose explained that the evaluation criteria and indicators have been revised to better apply at the alignments level. The revised criteria and indicators tables will be circulated by email.</p> <p>The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm.</p> |



**Western Vaughan Transportation Improvements
Individual Environmental Assessment
Review Agency Advisory Committee (RAAC)
Meeting #5 - October 27, 2009
Meeting Notes**

Attendees

RAAC Members

Jonathan Lin, 407 ETR
Allen Lew, MTO
Antonio Di Sabatino, MTO
Paul Kerry, Canadian Pacific
Selma Hubjer, City of Vaughan

Andrew Pearce, City of Vaughan
Carolyn Woodland, TRCA
Solange Desautels, MOE

Project Team Members

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

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

| Item | Description |
|--|--|
| Welcome, Introductions and Meeting Overview Sue Cumming Cumming+Company | The meeting was called to order at 2:30 pm by Sue Cumming (Facilitator). RAAC and Project Team Members introduced themselves. Sue provided an overview of the purpose of the meeting, ground rules, and the agenda. |
| Project Review Arup Mukherjee York Region | Arup Mukherjee presented: <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 |
| Assessment and Evaluation of Alternative Alignments for Road Improvements in Alternative 8 Marc Rose AECOM | 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. |
| Discussion | Key Discussion Points Noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The planned subdivision (Lakes-Rivers subdivision) on the north side of MM-2 has been draft approved for some time. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We've been in discussions with their engineers. They agreed to no pre-sales until Major Mackenzie Drive is sorted out. This alternative does not affect access; access will just be farther west. ▪ So the MM-2B alternative includes maintaining "old" Major Mackenzie Drive? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ That is outside the scope of the EA, but we intend to |

| Item | Description |
|------|--|
| | <p style="text-align: center;">maintain the existing road, and will take care of connecting the new and existing roads.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ One complication affecting segment MM-4 is that the north side of the roadway is owned by Ontario Heritage Trust (OHT). Does the TRCA know how much of an issue that will be? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ontario Heritage Trust (OHT) has owned these lands for a long time, and TRCA manages the property under agreement with OHT. OHT is relatively hands-off on day-to-day matters regarding managing the farm land, natural heritage restoration, maintenance, property security, and public use management. TRCA leases the farmhouse, and the fields are rented by local farmers for field cropping. OHT would be concerned about a heritage issue like the archaeological finds and would need to be involved in our meetings and the EA process if these sites were to be disturbed through construction of one of the road alignments. <p>An ossuary is located in the more northern portion of the property, and a few years ago when this sacred site was disturbed by routine agricultural ploughing, OHT lead a process with the Aboriginal representatives for re-constitution of the burial site. TRCA was involved and assisted with the process but OHT led all negotiations.</p> <p>When we know the nature of the archaeological sites, or determine if these sites can be protected through York Region's detailed alignment studies, then we can decide if OHT needs to be directly involved.</p> <p>A meeting with TRCA's technical team is arranged for next week (November 3, 2009) to further understand and discuss the environmental implications of alternative alignments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ When would construction of Major Mackenzie Drive start? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This is as yet undetermined, but it would be influenced by when MTO constructs the 427 extension. ▪ Is York Region coordinating the timing of submitting the EA report for Major Mackenzie Drive with the submission of the 427 extension? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The 427 EA report is currently in presubmission. We need to bring the draft EA report to York Regional Council before the formal submission to MOE, and there will be limited opportunity to do so (one meeting) between summer break and the provincial election. It is unlikely that submission of the two reports will occur at the same time. ▪ Are there multiple alternatives for segment MM-1? Peel Region is recognizing a wide band within which Major Mackenzie Drive might connect across Highway 50. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Moving Major Mackenzie Drive to the north was considered, but such an alignment was not developed as it could not properly accommodate the MTO's proposed alignment for the future Highway 427 interchange at Major Mackenzie Drive. Additionally, |

| Item | Description |
|---|---|
| | <p>the currently recommended alignment best respects the existing land uses on both the north and south sides of Major Mackenzie Drive. There are existing industrial sites on the north side which we would be impacted by shifting the alignment northward. Also, the existing CP Intermodal Yard requires a truck connection to Major Mackenzie Drive, which would need to be longer if the road were shifted north.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Has consultation with First Nations begun? That could be an issue with the OHT. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes – we had a meeting in May and will have another this November. ▪ MOE needs to be engaged in discussions with First Nations if any issues arise. |
| <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 4:30 pm.</p> |



**Western Vaughan Transportation Improvements
Individual Environmental Assessment
Review Agency Advisory Committee (RAAC)
Meeting #6 – July 13, 2010
Meeting Notes**

Attendees

RAAC Members

Lola Vaz-Rafearo, MTO
Allen Lew, MTO
June Murphy, TRCA

Sabbir Saiyed, Region of Peel
Kathy Cater, Region of Peel

Project Team Members

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

Erika Brown, 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 2:30 pm by Loren Polonsky (Facilitator). RAAC 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 designs for the transportation improvements along Major Mackenzie Drive using a computer animation. Key Discussion Points Noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Will review agencies be able to see meander belt analysis, road profiles, and the 100-year flood event line? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Road profiles and the 100-year flood event line can be made available; the meander belt report is currently in progress. ▪ How is this study being integrated with Peel Region's Highway 50 study? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We are sharing cross-section designs for the Major Mackenzie Drive and Rutherford Road intersections at Highway 50 with Peel Region. ▪ The TRCA prefers that wildlife fencing be within the proponent's right-of-way. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wildlife fencing will be on the Region's property. |
| Assessing the Effects of the Proposed Improvements: Impacts and Mitigation Marc Rose | 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. Key Discussion Points Noted: |

| Item | Description |
|--|---|
| AECOM | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What form of stormwater management (SWM) will be applied? Will SWM ponds be created? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The ROW does not have sufficient space to provide SWM ponds. The Region could request adjacent developers to design SWM ponds for proposed subdivisions to accept stormwater from the road allowance, or alternatively include Oil/Grit separators at the end of storm sewers immediately prior to discharge into the receiving watercourse. ▪ Did the project team contact Transport Canada (TC) to confirm the locations of navigable waterways, and the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) to confirm Species At Risk data? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The project team has not contacted TC yet. However, the team is currently preparing the Project Description for initiating a Federal Environmental Assessment and will be in contact with TC at such a time regarding navigable waterways. We will confirm whether MNR has been contacted regarding Species at Risk data. <i>Note: It was confirmed after the meeting that project ecologists identified locations of terrestrial species at risk using NHIC information, which includes MNR data, but did not contact the MNR directly about terrestrial species at risk. An MNR Regional Biologist was contacted directly to confirm waterways managed for Redside Dace.</i> ▪ How did the team model noise, and project future traffic? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A theoretical noise model was run, using 2031 traffic projections – these projections are based on population and employment growth projections from York Region’s planning department. Three-day traffic counts, taken in May and June, 2010, were used to model existing noise. ▪ Would noise walls and associated access facilities for maintenance be within the right-of-way? The proposed noise walls adjacent to TRCA property may fall within TRCA’s regulation limits, and permitting may be required to build these structures. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes – can TRCA give RWDI their regulation limits to flag any issues? ▪ For planned subdivisions with restricted access due to the proposed median, is there a way to give them access elsewhere? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For draft approved subdivisions, the City should engage York Region to ensure appropriate access. ▪ For the public presentations at the PCC, you might consider representing access restrictions with continuous lines rather than with stars in driveway locations. ▪ How will U-turns be accommodated to mitigate right-in/right-out only access restrictions? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is legal to make U-turns at intersections unless otherwise signed, but we can enhance the U-turn opportunities with signage and signalization. ▪ The phasing plan is in line with Peel Region’s expectations in terms of the Highway 50 improvement process. ▪ For the public presentation, you might consider removing the pink border around the phasing plan map, to avoid confusion with similarly-coloured road sections. ▪ The lane widths may not be sufficient to accommodate truck traffic, given that trucks will constitute up to 10% of total traffic. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The lane widths reflect York Regional Council’s approved design, adopted after detailed analysis. |
| Project Schedule and Upcoming Activities Marc Rose AECOM | <p>Marc Rose gave an overview of the remaining steps in the EA process, including the upcoming PCCs on July 21 and 27, and the preparation and submission of the EA report by the end of 2010 or in early 2011.</p> <p>The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm.</p> |