



NIAGARA TO GTA CORRIDOR PLANNING AND EA STUDY – Phase 1

Meeting: Municipal Technical Advisory Group (MTAG) and Regulatory Agencies Advisory Group (RAAG)

Location: Holiday Inn Burlington Hotel and Conference Centre Meeting No. 1
3063 South Service Road, Burlington

Purpose: **Joint MTAG & RAAG Meeting** Date: June 4, 2007

Chair: Glenn Pothier (GLPi) (facilitator) Time: 1:30 PM - 4:00 PM

Present: **NGTA Project Team**

John Slobodzian, MTO	Paula Neto, TSH
Darlene Proudfoot, MTO	Michael Chiu, MRC
Terry Hilditch, MTO	Sandy Nairn, Ecoplans Ltd.
Paul Hudspith, URS	Margaret Pak, Ecoplans Ltd.
Mike Delsey, TSH	Glenn Pothier, GLPi

MTAG Representatives

Paul Allen, City of Burlington	Andrew Head, Region of Halton
David Wong, Town of Oakville	Steve Robichaud, Region of Halton
Bill Mann, Town of Milton	

Christine Lee-Morrison, City of Hamilton

George Nicholson, Niagara Region - Planning	Kris Jacobson, City of St. Catharines
Eric Flora, Niagara Region - Transportation	John Grubich, City of Niagara Falls
Tim Stuart, City of Port Colborne	Ian Izzard, Town of Fort Erie
David Ferguson, City of Welland	

Betty Matthews Malone, Haldimand County	Edward Soldo, Haldimand County
---	--------------------------------

Bob Wheildon, Township of Puslinch

RAAG Representatives

Denise Fell	Environment Canada
Cora Sheppard	Ministry of the Environment (MOE)
Mike Eckersley (teleconference)	Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR)
Mike Stone (teleconference)	Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR)
Drew Crinklaw (teleconference)	Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA)
Janet Lo (teleconference)	Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal (MPIR)
Marion Plaunt	Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC)
Darren Kenny	Hamilton Conservation Authority
Jennifer Lawrence	Conservation Halton

Items Description Action by:

1

Introductions

T. Hilditch (MTO) thanked the attendees for coming to the Joint meeting. Members of the Project Team, the MTAG and the RAAG introduced themselves.

G. Pothier (GLPi), independent facilitator for the Project Team, presented the meeting agenda. It was noted that a summary of the meeting would be prepared and distributed to all attendees.

2

MTAG Orientation Session Presentation

T. Hilditch (MTO), S. Nairn (Ecoplans Ltd.), and M. Delsey (TSH) presented the following agenda items (refer to the attached presentation and handout):

- Why a Joint MTAG / RAAG Meeting?
- Overview of the Work Completed to Date
- Study Documentation
- Roles of the MTAG and RAAG
- Generating and Evaluating Transportation System Alternatives

Subsequent to each section of the presentation, there was a question and answer period.

G. Pothier started the presentation by discussing the ground rules for the meeting.

<u>Items</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Action by:</u>
	<p><i>Summary of Questions and Issues Raised</i></p> <p>The following outlines the comments and suggestions provided throughout the presentation:</p> <p><u>First part of the presentation</u></p> <p>G. Nicholson (Niagara Region) inquired if a hard copy of the Transportation Working Paper could be obtained. [Post Meeting Note: a copy of all three reports including the Overview of Transportation and Socio-Economic Conditions Working Paper was provided to all MTAG and RAAG attendees.]</p> <p>T. Hilditch (MTO) advised that the Community Advisory Group (CAG) membership would be finalized after the first round of PICs. As well, the public can interact with the Project Team through the web feedback form located on the project website: www.niagara-gta.com. Also, information, including the website, can be accessed at the project office - located in St. Catharines.</p> <p>J. Lawrence (Conservation Halton) inquired about the attendance of the Public Orientation Sessions. G. Pothier (GLPi) replied that attendees at public orientation sessions were by invitation only (invitations were sent to all individuals and groups on the project stakeholder list). In total, approximately 170 people attended. T. Hilditch (MTO) added that one of the key purposes of the orientation sessions was to solicit input regarding the development of the public consultation program.</p> <p>M. Plaunt (NEC) inquired as to who was represented at the May 17th Transportation Service Provider (TSP) meeting. G. Pothier (GLPi) replied that the attendance list would be made available to the group. M. Delsey (TSH) mentioned that while 40 TSP representatives were invited, only about 12-15 attended. He also noted that although representatives from CP and CN did not attend; there was representation from GO Transit. J. Slobodzian (MTO) acknowledged that the attendance at the TSP meeting was disappointing, speculating that conflicting schedules and priorities might be the reason. Consideration is therefore being given to the development of a customized consultation program for this stakeholder group. It was also noted that a follow-up questionnaire was sent to all of the TSP meeting invitees.</p> <p>M. Plaunt (NEC) and E. Flora (Niagara Region) requested a copy of the minutes from the TSP meeting. E. Flora (Niagara Region) commented that Niagara Specialized Transit (NST) was not invited to attend the Transportation Service Provider meeting. The Project Team is to invite the NST to the next meeting and to place them on the TSP mailing list.</p>	<p>URS/TSH</p> <p>URS</p>

<u>Items</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Action by:</u>
	<p><u>Second Part of the Presentation</u></p> <p>C. Lee-Morrison (City of Hamilton) inquired about the timelines for document review. S. Nairn (Ecoplans Ltd.) replied that the Project Team would like feedback by July 18th.</p> <p>S. Nairn (Ecoplans Ltd.) stated that the Project Team is looking for this group to provide feedback on the draft reports – particularly with respect to accuracy and completeness. D. Proudfoot (MTO) commented that agency mandates should help determine, what reports or sections of reports should be reviewed, if time and resources are an issue. J. Lawrence (Conservation Halton) inquired as to the difference between the NGTA Corridor Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference (EA ToR) and the Study Plan, and if the Project Team could highlight/specify the changes. S. Nairn (Ecoplans Ltd.) replied that the Study Plan provides more detail than the EA ToR. J. Lawrence (Conservation Halton) requested that Conservation Halton be sent hard copies of all reports to be reviewed. C. Sheppard (MOE) requested that MOE be sent multiple copies of all documents too.</p> <p>M. Plaunt (NEP) requested further clarification regarding the Study Plan. J. Slobodzian (MTO) replied that the EA ToR is a generic process document in support of the need for additional transportation capacity within the Niagara to GTA Corridor. S. Nairn (Ecoplans Ltd.) added that the Study Plan builds upon the information provided in the ToR; specifically with respect to the overall approach, schedule, consultation and deliverables. P. Hudspith (URS) stated that the Transportation Working Paper looks at existing transportation conditions only, it does not examine future transportation issues. M. Delsey (TSH) added that a highway is not necessarily the solution; the Project Team is taking an overall transportation master plan approach for the Niagara to GTA Corridor.</p>	<p>URS</p>
<p>3</p>	<p><u>Other Comments and Questions</u></p> <p>J. Slobodzian (MTO) provided an update on consultation activities with First Nations, including the recent community meeting with the Six Nations of the Grand River. Six Nations has indicated their preference for community-based meetings with the Project Team, whereas the Mississaugas of the New Credit have requested that MTO meet with their Elected Council. J. Slobodzian (MTO) acknowledged that traditional land use information is currently a data gap; MTO is discussing with Six Nations the possibility of undertaking a Traditional Knowledge Study.</p> <p>G. Pothier (GLPi) took the opportunity to ask the MTAG and</p>	

<u>Items</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Action by:</u>
	<p>RAAG for their input regarding how to actively involve them more; particularly the municipalities. He inquired if there were any perceived barriers to participation/ communication, and what the Project Team could do to make improvements. J. Lawrence (Conservation Halton) mentioned that a 30-day review period is not sufficient as a realistic timeframe for the commenting agencies to review documents; a minimum 60-90 day review period was requested. J. Slobodzian (MTO) stated that the ToR commits to a 90-day review period for Milestone documents; it does not however apply to Working Papers. C. Sheppard (MOE) mentioned that Regulatory Agencies do not have the time/resources to review documents in detail and that it would be helpful if the Project Team could outline the section(s) that impacts/affects each MTAG and RAAG. T. Stuart (City of Port Colborne) mentioned the need for the opportunity to negotiate timelines, including the name of a contact person.</p>	
	<p>T. Stuart (City of Port Colborne) stated that municipalities are currently updating/modifying their transportation network plans. G. Nicholson (Niagara Region) added that the Niagara Region is busy working on a Regional Growth Strategy and inquired as to whether the Strategy will be included in the MTO study. J. Slobodzian (MTO) replied that project documentation is not considered to be final until the EA Report is approved. As such, as new municipal (land use) information etc. becomes available, it will be incorporated as appropriate. To facilitate this, it important that the Project Team be notified.</p>	
	<p>T. Stuart (City of Port Colborne) requested that the Project Team be very specific about the type and detail of information required when making requests for municipal data.</p>	
	<p>J. Lo (MPIR) inquired if the directives of the <i>Growth Plan</i> for land use have been factored into this study. M. Delsey (TSH) confirmed that the <i>Growth Plan</i> and its land use directives are included in this study and is noted in the Study Plan. M. Delsey (TSH) added that the study would also take tourism travel and international trade into consideration because of the Niagara to GTA Corridor proximity to the US border.</p>	
	<p>S. Robichaud (Region of Halton) mentioned that MTO had recently requested traffic information from the Region of Halton - to feed into the GGH Modeling project. He also indicated that a 2-week turn-around timeline is not adequate. In addition, the Halton Region 2021 analysis exercise – to conform to the Growth Plan, may take up to 2 years to complete. He cautioned that the Region would likely have difficulty supporting output from the GGH model if MTO chooses not to wait for the revised data. M. Delsey (TSH) responded that the Project Team understands</p>	

<u>Items</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Action by:</u>
	<p>municipal concerns and challenges related to <i>Growth Plan</i> conformance, and noted that traffic information provided by municipalities will be used in the GGH as it becomes available.</p>	
	<p>E. Flora (Niagara Region) inquired if Niagara Region could obtain a copy of the minutes from the Transportation Service Providers (TSP) meeting. M. Plaunt (NEC) inquired if minutes from other meetings could also be made available. J. Slobodzian (MTO) stated that the Project Team would examine the requirements of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FIPP) Act legislation and then provide a response regarding distribution of meeting minutes.</p>	MTO
	<p>G. Nicholson (Niagara Region) inquired as to how membership of the Community Advisory Group (CAG) will be determined. G. Pothier (GLPi) replied that people who are interested in participating must apply; applications are currently available on the project website. In addition, the Project Team will actively be soliciting interest/applicants at the upcoming PICs. The total membership is expected to range between 25 and 40 people. If there is an overwhelming response, criteria and/or interviews may be used to aid with final selection. G. Pothier (GLPi) also clarified that the CAG is intended to be an advisory body, not a decision-making body; they will provide advice and share perspectives - as citizens representing a diversity of interests, knowledge and concerns within the NGTA Corridor.</p>	
	<p>T. Stuart (City of Port Colborne) inquired as to what will be provided/presented to the Minister’s Advisory Group meeting on June 7th. J. Slobodzian (MTO) replied that it would be a simplified version of the information presented to the MTAG/RAAG. He also clarified that the NGTA Project Team is not leading the Minister’s meetings; the Minister and her staff organize them.</p>	
	<p>B. Matthews Malone (Haldimand County) requested that the MTAG members be given advance notice of the next meeting date. Also, a meeting during the summer months should not be scheduled due to vacation-related absences.</p>	
	<p>E. Flora (Niagara Region) inquired about how the Project Team will examine economic impacts within the Niagara to GTA Corridor. J. Slobodzian (MTO) replied that economic impacts are part of the current study and that alternative approaches for adding transportation capacity to the corridor would be assessed in terms of their economic advantages and disadvantages.</p>	

<u>Items</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Action by:</u>
4	<p data-bbox="418 296 558 325"><u>Next Steps</u></p> <p data-bbox="418 352 1133 411">T. Hilditch provided the following, regarding next steps in the study:</p> <ul data-bbox="467 415 1133 535" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="467 415 1133 535">▪ First round of PICs will be held on June 12th (Rockton), June 14th (St. Catharines) and June 18th (Burlington). All MTAG and RAAG members are invited to attend.	