

TO: project\_team@gta-west.com  
FROM: Peter Miasek

August 14, 2010

### **GTA-West - Questions from PIC#4**

This is a followup from PIC #4 in June, 2010, which I attended. As you know, Transport Action Ontario (TAO), formerly Transport 2000 Ontario, has been actively following and commenting on this project (our letter of April 13, 2009). I have a few questions that arise from my reading of the presentation boards.

Although I am currently the president of TAO, the comments and questions below reflect only my personal opinions. However, I believe that my colleagues likely share my views.

#### **Active Traffic Management Study**

A region-wide study is cited on slide 9. What is meant by this term? Who is responsible for carrying this out?

#### **Enhancement of Existing Highway Network**

The 1st slide in the group "Optimize Existing Network" (slide 10) discusses relatively novel techniques that could be implemented early, including:

- expand use of bus bypass shoulders
- enhance incident/congestion management
- expanded use of ramp metering
- HOV/Transit bypass lanes on ramps
- Speed harmonization

While all these are noble objectives which I support, could you please provide more concrete details on definitive plans (if any) and progress (if any)?

#### **Freight Enhancement**

The 5th slide in the group "Add/Expand Non-Road Infrastructure" (slide 16) discusses supporting freight movement by rail. You cite the following improvement ideas:

- remove constraints to improve freight and passenger rail operations and increase utilization
- coordinate with CN, CP, MX to identify conflict points
- support potential future initiative to remove freight rail/passenger rail conflicts
- provide grade separation at key road/rail crossings
- support ON-QU Continental Gateway strategy

Again, while all these are noble objectives which I support, could you please provide more concrete details on definitive plans (if any) and progress (if any)?

**Alternatives 3-2 and 3-3**

I understand that these alternatives involved widening regional roads. Slide 2 of Cluster 3 of the presentation describes that they were rejected for various reasons. Could you please provide more details on these alternatives, including screen lines on traffic demand/capacity?

**Transportation Development Strategy**

This is referred to in Slide 22. As I understand it, this will be prepared as a Report for public review. What is the timing for this report?

If it is more convenient, I and my colleagues could meet with you to discuss these matters face-to-face. I look forward to continuing our dialogue.

Yours truly,  
Peter Miasek