

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3 – July 21, 22 and August 11, 2009

Note: This table summarizes the comments and concerns for all subject areas identified by stakeholders. Similar comments and concerns have not been duplicated.

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
1. COMMENTS REGARDING PIC FORMAT, PRESENTATION MATERIAL, NOTIFICATION AND COMMENT TIMELINES	
Comments Regarding PIC Format	<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>Comments on the PICs are very much appreciated and will help the study team to improve future PICs and consultation activities.</p> <p>The purpose of PICs is to gather information from interested persons and agencies and to obtain input on findings, alternatives and recommendations of a study.</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 individuals relative to the timing of their attendance; • It allows individuals to spend the time they want in reviewing the information presented; • It allows individuals to focus their questions and comments on the information/issues/items/locations that they are personally concerned about on a one-on-one basis with members of the study team; • By giving 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 interested persons equal access to members of the study team without being intimidated by the opinions and/or conflicting positions of others; and • Through the above, it encourages input from all individuals.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should have slides showing alternative routes synchronized with oral presentations 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Info session would have been better as a Power Point visual presentation to go through info step by step & explanation by MTO staff and answer questions from residents who may lose farms and livelihood. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefer public meetings 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I had to take time off work to attend a meeting 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like to have a discussion with questions and solid answers. Lots of people are upset and maybe this is why you didn't do this. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need better explanations. Prefer set times. Hold a few group info sessions. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hold a town hall forum where planners and people of the community could interact. Talk to landowners before putting anything on maps 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General discussions regarding the interpreting of images, studies, graphs and language used could have been improved 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have a meeting with a panel; include a suggestion box where people who do not want to stand up to ask a question can write it down. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appreciate having a comment sheet to express personal views on the project. It is extremely important to hear all the concerns that the Shakespeare residents have. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce paper waste 	

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3 – July 21, 22 and August 11, 2009

Note: This table summarizes the comments and concerns for all subject areas identified by stakeholders. Similar comments and concerns have not been duplicated.

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
Comments Regarding Information Presented	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MTO has had 3 previous sets of PIC's. This project is not new and has not been dropped on to the village of Shakespeare. 	<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>The study team has clearly responded to input received by meeting with agricultural and business groups and the Shakespeare Area Residents Association, adding corridor/route alternatives for consideration, refining evaluation factors/criteria, 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 held in the Fall of 2008 and the Spring of 2009, respectively, and PIC #3B to be held in July 2010 are additional PICs in response to stakeholder input, to provide more information on alternatives before their evaluation and selection.</p> <p>The information presented at PICs is intended to provide an overview/summary of the information contained in the various detailed 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.</p> <p>In the Study Process Overview Exhibit available on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca, 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> <p>Some individuals indicated that they were pleased with how the PICs were set up and how the study team responded to their questions while others indicated they found the information presented to be "confusing". Some people indicated that there were too few details and too many issues to discuss. Some stakeholders indicated that they were unhappy with the responses they received from the study team at the PICs, or</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the people had all of the answers to all of the questions of concern, that would be a little more helpful 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No clarification of where exactly the Shakespeare corridor proposal fits in the overall consultation/ decision making process. When we spoke to the representative it was not clear how the process will continue and how and when we will have input. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no budget or time line presented. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As my questions cannot be answered for certain, it is a constant stressful situation 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appreciate the chronological timeline, but information too detailed for average resident that may be directly affected by this project. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I sense some controversy within Government Departments; some wanting green (this is far from green), some encouraging businesses. Why should I trust you? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor presentation from MTO staff – did not provide details that gave any direction 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You should make your visuals correct. The yellow dotted line states it as preferred corridor. It goes behind the fire station and through my house. The MTO rep said that is incorrect. You think you would make it correct as you are talking about our lives, our homes and our children. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A lot of work has been done; evening was a good idea. Good presentation 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very informative, brought forward the main issues at hand. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portray the facts 	

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3 – July 21, 22 and August 11, 2009

Note: This table summarizes the comments and concerns for all subject areas identified by stakeholders. Similar comments and concerns have not been duplicated.

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Like any discussion, start from the beginning – objectives/assumptions 	<p>that there were contradictions in the answers. The study team appreciates these comments and will endeavour to continuously improve the quality and the clarity of information and explanations provided.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We feel that certain areas concerning watershed, air, noise, vibration loss of access to public institutions to name a few points should be resolved before moving on from the above mentioned draft. We are eager to work with the group to better understand the process and give input specific to our unique and somewhat urgent situation. 	<p>If there are specific questions you feel were not responded to, or there were specific elements of responses that need further discussion, we encourage you to make further inquiries. In addition, if you have information which you feel the study team may not be aware of, you are encouraged to provide it for consideration and follow-up.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent maps / graphics – good clarity 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The maps with alternate routes could have been handed out 	<p>A summary table of stakeholder written comments and study team responses regarding the information presented at each PIC is available on the study web site.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Smaller copies of the maps showing the alternate routes would be helpful for detailed study 	<p>One stakeholder indicated that they would like to see the “higher brass” 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>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good use of displays 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I found the boards confusing 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To correct your community facilities map exhibit 4.3 the map only shows a church, community centre and a school. It should also show there is a daycare one block south of the 7/8 highway, which will be a ½ block away if the proposed highway goes through. There is also a recreational facility 2 blocks south of the 7/8 highway 	
<p>Comments Regarding Project Team Staffing at PIC and Responsiveness</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pick 7 level headed people to discuss the format- facts and let them be your ambassadors. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have higher brass there 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chaos in trying to find someone 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More representatives to answer questions 1 on 1 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A member of the study team was very helpful in answering all of our questions even if they weren’t the answers we wanted. Maybe you could clone her and have all people 	

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3 – July 21, 22 and August 11, 2009

Note: This table summarizes the comments and concerns for all subject areas identified by stakeholders. Similar comments and concerns have not been duplicated.

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
hear the answers she gave.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I spoke with a very informative and courteous lady who answered my questions 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I appreciate a member of the study team listening to how negatively the highway coming through Shakespeare would impact my life and those around me. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2004, MTO replaced the culverts in front of our farm. To improve public safety, I inquired about installing a 6" manure transfer pipe in the open trench, and I offered to cover the full cost of the project, during the culvert replacement project. I was never further consulted. 	
Comments Regarding Notification / Comment Timelines	<p>Contact to the general public is made through newspaper notices. Additionally, notices of consultation events are sent directly to individuals who request that they be placed on the study contact/ mailing list.</p> <p>Newspaper notices announcing Study Commencement, PIC #1, PIC#2, PIC#2B, PIC#2C, PIC#3 and the upcoming PIC #3B were/will be posted in local newspapers as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> each round of public notices included newspaper advertisements on 2 separate days (one week-day and one weekend-day if possible), where project scheduling/timing and newspaper circulation timing jointly permitted; these public notices were placed in the following newspapers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Hamburg Independent; Tekawennake Gazette (New Credit Reporter); Turtle Island News (Six Nations); Tavistock Gazette; Kitchener-Waterloo Record; Stratford Beacon Herald; Stratford Citizen (formerly Inside Stratford/Perth) <p>In response to public comments, notices for the Shakespeare Community Workshops</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notice of meeting not good enough; all Shakespeare should get in mail. Little attempt to reach out to stakeholders in Shakespeare 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Send out invites to locals. With everyone involved, you'd be hard pressed to get democratic support for any of the alternatives. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is one to get involved / form an opinion, when buffeted by simplified yet meaningless letters? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where did the study originate and why was the public not included to participate? I personally was not involved. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No one at tonight's PIC who has previously provided input at other PICs should be able to input the same comments The agricultural groups have had their say 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have formed a residents group. All members of this group will be directly affected by this project, therefore we feel we need to have some consultation and input. We feel that there wasn't enough effort to reach out to such an important group, as relates to this project. As stakeholders with the most to lose we feel that this measure is justified. 	

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3 – July 21, 22 and August 11, 2009

Note: This table summarizes the comments and concerns for all subject areas identified by stakeholders. Similar comments and concerns have not been duplicated.

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders were not given adequate time to respond to study. I would like a 6 month extension to the Sept 30th 2009 deadline. 	<p>held in March 2010 were distributed to all residential and business properties within the Shakespeare area as well as to all individuals on the study mailing list. A similar notification process was used for the New Hamburg Community Workshops held in March 2009 and the additional PIC (PIC #2C) for the Stratford Area which was held in April 2009.</p> <p>After the preferred widening and/or new route and/or combination alternatives have been identified, at PIC #4, the properties potentially impacted can be identified, and the owners approached directly regarding their interests and concerns.</p> <p>A number of people requested additional time to provide comments on the information presented at PIC #3. As a result, the submission date for comments was extended from September 30, 2009 to October 31, 2009. The response period is a guideline to help the study team maintain the study schedule. However, comments are welcome at any time throughout the study process.</p>
<p>Requests for Information to be Sent</p>	<p>Requested information was provided.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please send me all copies of homes and businesses that will be affected 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please send a map of the Forest Road area? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To carefully comment I need to have a copy of the evaluation table 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please send me two copies of the 4 maps showing intersection interactivity at highways 8/125 as well as 125/32 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please send a list of the routes so we can make an informed decision 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could I please get an overview picture of the “through Shakespeare” plans like the ones I’ve seen here today? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide me a copy of report E. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To assist me in commenting please send me the evaluation table for section 3 (Shakespeare), well before Sept 30th 	

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3 – July 21, 22 and August 11, 2009

Note: This table summarizes the comments and concerns for all subject areas identified by stakeholders. Similar comments and concerns have not been duplicated.

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • deadline. • Please provide me a copy of the study done by Paul Dilse in 1981 entitled Man-Made Heritage in the Environment: Preliminary report. This report should be made available for us to review. • How can I access the 47 pg report collated by concerned area farmers to be better informed? 	
2. COMMENTS REGARDING PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES / NEED AND JUSTIFICATION / AREA TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM ALTERNATIVES / CORRIDOR ALTERNATIVES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MTO should be renamed Ministry of Car Drivers – when does this end? • Traffic projections are out of date / how are forecasts determined / traffic numbers and forecasts are not accurate • Given economic conditions generally and plant closures in Stratford specifically – does need still exist? • Use existing highway with minimal impacts – with increasing gas price, less mining, etc traffic won't increase as projected • A truck route is not needed • Cultural should be changing to reduce car use • Highway will not allow people to see the culture of the area – they'll just fly through/by • Never seen the route congested <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Old Stratford congested as would be expected of a main road through town but otherwise traffic doesn't warrant 5 lane road • It's okay the way it is (existing system) • Upgrading, not widening of roads through Shakespeare is preferred • Always thought a 4 lane highway was necessary for 	<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. <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</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3 – July 21, 22 and August 11, 2009

Note: This table summarizes the comments and concerns for all subject areas identified by stakeholders. Similar comments and concerns have not been duplicated.

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
development in Stratford	<p>provides a more detailed summary of transportation problems and opportunities in Exhibits 6.1 and 6.2 respectively.</p> <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 in the area road network which includes provincial and municipal roadways (i.e. 4 lanes on a single provincial highway 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. Accordingly, the study is investigating 4-lane alternatives on a single facility from New Hamburg to Stratford. 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> <p>Several stakeholders 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> <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;
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A route should be expanded to 4 lanes but not through Shakespeare 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 lanes through Shakespeare would be enough – Georgetown works this way and has more traffic 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roads need improvement already for safety issues (especially in winter) – focus on those areas first <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Between 101 and Stratford ○ Between CN bridge and Shakespeare ○ Between Shakespeare and Highway 7 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look at alternatives e.g. rail service; mass transit; more freight on trains not trucks 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solution is short sighted with no public transit considerations 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety concerns regarding access to driveways if road is widened 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why should Shakespeare lose homes and businesses so Stratford can see the benefits of people getting there faster? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A limited access highway is imperative 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What alternatives to Highway 7/8 were considered? Any? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best to do nothing 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement passing lanes only using MTO owned lands 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminate / bypass 4 traffic lights between New Hamburg and Stratford 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a tourist town – use Alternative 3B for trucks and only a centre left turn lane through town 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider 3 corridors using existing roads <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1 north of Shakespeare using Vivian Street ○ 1 south of Shakespeare through Punkey Doodles corner to Conc. 4/5 	

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3 – July 21, 22 and August 11, 2009

Note: This table summarizes the comments and concerns for all subject areas identified by stakeholders. Similar comments and concerns have not been duplicated.

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1 though Shakespeare with minimal widening ● Make sections of 7/8 one way and provide other way through a bypass route around Shakespeare ● If this must happen put the road in a tunnel under Shakespeare 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Use instead: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ an alternative south of railway tracks from New Hamburg to Stratford ○ Gibb Road / Perth Line 29 – fewer impacts, fewer accesses to consider, compliments Stratford improvements to Wright Boulevard ○ Pork Road / Perth Line 33 – fewer impacts (especially to businesses, homes and heritage buildings), will allow for future expansion (7/8 won't); plans to upgrade it are already in place – once that's done expansion of 7/8 will be redundant ○ Extension of Line 33 east from Stratford to Punky Doodle's Corner should be explored with service roads to control access points. It is preferred over widening highway through Shakespeare. We will not have to remove a train bridge, go over railway lines, relocate homes, impact farmland, destroy a historical village, a way of life and the Fryfogel Inn 	<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> <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 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 plan for improved 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> <p>At PICs #2, #2B and #2C, held in June 2008, November / December 2008 and April 2009 respectively, MTO presented a wide range of area transportation system alternatives; the two "combination" area system alternatives selected to be carried forward; an initial and revised "long list" of corridor alternatives; the screening of this long list, which resulted in an initial and expanded "short list" of corridor alternatives; and the process and criteria to be used to evaluate this short list. The revision and expansion to these lists were made in response to input received from stakeholders. All of this can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca, and is summarized below.</p> <p>A wide range of area transportation system alternatives were evaluated as follows:</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3 – July 21, 22 and August 11, 2009

Note: This table summarizes the comments and concerns for all subject areas identified by stakeholders. Similar comments and concerns have not been duplicated.

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • transportation demand management (TDM) such as ridesharing and telecommuting (working from home); • transportation system management (TSM) such as intersection improvements and access management; • improved/new freight rail service; • improved/new inter-regional transit and passenger rail service; • improved/new municipal roads; • new provincial transitway; and • improved / new provincial highway. <p>While many of the Area Transportation System alternatives can contribute positively to the identified problems and opportunities in the Analysis Area, most are limited in their effectiveness when considered individually. As a result, and in recognition that transportation system solutions require comprehensive, multimodal strategies for long term effectiveness and sustainability, the individual alternatives were grouped into logical Combination Alternatives for further detailed assessment. On the basis of the assessment results, the following two combination area transportation system alternatives were selected to be carried forward in the study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TDM/inter-regional transit plus widening of Highway 7&8; and • TDM/inter-regional transit plus local bypasses or a new corridor. <p>Further details about the generation, assessment and evaluation of Area Transportation System alternatives can be found in <i>'Report D – Area Transportation System Alternatives'</i>.</p> <p>During the 'Transportation Planning' phase of the study, the existing road network in the broader study area was assessed to determine travel patterns, the functional use of the area road network, and current and forecasted capacity deficiencies. The study then tested various network improvement alternatives, including the use of municipal roads to determine if local road improvements would address the identified problems and opportunities. Perth Road 33 (Pork Road) was identified, assessed and evaluated</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3 – July 21, 22 and August 11, 2009

Note: This table summarizes the comments and concerns for all subject areas identified by stakeholders. Similar comments and concerns have not been duplicated.

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	<p>as an alternative (see <i>'Report D – Area Transportation System Alternatives'</i>, Section 4.3 – Combination Alternative #3A) as were other municipal roads such as Vivian Street. Combination Alternative #3A included the widening of Perth Road 33 from two to four lanes between Stratford and Waterloo Road 1.</p> <p>The Perth Line 33 (Pork Road) alternative was compared to a number of other alternatives as detailed in Report D. The alternative comparisons were technical assessments to determine their ability to address the identified transportation problems and opportunities, with the most effective alternatives carried forward for further review during the 'Preliminary Planning' phase of the study.</p> <p>The detailed analysis, utilizing origin destination travel survey information and 103 travel zones developed and refined specifically for the study area, determined that a widened Perth Line 33 would not attract sufficient traffic from the existing Highway 7&8 corridor, leaving Highway 7&8 congested. Alternatives that do not address the identified transportation problems and opportunities are not carried forward as they will have environmental impacts without providing significant benefits. Therefore, since the Perth Line 33 alternative does not address the forecasted capacity deficiency in the Highway 7&8 corridor, it was not carried forward for further review and hence was not included in the long list of corridor alternatives.</p> <p>Based on feedback received from stakeholders and the public during the 'Preliminary Planning' phase of the study, the feasibility of the Perth Road 33 alternative to address the identified problems and opportunities was again assessed. The decision to not carry Perth Line 33 forward for further review was reconfirmed. The rationale for why Perth Line 33 is no longer being considered as an alternative is summarized below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perth Line 33 as a “second of two Highway 7&8s” with the new highway carrying truck traffic around Shakespeare and the current highway carrying car traffic through Shakespeare is not being carried forward because two 2-lane bi-directional highways do not address the problems and opportunities that the study

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3 – July 21, 22 and August 11, 2009

Note: This table summarizes the comments and concerns for all subject areas identified by stakeholders. Similar comments and concerns have not been duplicated.

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	<p>set out to resolve (e.g. improved passing opportunities are still not provided; the 2-lane deficiency in the overall provincial/municipal transportation system is not addressed, etc.).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perth Line 33 as a “second of two Highway 7&8s” with one carrying eastbound traffic and the other carrying westbound traffic is not being carried forward because (as noted above) two 2-lane highways do not address the problems and opportunities that the study set out to resolve, plus a new set of problems associated with one-way roadways is introduced (e.g. a considerable detour required for some short local trips). • The signing of Perth Line 33 as a municipal road bypass instead of widening Highway 7&8 is not being carried forward because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Capacity and safety concerns associated with the existing 2-lane highway (as noted above) would not be addressed for the 2031 planning horizon; ○ Perth Line 33 is not constructed to stand the wear and tear; ○ It is not appropriate to direct inter-regional traffic from a provincial highway to a local municipal road, and thereby change the role and function of that municipal road without converting/uploading it to become a provincial highway. • The conversion of Perth Line 33 from a municipal road to a 4/5-lane provincial roadway (i.e. “new” Highway 7&8), with the corresponding conversion of the current highway to a municipal road, is not being carried forward because it was <u>not preferred through a process of comparative evaluation</u>, for a number of reasons including but not restricted to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Perth Line 33 right-of-way (ROW) cannot accommodate 4/5-lanes without acquiring lands from adjacent property owners for its full length to accommodate widening; while the Hwy 7&8 ROW from Shakespeare westerly can accommodate widening to 4/5 lanes within the lands already acquired for this purpose.

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3 – July 21, 22 and August 11, 2009

Note: This table summarizes the comments and concerns for all subject areas identified by stakeholders. Similar comments and concerns have not been duplicated.

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The property fabric (building setbacks, multiple private entrances, etc) on Perth Line 33 is not established to accommodate a highway, while much of the property fabric along Highway 7&8 was established fully recognizing the presence of the highway. ○ The <u>change</u> in impacts to adjacent properties (noise, air quality, access, etc) is collectively less for widening a roadway that is already used as a provincial highway, than it is for widening a municipal road so that it can become a provincial highway. ○ The potential is high for businesses that rely on highway exposure to suffer negative impacts if the current roadway were to no longer be a provincial highway. A number of Shakespeare businesses have indicated that the viability of their businesses is dependent upon proximity and exposure to highway traffic, and if Perth Line 33 were to become the new Highway 7&8, Shakespeare would be too far away from highway traffic flow to attract their customers. A northern or southern by-pass in close proximity to Shakespeare has the potential to lessen potential business impacts due to increased visibility of the community. The popular opinions of residents are well documented; however the preferred alternative will be determined through the detailed technical assessments and environmental evaluations using a broad range of criteria. The study team is also receiving input from the Shakespeare business community on business needs, potential impacts associated with the range of alignment alternatives and potential mitigation measures. <p>Pork Road will not be further reviewed as a potential alternative for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the original technical findings have been verified with respect to the generation, assessment and evaluation of area transportation system and corridor alternatives; ● the additional consideration of Pork Road in response to input received, as documented above strengthens the original technical findings;

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3 – July 21, 22 and August 11, 2009

Note: This table summarizes the comments and concerns for all subject areas identified by stakeholders. Similar comments and concerns have not been duplicated.

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • based on the above, the Pork Road alternative could not successfully be demonstrated to meet EA requirements with respect to addressing study problems and opportunities; and • it is therefore time to finalize decisions that are the basis for moving forward with the next phase of the study, since many stakeholders want the study team to present recommendations for a preferred route. <p>Detailed responses to issues and concerns raised through prior consultation events (e.g. PIC #2B and PIC #2C) can be found on the study website at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca.</p>
3. COMMENTS REGARDING EVALUATION PROCESS / RESULTS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed comments provided on specific evaluation criteria results / ratings 	<p>The assessment and evaluation of corridor alternatives used a “reasoned” approach in which there was no weighting of the evaluation criteria against one another. This results in all evaluation criteria having the same weight.</p> <p>Quantification of potential effects is not a meaningful measure of impacts and the significance of these impacts at the corridor evaluation stage since it may be possible to avoid or minimize effects to many significant features within any given corridor through the generation of highway widening or new route alternatives during the next phase of the study. Quantification of potential effects will be done, where appropriate, during the detailed planning and preliminary design phases of the study.</p> <p>Specific concerns were raised regarding the evaluation results for the Shakespeare section of the Preferred Corridor (i.e. Section 3 evaluation results). In response to stakeholder input, the study team is conducting a more detailed review of route alternatives in the Shakespeare area, with the preferred alignment for Highway 7&8 through the Shakespeare area selected on the basis of the assessment and evaluation of route alternatives using the refined list of assessment and evaluation criteria for route selection.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are weightings / assumptions established 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social impact would be high if not included with land use and development considerations 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Times are crazy when fish and woodlots are why officials decide to destroy a village” 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation results are inaccurate / false: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Moderate impacts to urban areas in Shakespeare should be ranked as extremely high not moderate ○ How can cultural area be ranked most preferred through Shakespeare – what’s in the fields Alternatives 3E will impact? ○ Natives were on the north side of Shakespeare not the south – fix your work ○ Shakespeare option was not in the 1973 studies ○ Study is slanted to 3A without reason – fish and noise considerations in an agricultural field? ○ The process is not political and should be based on 	

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3 – July 21, 22 and August 11, 2009

Note: This table summarizes the comments and concerns for all subject areas identified by stakeholders. Similar comments and concerns have not been duplicated.

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<p>facts – the input from agricultural groups shouldn't influence decision to ruin Shakespeare</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The protection of agriculture lands should be the number one priority in route selection. 	<p>The assessment and evaluation of widening / route alternatives will be based on over 60 criteria from four major factor areas, specifically the natural environment, land use / socio-economic environment, cultural environment and transportation factors (see Exhibit 3.2 in <i>Report G – Generation of Detailed Planning Alternatives for Provincial Roadways</i>; note: an updated version of this table which incorporates the stakeholder input received through the PIC #3B consultation process and the follow-up Shakespeare Community Workshops will be presented at PIC #3B). No one criterion will be paramount.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to develop and apply an accurate inventory strategy to adequately define the impact on farm businesses along the corridor to be used in the evaluation and selection of the preferred route 	<p>Revisions and additions to the evaluation criteria have been made by the study team in response to stakeholder input. The revisions to the evaluation criteria and indicators include new / modified criteria and indicators for following sub-factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use / community • Noise sensitive areas • Agriculture • Air quality • Safety • Mobility and accessibility <p>Two evaluation approaches will be used to assist in the selection of preferred widening / route alternatives. A Reasoned Argument (or Trade-off) method will be the primary tool used to identify a preferred alternative. An Arithmetic (weighting-scoring) method will be the secondary tool and will be compared to the results of the trade-off method.</p> <p>The Reasoned Argument (trade-off) evaluation component will provide a clear presentation to stakeholders of the key trade-offs between the various evaluation factors and the reasons why one alternative is preferred over another.</p> <p>The Arithmetic evaluation provides a means to compare the alternative methods based on a numerical scaling with weights assigned by MTO and other stakeholders as determined through the EA Study consultation. A numerical approach is a good sensitivity analysis tool to determine if the conclusions of the reasoned argument</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3 – July 21, 22 and August 11, 2009

Note: This table summarizes the comments and concerns for all subject areas identified by stakeholders. Similar comments and concerns have not been duplicated.

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	<p>approach are valid and appropriate.</p> <p>It should be noted that weighting scenarios may vary for different sections of the study area. In addition, numerous sensitivity tests can be run to reflect different input on weighting received from stakeholders (note: interested persons will be invited to provide input on the weighting of evaluation factors, sub-factors, criteria and indicators through the PIC #3B consultation process). Such input will provide the Study Team with an understanding of community values with respect to the relative importance of each environmental feature.</p> <p>The study team will continue to liaise with interested persons to ensure accurate information is available to undertake the assessment and evaluation of the route alternatives and to support preliminary design activities.</p>
4. COMMENTS REGARDING PREFERRED CORRIDOR / ROUTE ALTERNATIVES	
Opposition / Disagreement with Preferred Corridor	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appalled that someone has proposed this as a realistic option; MTO and AECOM should be ashamed of proposal – take off engineering hats and think of this plan from a human perspective. • Disagree with the preferred alternative because of rail bridges or at-grade crossings at: Road 110, Monteith Ave & west of Stratford, new rail bridge at east end of route, new bridge at Avon River/ O’Loane Ave; very expensive route • Routing around Shakespeare would make more sense; corridor should bypass Shakespeare • This is not common sense and does not take public safety into consideration • During the 1950’s the USA developed the Interstate Highway system that crisscrossed the country with limited access roads providing the stimulus for vastly expanding commerce and safer travel. This was not an easy or 	<p>There are different opinions regarding the preferred corridor. Some individuals are supportive of the preferred corridor while others are not. Comments and concerns were submitted regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General opposition / disagreement with the preferred corridor • General support / agreement with the preferred corridor • Specific sections of the preferred corridor as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ West of Erie Street Section ○ Lorne Avenue Section ○ Stratford to Shakespeare Section ○ Shakespeare Section ○ Shakespeare to New Hamburg Section ○ New Hamburg Section <p>The following responses are provided in response to the comments received.</p> <p>With respect to all sections of the study corridor, opportunities to minimize impacts on</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3 – July 21, 22 and August 11, 2009

Note: This table summarizes the comments and concerns for all subject areas identified by stakeholders. Similar comments and concerns have not been duplicated.

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
popular process and disturbed many land owners but has proven to be for the public good and very wise planning. As well as polling public opinion and evaluating route popularity your group must provide some vision.	the natural, land use / socio-economic and cultural environments were considered during the corridor generation and route generation phases of the study. Opportunities to further reduce / mitigate impacts on the environment will be explored through subsequent design phases.
Support / Agreement with Preferred Corridor	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall the plan is coming together nicely with 'responsiveness' on the part of MTO and the consultant regarding our community needs / impacts. A lot of progress over the past year. Hope Shakespeare can rise to the challenge. 	In response to the input received regarding the proposed corridor west of Erie Street, the study team will be considering other potential route options within this section of the preferred corridor.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> You are doing a great job. Good choice of corridor; tries to relocate property owners. Improve downtown with as little damage as possible (some beautification). Good choice in using existing land between Stratford and Shakespeare. 	In response to the comments received through the PIC #3 consultation process, the study team is conducting a more detailed review of route alternatives in the Shakespeare area. Community workshops were held in March 2010 to support the development of a broader range of Shakespeare-area highway route alternatives and refined criteria for their evaluation.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current preferred route makes the most sense at a number of levels: destroys less farmland, creates less of a boundary between existing watersheds and habitats, keeps traffic directed through Shakespeare which will facilitate business and economic growth and would require less infrastructure development than an entirely new corridor. 	The input received at the workshops is being used to develop a broader range of Shakespeare-area highway route alternatives and refined criteria for their evaluation. This information will be presented for review and comment at an additional Public Information Centre (PIC #3B) to be held in Shakespeare in the Summer of 2010. Three groups of highway route alternatives are being considered to meet Highway 7&8 traffic capacity and safety needs in the Shakespeare area:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This 7&8 Corridor should be pursued. 	
West of Erie Street Section Comments / Concerns:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about movement of farm equipment across / along highway 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about impacts to agricultural lands 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When the route is extended via Lorne Ave. West how will the area known as Dunn's Bridge be addressed? There is a huge gully in this route which I am sure the truckers will not appreciate. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connecting the route to Lorne Avenue intersects Erie St/ Hwy 7 and sets up the future extension of Highway 8 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> highway bypass route alternatives north of the existing Highway 7&8 corridor that connect back to Highway 7&8 west and east of the hamlet; highway bypass route alternatives south of the existing Highway 7&8 corridor that connect back to Highway 7&8 west and east of the hamlet; and highway route alternatives that involve highway widening within the existing and/or expanded Highway 7&8 corridor (that is, making use of the existing corridor).
	Comments and concerns raised with respect to the preferred corridor / route

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3 – July 21, 22 and August 11, 2009

Note: This table summarizes the comments and concerns for all subject areas identified by stakeholders. Similar comments and concerns have not been duplicated.

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<p>around Sebringville another small town that would be devastated by the eventual expansion of Hwy 8.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section needs to be identified as an Area of Special Interest and further work needs to be completed to address these issues <u>before</u> MTO proceeds with the selection of a preferred corridor and route in this part of the study area. 	<p>alternatives will be addressed through the assessment and evaluation of widening / route alternatives which will be undertaken following PIC #3B, after further stakeholder input has been considered. Additionally, comments and concerns will be further addressed through subsequent design phases once a preferred widening / route alternative has been selected (e.g. intersection / entrance locations / treatments, pedestrian features, etc.).</p> <p>The assessment and evaluation of widening / route alternatives will be based on over 60 criteria from four major factor areas, specifically the natural environment, land use / socio-economic environment, cultural environment and transportation factors (see Exhibit 3.2 in <i>Report G – Generation of Detailed Planning Alternatives for Provincial Roadways</i>; note: an updated version of this table which incorporates the stakeholder input received through the PIC #3B consultation process and the follow-up Shakespeare Community Workshops will be presented at PIC #3B). The assessment and evaluation results and the preferred widening / route alternative for the entire study corridor will be presented at PIC #4 in late Fall 2010 for public review and comment.</p> <p>Intersection requirements / treatments and entrance locations / treatments will be defined during the preliminary design phase of the study which will be initiated after PIC #4.</p> <p>Detailed responses to issues and concerns raised through prior consultation events (e.g. PIC #2B and PIC #2C) can be found on the study website at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca.</p> <p>Further details on how MTO addresses the natural, land-use / socio-economic and cultural environment are available in the MTO 'Environmental Standards and Practices Documents', which are available on the MTO web site at http://www.raqsbt.mto.gov.on.ca/techpubs/eps.nsf/epsnw?openview, and from Publications Ontario.</p>
Lorne Avenue Section Comments / Concerns:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Road is already congested and would be better served by widening 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Road is already congested and is not a good choice as problems will be exacerbated 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will result in impacts to many homes and bring the highway too close to peoples' front doors 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about noise 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about pedestrians and cyclists accommodation / safety 	
Stratford to Shakespeare Section Comments / Concerns:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about movement of farm equipment across / along highway 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about impacts to agricultural lands 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about Impacts to residential and heritage homes 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific feedback provided on route alternatives 	
Shakespeare Section Comments / Concerns:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about pedestrian safety, especially with regards to children and access to school buses / surrounding area 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about bus service – will it stop on highway? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about speeding through Shakespeare 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about noise, vibration and air quality 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about snow removal – will be too close to homes/businesses making access/visibility worse 	

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3 – July 21, 22 and August 11, 2009

Note: This table summarizes the comments and concerns for all subject areas identified by stakeholders. Similar comments and concerns have not been duplicated.

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed to corridor choice <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is shocking ○ Is a poor solution ○ Is not right ○ Makes no sense ○ Is ridiculous ○ Won't address problem ○ Is short sighted ○ Is in opposition to 'values' of Shakespeare community ○ Will demolish / destroy / gut / kill / ruin / divide community ○ Will result in decreased quality of life, take away charm, small town atmosphere and sense of community 	<p>See response on Pages 15 to 17</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas identified for widening potentially contaminated 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about contamination of groundwater and impact on wells 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about emergency response times 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about impacts to servicing recently approved (e.g. watermain) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Streetscaping and parking improvements presented were 'smoke and mirrors'; why assume we want this 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Snowmobile crossing will be made more difficult 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about property impacts with respect to proximity of road, loss of driveway/access/parking for customers, will MTO relocate/rebuild my home elsewhere (on same property or another), loss of gardens 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tourism concerns with regard to business/commercial area displacement, tourist centre just finished at edge of Shakespeare – what will happen to it, loss of historical aspects/buildings, loss of character 	

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3 – July 21, 22 and August 11, 2009

Note: This table summarizes the comments and concerns for all subject areas identified by stakeholders. Similar comments and concerns have not been duplicated.

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about business area deterioration • Concerned about impacts to cultural heritage features; area just branded as the antique capital 	See response on Pages 15 to 17
Shakespeare to New Hamburg Section Comments / Concerns:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very concerned about moving Fryfogel Inn; gateway of Canada Company Huron Tract. One of the few Inns on its original site in all of Ontario, and probably Canada. The landscape is part of the site; the Tavern Brook – should be no changes to site either; gravesites on property as well. Eventually Fryfogel Inn will be an important historic destination for tourists; it is important that it not be moved. Protect Fryfogel tavern 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Fryfogel Inn should be moved to the back end of the property and improved. The inn has great historical value but relocating and making structural and cosmetic improvements would not only enhance the building and the property but would entice more tourists and locals to visit (increase safety, provide wheelchair access) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about potential impacts to Lingelbach Cemetery 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cost of expanding or replacing the railroad bridge west of New Hamburg is very high 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Your study states that there is no snowmobile trails identified. Attached is a map of the OFSA trails that cross the 7/8 highway. A trail crosses the highway near road 104, another trail that enters Shakespeare just before road 107, and another trail that crosses the highway just west of Shakespeare. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about movement of farm equipment across / along highway 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about property impacts and quality of life 	

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3 – July 21, 22 and August 11, 2009

Note: This table summarizes the comments and concerns for all subject areas identified by stakeholders. Similar comments and concerns have not been duplicated.

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
New Hamburg Section Comments / Concerns:	See response on Pages 15 to 17
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive of proposed corridor 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain walking trail at Peel Street and access to Fair Grounds 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From Nafziger Rd to Wilmot-Easthope does not need a median; just lowered speed limit. Intersections should remain as is 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is imperative that the intersection of Hwy 7&8 and Walker Road not be closed – for easy and quick access to highway heading west 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Hamburg needs to have access on both sides of the town to the highway to maintain town as a whole 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestions provided on intersection / interchange designs / locations 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about movement of farm equipment across / along highway • Concerned about increased noise impacts 	
5. COMMENTS REGARDING HIGHWAY CROSS SECTION AND HIGHWAY ACCESS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will accesses / farm lanes be considered. • How will agricultural vehicles cross / travel the highway? • How will children cross the highway for access to school buses? • How will school buses be safely able to stop? 	The design of the Highway 7&8 corridor will be based on current design standards and practices, taking into consideration the mixed use traffic utilizing the corridor and crossing the corridor.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the speed limit going to be? Regardless, more lanes will mean people drive faster than necessary. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This stretch of highway has claimed over 15 lives since 2000 and I am sure over 90% have been the result of human error. How will a corridor expansion be safer to residents of Shakespeare and area? Will this road solve the problem of human error? MTO should look at having vehicles made to travel no faster than the speed limit, not 	<p>A 4/5-lane facility will provide safer passing opportunities as vehicles are not required to enter the opposing lane of travel to pass a vehicle. The addition of a centre left turn lane separates the left turning traffic and the through traffic by providing a refuge for left turning vehicles.</p> <p>During the preliminary design phase of the study, the proposed treatment for each crossing road will be determined in consultation with regional and municipal staff and emergency service personnel. The proposed treatment for each crossing road will take into consideration the movement of agricultural equipment and emergency service</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3 – July 21, 22 and August 11, 2009

Note: This table summarizes the comments and concerns for all subject areas identified by stakeholders. Similar comments and concerns have not been duplicated.

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<p>200km plus.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What consideration has there been of snowmobiles crossing the highway? • How will this affect emergency service response? • Special attention should be paid to turning lanes at grade intersections and to wider and gentler shoulder designs, regardless of whether these features are incorporated as 'access management strategies' for a future four-lane highway or even if the road remains two lanes but is eventually improved or repaved. 	<p>requirements as well as traffic demands, safety and mobility.</p> <p>In addition, other design elements such as intersection requirements, the roadway cross section including the shoulder design / treatment, entrance locations / treatments, pedestrian features and school bus requirements will be defined.</p> <p>None of the alternatives being considered for this corridor include plans to increase the existing speed limits.</p>
6. COMMENTS REGARDING DRAINAGE	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When route selection is complete, but certainly before the Class EA study is finalized, all landowners along the route are systematically contacted by the study team and all drains, both public and private, along the route are clearly identified for future engineering input. • Site specific information provided regarding farm tile drainage 	<p>During the detailed planning (route) 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. This information will be presented at PIC #4. During the preliminary design phase, the study will consider drainage and hydrology engineering relative to channels, ditches, storm sewers and outlets/outfalls for drainage of the roadway; stormwater management facilities; and hydraulics of bridges culverts and water crossing inlets/outlets. This will include key elements to ensure feasibility of integration with existing drainage systems and account for the quality and quantity of stormwater runoff.</p> <p>During the preliminary design phase, the study team will systematically contact all relevant landowners along the preferred route to identify both public and private drains to support design work in subsequent design phases.</p> <p>MTO recognizes the importance of agricultural tile drainage. The issue of potential impacts and associated mitigation to/for agricultural tile drainage in specific farm fields will be addressed during detail design, which would be part of subsequent MTO studies.</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3 – July 21, 22 and August 11, 2009

Note: This table summarizes the comments and concerns for all subject areas identified by stakeholders. Similar comments and concerns have not been duplicated.

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
7. COMMENTS REGARDING BUILT HERITAGE	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve as many old buildings as possible. • A lot of homes are 50-100 years old and will end up close to the highway; what about structural damage? How will these homes be maintained with the amount of new traffic that the highway will bring? • Some of the buildings on the chopping block are historically significant. • Why would anyone want to destroy our history by taking down our historical buildings? 	<p>The environmental assessment process provides for consideration of impacts to cultural features including buildings during the evaluation of alternatives by way of the major factor area “Cultural Environmental Factors”.</p> <p>Considerations 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><i>‘Report F (Part 2) – Working Paper – Environmental Conditions and Constraints’</i> was released in July 2009, 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 which will be used for the evaluation of widening and/or route alternatives.</p> <p>Further details on how MTO addresses cultural heritage 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/epsnw?openview, and from Publications Ontario.</p>
8. COMMENTS REGARDING PROPERTY IMPACTS / PROPERTY ACQUISITION PROCESS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern Regarding Impact to Property Values, and Interference with Sale of Property Before Property Purchase • Once the corridor has been picked it may not happen for 5-20 years, how will home owners be compensated for not being able to sell their houses in the mean time? Who will 	<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 determined.</p> <p>Once environmental clearance is provided and the project is committed on the</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #3 – July 21, 22 and August 11, 2009

Note: This table summarizes the comments and concerns for all subject areas identified by stakeholders. Similar comments and concerns have not been duplicated.

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<p>want to buy it if it is stated to be torn down in the future?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a disturbing process. Residents wonder about making improvements to buildings when they could be demolished or otherwise devalued by a highway widening project. • I am a tenant, hoping to rent-to-own; how will you compensate me? What will happen to me? • Where is the township to make up for all of the lost taxes from these homes/businesses as there would be no where for them to relocate in the village? 	<p>government's 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 purchase, the owner is reimbursed for reasonable legal and appraisal costs, and/or a meeting with the Board of Negotiation.</p> <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 and after 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 issues or direct hardship should contact MTO to discuss their concerns and explore potential remedies.</p>

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided**

Public Information Centre #3 – July 21, 22 and August 11, 2009

Note: This table summarizes the comments and concerns for all subject areas identified by stakeholders. Similar comments and concerns have not been duplicated.

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
9. COMMENTS REGARDING CONSTRUCTION TIMING / STAGING	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing route should be upgraded in several stages. First by adding a third lane at each of the Perth Road crossings and for a kilometre thru the village of Shakespeare. This could be done without removing any buildings in Shakespeare and would definitely improve the traffic flow, especially thru Shakespeare. 	<p>An implementation strategy will be developed for the recommended improvements that will take into account several factors including areas of greatest need and will identify when and where the safety, operational and capacity improvements should be implemented over the 30-year planning horizon. It is important to note that the actual construction timing will be subject to the availability of funding as the forecasted needs become realized. In the meantime, regular maintenance activities such as replacement of driving surfaces may occur throughout the study area as the need is identified.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When MTO resurfaces the existing road it takes the best months of summer, I would suggest the preferred route will take summer and fall. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MTO should develop a strategy to facilitate moving forward with new phases of highway design and development immediately after the Class EA study is approved. Land acquisition in the stretches of heaviest use should be a preferred starting point. Another possibility, where some work should be launched quickly, is to seek access to infrastructure funding available for rehabilitation of roads and highways. A simple repaving of sections of the current 7/8 would be beneficial to all highway uses for many years. 	