

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>We will not be completing the weighting forms, since we feel not competent in filling them out. However, we do agree with the attached information of the ABC study group of Perth South, Perth East and Wilmot West.</p> <p>We are extremely concerned about the corridor in respect to drainage. All our farms are systematically tiled and if the corridor would pass thru the land, the drainage tile would have to be repaired to its original state and not just to the best of your capability. Repairing the drainage would be a very difficult and extremely expensive task.</p> <p>We are in favour of using existing roads, railway corridors or hydro corridors. We feel strongly, that Stratford, Perth South and surrounding townships have some of the very best, most valuable and productive farmland in the province and we definitely do not support building roads across. It would be detrimental to the farming community.</p> <p>In our opinion, there is already a lot of traffic on Lorne Avenue. With the city expanding, that corridor would go right thru the City in the future. We strongly believe, that it would be much better, and more long-term planning to move the corridor 1, or even better 2 sideroads to the south (Line 29 or 26) to allow for the city's future growth and diverting the traffic around, rather than thru the city.</p> <p>The following are properties of ours which might be affected by the corridor.</p> <p>It is also of great concern to us, how we will be able to commute from one farm to another, having to cross this corridor highway many times a day with large agricultural equipment. Let's hope you find a solution which causes minimal disruption to this multigenerational heritage farming community.</p>	<p>Your support of the official response from ABC regarding the arithmetic evaluation process has been documented.</p> <p>Two evaluation approaches were used to assist in the selection of the preferred route alternative.</p> <p>The Reasoned Argument (or Trade-off) method was the primary tool used to identify a preferred alternative. The Reasoned Argument (trade-off) evaluation component provides a clear presentation to stakeholders of the key trade-offs between the various evaluation factors and the reasons why one alternative is preferred over another.</p> <p>The Arithmetic (weighting-scoring) method was the secondary tool, with the results compared to the results of the trade-off method. The Arithmetic evaluation provides a means to compare the alternative methods based on a numerical scaling with weights assigned by the multi-disciplinary study team. A numerical approach is a good sensitivity analysis tool to determine if the conclusions of the reasoned argument approach are valid and appropriate. Weightings provided by stakeholders and the public through the consultation process were considered when conducting the sensitivity analysis.</p> <p>We understand why some stakeholders chose not to provide weightings for the arithmetic process. While soliciting public input on weightings is a widely accepted practice, the process was completely voluntary. Furthermore, the arithmetic weighting process was not dependent on the number of weighting submissions.</p> <p>A wide range of transportation alternatives were evaluated. While many of the transportation alternatives can contribute positively to the identified problems and opportunities in the Analysis Area, most are limited in their effectiveness when considered individually. As a result, and in recognition that transportation system solutions</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
	<p>require comprehensive, multimodal strategies for long term effectiveness and sustainability, the individual alternatives were grouped into logical Combination Alternatives for further detailed assessment. On the basis of the assessment results, the following two combination transportation alternatives were selected to be carried forward in the study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • transportation demand management (e.g. ridesharing and telecommuting) plus inter-regional plus inter-regional transit plus widening of Highway 7&8; and • transportation demand management (e.g. ridesharing and telecommuting) plus inter-regional transit plus local bypasses or a new corridor. <p>Please note that our 2031 forecasted traffic volumes have assumed that all reasonable modes of travel and demand management such as ridesharing, telecommuting, optimizing passenger/ freight rail capacity and increased inter-regional transit services are already implemented and operating to their fullest potential.</p> <p>Other alternatives that do not address the identified transportation problems and opportunities were not carried forward as they will have environmental impacts without providing the required transportation benefits.</p> <p>Opportunities to minimize impacts on the natural, land use / socio-economic and cultural environments were considered during the corridor generation and route generation phases of the study. Opportunities to further reduce / mitigate impacts on the environment will be explored through subsequent design phases.</p> <p>The assessment and evaluation of route alternatives is based on over 60 criteria from four major factor areas, specifically the natural environment, land use / socio-economic environment, cultural environment and transportation factors. The criteria were in part developed and modified to reflect local information provided by stakeholders through the consultation process. Local input is</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
	<p>valuable in terms of identifying local issues and conditions. The assessment and evaluation results and the preferred route alternative for the entire study corridor is being presented at PIC #4 for public review and comment.</p> <p>Intersection requirements / treatments and entrance locations / treatments will be defined during the preliminary design phase of the study which will be initiated after PIC #4. The proposed treatment for each crossing road will take into consideration the movement of agricultural equipment and emergency service requirements as well as traffic demands, safety and mobility.</p> <p>During the preliminary design phase, the study team will also systematically contact all relevant landowners along the preferred route to identify both public and private drains to support design work in subsequent design phases.</p> <p>MTO recognizes the importance of agricultural tile drainage. The issue of potential impacts and associated mitigation to/for agricultural tile drainage in specific farm fields will be addressed during detail design, which will be part of subsequent MTO studies.</p>
<p>MTO Weighting Questionnaire We believe the newest evaluation tool being used, the weighting questionnaire, is poorly designed, will produce tenuous results, reflects limited regard for the time of community members, and most importantly, is a feeble attempt to diffuse accountability for difficult decisions. There are two main issues:</p> <p>1. Design</p> <p>The consultant's mailing list is not a representative sample of study area residents and tabulated results will only reflect 'what is returned'. The results could be seen as rewarding those who access photocopy machines. The questionnaire and its instructions are confusing and certain response categories arbitrarily divide those living along the corridor. Numerous</p>	<p>Your concerns regarding the arithmetic evaluation method and specifically the weighting questionnaire have been documented.</p> <p>Two evaluation approaches were used to assist in the selection of the preferred route alternative.</p> <p>The Reasoned Argument (or Trade-off) method was the primary tool used to identify a preferred alternative. The Reasoned Argument (trade-off) evaluation component provides a clear presentation to stakeholders of the key trade-offs between the various evaluation factors and the reasons why one alternative is preferred over another.</p> <p>The Arithmetic (weighting-scoring) method was the secondary tool,</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>evaluation criteria are not relevant to this study area and most of us lack sufficient knowledge to weight many items meaningfully. Details concerning our reservations are noted in the attached annex. Since tabulated results of the questionnaire may influence decisions on route location, we are providing this critique to our members.</p> <p>2. Accountability</p> <p>Undoubtedly consultants were carefully selected and hired by MTO to bring their professional knowledge and experience to bear on this project; not to hold citizen plebiscites. Quite frankly all the inputs required to make final corridor and route recommendations are already available. We are sceptical of any process that seeks to diffuse accountability or responsibility for tough decisions or recommendations. We are well aware that trade-offs and choices will be difficult.</p> <p>However, we want to see a clear line of accountability for these choices and clear lines of justification for each respective choice. Weak questionnaire data collected without due attention to survey methods coming at this late stage hardly merits a glance. This flawed process will not be sufficient to make the argument that 'this is what the community wants'.</p>	<p>with the results compared to the results of the trade-off method. The Arithmetic evaluation provides a means to compare the alternative methods based on a numerical scaling with weights assigned by the multi-disciplinary study team. A numerical approach is a good sensitivity analysis tool to determine if the conclusions of the reasoned argument approach are valid and appropriate. Weightings provided by stakeholders and the public through the consultation process were considered when conducting the sensitivity analysis.</p> <p>We understand why some stakeholders chose not to provide weightings for the arithmetic process. While soliciting public input on weightings is a widely accepted practice, the process was completely voluntary. Furthermore, the arithmetic weighting process was not dependent on the number of weighting submissions.</p> <p>The assessment and evaluation of route alternatives is based on over 60 criteria from four major factor areas, specifically the natural environment, land use / socio-economic environment, cultural environment and transportation factors. These factors and criteria have been developed and are continually refined in consultation with regulatory agencies and the public through use in a wide variety of MTO and municipal projects so that a wide variety of policy objectives and regulatory requirements can be addressed. Their application is refined based upon the specifics of the study area.</p>
<p>Conclusion:</p> <p>We believe the time has come to get on with it and decide the final corridor and preferred routing, using existing knowledge and experience readily available to your consultants. In summary we expect and will support clarity in both decision accountability and in the criteria justification for final corridor and route selection.</p> <p>We will not participate in this component of the study. A blank evaluation form is attached.</p>	<p>Accordingly, for this study, the criteria were in part developed and modified to reflect local information provided by stakeholders through the consultation process. Local input is valuable in terms of identifying local issues and conditions. The assessment and evaluation results and the preferred route alternative for the entire study corridor is being presented at PIC #4 for public review and comment.</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>Comments on Questionnaire Design</p> <p>It's our understanding is that the study team will first evaluate and weigh all listed criteria through 'reasoned assessment'. This amounts to what makes sense to them for a final corridor and route selection based on all available inputs and their professional expertise.</p> <p>The questionnaire results will only be used to either validate or invalidate their 'reasoned assessment'. If 'gaps' appear the consultants will address them.</p> <p>The survey method used will not provide a 'representative sample' of people living in the corridor. The results will only portray what comes back from the questionnaires returned. We note that duplications and multiple copies were sent to several addresses and instructions are confusing. Return postage was not included as is customary in serious mail-out surveys. Thus the completion and return rate may be low and will be subject to many biases. It also favours those who choose to access photocopy machines as we doubt signatures will be validated. All results must therefore be considered very tenuous, and yet the results will likely be seen as a legitimate data source by the consultants based on their presentation at the July 21, 2010 PIC.</p> <p>The survey evaluation criteria appear to have been lifted from another study without consideration for this area's differences. Several components do not apply to the study area and yet respondents are asked to weight them. An example would be section 1.3.5 Groundwater, where dependent commercial applications such as water bottling are listed. Other examples not relevant to the study are given an apparent priority such as 1.2.5 Designated Special Areas where the questionnaire lists world biosphere reserves, national and provincial parks and heritage rivers. None of these are present here. Relevant criteria are also missing such as section 2.2. Land Use where there is no reference to municipal drains in rural areas. Factor Four - the Area Economy - is not to be weighted at all which is curious.</p>	<p>The responsibility and accountability for the selection of the preferred route rests with the Ministry.</p> <p>The preferred route addresses inter-regional transportation capacity and highway safety needs with the least overall environmental impact.</p> <p>Intersection requirements / treatments and entrance locations / treatments will be defined during the preliminary design phase of the study which will be initiated after PIC #4. The proposed treatment for each crossing road will take into consideration the movement of agricultural equipment and emergency service requirements as well as traffic demands, safety and mobility.</p> <p>As the study proceeds, we will continue to work with landowners along the preferred route to ensure we fully understand their concerns and we will strive to mitigate potential impacts.</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>The instructions for questionnaire completion include troubling biases. We believe that choices given in Section 2: Weighting Scenario are inappropriate. Respondents are asked to indicate if their weightings apply to Built-up Areas or Rural Areas. We believe these categories are potentially divisive for community members living along the corridor.</p> <p>Biases also appear in the factors and criteria listed in the questionnaire, columns which are highly variable. In the category Land Use (pages 2 and 3) as many as nine sub-factors are listed. In contrast Cultural Environment (page 3) has only two sub-factors. The lists of criteria found in column three are also quite variable in scope.</p> <p>Most respondents will see that they do not have the necessary expertise to attach meaningful weights to most of these factors. Many listed factors lay outside everyday experience and thus many weighting judgments will likely be quite arbitrary. For any public input process to be viewed as legitimate only salient categories and relevant forms of genuine comparison should be presented to respondents.</p>	
<p>As no attention to detail was made in your development of the mailing list for the Weighting Sheets for Route Evaluation, we received 4 packages in the mail. We are therefore returning 4 copies of the Evaluation Form and request that your calculations included these as four separate responses.</p> <p>All Weighting Sheets have been returned blank and are in support of the official response from ABC.</p>	<p>Your support of the official response from ABC regarding the arithmetic evaluation process has been documented.</p> <p>Two evaluation approaches were used to assist in the selection of the preferred route alternative.</p> <p>The Reasoned Argument (or Trade-off) method was the primary tool used to identify a preferred alternative. The Reasoned Argument (trade-off) evaluation component provides a clear presentation to stakeholders of the key trade-offs between the various evaluation factors and the reasons why one alternative is preferred over another.</p> <p>The Arithmetic (weighting-scoring) method was the secondary tool, with the results compared to the results of the trade-off method. The Arithmetic evaluation provides a means to compare the</p>

Summary of Input Received and Response Provided

Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
	<p>alternative methods based on a numerical scaling with weights assigned by the multi-disciplinary study team. A numerical approach is a good sensitivity analysis tool to determine if the conclusions of the reasoned argument approach are valid and appropriate. Weightings provided by stakeholders and the public through the consultation process were considered when conducting the sensitivity analysis.</p> <p>We understand why some stakeholders chose not to provide weightings for the arithmetic process. While soliciting public input on weightings is a widely accepted practice, the process was completely voluntary. Furthermore, the arithmetic weighting process was not dependent on the number of weighting submissions.</p> <p>We have updated our mailing list to eliminate duplicate mailings for your property.</p>
<p>Throughout the consultation component of this study both the MTO and its consultants have asked the community to participate, bring their best ideas forward and, “help” the consulting team. We believe we have done our utmost to assist you.</p> <p>Before MTO and its consultants come back once more to the community with more lines drawn on maps, we ask that you take our information seriously and provide accurate information when you do come to the community.</p> <p>We require that you not only listen to what is being said, but focus your energies on hearing what the community is saying.</p> <p>We are the ones that have to live with your decisions. Therefore, we have/will continue to assist with clarifications throughout this process.</p> <p>Summary We believe the centrality and enormous economic importance of agricultural business within the study area is still not fully</p>	<p>Thank you for the comments you provided. Your comments and concerns have been carefully reviewed and considered by the study team.</p> <p>The study team appreciates the input received from the agricultural community regarding existing farm businesses within the Analysis Area and has respected the privacy of this information, hence the reason why all of the detailed information we’ve received has not been incorporated into the study reports. Given the point we are at in the study process, adequate information is available to support the assessment and evaluation of route alternatives.</p> <p>As the study progresses, the study team will continue to liaise with agricultural landowners to ensure more detailed information is available to support preliminary design activities.</p> <p>References to the Nutrient Management Act and the Drainage Act have been added to the “Rationale for Factors and Sub-Factors</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>understood and the legislative responsibilities of farmers are not adequately represented in the recent consultant's reports presented at PIC 3B held in Shakespeare on July 21, 2010. The criteria used in the current Class EA decision model that determine the proposed corridor and route options are inaccurate and inadequate. It is not possible to comment on proposed options when the criteria are deficient.</p> <p>Background Agricultural business and its requisite land-base is a fundamental economic engine within the affected region. This community has come together using information collected from agricultural producers, Statistics Canada, official agricultural organizations, provincial legislation and regulations as well as local knowledge held by members of the community to present a more transparent understanding of the resources within the study area. MTO representatives have been provided with unprecedented access to the community through ABC Members.</p> <p>The following are still major issues for ABC and its members in response to PIC 3B.</p> <p>Issue 1 ABC and its members have worked with the study team for 24 months to broaden their understanding of the business of agriculture and its complexity. This included several on-farm site visits, rural property visits and business information meetings, including crucial discussions of current nutrient management requirements (Nutrient Management Act, 2002). Nutrient management is a major legislative requirement that profoundly influences how the land-base of modern agriculture is organized and where and how machinery is transported. Furthermore it is a huge environmental factor affecting water quality, species habitat and quality of rural life.</p> <p>The information from these meetings and the data presented to the study team does not appear in the consultant's Draft Report F (part 2). The owners of two properties listed on page 56 of Report</p>	<p>Evaluation" column of the "Evaluation Factors, Sub-factors, Criteria and Indicators for the Assessment and Evaluation of Detailed Planning Alternatives" table. Furthermore, the agricultural indicators for route selection do consider the potential and significance for impacts to nutrient management and drainage infrastructure.</p> <p>As the study proceeds, we will consult with the owners of farm properties impacted by the preferred route and with representatives of OMAFRA's Nutrient Management and Environmental Branch to ensure that the implications to nutrient management can be properly considered and addressed.</p> <p>During the preliminary design phase, the study will consider drainage and hydrology engineering relative to channels, ditches, storm sewers and outlets/outfalls for drainage of the roadway; stormwater management facilities; and hydraulics of bridges culverts and water crossing inlets/outlets. This will include key elements to ensure feasibility of integration with existing drainage systems and account for the quality and quantity of stormwater runoff.</p> <p>Furthermore, during the preliminary design phase, the study team will systematically contact all relevant landowners along the preferred route to identify both public and private drains to support design work in subsequent design phases.</p> <p>MTO recognizes that a number of farmers have concerns about agricultural tile drainage. The issue of potential impacts and associated mitigation to/for agricultural tile drainage in specific farm fields will be addressed during detail design, which will be part of subsequent MTO studies.</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>F (part 2) were participants in the above noted process and provided the study team with detailed maps of their property, yet the buildings are classified inaccurately and their use is listed incorrectly.</p> <p>We drew attention to this lapse in our most recent response to the PIC process and as far back as September, 2008.</p> <p>Consequently we did a sample inventory of some members of the agricultural community in preparation for the recent Shakespeare and Area Workshop. The objective was to demonstrate more accurately the centrality of nutrient management and its priority requirements as well as to highlight the inadequacies of the consultant's inventory and its potential negative impact on decisions.</p> <p>Therefore, it is our view that no Class Environmental Assessment study, within a predominately agricultural region, can ever be complete without placing nutrient management high on the list of inventoried criteria. Like the study area's flora and fauna, integrated agricultural business units need to be inventoried.</p> <p>Issue 2</p> <p>The study team still does not recognize that drainage of agricultural land must be a component of the evaluative criteria for route planning. There is no reference to the Drainage Act in their rationale and yet drainage is essential to farm viability.</p> <p>The drainage concerns of farmers (both for public and private drains) and the essential parts of the Drainage Act of concern to ABC were presented to the study team in the Drainage Annex to the Volume 2 brief of January 2009. Detailed recommendations were made in Chapter 6, and on page 23 of that volume. A formal response by letter from MTO indicated it was sufficient to 'trust' their engineers when any detailed engineering design phase became active. A recent workshop at the University of Waterloo, Spatial Decision Unit, showed that the consultant's maps showing water bodies are estimated by the University to be 50- 80% inaccurate. Municipal drains are identified as streams, nonexistent</p>	

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>wet soil areas are identified as ponds and a significant number of ponds identified by the MTO were in fact formerly wetter lands that have been systematically tile drained over the past 10 years and no longer exist.</p> <p>We have carefully examined the drainage maps used by MTO's consultants and have asked members of the agricultural community to compare their on-farm knowledge to these maps. In numerous instances the data in these maps for our members is both inaccurate and misleading. The MTO study team used data from the OMAFRA website for this portion of the study, which, as of 2010 is 10 years old. The map used by the MTO study team is found in Draft Report F (Part 2) Exhibit 3-9(c) page 61 and is dated 2009, yet numerous changes to farm drainage in the past decade are not reflected. Some members of the agricultural community improved their drainage systems (by adding private drains) as far back as 2000 and yet these improvements are not reflected in the 2009 maps. In recognition of issues of accuracy, OMAFRA itself has an accuracy disclaimer on its website regarding drainage see (http://www.omafra.gov.on.ca/english/landuse/gis/map_dis.htm) We now question whether there is sufficient will for accuracy on the part of the study team and this situation does not inspire the trust requested by MTO.</p> <p>In summary, from an agricultural business perspective, it is unimaginable that criteria for any Class EA assessment for highway development can be implemented without careful attention being paid to both the Drainage Act and to the environmental implications of excess surface water on agricultural land.</p> <p>Issue 3</p> <p>There remains a general lack of understanding in the Class EA process regarding modern farm business activity and its networks. There is an ecology to any rural landscape, a set of complex interactions between the land-base, the animals being</p>	

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>housed, the management of crops and feeding systems, the requirements for manure storage and dispersal, the cost and size of today's equipment and the access farmers need to fields and markets.</p> <p>For issues 1 and 2 above we identify very specific gaps in the Class EA process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Nutrient Management Act is missing from the evaluative criteria, and - The Drainage Act is missing. <p>As of PIC 3B held in July 2010, these critical pieces of legislation are still not being identified by the consultants as part of their planning rationale.</p> <p>However, even the inclusion of the above would not be enough. From the outset 'agricultural business' is given minimal priority within the existing Class EA framework. This systematic bias has resulted in an inaccurate analysis of the fiscal impact of road modifications to farm businesses in the affected region. Changes to road and travel patterns are more than a 'nuisance' to farmers; they can destroy the ecology of viable farm business units. The MTO consultants did expand the evaluative criteria for agriculture. These expanded criteria include whether highway development affects Class 1 or 2 farmland and the potential impacts on farm business units. However, the application of these new criteria is meaningless unless the farms potentially affected are inventoried in detail. In the MTO Rationale for Factor & Sub factor Evaluation for Agriculture from their March 19, 2010 document for the Shakespeare & Area Workshop: (See page 71, 72 in the Shakespeare and Area Summary Report), this sort of inventory has not been done. At the moment, the inventory maps used by the consultants are inaccurate and are clearly inadequate for presenting a picture of agricultural concerns. This will consequently result in negative impacts for farm businesses.</p>	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
 Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
 Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010**

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>Conclusion</p> <p>We are extremely concerned that after many attempts to provide and correct inaccurate information the study team has still failed to compensate for inadequate information in the evaluative criteria. This does not provide us with confidence that decisions the study team makes will accurately reflect the agricultural regulatory environment and the complex business of agriculture and food production.</p> <p>The fundamental assumptions related to agriculture in this study remain inaccurate, and as such, any final recommendations from the study team will reflect those inadequacies.</p>	
<p>I would like to thank you for hosting PIC 3B in Shakespeare this past Wednesday. It was unfortunate that we were not able to get together to discuss my observations regarding the EA Study process as I had hoped, as area residents seemed to be keeping you busy throughout the evening. I did however have the opportunity to review my thoughts and concerns with Brenda Jamieson and she said she would share her notes with you.</p> <p>It's been a long process and it's not over yet. We have been involved for more than a year and we have seen many changes. While last July it appeared that the MTO was prepared to expand Highway 7&8 through Shakespeare with little or no consideration for the safety of people or for the efficient flow of traffic, it now appears that our concerns have been heard and that significant changes have been made. We have seen many improvements to the EA Study over the past few months and we now have seven bypass options to consider. Options that ensure that the many drivers who will pass through the Shakespeare area someday will enjoy a safe and efficient passage.</p> <p>There are still many Shakespeare residents who are disappointed to know that expanding the highway through the village is still considered an option by the MTO. I suppose you would have to live in a small village yourself to understand how residents can</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback regarding the study process.</p> <p>The assessment and evaluation of route alternatives is based on over 60 criteria from four major factor areas, specifically the natural environment, land use / socio-economic environment, cultural environment and transportation factors. The criteria were in part developed and modified to reflect local information provided by stakeholders through the consultation process. Local input is valuable in terms of identifying local issues and conditions. The assessment and evaluation results and the preferred route alternative for the entire study corridor is being presented at PIC #4 for public review and comment.</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>come to love a community such as ours. A combination of friendly people and a unique collection of historic buildings combine to create an environment that must be passionately defended.</p> <p>I sense that the storm clouds over Shakespeare are beginning to clear and that the hard work by you, your team and by area stakeholders will soon result in the identification of a suitable bypass. One that will not only satisfy our primary concerns for a safe and efficient route but one that will leave our historic village intact for future generations to enjoy.</p> <p>Thanks again to you and your team and I look forward to seeing you all later this year when the final route selection is announced.</p>	
<p>I just wish to make a few comments for you and your staff to consider as this process moves forward. I understand there are 1,000 different opinions, many of which have some merit.</p> <p>My comments are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I appreciate the openness and opportunities everyone has had to participate. - I appreciate the open forums complete with pictures and plans. - I appreciate the fact the highway safety and traffic issues need to be addressed ASAP. Over the years I have encountered far too much death on this portion of road. - I do not appreciate the steamrolling of the village of Shakespeare. - I feel that this whole process is taking way too long and decisions need to be made. Let's get on with the project. <p>Far too many people's lives are being held in limbo. People cannot put their places up for sale, additions and construction cannot take place on private property, businesses cannot plan, and everyone is being held hostage to the length of time this process is taking. Believe me, I have done a lot of designing and building and this time line is ridiculous.</p> <p>Lastly, I just wish to comment on the overall scope of the project</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback regarding the route alternatives. The effort taken is both noted and appreciated. Your concerns regarding the study process, the transportation alternatives, the route alternatives, including the sketch you provided of a proposed "compromise solution", and the meeting format have been carefully reviewed and considered by the study team.</p> <p>A wide range of transportation alternatives were evaluated. While many of the transportation alternatives can contribute positively to the identified problems and opportunities in the Analysis Area, most are limited in their effectiveness when considered individually. As a result, and in recognition that transportation system solutions require comprehensive, multimodal strategies for long term effectiveness and sustainability, the individual alternatives were grouped into logical Combination Alternatives for further detailed assessment. On the basis of the assessment results, the following two combination transportation alternatives were selected to be carried forward in the study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • transportation demand management (e.g. ridesharing and telecommuting) plus inter-regional transit plus widening of Highway 7&8; and • transportation demand management (e.g. ridesharing and

Summary of Input Received and Response Provided

Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>as a whole. Last year it was my suggestion that you consider two lanes of traffic into Stratford from New Hamburg with three lane sections where traffic access on and off is important (i.e. Shakespeare). This would be the existing 7/8 highway with two in lanes. At the same time, the exiting Lorne Ave. which becomes Pork Road would continue and be constructed as a two lane out highway right through to New Hamburg. In many states, divided highways exist often to the point where they cannot be seen from each other. When I look at the crossroads, land use, construction costs, destruction of towns, houses, cemeteries, heritage sites and all the other factors listed on the sheets we have just filled out including all the farmland issues, I will say you are making a grave mistake. The overall opinion of myself and most others when it relates to all the issues at hand is that your design team is really not listening at all.</p> <p>I only write these comments for the benefit of the process and even though anything that happens will not directly affect my family, I am telling you as a citizen of this area which understand our township that I feel a mistake is in the works which will affect our community forever.</p>	<p>telecommuting) plus inter-regional transit plus local bypasses or a new corridor.</p> <p>Please note that our 2031 forecasted traffic volumes have assumed that all reasonable modes of travel and demand management such as ridesharing, telecommuting, optimizing passenger/ freight rail capacity and increased inter-regional transit services are already implemented and operating to their fullest potential.</p> <p>Other alternatives that do not address the identified transportation problems and opportunities were not carried forward as they will have environmental impacts without providing the required transportation benefits.</p> <p>Please find attached a handout which details why the Perth Line 33 (Pork Road) alternative was not carried forward for further review beyond the Transportation Planning phase.</p> <p>Opportunities to minimize impacts on the natural, land use / socio-economic and cultural environments were considered during the corridor generation and route generation phases of the study. Opportunities to further reduce / mitigate impacts on the environment will be explored through subsequent design phases.</p> <p>Comments and concerns raised with respect to the route alternatives have been addressed through the assessment and evaluation of route alternatives. Additionally, comments and concerns will be further addressed through subsequent design phases once a preferred route alternative has been selected (e.g. intersection / entrance locations / treatments, pedestrian features, etc.).</p> <p>The assessment and evaluation of route alternatives is based on over 60 criteria from four major factor areas, specifically the natural environment, land use / socio-economic environment, cultural environment and transportation factors. The criteria were in part</p>
<p>Some time ago I got involved in commenting on the highway 7/8 corridor improvement project and when the MTO chose the straight through Shakespeare approach I was shocked. I thought I would let it ride and see how it evolved. At my last time of writing a comment on the highway 7/8 corridor improvement project I was very skeptical about the path of design that the MTO had chosen and voiced my opinion. I then attended the last information session held in Shakespeare, listened and watched, discussed opinions with Brenda and tried to get an overall feeling for what was transpiring. Having had a couple of weeks to let it settle in, my skepticism has been totally confirmed and I felt it was very important to give an “inside the Township” view of what I really see happening. Whether or not you agree with the following assessment is up to you, but I am going to give you the real picture as I see it and I ask you to please read it all because the</p>	

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>issues are deeper than ever.</p> <p>Here are the issues at hand.</p> <p>Paragraph 1-4 How I felt about the last meeting</p> <p>Paragraph 5 My opinions on what is really happening in design</p> <p>Paragraph 6 My idea of a compromise solution that will help solve many of the issues</p> <p>When I attended the meeting in Shakespeare I went in with the feeling that the one road, five lane approach coming right through the heart of Shakespeare was totally wrong and a poorly conceived idea. I have always been of the opinion that Pork Road should be part of the solution. In discussing the heart of the issues with Brenda, here is what she said.</p> <p>1 – I asked her why Pork Road was not part of the solution and the answer was that the supporting data did not show it as viable. I have still not had one good reason why Pork Road cannot be part of the solution. I told Brenda that the land ownership and title was not an excuse for the very simple reason that if the Ontario Government can steamroll a 407 series of highway around the largest urban centres in this country, then using all or part of Pork Road in the final design is not an issue at all. There is absolutely no argument for this excuse.</p> <p>2- In front of 30 people, Brenda told us that we could not have a two lane in (highway 7/8) and a two lane highway out (Pork Road) because the supporting data showed that it would not handle the future traffic needs for the area in 30 years. No word of a lie if you can believe it! I challenged her in front of all. You mean to tell me that a four lane highway now will solve the problem better than 2 lanes out 2 lanes in. That still adds up to four and could easily be three lanes in the three lanes out on two separate roads which would be better than anything in 30 years.</p> <p>3- I asked Brenda if she had spent much time on the safety issues of a five lane highway and if she was thoroughly knowledgeable about the weather impact on the highway. Again I was told that</p>	<p>developed and modified to reflect local information provided by stakeholders through the consultation process. Local input is valuable in terms of identifying local issues and conditions. The assessment and evaluation results and the preferred route alternative for the entire study corridor is being presented at PIC #4 for public review and comment.</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>they have and had looked at the data. I stressed to her that between Shakespeare and New Hamburg we have a full weather transition zone. All our veterans of this township will tell you how wild the Shakespeare side can be and how the New Hamburg side is like a different country.</p> <p>It is and always has been black and white, night and day. I told Brenda that two of the last three years we have had close to thirteen feet of snow on our side. But you know, I really don't think she gets it. I told her that putting a four lane highway with a turning lane in the centre only compounds the safety issues especially since the weather severely affects the safety from New Hamburg to Stratford. This highway proposal is not a safe idea at all when considering winter and the winter transition zone. As evidence you can ask anyone who lives here, anyone who commutes, and check out the statistics on the five lane curve near little lakes. How many have already died there? The number one reason the highway improvements are being looked at is because of safety. Absolutely number one. The five lane solution proposed is totally defeated by the weather and the transition zone of weather that occurs here and it is not the answer. In fact it should not even be on the preferred routes list.</p> <p>4- I spent some time listening to the presentation and watching the people in attendance. I will tell you that the presentation was not an interactive presentation but was a "here is what we are going to do" speech. This is the format that seems to apply to us. Many of the attendees look around in stunned silence at the 'new' bypass proposals. But everyone feels useless and totally unheard. After the years of wasted time, and incredible costs of hours, websites, pictures and plans, paper, etc. nobody feels that the MTO is listening and many have given up in despair. "They are going to do what they want to do" is the common phrase now. Over the last couple of years this whole process has depressed everyone who lives in the area and is taking its toll. What a waste of time and money.</p>	

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>5- My opinions on what is really happening in design In designing route alternatives for the highway project the MTO went through the various ideas and heard from many people. In choosing the five lane preferred corridor they have alienated everyone but some of the farmers. In listening to some, I feel that the real issues of safety, the proper use of existing road corridors, the lives of affected people especially Shakespeare residents, and the important points raised by others have all fallen by the wayside. Common sense has been thrown out the window. No better results are achieved.</p> <p>But there is a bigger issue at hand here at this point in the process. It is the compounding of errors in design. Now that the five lane corridor has been chosen it is realized, as many would have said from the start, that a mistake has been made. We have now brought the entire village of Shakespeare into battle. What do we do? Who are we going to listen too? Are we going to listen to them? How do we solve this problem?</p> <p>In wishing to address the town of Shakespeare we have now compounded the problem. We now have a compound error. Lets put a bypass around Shakespeare. This bypass is an error. Maybe we should get their opinion while we are at it so they are involved. Well you know what. Nobody has confidence anymore because we have two serious errors going here which have created a huge compound error. What were we thinking when we made that first decision? Now we have farm land issues, traffic and access issues, and everything else that we tried to deal with in the first place right back in our laps. In other words, here we go again. The Shakespeare bypass is a bandaid solution to a greater problem and until we are willing to admit that, the whole process will spiral out of time and cost control.</p> <p>You know what? It is never too late to change your mind or to admit that mistakes have been made. It is time to go back to the</p>	

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>original plan and consider, land use, existing corridors, safety and practicality. The MTO could have spent less than \$50 to form a citizen's committee of competent township people who could have designed and created a master plan. You still can. If you go back to the four fundamentals and keep it simple you could save us all a fortune. This whole study has been nothing but a waste of taxpayers' money to keep some people employed. And quite honestly, the road could have been built by now.</p> <p>6- The compromise solution I have spent several weeks in contemplation and have driven the route countless times. In going back to the basics, keep it simple, and analyzing the real complications of the compound error, I have come up with the following solution which will need some tweaking but will address all issues. Since we have a five lane highway proposal starting in New Hamburg, let's keep that portion until we get to the weather transition zone where the real issue of safety is a concern. Since we are going to take farmland and buildings from the public to sweep from highway 7/8 to Pork Road near Stratford let's consider a location that does the same thing but occurs nearer to the weather transition zone. Since Shakespeare is a huge thorn in the designer's eye and all the issues concerning buildings, access to roads, business, tourism, and the lives and safety of the people are huge let's be open to leaving Shakespeare the way it is. Since we are now talking about taking farmer's land again, and sweeping around Shakespeare the way it is. Since we are now talking about taking farmer's land again, and sweeping around Shakespeare to avoid destructing the town and livelihoods of many let's take a smaller portion of land in another spot. Since Pork Road is not an option, let's open up the possibility of a shorter section of Pork Road, because you know what, that is where we are ultimately headed anyways.</p> <p>If you now would look at the attached sketch, I propose to you to combine all the projects (i.e. sweep, bypass, interchanges) into one project of half the size and complexity. If the proposed highway starting in New Hamburg proceeds until Road 106 then</p>	

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>the old highway continues, is leveled flat, turns into three lane road into Stratford. At road 106 a traffic lane to the right takes off, overpasses the old highway and the railroad track at the same time and heads down 106 till it arrives on Pork Road where it becomes a two lane highway. Similarly a highway lane of traffic coming north on road 106 will overpass the railroad and merge with the old highway into the new five lane road into New Hamburg. Check it out. Road 106 has virtually no buildings to destroy or move, lots of space, and the topography is already perfectly suited to under and overpass conditions.</p> <p>Next. As the two lanes of now highway curves toward Stratford, The Old Pork Road section will merge with 106 south. As the two lane divided highway (Pork Road) approaches road 107 to the divided highway. Road 107 south from Shakespeare will interchange at this Pork Road and will carry overpass style over to Tavistock. This last portion of Pork Road from Road 107 to Stratford will be a four-lane divided highway and will merge into a five-lane road known as Lorne Avenue which will provide access to the business end of Stratford and act as a bypass to highway 7 south and highway 8 east.</p> <p>There you have it. No bypass around Shakespeare, everything about Shakespeare is saved and the three-lane route through it will clean up the town and reinvigorate tourism and business, and protect the town's lifestyle. Full access to Shakespeare will be gained for tourists and all others directly on highway 8, or via the Pork Road interchange. There will be absolutely minimal loss of farmland around Shakespeare and on the east side of Stratford from the sweep with the exception of two interchanges and widening road 106 and Pork Road appropriately. A full highway network which does not look like a thorn on the landscape and does not look like a mistake will be created and very few houses or lives impacted along the entire route providing a comfort zone for the people of the township and of Shakespeare. And most importantly, a safe highway starting close to the weather transition zone.</p>	

Summary of Input Received and Response Provided

Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>I hope you like it. I can only encourage each and everyone to continue participating in the process and to stand their ground for the sake of our future. It takes much more than words for men and women to change their minds and in this case I hope each and everyone is open to a worthy solution.</p>	
<p>Whoever is thinking of putting a 4/5 lane highway through Shakespeare has I expect not spent much time there, if they had they would never consider tearing down the whole main street(well pretty much all). My husband travelled to Kitchener to work for 15 years prior to retiring 4 years ago and there was never any traffic holdups there. It is to me one of those political decisions made by people who have not the slightest idea what life is like in a small village and doesn't seem to really care. Typical of most of today's politicians unfortunately.</p>	<p>The Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study is being undertaken to identify and address the long-term (2031) transportation needs for the Analysis Area and to prepare a preliminary design for the provincial roadway components of the recommended plan.</p> <p>Three groups of highway route alternatives are being considered to meet Highway 7&8 traffic capacity and safety needs in the Shakespeare area:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. highway bypass route alternatives north of the existing Highway 7&8 corridor that connect back to Highway 7&8 west and east of the hamlet; 2. highway bypass route alternatives south of the existing Highway 7&8 corridor that connect back to Highway 7&8 west and east of the hamlet; and 3. highway route alternatives that involve highway widening within the existing and/or expanded Highway 7&8 corridor (that is, making use of the existing corridor). <p>The assessment and evaluation of route alternatives is based on over 60 criteria from four major factor areas, specifically the natural environment, land use / socio-economic environment, cultural environment and transportation factors. The criteria were in part developed and modified to reflect local information provided by stakeholders through the consultation process. Local input is valuable in terms of identifying local issues and conditions. The assessment and evaluation results and the preferred route alternative for the entire study corridor is being presented at PIC #4 for public review and comment.</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I want to know why this 4 lane highway has to go by a residential subdivision? 2. What are you going to do about Dufferin St? 3. Dufferin St is too close to Erie to put another set of lights in and without lights you will have people killed 4. Make Dufferin St a dead end at least 5. The full length of our back yard runs the distance of the 4 lanes. I want the tallest sound barrier you can build and before they start construction if can't find another route. 6. Have you even been along Lorne Ave??? 	<p>During the 'Preliminary Planning' phase, the Lorne Avenue alternative was preferred through a process of comparative evaluation, as detailed in Report E, so it was carried forward as the preferred alternative.</p> <p>Opportunities to minimize impacts on the natural, land use / socio-economic and cultural environments were considered during the corridor generation and route generation phases of the study. Opportunities to further reduce / mitigate impacts on the environment will be explored through subsequent design phases.</p> <p>Comments and concerns raised with respect to the route alternatives have been addressed through the assessment and evaluation of route alternatives. Additionally, comments and concerns will be further addressed through subsequent design phases once a preferred route alternative has been selected (e.g. intersection / entrance locations / treatments, pedestrian features, noise mitigation, etc.).</p> <p>The assessment and evaluation of route alternatives is based on over 60 criteria from four major factor areas, specifically the natural environment, land use / socio-economic environment, cultural environment and transportation factors. The criteria were in part developed and modified to reflect local information provided by stakeholders through the consultation process. Local input is valuable in terms of identifying local issues and conditions. The assessment and evaluation results and the preferred route alternative for the entire study corridor is being presented at PIC #4 for public review and comment.</p> <p>The study team has conducted many field reviews within the study area, including the Lorne Avenue corridor.</p> <p>Noise mitigation and intersection treatments will be defined during the preliminary design phase of the study which will be initiated after PIC #4.</p>

Summary of Input Received and Response Provided

Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>I would recommend in Shakespeare that two one way streets be set up. One would use old corridor and a new one either south by rail tracks or on north side of village. Thank you</p>	<p>A wide range of transportation alternatives were evaluated. While many of the transportation alternatives can contribute positively to the identified problems and opportunities in the Analysis Area, most are limited in their effectiveness when considered individually. As a result, and in recognition that transportation system solutions require comprehensive, multimodal strategies for long term effectiveness and sustainability, the individual alternatives were grouped into logical Combination Alternatives for further detailed assessment. On the basis of the assessment results, the following two combination transportation alternatives were selected to be carried forward in the study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • transportation demand management (e.g. ridesharing and telecommuting) plus inter-regional transit plus widening of Highway 7&8; and • transportation demand management (e.g. ridesharing and telecommuting) plus inter-regional transit plus local bypasses or a new corridor. <p>Please note that our 2031 forecasted traffic volumes have assumed that all reasonable modes of travel and demand management such as ridesharing, telecommuting, optimizing passenger/ freight rail capacity and increased inter-regional transit services are already implemented and operating to their fullest potential.</p> <p>Other alternatives that do not address the identified transportation problems and opportunities were not carried forward as they will have environmental impacts without providing the required transportation benefits. This includes an alternative comprised of a pair of one-way streets because two 2-lane highways do not address the problems and opportunities that the study set out to resolve, plus a new set of problems associated with one-way roadways is introduced (e.g. a considerable detour required for some short local trips).</p>
<p>My preferred route would be south by-pass #3 which would affect the least amount of farms and houses. The one house it would affect is rented out to a tenant who does not have a large stake in</p>	<p>The assessment and evaluation of route alternatives is based on over 60 criteria from four major factor areas, specifically the natural environment, land use / socio-economic environment, cultural</p>

Summary of Input Received and Response Provided

Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>the area. It is west of town under your yellow line on the map. The north route affects too many farm houses.</p>	<p>environment and transportation factors. The criteria were in part developed and modified to reflect local information provided by stakeholders through the consultation process. Local input is valuable in terms of identifying local issues and conditions. The assessment and evaluation results and the preferred route alternative for the entire study corridor is being presented at PIC #4 for public review and comment.</p>
<p>Please email the relevant study of the Pork Street alternative – why it isn't considered. Also, please provide the same information on Vivian Road. Also please provide information on pending changes in transit.</p>	<p>Please find attached a handout which details why the Perth Line 33 (Pork Road) alternative was not carried forward for further review beyond the Transportation Planning phase. The same rationale applies for the Vivian Road alternative.</p> <p>With respect to potential transit improvements for the study area, GO Transit is planning to extend rail service to the Kitchener-Waterloo area, with a layover site for trains located in Baden. VIA Rail has also indicated they have future plans to increase their rail service within the existing railway corridor south of existing Highway 7&8.</p>
<p>Presentation was a waste of time. Speeches are always repetitive. No new info.</p>	<p>The intent of the presentation was to provide PIC attendees with a brief overview of the material being presented at the PIC. New information presented at PIC #3B included the broader range of proposed Shakespeare-area highway route alternatives and refined evaluation criteria to be used for route selection.</p>
<p>The easiest way is to go straight through. The road is there! It's easy and cheaper. If it goes around our business community will fail for sure. In reality it's only a 4 lane road going through town. Every city has them, they're all through KW, you only notice when there are not 4 lanes.</p>	<p>The assessment and evaluation of route alternatives is based on over 60 criteria from four major factor areas, specifically the natural environment, land use / socio-economic environment, cultural environment and transportation factors. The criteria were in part developed and modified to reflect local information provided by stakeholders through the consultation process. Local input is valuable in terms of identifying local issues and conditions. The assessment and evaluation results and the preferred route alternative for the entire study corridor is being presented at PIC #4 for public review and comment.</p>

Summary of Input Received and Response Provided

Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>I am of the opinion that the best alternative would be to build a new 4-lane road directly from the curve in New Hamburg down Pork Road to go straight through to the Romeo Street / Lorne Avenue intersection.</p> <p>At all costs the village of Shakespeare must not be sacrificed! Why are there no better options for commuting by rail?</p>	<p>A wide range of transportation alternatives were evaluated. While many of the transportation alternatives can contribute positively to the identified problems and opportunities in the Analysis Area, most are limited in their effectiveness when considered individually. As a result, and in recognition that transportation system solutions require comprehensive, multimodal strategies for long term effectiveness and sustainability, the individual alternatives were grouped into logical Combination Alternatives for further detailed assessment. On the basis of the assessment results, the following two combination transportation alternatives were selected to be carried forward in the study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • transportation demand management (e.g. ridesharing and telecommuting) plus inter-regional transit plus widening of Highway 7&8; and • transportation demand management (e.g. ridesharing and telecommuting) plus inter-regional transit plus local bypasses or a new corridor. <p>Please note that our 2031 forecasted traffic volumes have assumed that all reasonable modes of travel and demand management such as ridesharing, telecommuting, optimizing passenger/ freight rail capacity and increased inter-regional transit services are already implemented and operating to their fullest potential.</p> <p>Other alternatives that do not address the identified transportation problems and opportunities were not carried forward as they will have environmental impacts without providing the required transportation benefits.</p> <p>With respect to potential transit improvements for the study area, GO Transit is planning to extend transit rail service to the Kitchener-Waterloo area, with a layover site for trains located in Baden. VIA Rail has also indicated they have future plans to increase their rail service within the existing railway corridor south of existing Highway 7&8.</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>Please just pick a route with your education and knowledge.</p>	<p>The assessment and evaluation of route alternatives is based on over 60 criteria from four major factor areas, specifically the natural environment, land use / socio-economic environment, cultural environment and transportation factors. The criteria were in part developed and modified to reflect local information provided by stakeholders through the consultation process. Local input is valuable in terms of identifying local issues and conditions. The assessment and evaluation results and the preferred route alternative for the entire study corridor is being presented at PIC #4 for public review and comment.</p>
<p>I couldn't possibly express my thoughts on the Highway 7/8 issue any better than this editorial does.</p> <p><i>The Beacon herald, July 21, 2010</i></p> <p><u>Obliterating Shakespeare should not even be on the table</u></p> <p><i>John Kastner</i></p> <p><i>For the umpteenth time, people will be gathering in Shakespeare tonight in the hope that somebody somewhere is going to listen to reason.</i></p> <p><i>It started out as a pretty reasonable notion. Traffic has increased, the road is dangerous as it stands now and better access from Stratford to Kitchener, and by extension to Highway 401, was an idea that its merits and supporters.</i></p> <p><i>But somehow this well-intended idea has gotten so far off the track it now could be the stupidest idea since John Galt and Tiger Dunlop cleared the Huron Tract in the 1820's.</i></p> <p><i>How someone, anyone, made the leap from "we need a better road from Stratford to Kitchener" to "we should drive four or five lanes through the heart of Shakespeare and all but destroy the place" is nothing short of remarkable.</i></p> <p><i>We know the consultants and bureaucrats who came up with the preferred routes aren't from around here but presumably they're</i></p>	<p>A wide range of transportation alternatives were evaluated. While many of the transportation alternatives can contribute positively to the identified problems and opportunities in the Analysis Area, most are limited in their effectiveness when considered individually. As a result, and in recognition that transportation system solutions require comprehensive, multimodal strategies for long term effectiveness and sustainability, the individual alternatives were grouped into logical Combination Alternatives for further detailed assessment. On the basis of the assessment results, the following two combination transportation alternatives were selected to be carried forward in the study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • transportation demand management (e.g. ridesharing and telecommuting) plus inter-regional transit plus widening of Highway 7&8; and • transportation demand management (e.g. ridesharing and telecommuting) plus inter-regional transit plus local bypasses or a new corridor. <p>Please note that our 2031 forecasted traffic volumes have assumed that all reasonable modes of travel and demand management such as ridesharing, telecommuting, optimizing passenger/ freight rail capacity and increased inter-regional transit services are already implemented and operating to their fullest potential.</p> <p>Other alternatives that do not address the identified transportation</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p><i>not from Mars either.</i></p> <p><i>One only has to drive a couple of hundred yards down the main drag of Shakespeare, look at the trees and buildings that have been earmarked for demolition and the conclusion is pretty obvious.</i></p> <p><i>Better yet, get out of the car, watch for cars, and pace off the width of a four-lane highway and visualize what the village will be like when you're finished.</i></p> <p><i>You don't need a degree in urban planning or transportation or Communities 101 to realize there is now way you can put five or even four lanes through Shakespeare.</i></p> <p><i>The place will be obliterated.</i></p> <p><i>Similarly, it makes no more sense to build a four-laned controlled access highway and rip up thousands of acres of some of the best farmland in the world.</i></p> <p><i>And keep in mind that even the people who were in favour of a better route to Kitchener were never asking for a 401-style connection with off ramps and a 50-metre median.</i></p> <p><i>And now we have farmers trying to preserve their farmland and residents of Shakespeare literally trying to save their community from destruction.</i></p> <p><i>There a less intrusive theories as to how to improve travel to Kitchener. It can be something as simple as improving one of the existing roads such as Line 33 (Pork Road) or Vivian Street.</i></p> <p><i>Or if someone's heart is set on four lanes then expand the existing Highway 7/8 instead of going through the middle of farmland and veer to the south around Shakespeare and to the north when you come to the Fryfogel Inn.</i></p> <p><i>Sometimes simpler is better – and this is one of those cases. In fact, if you can't improve the route to Kitchener without destroying Shakespeare or thousands of acres of farmland, don't do it.</i></p>	<p>problems and opportunities were not carried forward as they will have environmental impacts without providing the required transportation benefits.</p> <p>Please find attached a handout which details why the Perth Line 33 (Pork Road) alternative was not carried forward for further review beyond the Transportation Planning phase.</p> <p>Opportunities to minimize impacts on the natural, land use / socio-economic and cultural environments were considered during the corridor generation and route generation phases of the study. Opportunities to further reduce / mitigate impacts on the environment will be explored through subsequent design phases.</p> <p>Comments and concerns raised with respect to the route alternatives have been addressed through the assessment and evaluation of route alternatives. Additionally, comments and concerns will be further addressed through subsequent design phases once a preferred route alternative has been selected (e.g. intersection / entrance locations / treatments, pedestrian features, etc.).</p> <p>The assessment and evaluation of route alternatives is based on over 60 criteria from four major factor areas, specifically the natural environment, land use / socio-economic environment, cultural environment and transportation factors. The criteria were in part developed and modified to reflect local information provided by stakeholders through the consultation process. Local input is valuable in terms of identifying local issues and conditions. The assessment and evaluation results and the preferred route alternative for the entire study corridor is being presented at PIC #4 for public review and comment.</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p><i>Forget it. It's not that big a deal.</i></p> <p><i>And tonight may be the last best chance for decision-makers to come to that conclusion – and hopefully their senses.</i></p>	
<p>The attached clipping was in the July 21, 2010 Beacon Herald. We feel it makes very much sense. Why did the government buy all along the land beside the existing highway between Stratford and Shakespeare if they did not intend to use it?</p> <p><i>The Beacon herald, July 21, 2010</i> <u>Obliterating Shakespeare should not even be on the table</u> <i>John Kastner</i></p>	<p>A wide range of transportation alternatives were evaluated. While many of the transportation alternatives can contribute positively to the identified problems and opportunities in the Analysis Area, most are limited in their effectiveness when considered individually. As a result, and in recognition that transportation system solutions require comprehensive, multimodal strategies for long term effectiveness and sustainability, the individual alternatives were grouped into logical Combination Alternatives for further detailed assessment. On the basis of the assessment results, the following two combination transportation alternatives were selected to be carried forward in the study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • transportation demand management (e.g. ridesharing and telecommuting) plus inter-regional transit plus widening of Highway 7&8; and • transportation demand management (e.g. ridesharing and telecommuting) plus inter-regional transit plus local bypasses or a new corridor. <p>Please note that our 2031 forecasted traffic volumes have assumed that all reasonable modes of travel and demand management such as ridesharing, telecommuting, optimizing passenger/ freight rail capacity and increased inter-regional transit services are already implemented and operating to their fullest potential.</p> <p>Other alternatives that do not address the identified transportation problems and opportunities were not carried forward as they will have environmental impacts without providing the required transportation benefits.</p> <p>Please find attached a handout which details why the Perth Line 33 (Pork Road) alternative was not carried forward for further review beyond the Transportation Planning phase.</p>

Summary of Input Received and Response Provided

Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
	<p>Opportunities to minimize impacts on the natural, land use / socio-economic and cultural environments were considered during the corridor generation and route generation phases of the study. Opportunities to further reduce / mitigate impacts on the environment will be explored through subsequent design phases.</p> <p>Comments and concerns raised with respect to the route alternatives have been addressed through the assessment and evaluation of route alternatives. Additionally, comments and concerns will be further addressed through subsequent design phases once a preferred route alternative has been selected (e.g. intersection / entrance locations / treatments, pedestrian features, etc.).</p> <p>The assessment and evaluation of route alternatives is based on over 60 criteria from four major factor areas, specifically the natural environment, land use / socio-economic environment, cultural environment and transportation factors. The criteria were in part developed and modified to reflect local information provided by stakeholders through the consultation process. Local input is valuable in terms of identifying local issues and conditions. The assessment and evaluation results and the preferred route alternative for the entire study corridor is being presented at PIC #4 for public review and comment.</p>
<p>Get back to your job. Use your professional experience and get back to the community. Stop wasting our time on 'process' items that don't have any relevance. Put yourselves in the place of a local landowner and show more respect to those who want to work with you. Get on with your job!</p>	<p>The assessment and evaluation of route alternatives is based on over 60 criteria from four major factor areas, specifically the natural environment, land use / socio-economic environment, cultural environment and transportation factors. The criteria were in part developed and modified to reflect local information provided by stakeholders through the consultation process. Local input is valuable in terms of identifying local issues and conditions. The assessment and evaluation results and the preferred route alternative for the entire study corridor is being presented at PIC #4 for public review and comment.</p>

Summary of Input Received and Response Provided

Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>Why is the MTO still considering going through Shakespeare for this highway expansion? There has been a lot of public disapproval for such a corridor through the town if this is considered. There will be many people's homes and businesses torn down. This would really destroy lives (quality of life). Many of those homes have residents that have close ties to the community for decades including their children. Is the MTO prepared to build us new homes (at MTO expense) in Shakespeare? Build new businesses at MTO expense in Shakespeare? I personally will not settle for anything less.</p> <p>I would want a new home constructed somewhere in Shakespeare. That's my final decision.</p> <p>If MTO decides to come through Shakespeare this fall the fight to stop this from happening will just start. The present fight is just a warm up to what will come.</p> <p>How about we protest in front of your homes say on a weekend or at the MTO offices?</p> <p>How about we stop traffic on the highway 7/8 in front of my home?</p> <p>This protest, my protest has just begun. Stay tuned there is more to come.</p> <p>How can the MTO destroy homes and businesses which in turn will destroy lives and not expect an extra ordinary protest? Don't, it will happen. This is not a threat it is inevitable when you are talking about people's lives.</p> <p>Destroy live or take a little farm land. Think about it. Don't destroy lives, take the farm land.</p>	<p>Three groups of highway route alternatives were considered to meet Highway 7&8 traffic capacity and safety needs in the Shakespeare area:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. highway bypass route alternatives north of the existing Highway 7&8 corridor that connect back to Highway 7&8 west and east of the hamlet; 2. highway bypass route alternatives south of the existing Highway 7&8 corridor that connect back to Highway 7&8 west and east of the hamlet; and 3. highway route alternatives that involve highway widening within the existing and/or expanded Highway 7&8 corridor (that is, making use of the existing corridor). <p>Each of the above alternatives address the identified transportation problems including the need for increased capacity and improved passing opportunities through the provision of four lanes on one facility.</p> <p>Given that all identified alternatives in the Shakespeare area have the potential to result in affects on the natural, socio-economic and cultural environments, the detailed assessment and evaluation of alternatives was undertaken at the route level of detail, considering the advantages, disadvantages and tradeoffs associated with each alternative from an environmental and transportation perspective.</p> <p>The assessment and evaluation of route alternatives is based on over 60 criteria from four major factor areas, specifically the natural environment, land use / socio-economic environment, cultural environment and transportation factors. The criteria were in part developed and modified to reflect local information provided by stakeholders through the consultation process. Local input is valuable in terms of identifying local issues and conditions. The assessment and evaluation results and the preferred route alternative for the entire study corridor is being presented at PIC #4 for public review and comment.</p>

Summary of Input Received and Response Provided

Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>What would be the impacts of carrying the route just to the south of the rail road line all the way from the Waterloo-Perth townline to Lorne Avenue in Stratford?</p> <p>This would eliminate all necessary rail crossings (bridges) except at the Stratford Tavistock rail line.</p> <p>It would only impact 3 or 4 buildings near the New Hamburg end, which could be avoided.</p> <p>Is the Stratford Tavistock rail line still operational? Will it continue to be so?</p> <p>This suggestion should be looked at as an alternative to the more severe disruption which would be caused by using even a part of the existing highway.</p>	<p>During the 'Preliminary Planning' phase, consideration was given to a new corridor south of the existing railway corridor from west of New Hamburg to east of Stratford. This alternative was not preferred through a process of comparative evaluation, as detailed in Report E, so it was not carried forward.</p> <p>Based on feedback received from stakeholders and the public, a new corridor south of the existing railway corridor was again reviewed. The decision to not carry this alternative forward for further review was reconfirmed.</p> <p>The Stratford Tavistock rail line is no longer operational.</p>
<p>This particular PIC and the associated weighting material is totally inappropriate.</p> <p>Very concerned you have not responded to our last submission that deals with the west side of Stratford). There has not been a lot of information, feedback or discussion about that!</p>	<p>The study team did provide a response to your comment regarding the west side of Stratford in our February, 2010 letter. Further details regarding the preferred route west of Stratford are being presented at PIC #4 for public review and comment.</p>
<p>One of the concerns is safety. With Sebringville OPP area ending at the Region of Waterloo there is very limited patrol of the section of 7/8 from Shakespeare to New Hamburg. If safety is a concern, work with OPP to increase patrol and enforcement and note the effects as part of the study.</p>	<p>Your request for OPP to increase patrols and enforcement for the section of Highway 7&8 from Shakespeare to New Hamburg has been forwarded to OPP for their consideration.</p>
<p>Special open meeting with entire study area residents included.</p>	<p>Outreach and consultation are a major component of the Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study. To-date, six rounds of Public Information Centres (PICs) have been held. Three additional rounds of PICs are planned. The PICs are open to all members of the public, including study area residents.</p>
<p>Alternative #3 to bypass Stratford is preferred by me. Less farm land and forested – wetland area disturbed. My concerns are for residents of Lorne Avenue near Stratford especially if more widening is done to the road.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments regarding the route alternatives.</p> <p>The assessment and evaluation of route alternatives is based on over 60 criteria from four major factor areas, specifically the natural</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>Routes north and south of Shakespeare are interesting. The village could remain the same. However, a lot of impact may be negative which route is chosen.</p> <p>Fryfogel Inn is also a concern of mine.</p>	<p>environment, land use / socio-economic environment, cultural environment and transportation factors. The criteria were in part developed and modified to reflect local information provided by stakeholders through the consultation process. Local input is valuable in terms of identifying local issues and conditions. The assessment and evaluation results and the preferred route alternative for the entire study corridor is being presented at PIC #4 for public review and comment.</p>
<p>I don't see how filling out the weighting sheets are going to change anything. We've been told certain criteria need to be met.</p> <p>The most beneficial info is the map which shows the alternate routes. Do these meet the criteria and are they actual possibilities? If so, again, what point is there in completing the weighting sheets?</p> <p>Of the alternate routes shown, the NBP1 or NBP2 (in purple) make the most sense to me. It would definitely solve the most issues.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments regarding the route alternatives. Each of the route alternatives presented on the route alternatives plan satisfies the required design criteria.</p> <p>Two evaluation approaches were used to assist in the selection of preferred route alternative.</p> <p>The Reasoned Argument (or Trade-off) method was the primary tool used to identify a preferred alternative. The Reasoned Argument (trade-off) evaluation component provides a clear presentation to stakeholders of the key trade-offs between the various evaluation factors and the reasons why one alternative is preferred over another.</p> <p>The Arithmetic (weighting-scoring) method was the secondary tool, with the results compared to the results of the trade-off method. The Arithmetic evaluation provides a means to compare the alternative methods based on a numerical scaling with weights assigned by the multi-disciplinary study team. A numerical approach is a good sensitivity analysis tool to determine if the conclusions of the reasoned argument approach are valid and appropriate. Weightings provided by stakeholders and the public through the consultation process will be considered when conducting the sensitivity analysis.</p> <p>We understand why some stakeholders chose not to provide weightings for the arithmetic process. While soliciting public input</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
	<p>on weightings is a widely accepted practice, the process was completely voluntary. Furthermore, the arithmetic weighting process was not dependent on the number of weighting submissions.</p> <p>The assessment and evaluation of route alternatives is based on over 60 criteria from four major factor areas, specifically the natural environment, land use / socio-economic environment, cultural environment and transportation factors. The criteria were in part developed and modified to reflect local information provided by stakeholders through the consultation process. Local input is valuable in terms of identifying local issues and conditions. The assessment and evaluation results and the preferred route alternative for the entire study corridor is being presented at PIC #4 for public review and comment.</p>
<p>Time to make ‘the decision’. Alternatives have been pretty well thoroughly examined. Time to get on with experts choosing the optimum alternative from all the options on the table. Good luck!</p>	<p>The assessment and evaluation of route alternatives is based on over 60 criteria from four major factor areas, specifically the natural environment, land use / socio-economic environment, cultural environment and transportation factors. The criteria were in part developed and modified to reflect local information provided by stakeholders through the consultation process. Local input is valuable in terms of identifying local issues and conditions. The assessment and evaluation results and the preferred route alternative for the entire study corridor is being presented at PIC #4 for public review and comment.</p>
<p>You need to focus on the option that disrupts the least. Widen existing roads, utilize land by railway tracks and don’t waste tax payers money doing studies that you already know the answers to.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments regarding the route alternatives.</p> <p>A wide range of transportation alternatives were evaluated. While many of the transportation alternatives can contribute positively to the identified problems and opportunities in the Analysis Area, most are limited in their effectiveness when considered individually. As a result, and in recognition that transportation system solutions require comprehensive, multimodal strategies for long term effectiveness and sustainability, the individual alternatives were</p>

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
	<p>grouped into logical Combination Alternatives for further detailed assessment. On the basis of the assessment results, the following two combination transportation alternatives were selected to be carried forward in the study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • transportation demand management (e.g. ridesharing and telecommuting) plus inter-regional transit plus widening of Highway 7&8; and • transportation demand management (e.g. ridesharing and telecommuting) plus inter-regional transit plus local bypasses or a new corridor. <p>Please note that the future travel demand forecasts accounts for the reduction in auto demands associated with the implementation of transportation demand management measures and improved transit within the Analysis Area.</p> <p>Other alternatives that do not address the identified transportation problems and opportunities were not carried forward as they will have environmental impacts without providing the required transportation benefits.</p> <p>Opportunities to minimize impacts on the natural, land use / socio-economic and cultural environments were considered during the corridor generation and route generation phases of the study. Opportunities to further reduce / mitigate impacts on the environment will be explored through subsequent design phases.</p> <p>Comments and concerns raised with respect to the route alternatives have been addressed through the assessment and evaluation of route alternatives. Additionally, comments and concerns will be further addressed through subsequent design phases once a preferred route alternative has been selected (e.g. intersection / entrance locations / treatments, pedestrian features, etc.).</p> <p>The assessment and evaluation of route alternatives is based on</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
	<p>over 60 criteria from four major factor areas, specifically the natural environment, land use / socio-economic environment, cultural environment and transportation factors. The criteria were in part developed and modified to reflect local information provided by stakeholders through the consultation process. Local input is valuable in terms of identifying local issues and conditions. The assessment and evaluation results and the preferred route alternative for the entire study corridor is being presented at PIC #4 for public review and comment.</p>
<p>Put new highway south of CNR railroad tracks from New Hamburg to Stratford.</p>	<p>During the 'Preliminary Planning' phase, consideration was given to a new corridor south of the existing railway corridor from west of New Hamburg to east of Stratford. This alternative was not preferred through a process of comparative evaluation, as detailed in Report E, so it was not carried forward.</p> <p>Based on feedback received from stakeholders and the public, a new corridor south of the existing railway corridor was again reviewed. The decision to not carry this alternative forward for further review was reconfirmed.</p>
<p>The weighting sheets</p> <p>Had hoped each column over the 4 categories would have added up to 100% instead each subsection adds up to 100%. I.E. each subfactor section adds to 100% instead of being a % of the factor which is a percentage out of 100.</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback regarding the weighting sheets for the arithmetic evaluation process. Your preference for the weightings to be structured differently is noted. However, both approaches do achieve the same results.</p>
<p>North bypass is clearly unacceptable – ruining farms and homes, limiting future growth and taking traffic away from businesses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access for laneway? Unanswered. • When we built our home we were under the understanding that eventually there would be 4 lanes, which we understood and planned around. Never in a million years would we have thought there was the possibility of a bypass across the front of our property not even leaving us access! Please, 	<p>The assessment and evaluation of route alternatives is based on over 60 criteria from four major factor areas, specifically the natural environment, land use / socio-economic environment, cultural environment and transportation factors. The criteria were in part developed and modified to reflect local information provided by stakeholders through the consultation process. Local input is valuable in terms of identifying local issues and conditions. The assessment and evaluation results and the preferred route alternative for the entire study corridor is being presented at PIC #4</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>reconsider not using the north; the south along the tracks is clearly the best solution with the least disruption to someone's home! The tracks already have cut up some farms, it's not great farmland along there anyways, take another 30-50 meters and be done with it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After looking at these drawings time and time again, anyone can see that the bypass to the south along the tracks is the most suitable solution. By passing to the south is definitely the least complicated. Just look at the drawings, any idiot can see the south makes sense. 	<p>for public review and comment.</p>
<p>I am writing regarding the proposed transportation corridor from New Hamburg to Stratford. I have been a professional engineer since 1988 and a designated consulting engineer since 1994. My house is on a property that will likely be impacted by the preferred route southeast of Stratford.</p> <p>If I were designing the transportation corridor and Stratford bypass this is what I would not do:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Select a route that follows the 1828 road as much as possible • Maximize the number of rail crossings (Perth-Waterloo boundary, SE of Shakespeare, SW of Shakespeare, Road 110 east of Stratford, near Monteith Avenue in Stratford and somewhere west of Stratford) • Disregard impact on historical buildings such as Fryfogel Inn and Linglebach Church • Make sure residential, farm and business access driveways to route are not reduced • Ensure full access and usability for slow moving heavy equipment • Widen the existing corridor and demolish existing houses along the route wherever necessary • Divert from the existing highway corridor at the location east of Stratford where the current road widens to 4 lanes and is built to today's standards • Run bypass through Stratford rather than around it 	<p>Thank you for your comments regarding the route alternatives.</p> <p>Opportunities to minimize impacts on the natural, land use / socio-economic and cultural environments were considered during the corridor generation and route generation phases of the study. Opportunities to further reduce / mitigate impacts on the environment will be explored through subsequent design phases.</p> <p>The assessment and evaluation of route alternatives is based on over 60 criteria from four major factor areas, specifically the natural environment, land use / socio-economic environment, cultural environment and transportation factors. The criteria were in part developed and modified to reflect local information provided by stakeholders through the consultation process. Local input is valuable in terms of identifying local issues and conditions. Outreach and consultation are a key component of the Class EA process, and it has been important to provide adequate opportunity for this to occur.</p> <p>The assessment and evaluation results and the preferred route alternative for the entire study corridor is being presented at PIC #4 for public review and comment.</p> <p>The preferred route addresses inter-regional transportation capacity and highway safety needs with the least overall environmental</p>

Summary of Input Received and Response Provided

Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create gateway entrance to Stratford to choke point between City Dump and SWM facility • Choose an existing narrow congested ROW in Stratford for the bypass and relocate high voltage hydro corridors and demolish buildings as required • Do not touch any land used for agriculture except at SE side of Stratford where land is owned by city folk • Hold endless meetings, form committees and study teams comprised of non-professionals, make short term decisions, and review, create and change route alternatives based on factors, subfactors and criteria that seemingly change month to month. <p>I have great respect for the work of AECOM and MTO and know that they are transportation design leaders in North America, but if the plan is to design and construct the new transportation corridor and bypass as noted above then maybe a first principles re-evaluation should be done of the entire methodology and outcomes.</p>	<p>impact.</p> <p>Intersection requirements / treatments and entrance locations / treatments will be defined during the preliminary design phase of the study which will be initiated after PIC #4. The proposed treatment for each crossing road will take into consideration the movement of agricultural equipment and emergency service requirements as well as traffic demands, safety and mobility.</p> <p>As the study proceeds, we will continue to work with landowners along the preferred route to ensure we fully understand their concerns and we will strive to mitigate potential impacts.</p>
<p>The situation:</p> <p>The property where I have lived for thirty years is one of the proposed alternatives to take Highway 7 and 8 south. Here are the reasons why I believe that to run a 4 lane highway through this property is an unusual idea. XXXXX was born on this property. This property is part of Canadian Heritage.</p> <p>This extension would also destroy agricultural land on this property. The fields on this property are used to raise feed for livestock as well as food for human consumption. These fields are an important part of the economy.</p> <p>This extension will also destroy agricultural land on my neighbour's property. To destroy farmland in the face of dwindling food sources in Ontario just seems foolish and wrongheaded.</p> <p>This extension also poses a threat to forests on this property. Forests have proven to be a natural solution to the abundant</p>	<p>Your concerns regarding potential impacts of the route alternatives east of Stratford on your property and the surrounding area have been reviewed and considered by the study team.</p> <p>Opportunities to minimize impacts on the natural, land use / socio-economic and cultural environments were considered during the corridor generation and route generation phases of the study. Opportunities to further reduce / mitigate impacts on the environment will be explored through subsequent design phases.</p> <p>Comments and concerns raised with respect to the route alternatives have been addressed through the assessment and evaluation of route alternatives. Additionally, comments and concerns will be further addressed through subsequent design phases once a preferred route alternative has been selected (e.g. intersection / entrance locations / treatments, pedestrian features,</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>carbon dioxide in our air. A 4 lane highway will increase the amount of carbon dioxide. To destroy forest that can and does create cleaner air for us to breathe is counterproductive in a world where the ecology has become a primary concern to our very existence.</p> <p>There is also a danger of upsetting the wetlands that run through this property. This system feeds the groundwater which in turn feeds our wells with fresh clean naturally filtered water. If this source of clean water is damaged, it would be impossible to live here.</p> <p>It seems wrong to destroy a community, Shakespeare, agricultural land, forest, wetlands. It seems wrong to destroy habitat for deer, wild turkeys and pheasants and the numerous bird species and animals living in the area. It is wrong to destroy what many Canadians feel is an important heritage property for the convenience of people who do not live here, and are only looking for a quick way to move from one place to another.</p> <p>I want to be clear. I do not agree with the Highway 7 and 8 transportation corridor plan at all. If it has to be done, I strongly urge you to use one of the alternatives on your plan, that exist farther east of this property for all the reasons stated above.</p> <p>I work in the theatre and use the existing highway on a regular basis. Yes, it takes time, but it has become a part of my life as it has for many who live here in the area.</p> <p>I am not against progress but I must protest when it threatens my lifestyle and that of others who live in Perth County.</p>	<p>etc.).</p> <p>The assessment and evaluation of route alternatives is based on over 60 criteria from four major factor areas, specifically the natural environment, land use / socio-economic environment, cultural environment and transportation factors. The criteria were in part developed and modified to reflect local information provided by stakeholders through the consultation process. Local input is valuable in terms of identifying local issues and conditions. The assessment and evaluation results and the preferred route alternative for the entire study corridor is being presented at PIC #4 for public review and comment.</p> <p>As the study proceeds, we will continue to work with landowners along the preferred route to ensure we fully understand their concerns and we will strive to mitigate potential impacts.</p>
<p>We must admit to being disappointed with the weighting questionnaire. In fact, we have been disappointed with the manner that this project has been handled from the first time we met with MTO and AECOM representatives. This weighting questionnaire is, I suppose, what many who deal with government departments consider to be a typical government document: highly and un-necessarily detailed; very repetitive; confusing;</p>	<p>Your concerns regarding the study process, the evaluation process and the route alternatives have been reviewed and considered by the study team.</p> <p>The Fryfogel Tavern is recognized as a significant local heritage feature. The study team appreciates the involvement and input received from the Perth County Historical Foundation, the Ontario</p>

Summary of Input Received and Response Provided

Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>largely irrelevant; and frequently not covering items that we feel should be there. There are those amongst us who believe that the document is designed simply to achieve what the MTO and AECOM really want, and that is appallingly obvious.</p> <p>The processes that we have been following, almost ad nauseum, but with a real challenge, have so far produced a choice of roads that nobody wants. The most logical solutions are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For you: just continue along the existing Hwy 7/8 to produce a four or five lane road that is straight, but wipes out most of the heart of the village of Shakespeare, and totals the oldest and most historic structure in Perth County while costing the taxpayer a king's ransom in expensive bridges; or 2. For us: modifies the 1973 choice of Pork Street that most people, even including some of our farming friends, want, and is relatively dirt cheap. <p>Throughout this whole charade, you have rarely allowed any mention of "the people's choice", largely because the chair of ABC has made it be known that your version of Pork Street would not follow the route you have chosen through Wilmot Township as we propose starting the road at the junction of the County Road</p>	<p>Heritage Trust and the Ministry of Culture to-date. As the study proceeds, we will continue to work with stakeholders along the preferred route to ensure we fully understand their concerns and we will strive to mitigate potential impacts.</p> <p>Two evaluation approaches were used to assist in the selection of preferred route alternative.</p> <p>The Reasoned Argument (or Trade-off) method was the primary tool used to identify a preferred alternative. The Reasoned Argument (trade-off) evaluation component provides a clear presentation to stakeholders of the key trade-offs between the various evaluation factors and the reasons why one alternative is preferred over another.</p> <p>The Arithmetic (weighting-scoring) method was the secondary tool, with the results compared to the results of the trade-off method. The Arithmetic evaluation provides a means to compare the alternative methods based on a numerical scaling with weights assigned by the multi-disciplinary study team. A numerical approach is a good sensitivity analysis tool to determine if the conclusions of the reasoned argument approach are valid and appropriate.</p> <p>We understand why some stakeholders chose not to provide weightings for the arithmetic process. While soliciting public input on weightings is a widely accepted practice, the process was completely voluntary. Furthermore, the arithmetic weighting process was not dependent on the number of weighting submissions.</p> <p>A wide range of transportation alternatives were evaluated. While many of the transportation alternatives can contribute positively to the identified problems and opportunities in the Analysis Area, most are limited in their effectiveness when considered individually. As a result, and in recognition that transportation system solutions</p>

Summary of Input Received and Response Provided

Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>and Hwy 7/8 and proceed to Line 33, pave it as a two lane road, and finally link up with Lorne Avenue which your increasingly more convoluted and very expensive version would eventually accomplish.</p> <p>We explained our proposal to the Minister of Transport and yourselves months ago, but your insistence that your highway had to be four lanes wide (or more) has killed your efforts, and you made sure that we never got to talk about it just in case. An enemy was made, and more. None of the farming community, the PCHF, and the Shakespeare Area Residents Association now want a four lane road to be used to bypass Shakespeare as whatever route is chosen covers far too much farmland: a four lane road with wide paved shoulders takes up a lots of space. And who wants a “direct” four lane road that swings left and right and keeps crossing railway tracks, at a ridiculous expense. Your “alternate” route stratagem simply doesn’t make sense. But the thinking here is that this is your plan to get what you really want, indirectly.</p> <p>There appears to be no thinking outside the box in your planning: four lanes good, two lanes bad; don’t pay attention to “amateur” ideas, but do listen to influential people, though without acknowledging this, even if it was known all along. Treat the “amateurs” with arrogance and, at best, condescension. You have also annoyed people (who know this area very well, and are mostly educated professional people) with claims of traffic increases of anywhere from 15% to 100% in twenty or thirty years to justify the expansion. Further claims about how dangerous the present highway is just don’t stand up to scrutiny, even government figures. The worst section for safety is well known as the Four lane section between New Hamburg and the County Line. So much for bigger is better.</p> <p>I’m sorry to relate this to you, but it has been growing and festering over the last year. Yes: you have a difficult job to do, but it isn’t handled well, at least so far as many people of Perth County are concerned. Your research has been extensive, but</p>	<p>require comprehensive, multimodal strategies for long term effectiveness and sustainability, the individual alternatives were grouped into logical Combination Alternatives for further detailed assessment. On the basis of the assessment results, the following two combination transportation alternatives were selected to be carried forward in the study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • transportation demand management (e.g. ridesharing and telecommuting) plus inter-regional transit plus widening of Highway 7&8; and • transportation demand management (e.g. ridesharing and telecommuting) plus inter-regional transit plus local bypasses or a new corridor. <p>Please note that our 2031 forecasted traffic volumes have assumed that all reasonable modes of travel and demand management such as ridesharing, telecommuting, optimizing passenger/ freight rail capacity and increased inter-regional transit services are already implemented and operating to their fullest potential.</p> <p>Other alternatives that do not address the identified transportation problems and opportunities were not carried forward as they will have environmental impacts without providing the required transportation benefits.</p> <p>Please find attached a handout which details why the Perth Line 33 (Pork Road) alternative was not carried forward for further review beyond the Transportation Planning phase.</p> <p>Opportunities to minimize impacts on the natural, land use / socio-economic and cultural environments were considered during the corridor generation and route generation phases of the study. Opportunities to further reduce / mitigate impacts on the environment will be explored through subsequent design phases.</p> <p>Comments and concerns raised with respect to the route alternatives will be addressed through the assessment and</p>

Summary of Input Received and Response Provided

Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>not directed at the real concerns of the farming community and Shakespeare's integrity, nor sufficiently at the county's historical or environmental needs. And a better attitude at meetings to the "amateurs" would certainly have helped.</p> <p>As for the weighting questionnaire: I'll give it a shot for what it's worth, and look forward to the November meeting. Some decisions, perhaps?</p>	<p>evaluation of route alternatives. Additionally, comments and concerns will be further addressed through subsequent design phases once a preferred route alternative has been selected (e.g. intersection / entrance locations / treatments, pedestrian features, etc.).</p> <p>The assessment and evaluation of route alternatives is based on over 60 criteria from four major factor areas, specifically the natural environment, land use / socio-economic environment, cultural environment and transportation factors. The criteria were in part developed and modified to reflect local information provided by stakeholders through the consultation process. Local input is valuable in terms of identifying local issues and conditions. The assessment and evaluation results and the preferred route alternative for the entire study corridor is being presented at PIC #4 for public review and comment.</p>
<p>My opinion of the Shakespeare Bypass, in order of preference from best to least is, SBP2, SBP3, SBP1. Because the southern bypasses allow unimpeded Shakespeare development to the north, in the direction away from the railway and proposed motor vehicle corridor. But I really don't understand why MTO couldn't simply follow the south limit of the railway all along as far as possible, instead of crossing it.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments regarding the route alternatives.</p> <p>The assessment and evaluation of route alternatives is based on over 60 criteria from four major factor areas, specifically the natural environment, land use / socio-economic environment, cultural environment and transportation factors. The criteria were in part developed and modified to reflect local information provided by stakeholders through the consultation process. Local input is valuable in terms of identifying local issues and conditions. The assessment and evaluation results and the preferred route alternative for the entire study corridor is being presented at PIC #4 for public review and comment.</p>
<p>The Perth County Federation of Agriculture (PCFA) works in an advocacy role on behalf of the 1700 farm business members who live in Perth County. The PCFA wishes to present comments on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PCFA submission of October 31, 2009 2. Information Centre #3B 	<p>Responses to the comments and questions raised in your October 31, 2009 submission are provided in the attached May, 2010 letter.</p> <p>References to the Nutrient Management Act and the Drainage Act have been added to the "Rationale for Factors and Sub-Factors Evaluation" column of the "Evaluation Factors, Sub-factors, Criteria</p>

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>3. Weighting Evaluation Criteria</p> <p>1. PCFA submission of October 31, 2009 PCFA made a submission dated October 31, 2009 which contained a number of observations and questions. To date we have not received answers to the questions in that submission. In order for our Board to be as fully informed as possible as the Corridor Planning and Class AE Study progresses, we feel we need to have a response to those questions. We are attaching that document again and wish to receive answers to the specific questions as presented.</p> <p>2. Information Centre #3B We have previously submitted comments to the MTO and the Consultants regarding certain parameters that relate to Provincial Legislation - the Nutrient Management Act, Minimum Distance Separation formulae and the Drainage Act. From an agricultural perspective, for a Class EA Study in a major agricultural area of Ontario, to go forward without reference in the evaluation criteria for these pieces of Provincial Legislation/Regulation, results in a bias against agriculture.</p> <p>We have also made comment about how functioning modern farming businesses are interconnected within a given geographical area. While recognizing that the agricultural profile has been expanded within the evaluation process, there is still a complete lack of recognition of these parameters as evaluation criteria on individual farming operations in the route options as presented at PIC#3B.</p> <p>3. Weighting Evaluation Criteria Process Since the PCFA is not a direct landowner in the study area, we have decided not to participate in the weighting criteria process. However we have received concerns from a number of our members within the study area who feel it is a very flawed process, and should not be used to make an argument that truly reflects the wishes of the community.</p>	<p>and Indicators for the Assessment and Evaluation of Detailed Planning Alternatives” table. Furthermore, the agricultural indicators for route selection do consider the potential and significance for impacts to nutrient management and drainage infrastructure.</p> <p>Two evaluation approaches were used to assist in the selection of preferred route alternative.</p> <p>The Reasoned Argument (or Trade-off) method was the primary tool used to identify a preferred alternative. The Reasoned Argument (trade-off) evaluation component provides a clear presentation to stakeholders of the key trade-offs between the various evaluation factors and the reasons why one alternative is preferred over another.</p> <p>The Arithmetic (weighting-scoring) method was the secondary tool, with the results compared to the results of the trade-off method. The Arithmetic evaluation provides a means to compare the alternative methods based on a numerical scaling with weights assigned by the multi-disciplinary study team. A numerical approach is a good sensitivity analysis tool to determine if the conclusions of the reasoned argument approach are valid and appropriate. Weightings provided by stakeholders and the public through the consultation process will be considered when conducting the sensitivity analysis.</p> <p>We understand why some stakeholders chose not to provide weightings for the arithmetic process. While soliciting public input on weightings is a widely accepted practice, the process was completely voluntary. Furthermore, the arithmetic weighting process was not dependent on the number of weighting submissions.</p>

Summary of Input Received and Response Provided

Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>I am a lifetime landowner in South Easthope Ward and I have always had a keen interest in the development of an accessible route to Stratford. I am writing this letter in regard to the expansion of Highway 7-8 between New Hamburg and Stratford.</p> <p>I feel the land already acquired on the north side of the highway (North Easthope Ward) is sufficient for the widening and the upgrading of the present roadway.</p> <p>I suggest three lanes through Shakespeare would accommodate traffic flow for the future. This plan would be the most satisfactory and least disruptive solution to this ongoing discussion of the transportation corridor.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments regarding the route alternatives.</p> <p>The assessment and evaluation of route alternatives is based on over 60 criteria from four major factor areas, specifically the natural environment, land use / socio-economic environment, cultural environment and transportation factors. The criteria were in part developed and modified to reflect local information provided by stakeholders through the consultation process. Local input is valuable in terms of identifying local issues and conditions. The assessment and evaluation results and the preferred route alternative for the entire study corridor is being presented at PIC #4 for public review and comment.</p>
<p>Your road would cut through my best field.</p> <p>The whole region of 'The Little Lakes' (both on the South Easthope side and across the road on the North Easthope side) is a mess of sinkholes, small lakes, underground waters etc. When you study the old maps regarding this area, surely you will see why there has never been a cut through – the heavy machinery would sink. This was proven when, on widening the existing highway a few years back, they discovered they had a few extra days paid for the heavy machinery and they brought such along Forest Road and it sank; it went right through to the old corduroy road built by the pioneers. This is north of where you are planning – but indicates problems!</p> <p>I am not from that region myself but have listened to my late husband and his father when they discussed the various fields - - the drainage system has been done on the model as the family were from Arizona.</p> <p>You ask about first nations – long ago, when flax was grown, the Indians came back for the 'letting' but I don't know of permanent settlements. Old histories of Perth area would indicate whether they were deeper into the Queens bush.</p>	<p>Your concerns regarding potential impacts of the route alternatives east of Stratford on your property and the surrounding area have been documented.</p> <p>Opportunities to minimize impacts on the natural, land use / socio-economic and cultural environments were considered during the corridor generation and route generation phases of the study. Opportunities to further reduce / mitigate impacts on the environment will be explored through subsequent design phases.</p> <p>Comments and concerns raised with respect to the route alternatives have been addressed through the assessment and evaluation of route alternatives. Additionally, comments and concerns will be further addressed through subsequent design phases once a preferred route alternative has been selected (e.g. intersection / entrance locations / treatments, pedestrian features, etc.).</p> <p>The assessment and evaluation of route alternatives is based on over 60 criteria from four major factor areas, specifically the natural environment, land use / socio-economic environment, cultural environment and transportation factors. The criteria were in part developed and modified to reflect local information provided by</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
	<p>stakeholders through the consultation process. Local input is valuable in terms of identifying local issues and conditions. The assessment and evaluation results and the preferred route alternative for the entire study corridor is being presented at PIC #4 for public review and comment.</p> <p>As the study proceeds, we will continue to work with landowners along the preferred route to ensure we fully understand their concerns and we will strive to mitigate potential impacts.</p>
<p>This article sums up what many of us in the area of Shakespeare and Stratford are thinking and feeling.</p> <p>Improving the existing roads 7/8, Vivian Street and Line 33 – allows farmland, businesses and just as important our homes and lifestyles to be maintained.</p> <p>By improving I mean making Vivian and Line 33 2 lanes only – as it is but updating and extending them.</p> <p>However, the most reasonable approach is to go around Shakespeare – improve 7/8 and leave Vivian and Lorne 2 lanes as they are with upgrades only.</p> <p>Keep it safe. Keep it simple. Keep our homes and environment and land healthy and useable and enjoyable.</p> <p>As I have commented many times before our homes are where we have chosen to live. They are where we live, eat, sleep, raise families and entertain.</p> <p>Along Lorne Avenue – from Road 110 to Romeo there are about 14 homes and families that would be seriously affected by noise, air, traffic pollution. Please consider this when you look at 4 lanes highways, connections and interchanges etc.</p> <p>This is a rural area and we want to keep it this way – quiet, safe and beautiful.</p>	<p>Your concerns regarding potential impacts of the route alternatives east of Stratford on your property and the surrounding area have been carefully reviewed and considered by the study team.</p> <p>A wide range of transportation alternatives were evaluated. While many of the transportation alternatives can contribute positively to the identified problems and opportunities in the Analysis Area, most are limited in their effectiveness when considered individually. As a result, and in recognition that transportation system solutions require comprehensive, multimodal strategies for long term effectiveness and sustainability, the individual alternatives were grouped into logical Combination Alternatives for further detailed assessment. On the basis of the assessment results, the following two combination transportation alternatives were selected to be carried forward in the study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • transportation demand management (e.g. ridesharing and telecommuting) plus inter-regional transit plus widening of Highway 7&8; and • transportation demand management (e.g. ridesharing and telecommuting) plus inter-regional transit plus local bypasses or a new corridor. <p>Please note that our 2031 forecasted traffic volumes have assumed that all reasonable modes of travel and demand management such as ridesharing, telecommuting, optimizing passenger/ freight rail</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p><i>The Beacon herald, July 21, 2010</i> <u>Obliterating Shakespeare should not even be on the table</u> <i>John Kastner</i></p>	<p>capacity and increased inter-regional transit services are already implemented and operating to their fullest potential.</p>
<p>We have previously written to you opposing a 4 lane highway on Line 33. In those letters we stated our reasons and gave alternative solutions.</p> <p>On Wed. July 21, at PIC 3B in Shakespeare your team presented 4 route alternatives.</p> <p>The purpose of this letter is to once again express our concerns and great disappointment after viewing the proposed routes at the July 21, PIC 3B.</p> <p>Three of these routes appear to include connections/bypass and all this entails at the gateway to our home. This will definitely have a negative impact on our daily life and lifestyle, as well as affecting our rural property, its value and the safe access to it by farm machinery.</p> <p>This rural setting is our home, summer cottage, winter retreat and retirement property all wrapped up in one package. Would you want a 4 lane highway with connections/bypass, lights etc. at your front door every day year after year? It is very discouraging as a homeowner to learn that all we have worked hard to achieve and enjoy is threatened by more lanes of concrete and traffic.</p> <p>We built our home on this property to enjoy the rural landscape, the rural community and all of the fresh air, quiet, nature and recreation that country life offers. This wonderful rural way of life stands to be destroyed by all your proposal of a new highway.</p> <p>Please consider the homes and residents along Road 33, from Line 110 to Romeo St. in your evaluation. Consider the pollution created by a new highway. Who wants to hear gears changing, air brakes, boom boxes and speeding vehicles day and night? Who wants to breathe their pollution? Who wants to look at lanes of concrete not to mention the litter that comes with it? Those of us</p>	<p>Other alternatives that do not address the identified transportation problems and opportunities were not carried forward as they will have environmental impacts without providing the required transportation benefits.</p> <p>Opportunities to minimize impacts on the natural, land use / socio-economic and cultural environments were considered during the corridor generation and route generation phases of the study. Opportunities to further reduce / mitigate impacts on the environment will be explored through subsequent design phases.</p> <p>Comments and concerns raised with respect to the route alternatives have been addressed through the assessment and evaluation of route alternatives. Additionally, comments and concerns will be further addressed through subsequent design phases once a preferred route alternative has been selected (e.g. intersection / entrance locations / treatments, pedestrian features, etc.).</p> <p>The assessment and evaluation of route alternatives is based on over 60 criteria from four major factor areas, specifically the natural environment, land use / socio-economic environment, cultural environment and transportation factors. The criteria were in part developed and modified to reflect local information provided by stakeholders through the consultation process. Local input is valuable in terms of identifying local issues and conditions. The assessment and evaluation results and the preferred route alternative for the entire study corridor is being presented at PIC #4 for public review and comment.</p> <p>As the study proceeds, we will continue to work with landowners along the preferred route to ensure we fully understand their concerns and we will strive to mitigate potential impacts.</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3B – July 21, 2010

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Response
<p>who reside on Line33 have just as much at stake as do the farm businesses, small towns and special interest groups.</p> <p>We do not want a 4 lane highway with its connections/bypass etc. on our doorstep, nor do we want this highway destroying other homes and farmland in this area!</p> <p>We care about the rural way of life which so often seems to be ignored or taken for granted by “Bigger and Faster”. The rural people, the farms, and the landscape have so much to offer if only “Bigger and Faster” would slow down and notice. Once we are paved over it is too late – the damage is done.</p> <p>In reading “Letters to the Editor” in our local Stratford paper, it is very apparent many alternative routes have been offered to your team. Routes which are less intrusive to farmland, residents, community and the environment. Routes which are direct and cost effective. Routes that also serve Stratford as the rural tourist destination that it is.</p> <p>When destruction to homes, farmland, environment and rural way of life is greater than the need and benefit of a new 4 lane highway can it then be justified?</p> <p>Once again, use what we have, be creative and save our rural way of life and our community.</p>	