

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
1. PIC FORMAT AND INFORMATION; RESPONSIVENESS TO STAKEHOLDER INPUT		
#1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confusing 	<p>Outreach and consultation are a major component of the Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study. As indicated in 'Report A – Study Plan' which was released in July 2007, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca, a Public Information Centre (PIC) is held at each key point of decision-making.</p> <p>The purpose of PICs is to present stakeholders with the work, findings and recommendations of a specific study, and to obtain their feedback.</p> <p>The benefits of the drop-in format utilized by MTO for its PICs are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It provides flexibility for stakeholders relative to the timing of their attendance; • It allows stakeholders to spend the time they want in reviewing the information presented; • It allows stakeholders to focus their questions and comments on the information/issues/items/locations that they personally are concerned about on a one-on-one basis with members of the study team; • By giving stakeholders one-on-one access to members of the study team, it accommodates individuals who are not comfortable or even willing to make their points in front of an audience, or who feel that privacy is important; • It gives all stakeholders equal access to members of the study team without being intimidated by the opinions and/or conflicting positions of other stakeholders; and • Through the above, it encourages input from all stakeholders. <p>MTO does not use the "public meeting" format to present information and get feedback because it has been found to be much less effective in achieving the purpose of the PICs. The study will therefore continue using the drop-in format PIC.</p> <p>Concerns regarding the venue lighting have been noted and efforts will be made to address this issue at future PICs.</p> <p>The study team has clearly responded to input received by meeting with agricultural and business groups, adding corridor alternatives for consideration, scheduling additional rounds of PICs to address specific issues and concerns, holding working group meetings, and responding to written stakeholder input. For example, PIC #2B and 2C were additional PICs held in the Fall of 2008 and the Spring of 2009, respectively, in response to stakeholder input, to provide more information on corridor alternatives before they were evaluated and selected.</p> <p>The information presented at PICs is an overview/summary of more detailed information that is</p>
#15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Disappointed that the study team refuses to support our recommendation to hold public meetings that include formal presentations followed by a question and answer session. 	
#15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Very dissatisfied with the response received to our letter of Feb 6. There were significant elements that were not addressed. We will be forwarding additional comments in reference to this in the near future. 	
#15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A sixty day response period for the upcoming PIC is not adequate if you are truly interested in receiving comments. 	
#32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would be better if there was a presentation to the public every 2 hours to condense the transfer of information. 	
#10, 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Please mail me a copy of the proposed corridor (map) 	
#12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I liked the size of the crowd 	
#34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Send revised long list of corridors book dated April 2009 	
#43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Please hand out the proposed map 	
#4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good one-on-one with consultants. Made it a lot clearer and they answered questions well. 	
#10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Information was informative, displays were clear and easy to understand, good presentation. 	
#19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good presentation & staff 	
#9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I am pleased with the detailed 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	analysis of benefits of various alternatives	contained in the various reports that are provided at the PICs and on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca . We encourage you to review these reports and to contact the study team if you wish to discuss their content. You may also wish to attend presentations to the councils of municipalities within the analysis area, which are typically made in advance of each round of PICs.
#21, 38, 39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Public meeting please 	
#21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Too many issues to discuss and too few details here. Too much of “what if” 	
#21, 39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Too many contradictions in answers 	<p><i>‘Report A – Study Plan’</i> was released in July 2007, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca. In Exhibit 2.1, of Report A, the objectives and key tasks, the reports, the PICs, and the preliminary schedule for each phase of the study is presented. This will assist stakeholders in understanding the order of the study work and when they can expect it to be presented for their review and comment.</p>
#40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would like to see the minister of transportation present 	
# 53	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If you decide to pass through Shakespeare it would be good to formalize your plans as quickly as possible. You may contact me by phone (number withheld for privacy reasons) 	<p>Some stakeholders indicated that they were pleased with how the PICs were set up and how the study team responded to their questions. Considerable effort goes into preparing and running these PICs, so these comments are appreciated.</p>
#54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the hwy 7/8 proposal. I have attended two meetings at the Festival Inn in Stratford and I have been impressed by the presentations you have developed. I am most struck by the displays which articulate the environmental caveats you and the ministry purport to hold so dear. 	<p>Some stakeholders indicated that they found the information presented to be “confusing”. On the other hand, some stakeholders indicated that there were too few details and too many issues to discuss. The study team will endeavour to provide explanations on issues where stakeholders indicate clarity may be lacking. However, it should also be understood that the information presented at PIC #2C was at a broad corridor level of detail. At PIC #3, a higher level of detail will be presented for widening or new route alternatives in the various sections of the preferred corridor.</p> <p>Some stakeholders indicated that they were unhappy with the responses they received from the study team at the PICs, or that there were contradictions in the answers. The study team goes to considerable effort to respond in a consistent manner to questions on work completed to date, however, it should be understood that when responding to stakeholder input:</p>
#64	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Aerial photos were particularly useful. Many displays and photos were too small. The room lighting was very poor for reading and clearly seeing detail. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The study team must consider the transportation problems and opportunities (need) that the study has set out to address; • The study team must give equal consideration to the interests, concerns, positions, comments and questions received from all stakeholders/stakeholder groups, and recognize that they are at times in conflict with one another;
#6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would like to see aerial photos of routes, similar to those you have in Shakespeare 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the study team can indicate when and how upcoming study work will be undertaken, it would be misleading and inappropriate for them to speculate on the findings and recommendations of work that has not yet commenced; • The study team cannot investigate concerns, suggestions or changes to “overarching

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
 Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
 Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
		<p>issues” such as funding policies and commitments of governments, or the current roles of the different levels of government and transportation service providers; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If you perceive what appears to be inconsistencies in the answers you receive, the study team would like this brought to their attention immediately, so that clarification can be provided. <p>Within the above context, if there are specific questions that those stakeholders feel were not responded to, or there were specific elements of responses that need further discussion, we encourage them to follow-up in writing. In addition, if stakeholders have information which they feel the study team may not be aware of, they are encouraged to provide it for consideration and follow-up.</p> <p>One stakeholder group indicated that a 60-day response period would be inadequate for them to provide comments on the information presented at the upcoming PIC#3. For PIC #3, the information will be released on July 21, and comments are requested by September 30, resulting in a response period of 72 days. The response period is a guideline to help the study team maintain the study schedule. However, there is an opportunity for comments at any time throughout the study process.</p> <p>One stakeholder indicated that they would like to see the Minister of Transportation present at the public information centres (PICs). While the Minister’s Office is briefed on the project, it is not possible for the Minister to attend the large number of PICs held by MTO.</p>

2. NOTIFICATION TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC, AND CONTACT WITH PROPERTY OWNERS

#40, 48	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Notice in the mail was deceiving, made to look like the other corridor was gone. A lot of people would have been here if you had shown both by passes of Stratford 	<p>The public notice for PIC #2C indicated that the purpose of PIC #2C was “to present a new corridor alternative that utilizes Lorne Avenue and Erie Street through Stratford”, and showed a map of this alternative. The notice also indicated that a “Revised Long List of Corridor Alternatives (includes new alternatives)” would be presented. The study team regrets that a stakeholder took this to mean that other corridors south of Stratford were “gone”, since this was not the case. PIC #3 will present the results of the evaluation of the short list of corridor alternatives and the selection of a preferred corridor.</p>
#76	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We are a major landowner in New Hamburg and Wilmot Township, and would appreciate being notified of workshops to provide input and feedback. I received no notification of PIC 2C, which was updated on the website. Please confirm we are on the mailing list. 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	The entire study is very important to us.	
3. CONSULTATION WITH GOVERNMENT AGENCIES, MUNICIPALITIES AND TRANSPORTATION SERVICE PROVIDERS; COMPLIANCE WITH PROVINCIAL POLICY; ROLES OF GOVERNMENTS		
#40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The mandate of the MTO has to change. Make the roads that we have safe first 	<p>The province of Ontario is responsible for long distance inter-regional movement of people and goods. The local truck bypass created by the City of Stratford does not negate the need for the province to address long distance inter-regional movement of people and goods through the Stratford area.</p> <p>One stakeholder has suggested that the mandate of MTO has to change to make the roads we have safe first. One of the MTO priority areas is to “promote road safety so we remain among the safest jurisdictions in North America.” Accordingly each year MTO undertakes many construction and maintenance projects that address this focus. One example is the recent improvements made by MTO on Highway 7&8 through the New Hamburg area. The need for this short-term improvement was identified in the Study Design Report completed by MTO in 2005 that also recommended MTO undertake the current Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study.</p>
#8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stratford has failed in providing a new user friendly truck route, why should Provincial tax payers have to pay for their lack of foresight 	
#75	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Section 2.3 of the Provincial Policy Statement requires that prime farmland be protected for long-term use for agriculture. Cutting through several farm operations to save a minute or two of commuter travel time is not sufficient to justify this proposal. 	
4. TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES (NEED)		
#28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I do not believe that the current projections would be reliable with changes to the proposed plan 	<p>The need to undertake the current Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study was initially identified in the Study Design Report completed by MTO in 2005.</p> <p><i>‘Report A – Study Plan’</i>, which was released in July 2007 and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca, provides the preliminary statement of transportation problems and opportunities that this study set out to address, which are summarized below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate inter-regional/provincial transportation capacity between and through Stratford, Shakespeare, and New Hamburg; • Interference of the historic downtown function of Stratford and Shakespeare caused by inter-regional/provincial traffic passing through; • Inadequate east-west transportation connection from the analysis area to other regions of the province; and • Inadequate geometric and safety characteristics of the existing highway to address forecasted needs.
#18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I am still confused as to the “why” this proposed highway is needed 	
#18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Who is generating the push, for we know that since growth has not substantially changed from 1977 – 30,000 to 32,000, the real reason is not need and certainly not safety, so what or who is the real reason? 	
#8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What is the justification for 4 lanes from Stratford to New Hamburg? 	
#25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The present traffic count has not increased on 7&8 they only take 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	county roads because of the poor road conditions	
#1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What growth is coming to Stratford – not the festival 	<p><i>Report C – Area Transportation System Problems and Opportunities</i>, which was released in June 2008, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca, expands upon the information presented in Report A, and provides a more detailed summary of transportation problems and opportunities in Exhibits 6.1 and 6.2 respectively.</p>
#1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Accidents have been fewer since lights in New Hamburg and with more county roads being paved, local people avoid 7/8 	
#1, 50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ When will all the surveys end and work be done, this has been going on too long 	
#6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I don't believe there is a need for this, not enough traffic actually bypassing Stratford to warrant the spending. 	<p>With respect to inadequate inter-regional/provincial transportation capacity identified above, Report C indicates that from Stratford to New Hamburg there will be a road capacity deficiency of one lane in each direction within the corridor by 2031 (i.e. 4 lanes are required). Report C indicates that this capacity deficiency will occur in the shorter term (0 to 10-year timeframe) through Stratford and from Stratford to Waterloo Regional Road 1 and in the longer term (approaching 2031) for the New Hamburg area. The current condition of Highway 7&8 between Stratford and New Hamburg and of Highway 7 between Stratford and London does not influence this capacity deficiency. West of Stratford there is not a capacity deficiency, but there is a need to link the provincial highway system. Accordingly, the study is investigating 2-lane alternatives west of Stratford.</p>
#6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I believe most of the traffic is going into Stratford other than a minute bit of livestock truck traffic 	<p>The fact that a 2-lane capacity deficiency needs to be addressed does not mean that a new 4-lane facility is the only alternative. This is the reason that a new corridor is only one of a number of alternatives that are being considered.</p>
#8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As most truck traffic from K-W are deliveries in Stratford, there is absolutely no need for a 4 lane by pass around Stratford. 	
#37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Do we need a by pass around Stratford? Presumably many cars will go into Stratford. Possibly a 2 lane by pass is all that is needed with an up grade of Lorne Ave, Shakespeare with minimal of 4 lanes and protective barrier for sidewalks 	<p>One stakeholder has suggested that the traffic count has not increased on Highway 7&8 because drivers take county roads because of poor traffic conditions, and another has suggested that with more county roads being paved local people avoid Highway 7&8, While traffic has increased on Highway 7&8, Report C indicates that one of the problems to be addressed by this study is capacity constraints resulting in trip diversion to parallel rural municipal roadways in the analysis area that are generally not designed to handle high traffic volumes.</p>
#45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Get this done; it has gone on far too long. 	
#34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Forget about the bypass around Stratford until the infrastructure for better roads from Stratford to London/ 401/403 is in place. 	
#34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We do not feel a new big 4 lane highway is justified. 	<p>The issue of travel demand is addressed in Section 3 of Report C, which outlines the travel demand forecast approach and methodology, indicating, in part, that the travel demand analysis included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of existing data bases such as the 'Transportation Tomorrow Survey', Census, Statistics Canada, Commercial Vehicle Studies, and travel characteristics from origin-destination studies; • Strategic assessment of longer-term travel demand by specific user types to provide a perspective on the travel patterns and flows in the analysis area; • Development of a strategic model to forecast person trips; and • Forecasted travel demands based on planned population and employment growth in the analysis area and in central/south-western Ontario.

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
#8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No improvements have been made to 7&8 for years – fix it up, in these uncertain times both now and in the foreseeable future it makes no sense to consider 4 lanes 	<p>With respect to the population and employment projections indicated above, Report C indicates that they were obtained from the province's 'Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe' (2006), the approved Official Plans of the municipalities within the analysis area, and review of existing data bases such Census, Statistics Canada.</p>
#36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The traffic west of Hwy 7 is very little so why not leave those roads alone and let traffic flow as it may. 	<p>The origin-destination surveys, undertaken during the summer of 2004, captured both weekday and weekend travel patterns, and collected information on the auto occupancy, trip lengths, and trip purposes for vehicles using the major provincial highways in the analysis area. While recent changes in the economy and increases in fuel prices may have an influence on motorists' travel choices, this is not expected to reduce the need to invest in new transportation infrastructure over the longer term. Therefore, the travel characteristics identified from the origin-destination studies were considered in the development of forecasted travel demands for the analysis area.</p>
#59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The current analysis area extends to just west of Sebringville. If there are long terms plans or pressures to create new highway capacity from west of Stratford to Lake Huron, they should be brought forward now, and in this regard, the under-utilized rail line should be made the preferred option for transport. 	<p>With respect to questions regarding the potential need for corridor improvements on Highway 8 west of Sebringville, MTO has initiated a separate study for this section of Highway 8 to address rehabilitation requirements. No capacity deficiencies have been identified at the present time.</p> <p>As the Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Study proceeds, the study team will monitor the progress, findings and recommendations of other studies. It is anticipated the other studies could influence the preliminary design of interchanges or intersections with Highway 7&8, but that they will not affect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The corridor alternatives being considered; • The selection of the preferred corridor/combination; and <p>The associated widening alternatives and/or new route alternatives, as applicable, which are generated within that corridor/combination.</p>

5. SCREENING OF AREA TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM ALTERNATIVES – CONSIDERATION OF INTER-REGIONAL TRANSIT AND PASSENGER RAIL SERVICE

#42	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use improved rail service (passenger) 	<p>'Report D – Area Transportation System Alternatives' was released in June 2008, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca. Report D discusses the potential of inter-regional transit and passenger rail service in addressing the preliminary statement of transportation problems and opportunities, however the following provides a brief overview:</p>
#61	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Please work with the mayor of Stratford to get GO Transit to build the end of line station in Stratford instead of Baden. This would take car traffic off Highway 7&8. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transit potential in the Highway 7&8 corridor was established by aggressively assuming the mode share of commuter work trips on transit is more than doubled to 10% to Waterloo, Kitchener and Cambridge, and is increased from 3.2% to 5% to London;
#59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Engineering and designing 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	realistic solutions that will allow people to change their future travel habits from the automobile would be a visionary road to embark upon today.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Even if this transit potential is fully accommodated by providing 35 additional buses, or four light rail train sets (e.g. GO Transit), or one additional heavy rail passenger train per day, inter-regional transit and passenger rail cannot sufficiently reduce auto trip demand in the Highway 7&8 corridor to address the forecasted 2031 capacity deficiencies between and through Stratford, Shakespeare and New Hamburg, and beyond;
#74	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We continue to press for increased public transportation to reduce traffic on our roads and highways. Increased public transportation that reduces road traffic will preserve prime farm land and reduce our reliance on fossil fuels. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • However, inter-regional transit is considered an important and required service in the Highway 7&8 corridor, and it has been included in the two combination area transportation alternatives being carried forward in the study, for which “corridor alternatives” including widening of Highway 7&8, local bypasses, and new corridors have been generated; • Inter-regional transit could include existing passenger rail; new passenger rail; provincial transitway (separate inter-regional transit facilities directly associated with a provincial highway); transit infrastructure on a provincial highway, including reserved bus lanes, high occupancy vehicle lanes, and bus priority facilities; and buses in general purpose lanes. <p>The study team has advised GO Transit of the interests of a number of stakeholders for the GO rail system expansion to extend to Stratford. For further details on GO Transit’s proposed expansion program, please contact GO Transit directly.</p>

6. SCREENING OF AREA TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM ALTERNATIVES – CONSIDERATION OF FREIGHT RAIL SERVICE

#22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If truck transports were to increase dramatically from the west I think that existing rail lines should be accessed to handle the transport as an alternative to using trucks. 	<p><i>Report D – Area Transportation System Alternatives</i> was released in June 2008, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca. Report D discusses the potential of freight rail service in addressing the identified transportation problems and opportunities, however the following provides a brief overview:</p>
#22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I know the rail line has been leased to a private company. Government should look at purchasing or leasing the line 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Railways are best suited for carrying bulk commodities over long distances between major freight terminals. For short-distance hauls of non-bulk freight commodities by rail, it takes longer to load and unload than it does to ship them, rendering this unattractive to shippers, carriers and receivers from the perspectives of cost and timeliness, particularly for perishable products such as fresh vegetables and fruit; • Based upon the 2000 Commercial Vehicle Survey, approximately 63% of the truck demands in the Highway 7&8 corridor are for short to medium distance trips, and not suitable for diversion to freight rail service; • The long distance freight market currently served by trucks in the Highway 7&8 corridor is estimated at 560 vehicles per day. Even if all of the long distance freight could be shifted from truck to rail, this would not remove enough traffic from the Highway 7&8 corridor to address the forecasted 2031 capacity deficiencies between and through Stratford,

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
		<p>Shakespeare and New Hamburg, and beyond; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Considering the above, freight rail service is an area transportation alternative that is <u>not</u> being carried forward in the study. The 2031 forecasts do however account for a 20% shift of long distance freight from truck to rail which reduces the 2031 truck volumes in the corridor by approximately 100 trucks per day. Ownership of the rail line has no impact on the above.
7. SCREENING OF AREA TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM ALTERNATIVES – CONSIDERATION OF MUNICIPAL ROADS		
#51	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Taking road #130 to Hwy #8 would also work for Line #29 as a by pass alternative. If the existing truck route could be extended (line #33) on the east side up to the county road between Tavistock and New Hamburg just south of Punky Doodle Corner. This would alleviate some of the congestion to Hwy #8 	<p><i>'Report D – Area Transportation System Alternatives'</i> was released in June 2008, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca. Report D discusses the potential of municipal roads in addressing the identified transportation problems and opportunities, however the following provides a brief overview:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study has determined that there will be a road capacity deficiency of one lane in each direction within the corridor by 2031 (see <i>'Report C – Area Transportation System Problems and Opportunities'</i>); Widening Perth Road 33 to the south or Perth Road 37 to the north of Highway 7&8 may provide sufficient theoretical capacity to accommodate future demands, but constraints due to reduced speed limits, numerous private entrances, and lower design standards would result in an insufficient amount of traffic being removed from Highway 7&8 to address the forecasted 2031 capacity deficiencies, particularly through Stratford and Shakespeare; In the New Hamburg area, there are no continuous municipal road connections to the north or south of Highway 7&8 that could serve as a viable alternative without making a number of jogs at offset intersections. Even if these situations were rectified, the limitations discussed above would apply; Considering all of the above, the use and widening of municipal roads is an area transportation alternative that is <u>not</u> being carried forward in the study with one exception, as follows. Based upon input received from stakeholders, including the City of Stratford, a portion of the current municipal road truck bypass around Stratford was added to the short list of corridor alternatives, as presented to stakeholders at Public Information Centre #2C in Stratford on Wednesday April 22, 2009; Also based upon the above, MTO would not consider signing on Highway 7&8 to encourage drivers to divert from Highway 7&8 to municipal roads.
#81	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anyone going to Grand Bend from the east knows that Line 26 is the Stratford by-pass. Why not upgrade existing roads with appropriate signs to lead people in the right direction. 	
#75	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We recommend Perth Roads 109, 110, 111 be examined as possible targets for connecting Perth Line 33 and Highway 7&8, with best suited road being selected as target corridor. 	
#29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternate routes on improved Perth county roads need to be well signed, giving all traffic within the study area alternatives depending on destination 	
#40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of money could be saved 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	by using existing roads	
#40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We need 2 lane roads with wide shoulders 	
#40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Line 29 is empty and you want to put in a new road 1 ½ miles away 	
#34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Add signage in New Hamburg and Shakespeare to make travellers aware of Line #33 and Line #35 options 	
#19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I like the idea of upgrading the existing roads and adding several passing lanes 	
#20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I think that the best idea would be to make use of the existing Line #33. It seems to me that with these roads already existing that it would be the most cost effective and create the least disturbance to the existing farms which are very dependant on these existing roads. 	
#28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I would like to see the completion of county road #33 to New Hamburg as a form of traffic relief only to hwy 7/8. 	
#28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The completion of county road #37 north of Stratford would give local relief, then redo the counts for 2031 which would change the volume projections. 	
#22, 25, 27, 40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It makes no sense to build new roads when you could widen the existing routes that people already use. Use existing roads whenever possible 	
#43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seriously look at the existing roads around Stratford. Line 26 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
 Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
 Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	would be good alternative to come from the Woodstock area	
#46	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lots of people are using alternate routes rather than hwy 7 & 8. I would like to see them improved because local people are not going to go on a 4 lane hwy if they have a choice. You still have the option to upgrade the existing roads. 	
#13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ First pave Pork Street east of Hwy 59 to Punky Doodle Corners 	
#23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In addition to improvements to existing Highway 7&8 corridor from Stratford to Wilmot/Easthope Rd. Lorne Ave. / Pork St. corridor should be an alternative. It would avoid Shakespeare, Fryfogel Inn and Lingle Bank church and cemetery. 	
#47	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I believe consideration should be given to using the main route through the city which will result in less upset and will provide adequate access into the city and the small number of people and trucks which are passing through 	
#42	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use the existing corridor and turn Pork St into a 2 lane highway 	
#15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I think consideration should be given to upgrading Pork Rd, Harmony Rd, and Embro Rd including passing lanes. 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
8. COMMENTS ON CORRIDOR ALTERNATIVES; SUGGESTIONS FOR ADDITIONAL CORRIDOR ALTERNATIVES		
Widening 7&8		
#29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We need major improvements to Hwys 7&8 and 7 & 19 within the present corridors. 	<p>There is considerable disparity of opinion among stakeholders regarding corridor alternatives. The following responses are provided in response to the comments received:</p>
#34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Widen the existing 7/8 using land using land that the Province already owns in most cases. Connect areas that are already 4 lanes and you will have 4 lanes from Kitchener to Stratford with the exception of Shakespeare. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response regarding railway crossings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The alternative involving widening of the existing highway would include an increased number of lanes under the railway structure west of Regional Road 1. ○ Geometric and traffic safety characteristics along Highway 7&8 is one of the problems that the study has set out to address. Accordingly, level crossings at railways are unlikely to be considered. ○ The specifics regarding grade separations and vertical/horizontal alignment shifts of the highway, road and railways associated with the above would be developed following Public Information Centre #3.
#73	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Still concerned about the use of agricultural land to solve traffic flow problems. The new proposal still conflicts with homes, livelihoods, valuable farmland, drainage systems etc. We still recommend using the existing roads to bring them up to provincial standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response regarding intersections, interchanges and service roads: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provision of interchanges at key intersections would not on its own resolve the problems and opportunities that this study set out to address, particularly inadequate transportation capacity. Accordingly, although interchanges may be considered in association with the recommended alternatives, they will <u>not</u> be carried forward as a stand-alone alternative. ○ 'Report A – Study Plan' was released in July 2007, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca. Supporting Document #2 identifies that the preliminary planning, detailed planning and preliminary design phases of the work will all consider the location, configuration and template footprint of highway interchanges/intersections. These will be presented at future PICs.
#20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I think that the best idea would be to make use of the existing Hwy 7&8. It seems to me that with these roads already existing that it would be the most cost effective and create the least disturbance to the existing farms which are very dependant on these existing roads. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response regarding widening of the existing highway: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Widening of the existing highway is included in the corridor alternatives that were screened to be carried forward for further assessment in the study because it could make a significant contribution towards addressing the transportation problems and opportunities. ○ Although widening of existing Highway 7&8 to provide a third lane would provide a continuous left turn lane, it would not provide for improved transportation capacity. Since transportation capacity is one of the problems that the study has set out to address, this will not be carried forward. ○ A widening of existing Highway 7&8 to five lanes would provide additional traffic capacity, and may be one of the highway widening alternatives that is generated for
#22, 25, 27, 40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It makes no sense to build new roads when you could widen the existing routes that people already use. Use existing roads whenever possible 	
#33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I lean towards the existing hwy 7 & 8 (bite the bullet on the railway overpass). 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
#1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Land has been bought; homes have been rebuilt, disrupting families for years and still no change. 	<p>specific sections if the highway widening alternative is selected as the preferred corridor alternative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The attributes of sections of wide right-of-way lands currently owned by MTO along portions of the existing highway will be considered under the evaluation factor, sub-factor or criteria presented in Exhibit 7.2 and Supporting Document #5 in 'Report A – Study Plan'. These sections of wide right-of-way are not of themselves a corridor alternative. They are part of the existing corridor alternative. ○ 'Report A – Study Plan' was released in July 2007, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca. Supporting Document #2 identifies that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At the completion of the preliminary planning phase of the study, conceptual areas of widening may be selected as a corridor alternative to be carried forward in the study; ▪ In the detailed planning phase of the study, if widening is selected as a corridor alternative to be carried forward, specific location, extent and direction of widening will be identified; and ▪ In the preliminary design phase of the study, calculated horizontal and vertical alignment and cross-section will be developed. ▪ These will be presented at future Public Information Centres. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Response regarding local bypasses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Local bypasses to the south of Stratford, Shakespeare and New Hamburg are included in the corridor alternatives that were screened to be carried forward for further assessment in the study because they could make a significant contribution towards addressing the transportation problems and opportunities. ○ Although the Stratford south bypass corridor alternatives could have a longer "useful lifespan" than the Lorne Avenue corridor alternatives, the Lorne Avenue corridor alternatives will address the capacity deficiency for the 2031 planning horizon and beyond. ○ Based upon input received from stakeholders, including the City of Stratford, a portion of the existing truck bypass on municipal roads is part of a bypass of Stratford that was added to the short list of corridor alternatives. ○ The northerly limit of local bypass and new corridor alternatives is as close to Shakespeare as it can be and still have sufficient spacing in which to provide the necessary intersection and associated turning lanes for access to Shakespeare and clearance for a grade separation at the railroad. ○ Precedent from many projects in Ontario and North America indicated that impacts associated with the short list of corridor alternatives in and around Shakespeare can reasonably be mitigated. The existing conditions in and around Shakespeare are not sufficiently unique to justify a tunnel as a reasonable alternative to address the
#13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Our farm is a new layer operation south of the CNR off Road 106 south of hwy 7&8, one proposed corridor is of course right through our barn and /or house. We also have a dairy farm on hwy 7&8 across from Fryfogel Inn. We would rather have improvements made to the existing hwy 7&8 and other roads going in and out of Stratford, first pave Pork Street east of Hwy 59 to Punky Duddle Corners 	
#61	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Look at adding an extra lane between Stratford and New Hamburg, to be used as a passing lane. 	
#63	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Improving the current Highway 7&8 should be the route of choice. Making use of existing roads makes more sense than destroying prime farmland and uprooting farm operations and drainage. 	
#54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I am most struck by the displays which articulate the environmental caveats you and the ministry purport to hold so dear. Simply put, then to uphold these principles, the obvious solution is to widen the existing roadway. To do otherwise is to relegate these guidelines to the 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	<p>pile of platitudinous junk to which government after government contributes. There is no point talking about destructive foot prints unless one is prepared to seriously walk carefully. Let's walk the talk, do the right thing, minimize your impact, pave over as little as possible. Make the "redside dace" the poster animal.</p>	<p>problems and opportunities being addressed by this study, or to mitigate impacts. It will therefore not be carried forward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Study Team is not investigating a "trucks-only" bypass of Stratford, Shakespeare or New Hamburg, since the province does not limit the use of a provincial highway to a selected vehicle type, and this would limit the capacity and flexibility of the overall area transportation system in providing for peak travel periods. ○ The specifics regarding grade separations and vertical/horizontal alignment shifts of highway, road and railways associated with the above would be developed following Public Information Centre #3. ○ The study team is not investigating moving the railway southerly to accommodate a new corridor because any marginal benefits with respect to a new provincial highway corridor would be outweighed by the cost and footprint impacts associated with realignment of the railway corridor which would extend over a longer length due to rail design standards.
#41	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ East and west of Shakespeare can be possibly widened with just a small by pass around Shakespeare 	
	<p align="center">New Hamburg Bypass</p>	
#71	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The news about the Bypass is very shocking to me. We opened up a new business in New Hamburg this past March and had no idea that this was in the works or we would have backed out. <p>If the bypass goes through, this will greatly affect our business and the entire community of New Hamburg. We depend on this traffic.</p> <p>I cannot see how a bypass through prime farmland would even be considered. In fact I find it very disturbing.</p> <p>There is no problem with the existing highway. There are no backups or delays. It is a huge waste of our tax money.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Exhibit 7.2 and Supporting Document #5 of Report A indicate that one of the sub-factors for the evaluation of alternatives is traffic safety. The transition from a new corridor to the existing highway would be considered under this sub-factor. ○ 'Report A – Study Plan' was released in July 2007, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca. Supporting Document #2 identifies that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At the end of the preliminary planning phase of the study, conceptual local bypasses of Stratford, Shakespeare and New Hamburg may be selected as corridor alternatives to be carried forward in the study: ▪ In the detailed planning phase of the study, if local bypasses were selected as a corridor alternative to be carried forward, specific routes will be identified; and ▪ In the preliminary design phase of the study, calculated horizontal and vertical alignment and cross-section will be developed ▪ These will be presented at future Public Information Centres. ○ Corridor alternatives extending westerly to Perth Road 130/Avontown Road are <u>not</u> being considered due to the limitation associated with upgrading the Highway 8 intersection in Sebringville. ○ Corridor alternatives extending southerly to Perth Line 26 are not being considered because they do not address the transportation capacity problem the study has set out to address. ○ Perth Line #29/Gibb Road is included in the short list of corridor alternatives. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response regarding Lorne Avenue Corridor Alternatives : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is disparity of opinion both for and against the Lorne Avenue corridor alternatives.

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	My family and I extremely oppose the 7 & 8 Bypass.	
#80	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Will the New Burg Inn Motel be affected by the construction near New Hamburg? 	
#72	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Similar to the Highway 7/8 split in downtown Stratford; could that same type of split be done at New Hamburg and start Hwy 7 there. Then take Pork Street (Line 33), making it Highway 7 and direct trucks and other southerly traffic through that route. It would line up nicely with Lorne Avenue and solve a lot of traffic problems in Shakespeare, and regarding controlled access requirements, safety for agricultural traffic etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Widening of Lorne Avenue to 4/5 lanes will provide sufficient capacity to address needs for the 2031 planning horizon and beyond. ○ The Lorne Avenue corridor alternatives will retain connections to Ontario and Huron Streets for traffic that is destined for the Stratford urban centre. ○ Exhibit 7.2 in Report A indicates that 'urban and rural residential areas' and 'commercial/industrial areas' are factors that will be considered in the evaluation of the short list of corridor alternatives. Supporting Document #5 of Report A indicates that in the upcoming detailed planning phase of the study, consideration of 'urban and residential areas' and 'commercial industrial areas' will include the potential and significance of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ encroachment, severance, displacement and property acquisition; ▪ long-term alteration/disruption; ▪ change in area character/aesthetics; ▪ nuisance impacts ▪ change to access/travel time; ▪ change to facilities/utilities/services. ○ Noise sensitive areas are one of the factors that will be considered during the evaluation of the short list of corridor alternatives, and will be considered during the generation and evaluation of widening alternatives if one of the Lorne Avenue corridors is selected. In addition, at the preliminary design phase of the study, a detailed noise assessment will be undertaken for the preferred design to determine potential effects and mitigation measures.
	Shakespeare Bypass	
#41	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ East and west of Shakespeare can be possibly widened with just a small by pass around Shakespeare 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 'Traffic Operations' is one of the factors that will be considered during the evaluation of the short list of corridor alternatives. Under this factor, multiple entrances and intersections on Lorne Avenue will be considered. If one of the Lorne Avenue corridors is selected, design concepts at major intersections will be included in the generation of preliminary design alternatives. Intersection /entrance needs and design will also be addressed during preliminary design to ensure traffic flow is not unduly impacted and to provide for proper turning movements.
#53	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I have some concerns as to the placement of the eastern corridor as my business is on the main street of Shakespeare (marked with an X when passing through town) I do however understand the opportunity costs of a path through the local farmland. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If one of the Lorne Avenue corridors is selected, the need for sidewalks and bicycle lanes would be addressed during Preliminary Design. ○ The existing right-of-way width of Lorne Avenue can accommodate a 4/5 lane roadway, without impacting the landfill and with minimal potential conflicts (for the most part) with buildings along the corridor.
#69	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A bypass is the only answer for Shakespeare. High time for a new highway without the problems which exist on the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ With respect to a number of comments received from the agricultural community regarding the Lorne Avenue and Stratford South Bypass corridors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comments have been received indicating support of the Lorne Avenue corridors "because it requires the least amount of farmland for highway construction", and "farmers would rather lose 20-25 feet of frontage

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	existing Highway.	
	Stratford South Bypass	
#3, 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I like the proposal for the new bypass around Stratford. The highway proposals left in are much better than what you started with 	<p>rather than their whole farms. As indicated above, the short list of corridor alternatives will be evaluated using five factor groups, 26 factors/sub-factors, and 66 criteria.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ With respect to the comment that “much good farmland is threatened by the Lorne Avenue alternatives”, Canada Land Inventory Class 1, 2, 3 land will, as indicated above, be one of the criteria for evaluating the short list of corridor alternatives, and will be a consideration in the development of widening and new route alternatives if the Lorne Avenue corridor is selected from the short list. ▪ The concern that “the northeast / southwest orientation of the Lorne Avenue alternatives east of Stratford may cut through agricultural land at a 45-degree angle”, will be a consideration in the development of new route alternatives if the Lorne Avenue corridor is selected from the short list. ▪ With respect to the concern that “a large number of existing farms will be affected by the new flow of traffic”, relatively few farms actually front on (ie. Have entrances on) the Lorne Avenue corridor alternatives. Regardless of the corridor selected, agriculture and potential impacts, will be considered as discussed in the general response above. ▪ With respect to “vulnerability of agricultural lands to future development if a municipal road becomes a provincial highway”, Municipal Official Plans, not transportation corridor planning studies, are the mechanism by which urban sprawl associated with development is controlled. With respect to potential highway-related development, municipal Official Plans are complimented by MTO “highway access management”. It is MTO practice to discourage inappropriate highway-related development by significantly limiting new access to existing corridors which undergo significant improvement/widening, and by allowing virtually no private access to any new highway corridor. ‘<i>Report A – Study Plan</i>’ was released in July 2007, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca. In Supporting Document #2 of Report A, limitations on access to provincial highways is identified under preliminary planning, under detailed planning and under preliminary design. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response regarding new corridors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A new corridor to the south of existing Highway 7&8 is included in the corridor alternatives that were screened to be carried forward for further assessment in the study because it could make a significant contribution towards addressing the
#49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Having reviewed this (Lorne Avenue Corridor) we prefer the South by pass corridor # 1 	
#14	I suggest a by pass to #8 should extend to Avontown Rd. as it already is paved and traffic lights are at the corner. Suggest using the hydro transmission corridor for by pass to #7 and any swing from there over to road #29 to connect to #8	
#2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We propose the use of Gibb Rd. 	
#2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Long term transportation needs, this would serve the needs for many years. 	
#67	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Utilizing Lorne Avenue will provide only short-lived benefits. There are already daily occasions when Lorne Avenue is bumper-to-bumper. With southward development of Stratford, this corridor will become merely another city street rather than a bypass. A corridor with a longer useful lifespan would utilize Perth Road 29 or 26. Perth Road 26 already has significant truck traffic from Tavistock. 	
#44	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Design the road at city limits for immediate and future use, not a 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided	
	stop gap solution (at Lorne Avenue)	<p>transportation problems and opportunities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The study team is <u>not</u> investigating a trucks-only lane on either side of the railway because of the significant geometric challenges that would be associated with access and egress, and because new general-purpose lanes on a single right-of-way would provide a greater overall benefit. ○ The study team is <u>not</u> investigating a new corridor with no access between Stratford and New Hamburg, because this would restrict access and egress to Shakespeare and to key municipal arterials that a new corridor should be designed to serve. ○ Maintenance of provincial highways is undertaken according to cross-Ontario MTO standards. Accordingly, maintenance will not be considered in the evaluation of corridor alternatives. ○ Exhibit 7.2 and Supporting Document #5 of Report A indicate that one of the sub-factors for the evaluation of alternatives is traffic safety. The transition from a new corridor to the existing highway would be considered under this sub-factor. ○ 'Report A – Study Plan' was released in July 2007, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca. Supporting Document #2 identifies that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At the end of the preliminary planning phase of the study, a conceptual new corridor for a new provincial highway and/or transitway may be selected as a corridor alternative to be carried forward in the study; ▪ In the detailed planning phase of the study, if a new corridor was selected as a corridor alternative to be carried forward, specific routes will be identified; and ▪ In the preliminary design phase of the study, calculated horizontal and vertical alignment and cross-section will be developed. ▪ These will be presented at future Public Information Centres. ○ With respect to the suggestion that the new route chosen by MTO in 1975 should not be overlooked, the short list of corridor alternatives does include a new corridor alternative on the south side of the railway corridor from Stratford to west of New Hamburg. <p>The assessment and evaluation of the short list of corridor alternatives and the resulting preferred corridor will be presented at the upcoming round of PICs for public review and comment.</p>	
	Lorne Ave Corridor		
# 56	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ On behalf of Perth County Council and the residents of the County, I wish to express our appreciation for consideration of further corridor alternatives and for consideration of our residents comments and concerns at PIC #2C 		
#31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I hope the Pork Rd by pass will be seriously considered 		
#62	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We were very glad to see the addition of the Lorne Avenue corridor to the list. We think this is a good alternative which would work for the industrial businesses as well as the agricultural businesses. We hope you will really work hard on making this corridor work. 		
#78	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Advise against the Lorne Avenue/Erie Street Corridor. It runs through the city – business and residential areas and would have a short life span, as the city is growing, and there is heavy traffic there today. There are several slow points at Romeo, Downie, Erie and Queensland Road. Erie Street/Lorne Avenue is very congested today with several fast food restaurants that tie-up traffic. Heavy traffic makes it difficult to access Lorne Ave from businesses and residences. Queensland 		

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
 Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
 Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	<p>subdivision exists with a left turn from Queensland Road onto Lorne Avenue which is challenging both morning and night. The delivery vehicles for Sobeys line up on the shoulder of Lorne Avenue 2-3 at a time, waiting for access to the Sobeys loading dock. Lorne Ave is very heavy with commuters and factory traffic. Lorne Ave & O'Loan exist with a steep hill in all directions, which could prove difficult in the winter. Marsh Pond soccer field and play ground on north side at St. Vincent – many children traffic in summer, and angle parking on shoulder at side of road at game time. Expand current highway where possible, and have a Stratford bypass south to Line 29, out of the city limits. This will keep traffic disruptions to a minimum and life expectancy of route will be greater than Lorne Avenue.</p>	
#77	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The intersection at Lorne Avenue and Downie Street cannot accommodate the increase in traffic volumes that would occur if re-routed this way. The intersection also does not have any left, right or center turning lanes. When turning left off of Lorne Avenue, people sometimes pass on the right gravel shoulder. Since the traffic is backed up so much, we try to 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
 Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
 Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	<p>avoid this intersection. Expanding the road is not safe, as it would push the sidewalk closer to the power line tower. Why not instruct people to use Pork Road, off of Lorne Avenue, out to Perth Road 107 to Shakespeare.</p>	
#63	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The route using Lorne Avenue and Erie Street could possibly work, as it has worked well for the city when road work was done in the east end last year. 	
#22,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A cost – benefit analysis of this route compared to other routes would show it to be the most cost effective choice since most of the property required would already belong to the Province or municipality. 	
#12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Slowly but surely we are moving in the right direction for our community 	
#12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New and very good examples were Stratford south bypass, corridor #3, corridor #6, corridor #7 	
#8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This plan is considerably better but still needs work. 	
#7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would like to thank-you for listening to and considering Lorne Ave as a route. 	
#7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ You have the support of the City of Stratford, Perth County, Perth South and the Perth South landowners group for the use of Lorne Ave, so why not do this in this area it is what we would like 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
 Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
 Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	to see.	
#18,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This highway proposal is not needed, expand the present roadways only 	
#5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It would be better to keep the existing truck bypass (Hwy 7&8 to Delamere to Romeo to Lorne) 	
#44	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Using Lorne Ave. within the city brings the traffic immediately next to residential subdivisions. The road ¼ miles west of O'Loane Ave is ideal as it has few driveways and residences. It should be carried through to the road between concession 4 and 5 and then easterly on this road past the existing highway 	
#44	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Many businesses and some residences have access driveways onto Lorne Ave, therefore making it unacceptable for the by pass of Stratford. 	
#51	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What I do not understand is there is already an existing truck route on Line #32 so why can't you just use the existing route west of Hwy #7 to road #130 and then carry the road into Sebringville. There are already lights at the corner of Hwy # 8 and road #130 and at the railway tracks. Taking road #130 to Hwy #8 would also work for Line #29 as a by pass alternative. 	
#52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In general I agree with the plan to continue to use and expand Hwy #7 & 8 from New Hamburg through Stratford. However, I 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
 Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
 Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	<p>disagree with one of the proposals presented on April 22, 2009. The proposal to expand Lorne Ave and Pork Rd. does not appear to be the most feasible or the most practical alternative. The area along these roads already has a higher population density and significant industrial development. This alternative would require a very large number of access roads for existing businesses and homes, making it a very costly alternative. Another disadvantage would be that it would be directing a significant amount of traffic directly through the city. This will be problematic in the future as the city continues to grow. Instead I would endorse the city developing a by pass further south beyond the existing industrial section south of Lorne Ave. I believe this would be more practical for the future. This alternative would also provide good access to highway # 7 and hwy # 8, with room for future growth.</p>	
#2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ People from Sutter-Freeland and other areas walk their dogs along route – safety 	
#2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need a bike path 	
#2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase in traffic- effecting pedestrians (children) along Lorne Ave. 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
 Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
 Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
#23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I already use Lorne Ave / Pork St to hwy 59 and would use it farther east if it was paved. 	
#32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need good access to proposed highway from Perth Line #33 as this is a significant merging area 	
#34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We are most concerned with the new Lorne Ave / Erie Street corridor alternative. At this time we have not seen any plans to improve Highway 7 from Stratford to 401 or Highway 8 to Goderich. There are already 2 roads running parallel to Highway 7 and 8 into Stratford which means there are 3 roads already in existence to bring the traffic into Stratford where it would bottleneck because of the above 2 lane highways leading out of the City to the other major points. 	
#34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Add a turning lane within the city limits to line #33 and improve the intersection at Lorne and Downie Street This is where the traffic jams occur – not on the 7/8 highway. 	
#8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ West of Stratford it makes more sense for the traffic to go through to the county road & connect to Sebringville (as they do now) rather than using Perth Road 125 	
#30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Lorne Ave option is not a by pass, it runs through the city. Increased traffic on Lorne Ave even with a turning lane is too 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	<p>much. Turns made at rush hour are dangerous and additional lanes will make it worse.</p>	
#30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The number of building / houses in the Lorne Ave proposal is high and would require huge costs to compensate. There would be removal of hydro easements 	
#34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As we live on Perth Line #33 and have invested much time and money into our home and property we are most concerned with the Lorne Ave / Erie Street corridor alternative. 	
#43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Line 32 as you have it now. How would it work, that street is very busy. How would you make a 4 lane highway? Where would people park and how would it work with Sobeys 	
#44	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The use of Lorne Ave within the city transfers the existing problem from Ontario St to Lorne Ave. Lorne Ave was planned as a feeder road not a ring road. 	
#53	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The cities plan seems to ride over our new Stratford Perth museum & my home, 4285 Huron Rd, perhaps it would make more sense to extend along one of the side roads to the west. 	
#17,22,36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Using existing roads is the way to go. Upgrades and widening of these roads should handle future traffic requirements. The Lorne Ave proposal is what I favour. 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
 Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
 Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
#5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New alternative for south Bypass corridors 6&7 offer little improvement to traffic flow around Stratford because traffic movement would be bottlenecked at Lorne Ave which is already constrained by residential dwellings on both sides between Road 111 and landfill. 	
#5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Landfill site will constrain road on north side and several major intersection improvements will be required. 	
#5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Traffic will be slow and this is contrary to intent of bypass. 	
#14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Addition of Lorne Ave is best as a short term solution as it is used as an arterial road for cross city traffic. 	
#16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I really like the plan to come in to Lorne Ave via Pork St. entry through Lorne & Dunns Bridge, on to next cross road then swing north again to hwy 8 and on to the west. Makes good sense to me 	
#7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This route would take the least amount of agricultural land and would be the most acceptable route to a majority of the stake holders. 	
#6, 21, 38	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Destroying too much agricultural land & other sensitive areas 	
#5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The route unnecessarily cuts through farmland east of the City and a major rail crossing would be required. 	
#59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The new Stratford bypass 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
 Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
 Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	<p>corridors cut through farmland east of Stratford on a 45-degree angle. Options should be sought out that will minimize the impact to farmland and residents here.</p>	
#20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cutting across the farms at an angle seems to me like a crazy idea. Please give your strongest consideration to the use of existing roads. 	
#22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I think that the latest proposal to use Lorne Ave is the best solution because it requires the least amount of farmland for highway construction 	
#22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Using as many existing roads as possible will have the least damaging effect on farms and land owners. Farmers would rather lose 20 – 25 ft of frontage than their whole farms 	
#24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Much good farmland along Pork St. is also threatened. 	
# 27, 43, 48	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use existing roads when ever possible, the adjoining properties have been developed with this traffic in mind. The additional traffic on the back roads is increasing and impacts the safety of farm business. Farm land should not be impacted for convenience. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The section of the proposed corridor on Line 29 from Road 119 to Road 122 has agriculturally zoned lands on both north and south side, and industrial lands on the north 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
 Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
 Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	side. Would the study team consider these agricultural lands to be more or less vulnerable to future development if this stretch of road were to become a provincial highway?	
#66	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I would like to see existing roads used on the east side of Stratford rather than going over farmland, just as was done southwest of Stratford. 	
#59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ West of Stratford, corridor connections involving Road 125 look like they may be done with high speed curves that would have high impact on these farms. Alternatives need to be given fair examination. 	
#59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Given the desire of Stratford to remove truck traffic from the downtown and remain a destination community with respect to auto traffic, my recommendation on a bypass of Stratford is to kept small, simple and close to Stratford. 	
#59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Allow the 4-lane capacity of Ontario and Huron Street to continue to be utilized by allowing motorists and easy choice of continuing on them or using the bypass. Since this would avoid funnelling most of the traffic to the Lorne Avenue Bypass, it would function for an indefinite time. 	
#50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If Lorne Avenue is utilized and the industrial lands in south 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
 Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
 Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	Stratford is developed in 20 years, will MTO be looking for another corridor south of the City?	
#60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If Lorne Avenue is utilized, what is going to happen with the Hydro Corridor? 	
#60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If Lorne Avenue is utilized, how will the current property accesses/entrances be handled, and how many properties will lose their buildings? 	
#60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ With no land base available at the intersection of Lorne Avenue and Erie Street, how will traffic backups and flow be handled? 	
#60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If the new highway is 4 lanes up to the Stratford City limits and then reduced to two lanes, will a bottleneck be created? 	
#60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would the landfill site be utilized for the Lorne Avenue corridor alternative? 	
#60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I understand the City of Stratford Engineering Department has done no investigation into the use of Lorne Avenue for this purpose. 	
#60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ From both a short-term and long-term perspective, Lorne Avenue doesn't seem to be the best option. The corridor to the south of the City would be more appropriate. 	
#65	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I am shocked by the new Lorne Avenue corridor and the potential loss of the house my father built. Please don't ignore 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	<p>the interests of a few residents who view their property as priceless to them because of the influence of the agriculture lobby.</p>	
#30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The noise from this proposal would effect a lot more people in town 	
	New Route	
#9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I like the proposals which route traffic south of Shakespeare and Stratford 	
#33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If it was controlled access the one South of the track seems like the best option. At the other end (west), follow the hydro line as close as possible. Traffic counts should be lower. 	
#9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I like the concept of a multi-mode transportation corridor (rail, road etc..) with a 4 lane highway running parallel to the GEXR from Tania Inn area to the Forest Motel area 	
#9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I am unsure as to the best way to route traffic for Highway #8 incoming or out going. I would prefer a fairly direct route with as few turns as possible, possibly running parallel eventually to the GEZR between Stratford and Sebringville. 	
#64	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The new route chosen in the 1975 MTO study should not be overlooked. The lobbying to have this previous easement removed from land titles show a failure to recognize the best 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	<p>interests of rural agriculture instead of special interests. Unless a new permanent limited access route is chose, we are doomed to have a new expensive study every 35 to 40 years.</p>	
#70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Our home backs onto Lorne Ave. in Stratford. It appears on the diagram on the notice that the hwy would go down Lorne Ave. directly behind our home. Please make note that we are totally against that. Lorne Ave. is already busy enough, to make it a highway would make it worse. 	
#79	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider truck-only lanes, as being used in the USA. Further discussions are occurring throughout the USA on this approach. Seems like they could be quite appropriate for routing trucks around/ under Shakespeare, as they are on the plate for discussion elsewhere in Canada. Look forward to further discussions on planning for Shakespeare and area. 	
9. CONCERNS ABOUT IMPACTS TO FARMLAND AND FARM OPERATIONS		
#59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The willingness of the project managers to learn about agriculture from the grassroots industry and farm organizations is recognized and appreciated. 	<p>The screening criteria for the long list of corridor alternatives included Class 1,2,3 agricultural land as a screening criterion.</p> <p>The short list of corridor alternatives will be evaluated using five factor groups, 26 factors/sub-factors, and 66 criteria. These are presented in Exhibit 7.2 and Supporting Document #5 in 'Report A – Study Plan', which was released in July 2007, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca.</p>
#74	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposed new road that angles from 7&8 to Perth Line 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	<p>33, Lorne Avenue, east of Stratford will cut through more than 1000 acres of prime farm land. Farmers will lose access to parts of their farms. Other farms outside the affected area, will need to move machinery north and south across the corridor and will be inconvenienced. Will wide, high speed curves be placed at the corners of Perth Line 32 and Perth Road 125 and Perth Road 125 and Highway 8 – as such curves would result in considerable loss of access to farm lands and destruction of buildings.</p>	<p>Agriculture is included in the above. Supporting Document #5 of Report A further indicates that considerations for agriculture will include the potential and significance of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encroachment, severance, displacement and property acquisition; • Long-term alteration/disruption; • Change in area character/aesthetics; • Nuisance impacts; • Change to access/travel time; and • Change to facilities/utilities/services. <p>As applicable to Canada Land Inventory Classes 1, 2 and 3 soils; specialty crops/cropland/dairy/livestock operations; field crop operations; high investment agricultural operations; and established agricultural farm communities.</p> <p>In response to concerns about the criteria for evaluating agriculture, we are enhancing our approach by giving agriculture its own evaluation factor (rather than being a sub-factor under “land use resources” and by providing it with five evaluation criteria (and associated indicators), as follows:</p>
#75	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Very concerned with potential impact proposed Highway 7&8 will have on prime agricultural land southeast of Stratford. Proposed Lorne Avenue/Erie Street Corridor will dissect a number of farms southeast of Stratford as it runs north-east from Perth Line 33 through to Hwy 7&8. These farms are Class One farm land and high productive enterprises. Construction a highway through the farms will impair their ability to operate successfully. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agriculture – Canada Land Inventory Class 1, 2, 3 land <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Potential to affect specialty crop areas and/or areas of Canada Land Inventory Classes 1,2,3 land 2. Agriculture – Farm Infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Potential to affect farm infrastructure (field tile systems/outlet, irrigations systems, barns/silos/structures, etc) 3. Agriculture – Operations on Individual Farms <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Potential to sever/disrupt in-farm field operations (planting, harvesting, grazing, nutrient management, etc.) 4. Agriculture – Transportation Linkages Between Multiple Farm Operations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Potential to sever/disrupt transportation linkages between multiple-farm operations (movement between linked multiple-farm operations of equipment, materials, workers, etc.
# 57/55	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provided an article regarding ‘Canada’s Disappearing Farmland’ discussing loss of Canada’s limited agricultural land, the very small amount designated as Class 1, the 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Agriculture – Farm Gate Sales (to be considered in the detailed planning and preliminary design phases only) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Potential to sever/disrupt customer access

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	<p>alarming loss/shrinkage of this resource, and the need for legislation to protect it.</p>	<p>With respect to farm infrastructure (criterion #2 above), it should be noted that the broader issue of wells is addressed under the groundwater factor, and that the broader issue of drainage along and across transportation rights-of-way is addressed as part of “drainage and hydrology engineering” that is undertaken for the selected alternative. With respect to transportation linkages between multiple-farm operations (criterion #4 above), it should be noted that the generic issue of shipments to/from farms is covered under the broader transportation sub-factor “movement of goods; the generic issue of farm resident/worker movement to/from farms is covered under the broader transportation sub-factor “movement of people”; and that the movement of equipment, materials and workers between multiple-farm operations will occur in the context of increased overall traffic within the analysis area regardless of the alternative selected.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The section of the proposed corridor on Line 29 from Road 119 to Road 122 has agriculturally zoned lands on both north and south side, and industrial lands on the north side. Would the study team consider these agricultural lands to be more or less vulnerable to future development if this stretch of road were to become a provincial highway? 	<p>All of the above clearly indicates that the study recognizes the importance of agriculture, protection of agricultural land and potential impacts to agricultural operations, and the associated provincial policies. However, it must also be recognized that the transportation policies of the province require corridors be identified and protected to meet current and projected needs for various travel modes.</p>
#58	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned that proposed corridors cut through valuable farmland in livestock intensive areas, and that potential changes to land accessibility could impact compliance with the Nutrient Management Act. 	<p>A number of comments were received from the agricultural community regarding the Lorne Avenue and Stratford South Bypass corridors. These are addressed in the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments have been received indicating support of the Lorne Avenue corridors “because it requires the least amount of farmland for highway construction”, and “farmers would rather lose 20-25 feet of frontage rather than their whole farms. As indicated above, the short list of corridor alternatives will be evaluated using five factor groups, 26 factors/sub-factors, and 66 criteria.
#18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Whose agenda are the farmers paying for, who’s agenda is it fulfilling for we know that it is not the majority of the county folks who want this. 	
#18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Farmers and farm life should not be paying for others needs or ambitions with their livelihoods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With respect to the comment that “much good farmland is threatened by the Lorne Avenue alternatives”, Canada Land Inventory Class 1, 2, 3 land will, as indicated above, be one of the criteria for evaluating the short list of corridor alternatives, and will be a consideration in the development of widening and new route alternatives if the Lorne Avenue corridor is selected from the short list.
#8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We need local produce – can’t be sure of safety of imports 	
#8, 47	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Save the farmland and many livelihoods. Once land is paved it can never be restored 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The concern that “the northeast / southwest orientation of the Lorne Avenue alternatives east of Stratford may cut through agricultural land at a 45-degree angle”, will be a consideration in the development of new route alternatives if the Lorne Avenue corridor is selected from the short list.
#20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cutting across the farms at an angle seems to me like a crazy idea. Please give your strongest 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	consideration to the use of existing roads.	
#22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I think that the latest proposal to use Lorne Ave is the best solution because it requires the least amount of farmland for highway construction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With respect to the concern that “a large number of existing farms will be affected by the new flow of traffic”, relatively few farms actually front on (ie. Have entrances on) the Lorne Avenue corridor alternatives. Regardless of the corridor selected, agriculture and potential impacts, will be considered as discussed in the general response above. • With respect to “vulnerability of agricultural lands to future development if a municipal road becomes a provincial highway”, Municipal Official Plans, not transportation corridor planning studies, are the mechanism by which urban sprawl associated with development is controlled. With respect to potential highway-related development, municipal Official Plans are complimented by MTO “highway access management”. It is MTO practice to discourage inappropriate highway-related development by significantly limiting new access to existing corridors which undergo significant improvement/widening, and by allowing virtually no private access to any new highway corridor. ‘Report A – Study Plan’ was released in July 2007, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca. In Supporting Document #2 of Report A, limitations on access to provincial highways is identified under preliminary planning, under detailed planning and under preliminary design.
#22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Using as many existing roads as possible will have the least damaging effect on farms and land owners. Farmers would rather lose 20 – 25 ft of frontage than their whole farms 	
#24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Much good farmland along Pork St. is also threatened. 	
# 27, 43, 48	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use existing roads when ever possible, the adjoining properties have been developed with this traffic in mind. The additional traffic on the back roads is increasing and impacts the safety of farm business. Farm land should not be impacted for convenience. 	<p>With respect to the heritage aspect of some farms, the “cultural heritage – built heritage and cultural landscapes” factor includes “buildings or standing sites of heritage significance” and “cultural heritage landscapes”, which are evaluated in a similar manner.</p> <p>It should be noted that it is premature to assume farm-specific potential agricultural impacts since widening and new route alternatives have not yet been evaluated and a preferred alternative has not yet be selected.</p>
#29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The community is well served with corridors for moving cars and trucks through Canada’s bread basket. In this day, when good food produced locally is not possible in many areas why would anyone accept the dissecting of productive farms as a solution to traffic concerns 	<p>‘Report F (Part 1) – Working Paper – Environmental Conditions and Constraints’ was released in July 2007, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca. It presents mapping and a description of a wide spectrum of natural, socio-economic, and cultural environmental features and issues that were considered in the generation and screening of corridor alternatives. As is indicated in Report A, additional existing conditions information for the corridor selected will be provided in ‘Report F (Part 2) – Working Paper – Environmental Conditions and Constraints’, to support the generation and evaluation of widening and/or route alternatives. Some farms in the analysis area were visited by members of the study team by invitation during the fall of 2008. The study team may request the opportunity to visit other farms that are located within the preferred corridor following PIC #3.</p>
#32, 43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about large number of existing farms and business affected by the “new” flow of traffic. 	
#32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The new route would have a 	<p>Farm gate businesses and linked farm operations across the Highway 7&8 corridor need Highway 7&8 to function well for both long-distance and local traffic. If nothing is done to address future travel demands, the projected traffic on Highway 7&8 will have a significant impact on farm</p>

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	major impact on the ability to move farm equipment	gate businesses and the movement of farm machinery because of traffic congestion on the highway, and the associated transportation challenges such as left turns into the businesses, business areas and farm fields, and crossing the highway from one side to the other.
#41	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I hope the Pork St by pass is considered rather than cutting through farmland, Pork St already exists so why not use it 	<p>Outreach and consultation are a major component of the Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study. As indicated in Section 2.4 of 'Report A – Study Plan' which was released in July 2007, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca, the study team will “constructively address input, with all relevant evidence, opinion and perspectives considered”. The study team has clearly responded to input received by meeting with agricultural and business groups, adding corridor alternatives for consideration, scheduling additional rounds of PICs to address specific issues and concerns, holding working group meetings, and responding to written stakeholder input. The study team is therefore appreciative of the comment: “The willingness of the project managers to learn about agriculture from the grassroots industry and farm organizations is recognized and appreciated”. Members of the agricultural community who are interested in comments from other stakeholders can view a complete set of comments and responses for all subjects identified on the study web site.</p> <p>NOTE: All stakeholders who expressed concerns about impacts to farmland and farm operations have also been provided with the response to concerns about flooding, drainage and hydrology; and tile drainage of farm fields.</p>
#51	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ My family and I farm at the corner of Line #32 and road #125 in the township of Perth South. We use this side road extensively for our farming operation. We operate 700 acres in the township of Perth east just across Hwy #8. These farms are in our nutrient management plans for proper rotation in the even application of manure. Therefore we must spread our manure on these farms. 	
#45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose highway going through prime farmland. 	
#63	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ My farm is encompassed in one proposal. I have had no “survey” of my property. Why? 	
#66	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We cannot eat from asphalt. Farm families are struggling as it is without losing their land or incurring the hardship of lack of access to their land. Please improve the existing roads rather than building new ones. 	
#81	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I do not agree with a new highway which slices farms into shreds; we are losing more farmland annually to urban sprawl. Every time the land is disturbed, the change in elevation changes drainage 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
 Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
 Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	<p>issues of the fields, which may affect field productivity. As well, the roar of traffic may affect hogs on a farm. Most animals have more sensitive hearing than humans, and the noise may spook animals and they may not grow to the contract weight. Will you compensate for this loss?</p>	
#68	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The farmland of Perth County is precious and should be preserved. It is more important than factories and homes that may be torn down. 	
<p align="center">10. CONCERNS ABOUT FLOODING, DRAINAGE AND HYDROLOGY; AND SYSTEMATIC TILE DRAINAGE OF FARM FIELDS</p>		

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
 Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
 Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
#26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grave concerns about the destruction of historic family farms and waterways 	<p><i>'Report A – Study Plan'</i> was released in July 2007, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca. In Section 2.4.2, it indicates the approach to identification and mitigation of impacts. Exhibit 7-2 presents the wide spectrum of factors, sub-factors and criteria to be considered in evaluating alternatives and Supporting Document #5 provides additional details.</p> <p>Supporting Document #2 of Report A indicates the following with respect to drainage and hydrology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the detailed planning phase, the study will consider the specific location/type/character of bridges, major culverts, major channels, and major stormwater management facilities for drainage along, and across, the right-of-way; and • 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. <p>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>The engineering standards for this work are rigorous state of the art requirements of the <i>'MTO Drainage Manual'</i>, which is used as a reference by many authorities including many municipalities.</p> <p>The identification and mitigation of impacts is a legal requirement under the <i>'Class Environmental Assessment for Provincial Transportation Facilities'</i> that was approved through Order-In-Council in 1999. MTO will therefore fulfill this responsibility.</p>
11. CONCERNS ABOUT IMPACTS TO BUILT HERITAGE AND CEMETERIES		
#26, 43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grave concerns about the destruction of historic family farms and waterways 	<p>The screening criteria for the long list of corridor alternatives included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Built Heritage – minimize loss of heritage buildings; and • Cultural Heritage landscapes – minimize loss of amenities in heritage downtown areas.
#1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Historical buildings & churches can be removed instead of homes that have been around for centuries 	<p>The short list of preliminary planning alternatives will be evaluated using five factor groups, 26 factors/sub-factors, and 66 criteria. These are presented in Exhibit 7.2 and Supporting Document</p>

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
#9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I feel we need to decide what most in need of protection is: woodlots, heritage buildings, non-heritage buildings, farmland etc 	<p>#5 in 'Report A – Study Plan', which was released in July 2007, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca.</p>
#23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In addition to improvements to existing highway 7&8 corridor from Stratford to Wilmot/Easthope Rd. Lorne Ave. / Pork St. corridor should be an alternative. It would avoid Shakespeare, Fryfogel Inn and Linglebach church and cemetery. 	<p>Buildings or standing sites of heritage significance, cultural heritage landscapes, and cemeteries are included in the above under the “Cultural heritage – built heritage and cultural landscapes” factor. Supporting Document #5 of Report A further indicates that considerations for heritage buildings will include the potential and significance of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encroachment, severance, displacement and property acquisition; • Long-term alteration/disruption; • Change in area character/aesthetics; • Nuisance impacts; • Change to access/travel time; and • Change to facilities/utilities/services.
#41	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I don't think the building in Shakespeare should be disturbed 	<p>It should be noted that it is premature to assume location-specific potential cultural heritage impacts since widening and new route alternatives have not yet been evaluated and a preferred alternative has not yet been selected.</p> <p>'Report F (Part 1) – Working Paper – Environmental Conditions and Constraints' was released in July 2007, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca. It presents mapping and a description of a wide spectrum of natural, socio-economic, and cultural environmental features and issues. As is indicated in Report A, additional existing conditions information for the corridor selected will be provided in 'Report F (Part 2) – Working Paper – Environmental Conditions and Constraints', to support the generation and evaluation of widening and/or route alternatives.</p> <p>Further details on how MTO addresses cultural heritage are available in the MTO 'Environmental Standards and Practices Documents', which are available on the MTO web site at http://www.raqsb.mto.gov.on.ca/techpubs/eps.nsf/epsww?openview, and from Publications Ontario.</p>
12. CONCERNS ABOUT IMPACTS TO TERRESTRIAL AND AQUATIC ECOSYSTEMS		
#24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Once again the study area is just north of Pork St. Line 33 includes a reforested area and wetlands (south of Forest Rd.) This area needs to be avoided. 	<p>The screening criteria for the long list of corridor alternatives included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrestrial Ecosystems – minimize direct loss of Provincially Significant Wetlands, Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest, Environmentally Sensitive Areas, and core woodlots;

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
#81	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Farms part of the Upper Thames watershed have been noted for sink holes due to the little lakes not having a solid bottom; disturbing that area will definitely interrupt the watershed and ecosystem of that area. 	<p style="text-align: center;">and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fisheries and aquatic ecosystems, surface water – minimize number of stream crossings. <p>The short list of corridor alternatives will be evaluated using five factor groups, 26 factors/sub-factors, and 66 criteria. These are presented in Exhibit 7.2 and Supporting Document #5 in <i>'Report A – Study Plan'</i>, which was released in July 2007, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca.</p>
#26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grave concerns about the destruction of historic family farms and waterways 	<p>Wildlife, vegetation, fisheries and aquatic ecosystems are included in the above under the “terrestrial ecosystems” factor.</p> <p><i>'Report A – Study Plan'</i> was released in July 2007, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca. In Section 2.4.2, it indicates the approach to identification and mitigation of impacts. Exhibit 7-2 presents the wide spectrum of factors, sub-factors and criteria to be considered in evaluating alternatives and Supporting Document #5 provides additional details.</p> <p>It should be noted that it is premature to assume location-specific potential terrestrial and aquatic ecosystem impacts since widening and new route alternatives have not yet been evaluated and a preferred alternative has not yet been selected.</p> <p><i>'Report F (Part 1) – Working Paper – Environmental Conditions and Constraints'</i> was released in July 2007, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca. It presents mapping and a description of a wide spectrum of natural, socio-economic, and cultural environmental features and issues. This report is based upon secondary source information (from MNR, conservation authorities, municipalities, etc). It includes information on both the Grand River and Thames River watersheds, and the sub-watersheds for each of them that are within the analysis area.</p> <p>As is indicated in Report A, additional existing conditions information for the corridor selected will be provided in <i>'Report F (Part 2) – Working Paper – Environmental Conditions and Constraints'</i>, to support the generation and evaluation of widening and/or route alternatives. The development of this report will include field investigations as may be appropriate.</p> <p>Further details on how MTO addresses terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems are available in the MTO <i>'Environmental Standards and Practices Documents'</i>, which are available on the MTO web site at http://www.raqsb.mto.gov.on.ca/techpubs/eps.nsf/epsww?openview, and from Publications Ontario.</p>

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
13. CONCERNS ABOUT NOISE SENSITIVE AREAS		
#30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The noise from the Lorne Avenue proposal would affect a lot more people in town 	<p><i>'Report A – Study Plan'</i> was released in July 2007, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca. In Section 2.4.2, it indicates the approach to identification and mitigation of impacts. Exhibit 7-2 presents the wide spectrum of factors, sub-factors and criteria to be considered in evaluating alternatives and Supporting Document #5 provides additional details.</p> <p>Highway noise is included under the noise sensitive areas factor group. Document #5 of Report A indicates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise sensitive areas is one of the factors considered during the evaluation of the short list of corridor alternatives; • At the detailed planning stage (generation and evaluation of widening or new route alternatives for the various sections of the preferred corridor) of the study, the potential for increased traffic noise in noise sensitive areas will be considered qualitatively during the generation, assessment and evaluation of highway widening and/or new route alternatives; and • At the preliminary design phase of the study, a detailed noise assessment will be undertaken for the preferred design to determine potential effects and mitigation measures.
#69	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The noise level is already above what it should be, let alone what it will become. 	
14. CONCERNS ABOUT ACQUISITION AND PAYMENT FOR PROPERTY		
#18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If you plan on following through with this obviously ridiculous idea then farmers should be compensated far beyond market value, The choice to damage farmers livelihoods goes far beyond market value 	<p>After the preferred widening and/or new route alternatives have been identified at PIC #4, the properties potentially impacted can be identified. During the preliminary design phase of the study, the plans for the preferred alternative will be developed in more detail and the property requirements will be finalized.</p> <p>Once environmental clearance is provided and the project is committed on the Southern Highway Program, then typically property acquisition activities will commence 18 to 24 months before the scheduled construction date. Representatives of the ministry will contact impacted property owners to explain the procedures for the acquisition of the property by the ministry. This may involve a survey of the lands to be acquired, a real estate appraisal estimating the market value or compensation for the property being acquired and negotiations with the property owner to acquire the lands by amicable transfer. The proposed plans, the landowner's property rights and an offer of compensation will be presented. If the landowner does not agree with the offer of compensation, they may exercise their entitlements as detailed within the Expropriation Act. This may include the owner undertaking an appraisal and upon final agreement of the property</p>
#81	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Will farmers be compensated the \$10,500 - \$11,000 / acre for their farm that has decreased in value as a result of this highway? 	
#58	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Any property owned by me that is 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
 Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
 Public Information Centre #2C – April 22, 2009**

Stakeholder name and Address	Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	<p>taken for future development of the highway must be replaced.</p>	<p>purchase, the owner is reimbursed for reasonable legal and appraisal costs, and/or a meeting with the Board of Negotiation.</p>
#65	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Where will we go to get property like we have now, and how will we cope with the stress of moving? 	<p>This process does not include replacement of the lands acquired by MTO. Property owners may seek to purchase additional/replacement land.</p> <p>MTO recognizes the challenges associated with the property acquisition process. Consequently, MTO property agents will be available throughout the study to speak directly with property owners regarding the property acquisition process and potential property effects / remedies.</p> <p>As the study progresses and property requirements are better defined, any property owner who feels that the recommended design is causing direct hardship should contact MTO to discuss their concerns and explore potential remedies.</p>