



A member of  MMM GROUP

2655 North Sheridan Way
Mississauga, Ontario L5K 2P8
Tel: (905) 823-4988
Fax: (905) 823-2669
E-mail: eweatherston@ecoplans.com
Website: www.ecoplans.com

COMMUNITY WORKSHOP # 1 MINUTES

PROJECT: Queen Elizabeth Way Improvements, from Cawthra Road to Evans Avenue
Preliminary Design and Class Environmental Assessment Study

MEETING NO: Community Workshop # 1

DATE: December 8, 2012 **TIME:** 9:00a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

PLACE: Lakeview Golf Course, 1190 Dixie Road, Mississauga, ON L5E 2P4

PRESENT: *Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO)*

Olga Garces	MTO, Senior Project Engineer
Rebecca Li	MTO, Senior Project Engineer
Sarah Merriam	MTO, Environmental Planner
Astrid Poei	MTO Communications Coordinator
Shelley Miller	MTO, Negotiations Supervisor

Consultant Team

Michael Chiu	MRC, Consultant Project Manager
Heather Templeton	MRC, Assistant Project Manager
Dana Glofcheskie	MRC, Project Engineer
Sandy Nairn	Ecoplans, Consultant Environmental Planner
Dawn McKinnon	Ecoplans, Assistant Environmental Planner
Evan Weatherston	Ecoplans, Junior Environmental Planner

Independent Facilitator

Glenn Pothier	GLPi
---------------	------

Participants who RSVP'd in advance of the Community Workshop or signed-up to be added to the project contact list at the Community Workshop.

J. Darenwych	J. Moroz
C. Schmitt	J. Lem
B. Barbosa	D. Faulkner
A. Bright	S. Plewes
P. Mezori	J. Di Filippo
G. Bartel	R. Wiens
G. Aregers	A. Di Vito
J. Cichon	J. Pill
D. Chin	G. Stidwell
J. Walmark	R. Pylypiw
G. Smith	P. Petrouna
L. Judge	J. Pugh

- | | |
|------------------|-----------------|
| S. Hugel | J. Lanari |
| B. Twomey | J. & M. Arruda |
| F. & M. Machanek | J. Fletcher |
| M. Machanek | P. & D. Galardo |
| K. Rossi | N. Casale |
| B. Bernardo | R. & G. Bartel |
| G. & G. Timms | T. & A. Raposo |
| H. & J. DeHaan | V. Lee |
| J. & S. Graterol | T. Jaalaspä |
| S. Sinopoli | L. Ferguson |
| D. Defilippis | S. Weeden |
| S. Boccia | D. Champagne |
| D. Santos | D. Briggs |
| L. Asal | D. Juiluisson |
| J. De Luca | D. Tomiuk |
| R. Bullock | J. Ierullo |

PURPOSE: The purpose of this meeting was to present and discuss the following:

- Study purpose, scope, and key milestones;
- Key study and community issues; and,
- Study alternatives.

OVERVIEW

The first Community Workshop for the Queen Elizabeth Way Improvements from Evans Avenue to Cawthra Road, Preliminary Design and Class Environmental Assessment Study, was held on Saturday, December 8, 2012 at Lakeview Golf Course, in Mississauga, Ontario. The meeting took place from 9:00 a.m. to 12:15 p.m. The attendees were seated at tables of approximately 8 to 9 people, each attended by a member of the project team. After the presentation, the groups worked through their workbooks and presented their main concerns and comments.

ITEM PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

1.0	Opening Remarks	
1.1	<p>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. He then provided an overview of the meeting’s purpose and agenda, noting that the meeting had two main objectives:</p> <p>1. To provide attendees a thorough understanding of study scope and the issues; and 2. For the project team to receive constructive input from workshop attendees.</p> <p>G. Pothier also noted that if participants had ideas for alternatives that were different from those generated by the project team, that there would be opportunities during the meeting to share them with the group.</p>	
1.2	<p>G. Pothier then introduced the project team members and noted their roles in the study.</p>	

ITEM PROCEEDINGS:

**ACTION
 BY:**

2.0	Overview Presentation	
2.1	H. Templeton provided an overview presentation of the project to the workshop attendees. She reviewed the study purpose, key milestones, key study issues, the QEW Dixie Road Interchange Alternatives, QEW mainline and bridge alternatives and next steps in the study process.	
	The following questions/comments were shared after the presentation :	
2.2	<i>Question:</i> Will Park Royale Boulevard have access to the QEW in the future? <i>Answer:</i> All future access to/from the QEW will be directly to/from Dixie Road.	
2.3	<i>Question:</i> Why is Metrolinx not involved in this study? <i>Answer:</i> This study is focusing on rehabilitation and operational improvements on the QEW (provincial freeway) within the study area. New or improved transit/rail initiatives were considered as part of the assessment of alternative ways of addressing the identified transportation problems, and it was noted that these transit measures have been included in the transportation modelling used in this project based on policy directions within the Provincial Growth Plan. These include the initiatives identified as part of the Province’s 25-year regional transit plan, the Big Move (Metrolinx). Transit improvement initiatives identified in this area in The Big Move include an Express Rail service along the Lakeshore GO line (from Hamilton to Oshawa) and Regional GO services extensions to the Niagara Region, among others. However, on their own these initiatives do not address the identified transportation problems. As part of the QEW mainline, bridge and Dixie Road Interchange improvements being considered, the project team will work closely with the local transit authorities and Metrolinx to mitigate any potential impacts to existing transit routes resulting from the Preferred Alternative to ensure local transit services are maintained.	
2.4	<i>Question:</i> Are local roads part of the study? <i>Answer:</i> Any potential local road impacts will be addressed as part of the study and will be dealt with in consultation with the applicable road authority (City of Mississauga or Peel Region).	
2.5	<i>Question:</i> There are new houses being built on Marionville Drive, have the builders been notified? <i>Answer:</i> Yes	
2.6	<i>Question:</i> Have there been traffic counts on Rometown Drive and Sherway Drive? <i>Answer:</i> Yes	
2.7	<i>Question:</i> How much traffic as a percentage can a Diamond interchange handle compared to a Parclo interchange and how will this impact your selection of the Preferred Alternative? <i>Answer:</i> The traffic analysis will assess the overall level of service of each Dixie Road Interchange Alternative under future 2031 traffic conditions. The results of the traffic analysis will only be one factor considered in the evaluation of interchange alternatives; effects to Socio-economic, Cultural Heritage and Natural Environments, as well as other Technical Considerations will be included in the evaluation. However, in general a Parclo configuration is able to handle higher volumes of traffic than a diamond configuration due to a Parclo having two additional on-ramps and free-flow on-ramp moves.	Project Team
2.8	<i>Question:</i> How accurate is the black shading on these maps? <i>Answer:</i> These are conceptual maps and if the property is even slightly impacted the	

ITEM PROCEEDINGS:

**ACTION
 BY:**

	<p>project team have shaded the whole property. At this point in the study, the team is only at the stage of assessing and evaluating alternatives, no recommendation has been made at this time on the acquisition of property. The extent of property impacts associated with each alternative will be confirmed in the coming months as the project team begins reviewing all the comments received from the community, agencies and other stakeholders, refines the presented alternatives based on this input, and commences the evaluation of alternatives. Based on all comments received, the project team will examine all reasonable opportunities to minimize/avoid potential property impacts. Along with all other environmental considerations, property impacts for each alternative will be included in the comparative assessment of impacts to the social, cultural, natural, and economic environments to identify the Preferred Alternative.</p>	
<p>2.9</p>	<p><i>Question:</i> What is the timing for this project? <i>Answer:</i> It is expected that this Class EA Study will be completed late 2014. After the EA has been finalized the project can then enter the detail design phase. While the improvements to this section of QEW are not currently part of the ministry's 5-year construction plan, the project is identified under "Planning for the Future" in the Ministry's Southern Highways Program for 2012-2016. Each year the ministry carefully plans for and re-examines highway programs and project priorities across the province. Further consideration may be given to the timing of this project pending availability of funds.</p>	
<p>2.10</p>	<p><i>Question:</i> What will the traffic impacts be during construction? <i>Answer:</i> The existing 6 basic lanes of traffic on the QEW will be maintained for the duration of construction. A traffic management plan will be developed to identify potential traffic impacts and a staging plan will be developed for the Preferred Alternative following PIC #2 as part of the Preliminary Design phase of this study, and presented at PIC #3.</p>	
<p>2.11</p>	<p><i>Question:</i> How will this study affect the noise coming from the QEW? <i>Answer:</i> A detailed noise analysis for the Preferred Alternative will be carried out following PIC #2 as part of the Preliminary Design phase of the Study. This will include assessing future noise levels and examining the technical and economic feasibility of providing noise mitigation, although noise barriers are currently in place for much of the highway corridor. The results of this assessment will be available at PIC #3.</p>	
<p>2.12</p>	<p><i>Question:</i> How are you contacting the community? I did not receive a notice. <i>Answer:</i> Notification for study commencement and PIC #1 for this project occurred through newspaper advertisements (Etobicoke Guardian, Mississauga News and L'Express), through direct notification letters mailed and/or e-mailed to the project mailing list (including agencies, municipalities, and members of the public) and brochures were distributed via Canada Post Bulk Mailout to nearly 9,000 residents and businesses surrounding the study area. Notices were also placed on the project website www.qewdixieea.ca.</p> <p>Individuals wishing to attend and participate in Community Workshop #1 were requested to contact the project team at project-team@qewdixieea.ca or sign-up at PIC #1 to be added to the workshop contact list. These people were then notified of the first community workshop and asked to RSVP for the event.</p> <p>Moving forward in this study, people on the community workshop contact list will receive direct notification and invitations to future community workshops and PICs.</p>	

ITEM PROCEEDINGS:

**ACTION
BY:**

	<p>All property owners who may be potentially impacted by the any of the proposed alternatives have been identified at this time and were notified about this study through the brochure distribution for the Notice of Study Commencement and PIC #1. Once a Preferred Alternative is selected and potential property impacts determined, potentially impacted property owners will receive direct notification and invitations to future consultation events.</p> <p><i>Follow up Comment:</i> You are not doing a good enough job, there are a lot of elderly in this area who do not use the internet and will throw out your brochures thinking it is junk mail. You should hand deliver notices to everyone in the area.</p> <p>Answer: Comment Noted</p>	
3.0	Break Out Groups: - A Community Perspective	
3.1	<p>The workshop attendees were seated at tables with 8-9 people and one project team member and asked to work through the questions in the workbook dealing with the community’s perspective.</p> <p>When the allotted time was finished the project team members were asked to provide through rapid response their groups main concerns/comments.</p>	
3.2	<i>Question:</i> What are your/your community’s current travel and traffic-related issues/concerns/frustrations with implications for this project’s Study Area?	
3.2.1	<i>Comment:</i> QEW traffic along the South Service Road is moving at high speeds and turning onto the Service Road is dangerous.	
3.2.2	<i>Concern:</i> High noise levels.	
3.2.3	<i>Concern:</i> Too much traffic on Sherway Drive and it is difficult to access the neighbourhoods.	
3.2.4	<i>Comment:</i> No issues with traffic and access with the existing configuration of the Dixie Road Interchange.	
3.2.5	<i>Comment:</i> Traffic and congestion on the QEW is an issue.	
3.2.6	<i>Concern :</i> Access to Dixie Mall.	
3.2.7	<i>Concern:</i> Dixie Road and North Service Road intersection.	
3.2.8	<i>Comment:</i> Need for pedestrian and cycling access across the Etobicoke Creek.	
3.2.9	<i>Concern:</i> Balancing the local community and a megamall.	
3.2.10	<i>Concern:</i> South Service Road used as a thoroughfare for the QEW.	
3.2.11	<i>Concern:</i> The Sherway Drive and Dixie Road intersection is not safe.	
3.2.12	<i>Concern:</i> On street parking.	
3.2.13	<i>Concern:</i> More traffic in the neighbourhood.	
3.2.14	<i>Comment:</i> The North Service Road & Dixie Road junction is unsafe and needs to be changed.	
3.3	<i>Q:</i> What transportation network and local access improvements would you like to see within the Study Area?	
3.3.1	<i>Comment:</i> Congestion easing.	
3.3.2	<i>Comment:</i> Rename the South Service Road “Boxwood Way”.	
3.3.3	<i>Comment:</i> Improve the Sherway Drive and Dixie Road intersection.	

ITEM PROCEEDINGS:

**ACTION
BY:**

3.3.4	<i>Comment:</i> Noise levels are too high; the noise wall needs to be continuous.	
3.3.5	<i>Comment:</i> Need local buses and better access to transit.	
3.3.6	<i>Comment:</i> Improvements to the Haig Boulevard and Dixie Road intersection.	
3.3.7	<i>Comment:</i> Better access to the Dixie Mall.	
3.3.8	<i>Comment:</i> A Highway 403 extension should be completed to Highway 427, this will ease QEW traffic.	
3.3.9	<i>Comment:</i> Close the QEW.	
3.3.10	<i>Comment:</i> Need for better signal timing on Sherway Drive.	
3.3.11	<i>Comment:</i> Maintain access to the community and the local school during construction.	
3.3.12	<i>Comment:</i> Traffic calming within the neighbourhoods.	
3.3.13	<i>Comment:</i> Consider a new ramp connection westbound QEW to Dixie Mall that goes under the QEW to transfer mall traffic off Dixie Road.	
3.4	What else does the project team need to know about the community that should influence the transportation planning?	
3.4.1	<i>Concern:</i> The age of the community, this impacts the projects team's communication strategies and increases the need for walkability within the neighbourhoods.	
3.4.2	<i>Concern:</i> Poor communication – need to use Canada post and personal addresses.	
3.4.3	<i>Comment:</i> Sedona is asking for access to the outlet mall.	
3.4.4	<i>Comment:</i> Sidewalks are not wanted on the South Service Road.	
3.4.5	<i>Comment:</i> Drivers speed on Rometown Drive and Park Royale Drive.	
3.4.6	<i>Comment:</i> There are poor sightlines southbound on Dixie Road for residents turning onto Rometown Drive.	
3.4.7	<i>Concern:</i> Noise becomes worse with the noise barrier.	
3.4.8	<i>Comment:</i> The increase in through traffic within the neighbourhoods will endanger children and damage the community.	
3.4.9	<i>Comment:</i> Any new noise barrier built must be fronted with green (trees or shrubs).	
3.4.10	<i>Comment:</i> It is difficult to enter the QEW heading eastbound from Cormack Crescent due to excessive speed on South Service Road and limited line of sight due to the existing Dixie Road Bridge.	
3.4.11	<i>Comment:</i> Traffic numbers should be reviewed as there are many new construction activities occurring along Dixie Road and The Queensway.	
4.0	Dixie Road Interchange Alternatives	
4.1	What do you see as the strengths/advantages and weaknesses/disadvantages of the various alternatives identified for the Dixie Road Interchange area?	
4.1.2	<i>Comment:</i> It is a disadvantage to bring the South Service Road down to Rometown Drive. Dixie Mall traffic exiting at Rometown Drive must move to the right now and on all proposed drawings.	
4.1.3	<i>Concern:</i> What can be done to eliminate traffic exiting Dixie Mall and traffic exiting Rometown Drive from meeting when residents are exiting to the right to go	

ITEM PROCEEDINGS:

**ACTION
BY:**

	north on Dixie Road?	
4.1.4	<i>Comment:</i> Strengths/advantages – None! Weaknesses/disadvantages? 1. Destroying people’s hopes/dreams by expropriating their homes. 2. Access to homes/plaza will be severely restricted. 3. Property Impacts!!!	
4.1.5	<i>Comment:</i> Dixie Road improvements are necessary. All alternatives are agreeable.	
4.1.6	<i>Comment:</i> Maintain access, maintain egress, and why not capacity improvements instead of West Mall alternatives.	
4.1.7	<i>Comment:</i> The fewer property impacts the better.	
4.1.8	<i>Comment:</i> Alternative 1 is the best as it improves traffic the most.	
4.1.9	<i>Comment:</i> If you’re going to do it, do it right.	
4.1.10	<i>Comment:</i> Extending the West Mall on-ramp is a good idea.	
4.1.11	<i>Concern:</i> Service road elevation.	
4.1.12	<i>Comment:</i> Schools in the area need safe access.	
4.1.13	<i>Comment:</i> Alternatives 2 and 3 are good because they limit property impacts.	
4.1.14	<i>Comment:</i> Tunnel the QEW through the area.	
4.1.15	<i>Comment:</i> Reconsider Alternative 1 because of the property impacts.	
4.1.16	<i>Comment:</i> Can the Dixie Mall main entrance be moved further south?	
4.1.17	<i>Comment:</i> Weakness: Adding a westbound on-ramp at Dixie Road will add to the volume of traffic passing through the neighbourhoods. All of the proposed plans will also cause a massive disturbance and deterioration in the quality of life for residents within the neighbourhoods. Strength: Eliminating the Dixie Road and North Service Road junction will eliminate some of the chaos.	
4.1.18	<i>Comment:</i> A full cloverleaf interchange at Dixie Road would be the best <u>if</u> there are no property impacts.	
4.1.19	<i>Concern:</i> There will be additional noise impacts to residential homes from the changes to ramps and service roads.	
4.1.20	<i>Concern:</i> The improvements will increase traffic to Dixie Road.	
4.1.21	<i>Concern:</i> Signalizing of the South Service Road and Dixie Road intersection will cause traffic impacts and reduce its effectiveness.	
4.1.22	<i>Concern:</i> These improvements will impact property values.	
4.2	What suggested refinements/enhancements to the alternatives — or new alternatives — would you propose that will address the transportation problems and opportunities?	
4.2.1	<i>Comment:</i> Visualizations showing how traffic flows should be considered for the next PIC.	
4.2.2	<i>Comment:</i> The Diamond Interchange in Alternative 5 should be tightened.	
4.2.3	<i>Comment:</i> Signage improvements on the Westbound QEW.	
4.2.4	<i>Comment:</i> Show that you are planning for future growth.	

ITEM PROCEEDINGS:

**ACTION
BY:**

4.2.5	<i>Comment:</i> Make them more pedestrian friendly.	
4.2.6	<i>Comment:</i> Explain what the Alternative 1 at Sherway Drive means.	
4.2.7	<i>Comment:</i> Need to consider seniors.	
4.2.8	<i>Comment:</i> Consider active transportation for schools.	
4.2.9	<i>Comment:</i> Alternative 4 has a larger impact on the community.	
4.2.10	<i>Comment:</i> Traffic cuts through Rometown Drive and up Park Royale Boulevard.	
4.2.11	<i>Comment:</i> Conflicts with Alternative 1 intersection in SE quadrant	
4.2.12	<i>Comment:</i> Exiting Dixie Mall conflicts at the intersection.	
4.2.13	<i>Comment:</i> Londonderry Boulevard and Larchview Trail are currently not shown/included on the plans; they need to be included to show that there are other accesses in addition to Rometown Drive for Orchard Heights.	
4.2.14	<i>Comment:</i> Service roads need to be lined out.	
4.2.15	<i>Comment:</i> New alternatives: 1. Dig a tunnel!! 2. How about a causeway running out along the lake.	
4.2.16	<i>Comment:</i> Don't put the South Service Road traffic on Rometown Drive.	
4.2.17	<i>Comment:</i> Consider using Alternative 1 Parclo A4 with the Service Road Alternative 2.	
4.2.18	<i>Comment:</i> Sound barrier improvements such as glass topped sound barriers.	
4.2.19	<i>Concern:</i> How will Sedona, Star Academy or any business along Cormack Crescent be serviced?	
4.2.20	<i>Comment:</i> Have the potential impacts of the proposed alternatives to the existing and future land uses and traffic patterns been considered for compatibility?	
4.2.21	<i>Comment:</i> Leave the interchange alone, just modernize the infrastructure.	
4.2.22	<i>Comment:</i> Widen the QEW.	
4.2.23	<i>Comment:</i> Reduce speeds on the QEW to 50km/h.	
4.2.24	<i>Comment:</i> All of the alternatives are worse than existing conditions.	
5.0	Etobicoke Creek Bridge Improvements	
5.1	What do you see as the strengths/advantages and weaknesses/disadvantages of the various alternatives identified regarding Etobicoke Creek Bridge area improvements?	
5.1.1	<i>Comment:</i> Need more information on the preferred alternative.	
5.1.2	<i>Comment:</i> Repairs are necessary. Whether the refurbishment or the replacement alternative is selected it should be influenced by the environmental impact during the construction phase.	
5.1.3	<i>Comment:</i> Need proper signage and movement during construction.	
5.1.4	<i>Comment:</i> Avoid environmental damage to the valley.	
5.1.5	<i>Comment:</i> Can we make it a more public friendly place?	
5.1.6	<i>Comment:</i> The noise wall north of the QEW should be extended from the Etobicoke Creek Bridge west all the way to where it currently ends at Brentano Boulevard.	

ITEM PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

	<i>Comment:</i> Disadvantage: More green taken up by concrete.	
5.2	What suggested refinements/enhancements to the alternatives — or new alternatives — would you propose that will address the transportation problems and opportunities?	
5.2.1	<i>Comment:</i> Incorporate public transportation into the study.	
5.2.2	<i>Comment:</i> Two lanes on the On-Ramp at the West Mall narrows to one which causes a bottleneck in a neighbourhood where Sherway Towers are increasing traffic flow.	
5.2.3	<i>Comment:</i> Minimize property impacts.	
5.2.4	<i>Comment:</i> If the costs are similar then replace the bridge.	
5.2.5	<i>Comment:</i> No connection from Orchard Heights.	
5.2.6	<i>Comment:</i> Create a wildlife corridor.	
5.2.7	<i>Comment:</i> Don't open Middle Road for cars.	
5.2.8	<i>Concern:</i> Access to and from Sherway Drive.	
5.2.9	<i>Comment:</i> Add collector lanes with the widening on the bridge.	
5.2.10	<i>Comment:</i> Minimize traffic disruptions.	
5.2.11	<i>Comment:</i> Do nothing.	
5.2.12	<i>Comment:</i> If it is needed, then replace it instead of repairing it.	
6.0	Success of the project	
6.1	What are the key criteria that should be used to gauge the success of the project?	
6.1.1	<i>Comment:</i> Do what the residents of the community want opposed to an objective study that will not appreciate the local context.	
6.1.2	<i>Concern:</i> The added lanes won't bring anything to the community.	
6.1.3	<i>Concern:</i> There is no benefit of more cars, better public transportation is needed.	
6.2	Additional Comments	
6.2.1	<i>Question:</i> Will there be ramp closures on Kipling Avenue? <i>Answer:</i> Although proposed works at Kipling Avenue are not part of this preliminary design study, the City of Toronto is a key stakeholder and as a result has been consulted with throughout the study. The project team will continue to consult with the City of Toronto as the study progresses in order to take into consideration any City's plans within the study limits and not preclude any municipal initiatives.	
6.2.2	<i>Question:</i> If there is a spring election will it impact the project? <i>Answer:</i> No	
6.2.3	<i>Comment:</i> The City wants to spend the money on the Etobicoke Creek Trail Extension (Sherway Trail) and the MTO won't allow us to go under the bridge why are you stopping it? <i>Answer:</i> The proposed pedestrian trail underneath the Etobicoke Creek Bridge is independent of this Class EA Study and is being undertaken by the Toronto Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) with the City of Toronto. As the study proceeds the Ontario Ministry of Transportation is committed to working with TRCA and the City to not preclude any proposed initiatives they may undertake.	

ITEM PROCEEDINGS:

**ACTION
BY:**

6.2.4	<i>Comment:</i> If this project is to go ahead a higher sound wall is a must.	
6.2.5	<i>Comment:</i> Public transportation from Dixie Mall to Kipling Station is needed.	
6.2.6	<i>Comment:</i> There should be a service road for Dixie Road <u>only</u> from West Mall to Dixie Road.	
6.2.7	<i>Comment:</i> There is a lack of information and clarity regarding the shaded property impacts from the PIC. More info and explanation are required on the project.	
7.0	Closing Remarks	
7.1	H. Templeton reviewed the project's next steps which are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporating the public and agency input from Community Workshop #1 into the study; • Assessing and evaluating the alternatives; • Selecting the Preferred Alternative; and • Presenting the Preferred Alternative to the public in a second round of consultation, which includes a second Public Information Centre and a second Community Workshop, during the Summer of 2013. 	
7.2	G. Pothier and O. Garces thanked the group for their attendance and valued input. It was noted that meeting minutes for the Community Workshop would be circulated to all attendees and posted to the project website (www.qewdixieea.ca) following the workshop and that the names of the attendees would be listed in the minutes. Anyone not wishing to have their name shown on this document was asked to notify a member of the project team.	
7.3	R. Li was introduced as the new MTO Project Manager. If attendees have any further questions, they are welcome to speak with the project team now or send in further comments via mail, email or telephone.	
	Meeting Adjourned 12:15 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: Evan Weatherston
Ecoplans, a member of MMM Group

Evan Weatherston

cc: Attendees, and by request