



**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). 	
<p>Meeting Conclusion</p>	<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. 	