

---

## COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #2 MINUTES

**PROJECT:** QEW Mississauga Road to Hurontario Street Preliminary Design and Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Study

**MEETING NO:** Community Workshop #2

**MTO FILE NO.:** W.O. 08-20008                      **MRC FILE NO.:** 7733

**DATE:** March 5, 2011                      **TIME:** 9:10 a.m.

**PLACE:** Huron Park Recreation Centre, Ojibway A/B Room, Mississauga ON

**PRESENT:** *Workshop Sign-in Attendees*

John McGlone	Chris Mackie
Bruce Lancaster	Ed Mickiewicz
Mary Simpson	Ara Arzuranian
Rick Mateljan	Michael Spaziani
Alison Maloney	Alan Willis
Leo Darmitz	John Kozusko
Julie Robinson	Dorothy Tomiuk
Rob Sapienza	Bill Notenboom
Newt Seawright	Gordon Stewart
Claudina Sula	Anil Persaud
Stephen Whitehead	Gail Whitehead
Karen Simmonds	David Simmonds
Michael Walmsley	Vesna Walmsley
Michelle Walmsley	David Jones
Judy Marcuson	Sam Marcuson
Oli Hajly	Susan Aiken
David Aiken	Roger Coote
Dominic Crawley	Joanne Crawley

*Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO)*

Joseph Lai	MTO Highway Engineering
Rina Kulathinal	MTO Highway Engineering
Margaret Pak	MTO Environmental
Graziano Masiello	MTO Environmental

*Consultant Team*

Michael Chiu	MRC
Heather Templeton	MRC

Mike Bricks                      BPE Inc.  
 Catherine Christiani            Ecoplans Ltd.  
***Independent Facilitator***  
 Glenn Pothier                    GLPi

**PURPOSE:**                      To present and discuss the following:

- Study progress update
- Evaluation of alternatives and the rationales for the Study Team’s preliminary preferred alternatives
- Enhancement and mitigations

ITEM	PROCEEDINGS:	ACTION BY:
1.0	<b>Opening Remarks</b>	
1.1	G. Pothier, the independent meeting facilitator, called the meeting to order, welcomed and thanked all participants for taking time out of their schedules to attend the session, and encouraged the group to take the opportunity to participate fully in the meeting.	
1.2	G. Pothier then had the Project Team members introduce themselves and note their roles in the study.	
2.0	<b>Study Update Presentation</b>	
2.1	<p>Prior to the study overview presentation, R. Kulathinal thanked attendees for coming to the workshop and provided an update on the QEW Credit River Rehabilitation Holding Strategy Study, outlining the following.</p> <p>MTO has initiated two studies in the vicinity of the QEW Credit River Bridge: the Rehabilitation Holding Strategy Study (Detail Design Study) and this study (the Preliminary Design and Class EA Study). The purpose of the Holding Strategy Study is to develop and implement an interim rehabilitation strategy to maintain the safe use of the existing QEW Credit River Bridge until planning, design, and construction of the long term strategy for the bridge can occur. The Holding Strategy Study will address the <u>immediate needs</u> of the bridge.</p> <p>Construction of the Holding Strategy Study is planned to begin later this Spring, with estimated completion in Fall 2012. The principle work that will be taking place first will be the building of an access road, near Mississauga Crescent, to provide access to the valley.</p>	
2.2	M. Bricks provided a study update presentation, and reviewed the study purpose, study process and key milestones, provided brief summaries of Public Information Centre (PIC) #1 and Community Workshop #1, discussed the evaluation process, alternatives considered, the evaluation results, rationale for the preferred alternative, upcoming preliminary design considerations and the study’s next steps.	
2.3	The following questions/comments were shared during / after the presentation:	
2.3.1	<i>Question:</i> What is the Holding Strategy Study doing to address the condition of the	

ITEM	PROCEEDINGS:	ACTION BY:
	<p>expansion joints? Cars and trucks travelling over the deteriorated expansion joints create the most noise.</p> <p><i>Response:</i> The Holding Strategy will include the replacement of the existing expansion joints so they are flush with the pavement. Construction for the Holding Strategy is anticipated to begin in Spring 2011, with estimated completion in Fall 2012. In the first year of construction, the focus of work will be on repairing the underside of the bridge. In the second year of construction, the surface of the bridge will be repaired, including the replacement of the existing expansion joints.</p>	
2.3.2	<p><i>Question:</i> Has the Holding Strategy Study Team considered placing the expansion joints diagonally, rather than horizontally, in order to reduce the noise that results from cars and trucks travelling over them.</p> <p><i>Response:</i> Diagonal expansion joints are not possible due to the supporting structural form. In addition, due to the night closures that will result from having to work on the surface of the bridge, the Study Team's strategy is to minimize the amount of work needed to be done and wish to complete the surface bridge work as soon as possible. Fixing the expansion joints and making them flush with the pavement will result in a reduction in noise, until the long-term strategy for the bridge is implemented.</p> <p><i>Follow-up Question:</i> How long will the expansion joints stay flush with the pavement?</p> <p><i>Response:</i> The repairs to the pavement at the expansion joints will solve the differential issues that currently cause some of the noise heard by the local residents. The Preliminary Design Study will address the long-term issues of the expansion joints.</p>	
2.3.3	<p><i>Question:</i> Can the Project Team clarify what the ultimate design width of the preferred alternative is. Is the ultimate right-of-way width in each direction going to be 4 lanes?</p> <p><i>Response:</i> The preferred alternative in this study will have 3 basic lanes in each direction, as existing. However, as a part of this study, the Project Team does not want to preclude the possibility of implementing additional HOV lanes through Mississauga in the future. Additional EA studies are required to determine how to implement HOV lanes through Mississauga. This project will be protecting for additional HOV lanes in order to maintain flexibility in the event that subsequent EA studies determine that additional HOV lanes are required through Mississauga.</p>	
2.3.4	<p><i>Comment:</i> We can't wait several years before the expansion joints are replaced. They need to be fixed now.</p> <p><i>Response:</i> Comment noted. See also Item 2.3.2.</p>	
2.3.5	<p><i>Comment:</i> Creating possible cycling/pedestrian connections on or under the new bridge hasn't been addressed.</p> <p><i>Response:</i> The City's Draft Cycling Master Plan has identified future possible cycling / pedestrian crossings of the Credit River at both Queensway and the north side of the QEW, as well as a cycling / pedestrian crossing of the QEW at Stavebank Road. These crossings would ultimately be the responsibility of the City of Mississauga; however, the City has requested that the Project Team consider the feasibility of incorporating these cycling / pedestrian crossings within the study limits. The Project Team has talked with City of Mississauga staff regarding incorporating cycling/pedestrian connections in the study area, and we are committed to working with the City and to</p>	

ITEM	PROCEEDINGS:	ACTION BY:
	<p>not preclude any proposed crossing initiatives the City may undertake. The technical, safety and legislative issues associated with creating a cycling/pedestrian access adjacent to traffic or underneath the bridge deck also needs to be investigated.  <i>Follow-up Comment:</i> Cycling paths exist next to highways and underneath bridges in other jurisdictions.  <i>Response:</i> Comment noted.</p>	
2.3.6	<p><i>Question:</i> When will the Project Team be completing the bridge's detailed design?  <i>Response:</i> The preferred alternative has just been selected, and its Preliminary Design needs to be completed prior to Detail Design commencing. Preliminary Design is anticipated to be completed by early 2012. Any functional comments on the preferred bridge alternative are welcome now.</p>	
2.3.7	<p><i>Comment:</i> More bridge renderings, from different angles, need to be prepared. The Project Team should also be aware that there is a Trans Northern pipeline in the area, and a potential Indian burial ground present.  <i>Response:</i> Comments noted. The Project Team is aware of these items. Additional bridge graphics are available at each of the tables. All of this material will be at the PIC and, once finalized, will be posted to the project website.</p>	
2.3.8	<p><i>Question:</i> Can the Project Team clarify what improvements are included in the preferred Mississauga Interchange alternative?  <i>Response:</i> The preferred alternative, Alternative 1, involves operational improvements to the existing interchange, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both eastbound on-ramps and speed change lanes improved to current MTO standards;</li> <li>• Minor alignment changes and changes in lane arrangements (i.e. addition or removal of turning lanes);</li> <li>• Implementation of traffic signals; and,</li> <li>• Changes in existing traffic signal phases / timing.</li> </ul> <p><i>Follow-up Comment:</i> Agree with the proposed approach. The proposed changes will help to improve the current interchange, which is sub-standard and dangerous.  <i>Response:</i> Comment noted.</p>	
2.3.9	<p><i>Comment:</i> The Project Team hasn't adequately addressed the noise issue.  <i>Response:</i> The Project Team is aware that noise is a significant issue to the local community. The Holding Strategy Study will be addressing noise in the short-term through rehabilitation of the pavement at the expansion joints. As a part of this long-term study, a detailed noise analysis will be conducted following confirmation of the preferred alternative (after Public Information Centre #2). This detailed noise study will assess future noise levels and examine the technical and economic feasibility of providing noise mitigation. The results of this detailed noise analysis will be presented at Public Information Centre #3.</p>	
2.3.10	<p><i>Question:</i> Has the Project Team assessed which houses will be affected by the preferred alternative?  <i>Response:</i> There will be direct effects to two properties north-east of the bridge. The rest of the lands required are owned by MTO or are a part of the hydro corridor.</p>	

ITEM	PROCEEDINGS:	ACTION BY:
2.3.11	<p><i>Question:</i> Will there be impacts to properties on Keddleston Way?  <i>Response:</i> Alternative 1 does not directly impact any properties. The new eastbound QEW ramp will be closer to Keddleston Way; however, the noise from a ramp is not as pronounced as highway noise due to the lower volume of traffic. This will be assessed as part of the detailed noise analysis on the Technically Preferred Alternative.</p>	
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Workshop Session</b>	
3.1	<p>G. Pothier introduced the workshop section of the meeting. Attendees were asked to work through the workbook provided to each table, with the help/guidance of their assigned Project Team member. The table discussions will be followed by a plenary session, to share the results of the table discussions. He noted that a technique called the AIMMM tool would be used to help structure the discussion. The AIMMM tool acronym stands for:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> <b>A</b>DVANTAGES  <b>I</b>MPEDIMENTS  <b>M</b>AYBE’S  <b>M</b>ISSING  <b>M</b>ITIGATION </p> <p>During the workshop session, participants provided feedback on the Project Team’s preliminary preferred alternatives (and their related rationales), as well as discussed possible methods for enhancing design and reducing residual effects.</p> <p>Workshop Attendees were invited to submit their individual worksheets / additional ideas to the Project Team following the meeting.</p>	
3.2	<p>Upon completion of the table discussions, G. Pothier asked each table to share the highlights of their discussion. The following items were noted:</p> <p><b>ADVANTAGES</b> (What do you like about this preliminary recommendation — what are its strengths, advantages...what’s good about it...what makes it desirable, what benefits might it produce, etc.?)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The preferred interchange alternative seems safer</li> <li>• North Twinning seems to be the best option</li> <li>• Like that there is no acquisition of property required on Keddleston Way</li> <li>• Like that there are no in-water works (i.e. no bridge piers in the water)</li> <li>• Anticipates there will be benefits to cyclists on Mississauga Road</li> <li>• Having two QEW eastbound ramps, particularly the dedicated eastbound lane available to southbound Mississauga Road vehicles</li> </ul> <p><b>IMPEDIMENTS</b> (What are the weaknesses/disadvantages of the preliminary recommendation, things that don’t make sense to you or that are potentially problematic, what are the key barriers to implementation, what are the potential flaws in the rationale underlying the recommendation, etc.?)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although the North Twinning option minimizes effects, the Project Team should re-look the design of the new bridge. The new bridge should be designed to as high an aesthetic standard as the existing heritage bridge (i.e. be its own signature structure)</li> </ul>	

ITEM	PROCEEDINGS:	ACTION BY:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-look Option NT-2B as it further reduce aesthetic effects on the existing heritage bridge</li> <li>• The Project Team is not addressing the bottleneck that exists on the QEW beyond Hurontario Street</li> <li>• Why is it going to take up to 10 years for the long-term strategy to be put into place?</li> </ul> <p><b>MAYBE’S</b> (What, if any, are the uncertainties related to the alternative? What key questions do you have about it? What are the major unknowns?)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property acquisition</li> <li>• Impact of traffic on other local thoroughfares, ex. Lakeshore Road and Dundas Street</li> <li>• Fear that there will be double as much road noise now that there will be two bridges</li> <li>• Would closing the off-ramp from the QEW to South Sheridan Way improve eastbound movements? Redistribute this traffic to Erin Mills or Hurontario</li> <li>• Instead of vertical faces, noise barriers should have inclined faces</li> <li>• How will cycling/pedestrian access be incorporated into the study?</li> <li>• Create a separate bridge just for cycling/pedestrians</li> </ul> <p><b>MISSING</b> (What, if any, considerations have been overlooked? What, if anything, was not covered that you believe should have been?)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need more information on traffic and noise levels</li> <li>• Where would the noise barrier adjacent to Keddleston Road be located?</li> <li>• Consider placing the Mississauga Road southbound ramp to the eastbound QEW further north, or before the traffic signal, in order to ensure no illegal lefts onto the other eastbound ramp</li> <li>• Not enough emphasis has been placed on where traffic is going</li> <li>• What are MTO’s long term plans for the QEW?</li> <li>• Noise should be addressed sooner rather than later</li> <li>• The scope of the project should be broadened to address the capacity issues that aren’t being addressed</li> <li>• Impacts to wildlife, particularly deer, during construction</li> <li>• Consider a cycling/pedestrian tunnel under the bridge</li> <li>• Consider providing cycling/pedestrian access to the river</li> <li>• Design excellence for the new bridge, i.e. creating a new signature structure</li> <li>• Potentially widening Mississauga Road underneath the QEW to improve sightlines (for cars and cyclists)</li> </ul> <p><b>MITIGATION</b> (How can your concerns or objections be addressed — how can perceived weaknesses/disadvantages or flaws be mitigated, reduced or eliminated? What design advice do you have for the team?)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Holding Strategy Study should consider placing a rubber membrane under the new expansion joints in order to reduce noise</li> <li>• Consider a more sympathetic bridge design. Strive for design excellence</li> <li>• Minimize effects and re-naturalize</li> <li>• Erosion and sediment control. Ensure you don’t cause erosion downstream</li> <li>• Noise mitigation – use innovative designs and, if possible, ensure a view of the valley is maintained</li> <li>• Concerned regarding the safety of the current bridge. Consider implementing</li> </ul>	

ITEM	PROCEEDINGS:	ACTION BY:
	<p>reduced loads on trucks before work is completed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider landscaping and berms</li> </ul>	
3.3	The following questions/comments were shared during the workshop exercise:	
3.3.1	<p><i>Comment:</i> More important than the number or volume of cars travelling through the study area is to have an understanding of the number of people in each car. Ways to promote an increased use in HOV lanes and carpooling is important. <i>Response:</i> Comment noted.</p>	
3.3.2	<p><i>Comment:</i> GO Transit needs to increase their off-peak service on the Lakeshore West GO line to more than once an hour. <i>Response:</i> Comment noted.</p>	
3.3.3	<p><i>Comment:</i> Concerns raised at the last workshop have not been addressed. People want to know the expected impact of the project. <i>Response:</i> Comment noted.</p>	
3.3.4	<p><i>Comment:</i> Steel is a safer bridge material option than concrete. <i>Response:</i> Comment noted.</p>	
3.3.5	<p><i>Comment:</i> The area is made up of shale. Cushioning should be placed around the new bridge to reduce increased vibration effects. <i>Response:</i> Comment noted.</p>	
3.3.6	<p><i>Comment:</i> The selection of North Twinning as the preferred alternative is only the first step. The Project Team now needs to strive for bridge design excellence. The new bridge should be of the same high aesthetic quality as the existing bridge (enough so to be considered a heritage bridge itself), be naturally compatible, and be sympathetic to the existing bridge design without being a duplicate. <i>Response:</i> Comment noted.</p>	
3.3.7	<p><i>Comment:</i> Round caissons would help mitigate effects in the riverbed. <i>Response:</i> Comment noted.</p>	
3.3.8	<p><i>Comment:</i> There has been much improvement in the study since the last workshop. North Twinning is the best option. <i>Response:</i> Comment noted.</p>	
3.3.9	<p><i>Comment:</i> A select group of neighbours is present at the meeting. Everyone in the neighbourhood should be informed of the workshops so they too can attend and comment. <i>Response:</i> The workshops are meant for a smaller group. A larger Public Information Centre meeting will be held on March 31, 2011 for the general public.</p>	
3.3.10	<p><i>Comment:</i> An urban designer, recreation planner, landscape architect and heritage specialist need to be added to the Project Team. Some of the decision-making has begun without their involvement.</p>	

ITEM	PROCEEDINGS:	ACTION BY:
	<i>Response:</i> Comment noted.	
3.3.11	<p><i>Comment:</i> Proper notice of Public Information Centre #1 was not given. The Project Team is not properly consulting with the local community.</p> <p><i>Response:</i> The consultation plan for this project includes the following items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Maintenance of a project website <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="http://www.qewcreditrivera.ca">www.qewcreditrivera.ca</a>; the project website is updated regularly and contains study information and documents.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Newspaper notices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advertised in local newspapers – The Toronto Star, Mississauga News and Toronto L’Express.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Brochure mailings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prior to each Public Information Centre, study brochures containing the meeting information are distributed via bulk mail to residents directly adjacent to the study area.</li> <li>• We have discussed the late/non-delivery of the Public Information Centre #1 brochure with Canada Post and have investigated alternative delivery methods. The Public Information Centre #1 brochure was provided to Canada Post two weeks before the PIC, and we were assured delivery within 5 business days. The brochure flyers were in addition to PIC notices published in local newspapers.</li> <li>• For the PIC #2 brochure mailout, we have allotted extra time to ensure the brochures are delivered on time, and plan on following up with Canada Post and select local neighbours to confirm delivery.</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. Mail/email notices to the study mailing list</li> <li>5. Public Information Centres and Community Workshops</li> </ol> <p><i>Follow-up Comment:</i> Mississauga News delivery is sporadic and not dependable. The Project Team should consider advertising on Cable 10 and in the Globe and National Post newspapers as well. Not everyone gets the Toronto Star.</p> <p><i>Response:</i> Comment noted.</p>	
3.3.12	<p><i>Comment:</i> Shouldn’t a councillor be present at these meetings?</p> <p><i>Response:</i> The Mississauga Heritage Advisory Committee indicated that a local councillor would attend, but they have yet to arrive.</p>	
3.3.13	<p><i>Post Meeting Note from an attendee:</i> The acoustics in the room were terrible, and some found it very hard to hear all that was being said. For future meetings the Project Team should ensure that a portable Public Address (PA) system is used, and that all future presenters are familiar with its use prior to the meeting.</p>	
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Closing Remarks</b>	
4.1	M. Bricks reviewed the project’s next steps, noting that the next Community Workshop would be held prior to Public Information Centre #3 – anticipated for Late 2011.	
4.2	G. Pothier and R. Kulathinal thanked the group for their attendance and valued input. If attendees have any further questions, they are welcome to speak with the Project Team now or send in further comments via phone or email.	

ITEM	PROCEEDINGS:	ACTION BY:
	Meeting Adjourned 12:30 p.m.	

*The forgoing represents the writer's understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the undersigned immediately upon receiving these minutes (905-823-4988).*

Minutes Prepared by:

**Ecoplans Limited**



---

Catherine Christiani

cc: Attendees