



**RAAG Representatives**

Sondra Meis	Ministry of Economic Development & Trade
Jennifer Lawrence	Conservation Halton
Darren Kenny	Hamilton Conservation Authority
Denton Miller (via teleconference)	Ministry of the Environment
Drew Crinklaw (via teleconference)	Ministry of Agriculture & Food
Carlene Whittingham	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Mike Eckersley (via teleconference)	Ministry of Natural Resources
Mike Stone (via teleconference)	Ministry of Natural Resources
Mike Kim (via teleconference)	Ministry of Energy and Infrastructure
Henry Turner (via teleconference)	Ministry of Tourism
Solange Desautels (via teleconference)	Ministry of the Environment

**Items**      **Description**

1. & 2.      Introductions and Review of Previous Meeting Minutes
- G. Pothier (GLPi), independent facilitator, provided a session overview and thanked the attendees for coming to the meeting.
- G. Pothier also briefly reviewed the minutes of the last Joint MTAG / RAAG meeting held on February 5, 2009 and the RAAG meeting held on June 19, 2009. No errors or omissions were identified, and there were no outstanding action items.

3.      Study Update
- P. Hudspith and P. Puccini provided an update on the study progress, including the individual alternatives, combination alternatives and the assessment of the alternatives.

4.      Identification and Assessment of Individual Transportation Alternatives

**QUESTIONS (Q), ANSWERS (A) & COMMENTS (C)**

Q: What transit mode split has been assumed?

A: A 26% transit mode split has been assumed on the basis of the Metrolinx *RTP*.

<u>Items</u>	<u>Description</u>
--------------	--------------------

Q: What transit mode split has been assumed in the NGTA study area?

A: Currently there is a 2-3% transit mode split in the study area. Based on the Metrolinx *RTP*, it is expected that this will increase to as much as 7-8% (Halton area).

Q: Is the reference to Goods Movement at the Hamilton International Airport Air/Rail or Air/Truck?

A: The reference is to both rail and truck.

C: To the extent possible, the study team should take into account the degree to which manufacturers shift modes based on emerging manufacturing trends.

5. Identification and Assessment of Combination Alternatives

P. Puccini presented an overview of the combination alternatives that have been developed.

Q: Has a GTA West corridor been assumed in developing lane requirements for the Group #3 alternatives?

A: At this stage no assumptions have been made based on the GTA West corridor. Coordination between the two studies will continue.

Q: If there is a GTA West, would there be a connection to the NGTA?

A: It is not possible to predict this as the need for a new corridor has not been identified in either study.

P. Hudspith presented an overview of the high level assessment that has been completed for the combination alternatives.

C: Overall agreement with the bubble sizes on environment, however Group #3 may have significant impacts depending on the specific improvements entailed. Do not understate the environmental impacts of Group #3.

Q: Does MTO consider what is meant on Slide 31 by the term “significant congestion”. Is the highway network significantly congested today?

A: Yes, in some locations, and in the future it gets significantly worse than today. Group #3 or Group #4 gets us back to approximately where we are today in terms of congestion.

C: A new 400 series highway would have significant environmental impacts on agricultural areas which should be considered.

G. Pothier discussed the POWER method and encouraged a discussion on the information presented based on the following categories:

<u>Items</u>	<u>Description</u>
--------------	--------------------

	P = Positives
--	---------------

	O = Objections
--	----------------

	W = What Else?
--	----------------

	E = Enhancements
--	------------------

	R = Remedies
--	--------------

	<b>POSITIVES</b>
--	------------------

	The team appears to have maximized the use of existing infrastructure e.g., speed harmonization.
--	--

	Good job of contextualization of goods movement.
--	--

	Agree with the stepped approach to assembling combination alternatives.
--	---

	<b>OBJECTIONS</b>
--	-------------------

	Skeptical that a new highway will alleviate congestion.
--	---

	If future transit ridership embodied in the Metrolinx <i>RTP</i> is overly optimistic, what does it mean if it is not fully realized?
--	---

	There appear to be limited opportunities to move goods from truck to rail.
--	--

	Assumptions with regard to the effectiveness of TDM may be overly optimistic.
--	---

	<b>WHAT ELSE?</b>
--	-------------------

	Q: How do the GTA West and NGTA studies link in the public process?
--	---

	A: The display material has been coordinated. While both projects are distinct, it is recognized that the recommendations that emerge for both studies need to be coordinated.
--	--

	C: A stronger emphasis on goods movement is needed to comply with the vision of the <i>Growth Plan</i> .
--	--

	<b>ENHANCEMENTS</b>
--	---------------------

	C: A big dots vs. small dots assessment is needed for Group #1 and Group #2.
--	--

	A: It was noted that this has been completed, but is not included in the slides.
--	--

	<b>REMEDIES</b>
--	-----------------

	C: A consistent level of detail should be used for all environmental assessment criteria e.g., the agricultural factors on Slide 35.
--	--

<u>Items</u>	<u>Description</u>
	<p>Q: Will the study team be addressing phasing in the final Transportation Development Strategy?</p> <p>A: Yes, the intent is to present phasing improvements in the final strategy.</p> <p>C: A new highway never resolves the problem. Preference would be to invest in what we have (Group #3) however it is recognized that there are environmental impacts with Group #3. Impacts and benefits vary by geographic location for Groups #3 and #4.</p> <p>C: In the assessment of Group #3 vs. Group #4, it should be noted that a new corridor would attract development.</p> <p>C: A new corridor is needed near Hamilton as there is less opportunity to widen the existing roads.</p>
6.	<p><u>Other Business</u></p> <p>C: In the upcoming phase of the project, please consider timelines i.e., sufficient time for municipal staff and council to review reports.</p> <p>Q: Can displays be made available for this group?</p> <p>A: The displays (and all other information) are available on the project website. The link will be included with the distribution of the meeting minutes.</p>

**Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.**