

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

Location: Casablanca Winery Inn, Reflections Room (4 Windward Drive, Grimsby, Ontario L3M 4E8) Meeting No. 2

Purpose: To inform participants of project status and provide a project update. Date: December 13, 2007

Chair: Glenn Pothier (GLPi) (facilitator) Time: 1:30 P.M. - 3:30 P.M.

**Present:**

**NGTA Project Team**

John Slobodzian, MTO	Mike Delsey, TSH
Susan Sieradzki, MTO	Michael Chiu, MRC
Terry Hilditch, MTO	Paul Hudspith, URS
Frank Pravitz, MTO	Tyler Drygas, URS
Frank Williams, MTO	Patrick Puccini, URS
Glenn Pothier, GLPi (facilitator)	

**MTAG Representatives**

David Wong	Town of Oakville
Peter Vujic	Niagara Region
Tyson Haedrich	Haldimand County
Lloyd Rollinson	Haldimand County
Christine Lee-Morrison	City of Hamilton
Bob Wheildon	Township of Puslinch
Brent Bouteiller	Township of Puslinch
Tom Eichenbaum	City of Burlington
Melissa Green-Battiston	Region of Halton
Steve Robichaud	Region of Halton
David Ferguson	City of Welland
Sal Iannello	City of Port Colborne
Angela Janzen	Town of Milton
Brian Treble	Township of West Lincoln (Niagara Region)



<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 key presentation items, as well as the comments and suggestions provided throughout the presentation:</p> <p><b><u>Study Overview Presentation</u></b></p> <p>P. Hudspith provided an overview of the study purpose and process as well as an update on the Study Plan, Overview of Transportation and Socio-economic Conditions Report, and Overview of Environmental Conditions and Constraints Report. It was noted that although various refinements were made to reflect the comments provided by all stakeholders, no significant changes were made to the format or content of these documents.</p> <p>P. Hudspith noted that a Consultation Record has been prepared to document the stakeholder comments provided, the Project Team’s response and the actions taken by the Project Team (if any).</p> <p>In general, changes to the Study Plan focused on evaluation factors, details regarding the Preliminary Study Area, the process for identifying transportation problems and opportunities and the consultation plan.</p> <p>A question and answer period followed the Study Overview presentation. A summary of the questions and responses are as follows:</p> <p>Q – Has the Project Team consulted with New York State transportation authorities?</p> <p><i>R – The Greater Buffalo Niagara Regional Transportation Council (GBNRTC) is a member of the Municipal Technical Advisory Group. In addition, Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA) is involved and has contacts with U.S border agencies. An extensive O-D survey of Niagara bridges has been undertaken to update the 2000 survey and there is ongoing consultation as part of the Bi-National Transportation Strategy.</i></p> <p>Q- How will the Study Plan evolve throughout the course of the study? Will addendums be prepared as the study progresses?</p> <p><i>R- The Study Plan is an overview process document and does not provide a detailed description of the technical work that will be undertaken. These details will evolve as the study progresses. Rather than continuing to update the Study Plan, the Project Team will issue information and undertake consultation at each study stage.</i></p>	<p>URS/TSH/ECoplans</p>

<u>Items</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Action by:</u>
	<p>Q – Given that municipalities are still in the process of developing future land use allocations that conform to the Growth Plan, what level of detail with regard to future land use is required by the Project Team to continue their work for this study?</p>	
	<p><i>R – The Project Team recognizes that municipalities are in the process of developing their future land use allocations and that this information will not be available until 2009. This was a key discussion point at the meeting with the Municipal Executive Advisory Group in September 2007.</i></p>	
	<p><i>The Project Team is of the opinion that there is enough technical information available to proceed. As the future land use allocations are updated this information will be reviewed to see whether it is necessary to undertake further modeling/forecasting work.</i></p>	
	<p><b><u>Process for Identifying Problems and Opportunities Presentation</u></b></p>	
	<p>M. Delsey presented the Problems and Opportunities Framework and explained the details of each of the seven steps for identifying problems and opportunities. He reiterated that this study is looking at the potential and limitations of all modes to address capacity needs in the Niagara to GTA Corridor and noted that the Project Team is currently conducting meetings with Transportation Service Providers and Business and Commercial Stakeholders to obtain their input on these issues. It was noted that a follow-up meeting would be arranged in Spring 2008 to present and discuss the details of modelling/forecasting exercise.</p>	
	<p>The following summarizes the questions raised regarding the Problems and Opportunities identification process.</p>	
	<p>Q –The traffic modelling work should account for future planned infrastructure as well as existing infrastructure.</p>	
	<p><i>R – We will incorporate planned improvements along with existing infrastructure and will be forecasting future economic, land use and tourism conditions.</i></p>	URS/TSH/Ecoplans
	<p>Q – How will the Project Team account for the potential to shift future trips to a different mode of transportation in the traffic modelling work? This potential should be based on desirable scenarios, as opposed to historical information.</p>	
	<p><i>R – We will be looking at a range of possible future scenarios including different modal assignment assumptions. We will take the vision of the Growth Plan and develop specific goals and objectives. We will also ask the</i></p>	URS/TSH/Ecoplans

<u>Items</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Action by:</u>
	<p><i>Transportation Service Providers about what is possible and what could be achieved if barriers were removed. Assumptions used in the forecasting exercise must be realistic and credible. We will be able to provide more information about the modeling/forecasting work at the next meeting.</i></p> <p>Q – How much change is reasonable?</p> <p><i>R – J. Slobodzian (MTO). The vision and goals are provided by the Growth Plan. We will talk to the Transportation Service Providers to determine their ability to accommodate additional capacity. We will not arbitrarily determine modal allocations. As part of this exercise, our Team needs to be able to show all stakeholders where the assumptions came from (i.e., approved planning policies, input from the Transportation Service Providers).</i></p> <p>Q – The preliminary results of the Greater Golden Horseshoe Model (GGH Model) are not acceptable to the Regional Municipality of Halton. It is premature for the Project Team to begin the identification of Transportation Problems and Opportunities. Particularly given the status of the Growth Plan conformity exercise.</p> <p><i>R – MTO acknowledges this concern. Municipalities have until 2009 to conform to the Growth Plan. There is no mandate for MTO to wait until 2009. As such, the Project Team is moving forward and will do the best we can with available information, and new information will be reviewed as we move forward. We will compare the final allocations to what we used, and will determine whether it is necessary to undertake further modelling/forecasting work.</i></p> <p>Q - Work on developing other modes of transportation and determine future plans and possible limitations. There should be a unique approach for each mode.</p> <p><i>R – Determining opportunities and limitations for other modes is dependant upon the Information that the Transportation Service Providers are willing to provide to the Project Team.</i></p> <p>Q - Coordination with other initiatives such as Metrolinx and the GTA-West Corridor Planning and EA Study is essential for the study.</p> <p>R – Agreed. There is integration and coordination amongst these initiatives.</p>	
3	<p><b><u>CAG’s Vision for the NGTA Corridor</u></b></p>	
	<p>The following outlines the comments provided by MTAG and RAAG representatives regarding the CAG’s transportation</p>	

<u>Items</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Action by:</u>
	<p>vision for the Niagara to GTA Corridor and their perspectives on transportation problems and opportunities (refer to handout “Creating a Transportation Vision for the Niagara to GTA Corridor” and presentation slide “Transportation Problems”).</p> <p><b><i>Building on the CAGs Vision:</i></b></p> <p>G. Pothier (GLPi) provided an overview of the CAG vision for the NGTA Corridor and the transportation problems and opportunities that were identified at the CAG meeting on November 29<sup>th</sup>, 2007.</p> <p>The transportation vision developed by the CAG seems reasonable. However, this vision should include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Change the “car culture” attitude through public education programs.</li> <li>▪ Consolidate/focus infrastructure improvements to promote economic growth.</li> <li>▪ The effect of greenhouse gases/climate change should be given more emphasis in the transportation vision.</li> <li>▪ Opportunities to make elements of the Transportation Development Strategy more environmentally sustainable should be included in the transportation vision. The Red Hill Valley Parkway project should be reviewed in this regard.</li> <li>▪ The transportation vision should include the concept of improving human health along with environmental health.</li> </ul>	URS/TSH/Ecoplans
	<p>The Transportation Problems identified by the CAG appear reasonable. However, the following should be added:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Emergency response times need to be improved when incidents occur on the transportation network (e.g. train derailments, highway accidents, etc.).</li> <li>▪ Environmental constraints should be included.</li> </ul>	URS/TSH/Ecoplans
5	<p><b><u>Next Steps</u></b></p> <p>The next steps are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical work and consultation to support the identification of Transportation Problems and Opportunities</li> </ul>	URS/TSH/Ecoplans

<u>Items</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Action by:</u>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Follow-up meetings regarding the Modelling/Forecasting Exercise</li><li>• Preparation of “Area Transportation System Problems and Opportunities” Report.</li></ul> <p>After discussing next steps, participants offered the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Project Team should prepare a “fact sheet” on transportation demand forecasting.</li><li>• Meeting materials should be provided in advance to promote enhanced discussion.</li></ul>	
6	<b><u>Closing Remarks</u></b> <p>G. Pothier (GLPi) and the Project Team thanked participants for their participation at the meeting.</p>	