

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008**

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
PIC FORMAT AND INFORMATION; RESPONSIVENESS TO STAKEHOLDER INPUT	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need more examples to represent the issues. ▪ Good one-on-one with consultants. Made it a lot clearer and they answered questions well. ▪ I would like to meet the neighbours and get their feelings on the issues. ▪ People with more knowledge of broader provincial and federal initiatives (i.e. high speed rail, future corridor connections (Highway 401, London, 402 etc.) should be present. ▪ All project team members have been sincere, knowledge and polite and helpful – the team is professional and business-like. ▪ Thank-you for listening to the public. ▪ Representatives answered questions very well and without hesitation. ▪ Need more information regarding effect on the people to encourage better turn-out at PICs. ▪ Information was informative, displays were clear and easy to understand, good presentation. ▪ The PIC is useless; a good well informed speaker could have outlined all of the important issues in a public meeting and question time. 	<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 June 2008, 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.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Direct the consultants to change the format of each of the future planned PICs. Future community gatherings should include an opportunity for individual review of the options and conversations with the consultants followed by a public meeting format. The public meeting should include a formal presentation by the consultants followed by a question and answer session with the public. 	<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, 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 was an additional round of PICs held in late 2008, in response to stakeholder input, to provide more information on corridor alternatives before they are evaluated and selected.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ These PICs are an excuse for a true public meeting and should be abandoned. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What do other people say about the proposal? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PICs are a way to control information, politicians, and citizens. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Displays and staff were unable to provide concrete and factual answers to critical aspects 	<p>The information presented at PICs is an overview/summary of more detailed information that is 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</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
of the Study.	round of PICs.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This was “Black Box” in nature and could improve with little risk for confidentiality or privacy issues. ▪ The time of the workshop (4:00 to 8:00 pm) is a problem. Most of the agricultural community are completing chores until after 7:30 pm and then require their evening meal ▪ MTO representatives have a caviller attitude about real concerns and distresses – this was most upsetting. ▪ Good information, good pictures, and the hours were convenient. Plenty of opportunity for input ▪ Large maps at PIC were helpful. ▪ Several years ago I submitted a petition with 22 names to our local MPP (Ted Arnott) and MTO in regard to this subject and received unsatisfactory results. I have a large file of correspondences that I would be willing to share with you. ▪ This project must be stopped by a coalition of farmers in the area. ▪ Farmers get enough tax breaks as it is. ▪ Seem to be doing what Stratford wants and not worry about us. 	<p><i>'Report A – Study Plan'</i> was released in June 2008, 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> <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> <p>Some stakeholders indicated that they were unhappy with the responses they received from the study team at the PICs. The study team goes to considerable effort to respond to questions on work completed to date, however, it should be understood that when responding to stakeholder input:</p> <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; • 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; and • The study team cannot investigate concerns, suggestions or changes to “overarching issues” such as funding policies and commitments of governments, or the current roles of the different levels of government and transportation service providers. <p>Within the above context, if there are specific questions that those stakeholders feel were not responded to, 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>MTO practice is to limit staff attendance at public information centres to those who are directly participating in the work being presented. The study team has easy access to information on other projects if it is necessary, and depending upon the circumstances, will either obtain the information for the stakeholders or refer them to the appropriate contact person.</p> <p>In response to the interest of some stakeholders to see the broader picture with respect to input from others, a complete set of comments and responses for all subjects identified by</p>

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
 Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
 Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008**

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	<p>stakeholders at PIC #2B as well as previous PICs will be placed on the study web site.</p> <p>Some members of the agricultural community indicated concern about the 8:00 pm closing of the PICs relative to the completion of their evening chores. Given the importance that the study team places on input from the agricultural community, future PICs (after PIC #2C) will close at 9:00 pm, and the public notices placed in area newspapers will reflect this change.</p>
NOTIFICATION TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC, AND CONTACT WITH PROPERTY OWNERS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I did not know that my property was going to be affected by this project. ▪ Visits to every property and talk to the land owners in person. ▪ Newspaper articles are too small. ▪ We did not receive notification through the initial stages. ▪ Letters to individual houses would help. ▪ Have landowners been contacted that don't live on the property? ▪ Keep talking one-on-one with those directly impacted. 	<p>Contact to general-public stakeholders is made through newspaper notices and to individuals who request that they be placed on the study contact/ mailing list.</p> <p>The size and format of the public notices placed in area newspapers is the standard used by the province.</p> <p>Newspaper notices announcing Study Commencement, PIC #1, PIC#2 and PIC#2B were posted in local newspapers as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each round of public notices included newspaper advertisements on two separate days (one week-day and one weekend-day if possible), where project scheduling/timing and newspaper circulation timing jointly permitted; and • 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; and ○ Stratford Citizen (formerly Inside Stratford/Perth). <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>During the preliminary design phase of the study, “contact” will also be made by mailing notices to each address that abuts the recommended improvements to the existing highway and/or the recommended new corridor. As indicated in the introductory information provided in this letter, those recommendations have not yet been made. MTO does not search out landowners who do not live on the property unless property acquisition is being pursued, which would occur subsequent to the current study.</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
CONSULTATION WITH GOVERNMENT AGENCIES, MUNICIPALITIES AND TRANSPORTATION SERVICE PROVIDERS; COMPLIANCE WITH PROVINCIAL POLICY; ROLES OF GOVERNMENTS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We ask that MTO work with other ministries and governments to look at transportation options that do not rely on expanding highways through farmland and rural communities. ▪ There is a need for communication between Provincial Ministries; OMAFRA promotes investing in local food, and recognizes the benefits to the people and farmers of Ontario in supporting local food production, distribution and promotion both for local people and tourists. MOE highlights that Ontario's Climate Change Action Plan makes it a leader toward a sustainable future including Ontario food, expanding transit in Greater Toronto, Hamilton area and more thought to modes of personal transportation. This appears contradictory to MTO to expand highways at expense of highly productive farmland. ▪ More cooperation between Provincial and County representatives on issues of funding and taxes that are earmarked for roads. ▪ We cannot support current proposal when full discussion of alternatives have not been discussed one on one with key sectors of transportation industry or municipal/provincial governments involved. ▪ We believe that it is imperative that all levels of government, along with Crown corporations like VIA Rail come together to jointly find ways to move people and goods while taking into account social, economic and ecological impacts. ▪ The proposals are contradictory to Ontario plans for urbanization. The province is encouraging municipalities to build upwards instead of creating and supporting urban sprawl. A cost benefit analysis should be done on all projects. 	<p>A regulatory agency advisory group (RAAG) has been created for this study to support inter-agency consultation, and agencies such as OMAF, MOE and the conservation authority are members. RAAG members are invited to participate in a meeting in advance of each round of Public Information Centres. Regulatory agency interest typically relates to the study process and recommendations that relate to policies, regulations and approvals, as well as protection of sensitive or designated features. With respect to compliance with provincial policy, the following should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Report A – Study Plan' was released in June 2008, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca. In Exhibit 2.1, Report A outlines the study phases, and the objectives and key tasks associated with each phase, including how alternatives are generated, evaluated and selected in a sequential fashion, with consultation occurring at each key decision point. The approach presented in Exhibit 2.1 is consistent with the requirements of the <i>Environmental Assessment Act</i>, the 'Class Environmental Assessment for Provincial Transportation Facilities', the 'Provincial Policy Statement', and the 'Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe'; and • The three land use/socio economic screening factors that were used in the screening of the long list of corridor alternatives (agricultural land, approved land development, existing land development) reflect the requirements of 'Provincial Policy Statement' (2005) issued under the <i>Planning Act</i>, and it would not be appropriate to selectively remove some of them. <p>A municipal advisory group (MAG) has been created for this study to ensure that the appropriate provincial/municipal consultation and co-ordination occurs. MAG members are invited to participate in a meeting in advance of each round of Public Information Centres. In addition, presentations are made to municipal councils in advance of each round of Public Information Centres. Municipal interest relates to what the study can do for their interests, as well as how the study relates to the work of their engineering, transportation, planning, heritage, recreation, and economic development departments. With respect to consultation with municipalities, the following should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The province of Ontario is responsible for long distance inter-regional movement of people and goods. The municipalities are responsible for local movement of people and goods (through municipal roads and transit). This study is not a mechanism by which potential changes to the transportation and funding policies of the provincial and municipal governments, or the current roles of the different levels of government and transportation service providers, are considered;

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008**

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is surprising that the results of this process are roughly the same as the 1950's and 1960's replace the existing highway with another new limited access highway. This does not correspond to the spirit of the "Places to Grow" document. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 June 2008, 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; and • Based upon input received from stakeholders, including the City of Stratford, a portion of the current municipal road truck bypass around Stratford will be added to the short list of corridor alternatives. This will be presented to stakeholders at a focused Public Information Centre in Stratford in the spring of 2009. <p>Consultation with transportation service providers is undertaken with respect to their long-range plans and potential impacts to their services and infrastructure. Some transportation service providers are in competition with one another, and the degree of their participation in the study may reflect this. VIA Rail, who currently provides service through the analysis area, and GO Transit, who is currently undertaking a study to expand rail service into the Kitchener-Waterloo area, have been contacted and have provided information regarding their existing service/potential future expansion considerations and their ongoing planning study, respectively.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Require the consultants to include representatives from Perth County, the Municipality of Perth East and Perth South in their discussions and deliberations regarding decisions on traffic volume data and population projections that will impact our community. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MTO and VIA Rail do not have any mandate or procedure to consult each other or look for joint opportunities to improve transportation between New Hamburg and Stratford. All levels of government should come together to find ways to move people and goods while taking into account social, economic and ecological impacts. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This project should be following the Provincial Policy Statement that existing roadways be used to the full extent before new roadways are cut through farmlands. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The screening process identifies two items that need to be redefined: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Land Use Planning – minimize loss of approved development lands; and ○ Land Use Planning – minimize removal of existing development. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Allocate the money for more important things such as schools and hospitals. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Money for this project could be used for policing. 	
TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES (NEED)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not needed; numbers seem exaggerated and number of cars too high. Not enough traffic to merit a bypass. Present stoplights prevent excessive speeding. 	<p>'Report A – Study Plan', which was released in June 2008 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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stratford to New Hamburg expansion has been 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008**

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<p>in process for many years - makes sense to continue.</p>	<p>Stratford, Shakespeare, and New Hamburg;</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why are you using such old data for traffic counts? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interference of the historic downtown function of Stratford and Shakespeare caused by inter-regional/provincial traffic passing through;
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are there any accurate numbers for traffic increases to justify a bypass? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate east-west transportation connection from the analysis area to other regions of the province; and
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The traffic demands on the west side of Stratford may not increase at the same rate as the traffic demands on the east side. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate geometric and safety characteristics of the existing highway to address forecasted needs.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For rural communities to remain healthy, industries (agriculture and tourism) need effective links to regional urban centres without gridlock. 	<p>With respect to inadequate inter-regional/provincial transportation capacity identified above, 'Report C – Area Transportation System Problems and Opportunities', which was released in June 2008, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca, indicates that there will be a road capacity deficiency of one lane in each direction within the corridor by 2031. 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.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Costs of this project don't meet terms of sustainability in terms of economic numbers, where looking after local economy should be main priority. 	<p>The issue of travel demand is addressed in 'Report C – Area Transportation System Problems and Opportunities', which was released in June 2008. Section 3 of Report C outlines the travel demand forecast approach and methodology, indicating, in part, that the travel demand analysis included:</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This project does not meet the terms of sustainability in terms of economic numbers. 	<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"> ▪ Job loss due to U.S. owned businesses will slow down the need for project to continue (i.e. car manufacturers will be moved to the US). 	<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;
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Highway 7&8 definitely needs improvement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of a strategic model to forecast person trips; and
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This route will certainly solve Stratford's bypass problems but Stratford should solve its own problems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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"> ▪ I travel Highway 7&8 to Cambridge daily and have no problem with traffic. 	<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 as Census, Statistics Canada.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Trucks are what causes the extreme traffic – as jobs are being eliminated – less trucks will be on the road and Stratford will become desolate – save money for policing. 	<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</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is not enough traffic to merit a bypass. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The two lane road from New Hamburg to Stratford is dangerous with too many people making unsafe lane changes. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Many people do car pool or share the commute to work in one car, this can be extremely stressful when considering the safety of an entire family. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No need for a four-lane highway west of 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008**

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
Highway 7 south.	studies were considered in the development of forecasted travel demands for the analysis area.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Two-lane road from New Hamburg to Stratford is very dangerous, as many drivers pass when not safe to do so. 	<p>With respect to a recommendation that a complete study of north-south travel across any controlled access highway be undertaken before any plans to build the highway begin, it is important to note that a broad range of access management alternatives will be considered for the crossing roads, including interchanges, overpasses and underpasses, and at-grade intersections. The development of crossing road treatments, to be undertaken during the detailed planning and preliminary design phases of the work, will take into consideration local/agricultural access requirements and emergency services requirements. The results of this work will be presented at future Public Information Centres.</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 • The associated widening alternatives and/or new route alternatives, as applicable, which are generated within that corridor/combination.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Speed of traffic is critical; it must be slowed down in congested areas. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The speed limit in Shakespeare is too fast. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is no need for six-lanes coming into Stratford. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It would be important to consider the Brantford-Cambridge Transportation Corridor EA, Highway 7&8 Detail Design and Class EA (Kitchener), and Major improvements to Trussler Road planned by Regional Municipality of Waterloo. Especially if Trussler Road is selected for a new interchange with Highway 401 (as part of Brantford to Cambridge EA) and also for it's recently approved upgrade to Regional/County Road status. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Get this done; it has gone on far too long. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How many years would using the existing Highway 7&8 with Shakespeare bypass serve the area? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Present day business practice of 'just in time' is what has caused the overload of truck traffic, with trucks going every direction, with less than full loads. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Require the consultants to re-evaluate and confirm their population projections for the study area based on accurate information and discuss their findings with the County of Perth and the Regional Municipality of Waterloo BEFORE proceeding to input this information into the development of the traffic projections for the year 2031. ▪ Require the consultants to include representatives from Perth County, the Municipality of Perth East and Perth South in their discussions and deliberations regarding decisions on traffic volume data and population 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
 Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
 Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008**

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<p>projections that will impact our community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Instruct the consultants to use this brief overview as a qualitative guide to pragmatic solutions offered by everyday highway users, and that MTO and the consultants follow our work with more in-depth probing of trucking firms, their travel patterns and their actual needs. ▪ Recommend a complete study of north-south travel across any controlled access highway be undertaken before any plans to build the highway begin. 	
SCREENING OF AREA TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM ALTERNATIVES – GENERAL	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Residents are looking to transportation system decision-makers to provide innovative leadership to reduce carbon emission impacts. 	<p>Highway 7&8 is an important corridor conveying both commercial and automotive traffic across the region. Common emissions released from traffic include particulate matter (PM), carbon monoxide (CO), sulphur dioxide (SO₂), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and volatile organic compounds (VOC). These emissions contribute to poor air quality and the formation of smog. We acknowledge that the Highway 7&8 improvements will provide additional capacity and support/accommodate an increased number of vehicles. However, this project will also help alleviate traffic congestion, which will result in greater air quality benefits compared to maintaining existing conditions and not proceeding with the improvements to the Highway 7&8 corridor.</p> <p>In addition, air quality will be positively influenced by other developments in the Province such as the adoption of stricter truck and car emission standards and expected significant reductions in transboundary pollution. The following actions are being undertaken by the Federal and Ontario governments to improve air quality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement new vehicle emission standards to cut car and truck emissions by 70-90%; • Reduce the sulphur in gasoline and diesel fuel by 90% to reduce emissions and to assist the development of ultra-clean vehicle technologies; • Ontario's Drive Clean program; • Support the expansion and improvement of public transportation; • Encourage the use of alternative fuels; and • Reduce industrial emissions by 45%. <p>Prior to 2002, the average sulphur level in Canadian gasoline was approximately 350 part per million (ppm). Federal regulations of 1999 set the average level at 150 ppm effective on July 1, 2002, and 30 ppm effective on December 1, 2005. Such a major reduction in sulphur dioxide will</p>

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
 Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
 Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008**

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	<p>result in reduced particulate emissions as well as significant reductions in CO, NOx and hydrocarbon emissions. Reductions in NOx emissions will have the benefit of reducing ozone levels in the atmosphere.</p> <p>The new “Tier 2” vehicle emission standards which have been in effect in the US and in Canada since 2004, will reduce vehicle emissions even further. The federal government has also adopted a new on-road diesel fuel sulphur standard. Currently on-road diesel vehicles emit a sulphur level of 500 ppm. The new standard is set at 15 ppm for 2006. NOx and PM10 emission standards for heavy-duty on-road diesel engines will also be improved by approximately 90% in 2007. The net effect of these mandated improvements is expected to be a reduction of total vehicle emissions over the 1994 to 2008 period. This improvement does not include the contribution of the provincial Drive Clean Program.</p>

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

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We need to start a long distance light rail system in Ontario. ▪ Europe has a great rail system; now is the time to start the first long distance light rail system in Ontario (London, Stratford, Kitchener-Waterloo, Toronto). ▪ Reduce the number of commuting vehicles, reduce the amount of CO₂ emissions and reduce the need for more highways and upgrades. ▪ With recent announcement of stronger ties between University of Waterloo and Stratford, the need for an efficient world-class commuter train is needed. Waterloo has made commitments to improve urban public transit networks and is a strong advocate for options other than expanding the New Hamburg – Stratford corridor. ▪ A benefit to our mid-sized regional centres would be for convenient, affordable and rapid public transportation. ▪ Reduce carbon emissions and use alternate transportation. ▪ Alternative modes of transportation must be considered (i.e. bus/GO trains). ▪ Railway and bus service not readily accessible 	<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 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> <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; • Even if this transit potential is fully accommodated by providing 35 additional buses, or four light rail train sets, 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; • 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 consideration of long distance passenger rail systems across the province, such as the proposed Windsor to Quebec high speed rail initiative, is well beyond the scope of this study, and</p>
--	---

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008**

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<p>in area; travel to Kitchener/Stratford by car to get to stations is required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why is there no mention of providing high-speed passenger rail service between Kitchener-Waterloo and Stratford? ▪ It would be a significant benefit for our mid-sized regional centres like Kitchener Waterloo and Stratford to have convenient, affordable and rapid public transportation links between them, links which could also connect to small rural towns like Shakespeare and New Hamburg. 	<p>since no recommendations are available with respect to their applicability to the Highway 7&8 corridor, they cannot be considered.</p>
SCREENING OF AREA TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM ALTERNATIVES – CONSIDERATION OF FREIGHT RAIL SERVICE	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why is there no mention of improving rail line to achieve a reduction in truck shipping between Kitchener-Waterloo and Stratford? ▪ We would argue for serious consideration of rail-based transportation which could reduce the need for a massive expansion to the current Highway 7&8. ▪ Movement of goods by rail is considered up to three times more fuel efficient than truck transport. ▪ Different modes of transportation (rail) should be promoted and less trucks would be required on roads. 	<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> <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, Shakespeare and New Hamburg, and beyond; and • 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.
SCREENING OF AREA TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM ALTERNATIVES – CONSIDERATION OF MUNICIPAL ROADS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wise investment of infrastructure dollars spent on existing road systems in study area would go a long way to providing viable options to 	<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</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<p>ease transportation concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use Line 29, Pork Road (33), 7&8 and Line 37. ▪ Highway 7 West two-lane. The use of line 29 is the least obtrusive, rather than cutting through three farms. The right-of-way can be adjusted to the north or south depending on the location of trees and buildings etc. ▪ Present corridors out of Stratford should all be paved, with passing lands and highway improvements on existing Highway 7&8. ▪ Transfer Highway 7&8 highway one way west & transfer Perth Road 33 one way east. ▪ Develop Line 33 from New Hamburg to Romeo Street, then bypass to Embro #7 (south of Stratford). Roads should have wide shoulders so farm equipment does not interfere with traffic – this would cost less. Would provide access to Stratford Industrial Park and St. Mary's. Lorne Avenue could be Mitchell Bypass. Maintenance and snowplowing would be reduced. ▪ Follow existing roads and down Gibb Road and Line 125 will minimize valuable farm land. ▪ Expand existing highways where possible, using existing municipal roads from New Hamburg to Stratford. ▪ Limit farmland destruction using existing roads, rerouting laneways – it is a matter of stewardship of our natural resources. ▪ There is access to Stratford from the south via Embro from Highway 401. Those who wish a more direct route should explore that possibility. ▪ I feel that the existing roads that include the truck bypass of Pork Road, Lorne and O'Loane Avenues should be considered in the planning process. ▪ Turn the present Highway 7&8 into a two-lane westbound and turn Pork Road into two-lanes eastbound, join the two roads at side road east of Little Lakes to allow use of four-lane Ontario 	<p>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 will be added to the short list of corridor alternatives. This will be presented to stakeholders at a focused Public Information Centre in Stratford in the spring of 2009.

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<p>Street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The widening of Line 33 would not disturb farmlands. ▪ Why isn't a potential connection from Highway 7&8 to existing truck route on the current short list of corridor alternatives? ▪ Why isn't a potential connection from Highway 7&8 to existing truck route on short list of corridor alternatives (Line 29/Road 125 bypass)? ▪ I would like to elaborate on using Pork Street as a Truck Route to move trucks around Stratford. ▪ Understand that I live on the gravel part of Pork Street and it is of no benefit to me to have all the truck traffic going past my door, but in the interest of the community and the farm businesses I think it would be a good solution. ▪ Start at the westerly traffic lights at New Hamburg, feed the trucks, with good signage, through Punkydoodles up to Pork Street. ▪ For safety reasons, that Pork Street interchange should be moved a little farther along to the next north-south road where it is more level and the corners rounded, and close the existing access to Pork Street. ▪ Pork Street could remain a two-lane road that should be levelled out and paved with wider shoulders to accommodate the farm machinery. ▪ There are two, possibly three houses that are rather close to the road that could be bought or moved – the rest of the way is clear and straight. ▪ A traffic light at Road 107 would be a good investment then. ▪ Maybe the Province could take over Pork Street . ▪ Pork Street from Road 107 to Stratford is a good road and lines right up with Lorne Avenue, which I understand was Mayor 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
 Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
 Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008**

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<p>Matheson's first choice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If deemed necessary to bypass Stratford down Line 29, why not extend it down to Avonton Road as opposed to turning down Road 125? ▪ Continue paving Pork Road (#33) and provide overpass on Highway 59 (#107) to access outskirts of Stratford with no stops. Spread traffic around for best results. Provide an overpass to the south of Shakespeare. Concerned about farmland. ▪ Truck route from Punkydoodles corners to Stratford. The truck-only lanes would consist of four lanes at the current Punkydoodles corner with re-development of small country surface roads into truck two-lane intersecting and then following Pork Road to Stratford. ▪ Perth Line 37 (one block north of Highway 7&8) should be upgraded and marked as bypass to offload traffic headed to points north and west of city. ▪ Improve Pork Road to O'Loane and connect with Highway 7&8 west by clover leaf at Sebringville entrance of O'Loane. ▪ With the new highway lights at Sebringville, most trucks are turning onto County Road 130 and then taking Line 32 past the city - because of stop lights and steep hill are already using Line 29. ▪ Improve Line 33 and extend to link with Highway 7&8 at New Hamburg. This would give trucks going to Stratford Industrial area a more direct route to and around Stratford and reduce traffic flow on existing highway. Line 33 at Highway 59 should have stop signs reconfigured, with north-south traffic stopping and use roundabouts along existing roadways. Line 37 should be improved to New Hamburg and extension from Vivian to Quinland Road in Stratford to encourage movement toward Mitchell. ▪ Highway 7&8 could be restricted to non- 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008**

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<p>commercial traffic and enforce the use of existing truck-bypass routes. Using Perth Line 33, extension of Lorne Avenue bypass, would achieve goal of addressing 'linkage needs' with less disruption to Class 1 agricultural land etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Upgrade County Road 33 to a four-lane highway, instead of new highway along rail route, to Punkydoodles Corners. It would remove necessity of widening railway overpass west of New Hamburg. ▪ Pork Road is a good by-pass around Shakespeare, which needs to be upgraded to provincial standards between Perth Road 107 and Punkydoodles Corners and linked properly to Highway 7&8 via Wilmot/Easthope Road #1. ▪ We have a dairy farm on the study area; still we feel that the present corridors out of Stratford should be paved and solve the problems including passing lanes and highway improvements. It would be a lot more economical. ▪ A side route around Stratford (east of Canadian Tire) with easy turn lanes for large trucks to Lorne Avenue, improved turn lanes at Downie and O'Loane Avenue and Perth Road 130. ▪ Actively discuss with Perth County and the three municipal councils the re-designation of certain county and township roads to create some two-lane 7&8B truck corridor options that would further reduce truck volume and use of the existing Highway 7&8 highway. 	
COMMENTS ON CORRIDOR ALTERNATIVES; SUGGESTIONS FOR ADDITIONAL CORRIDOR ALTERNATIVES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why do you have to look at a 1 km wide corridor when looking at a new road? It's very confusing. ▪ People would get a much better idea as to what a new road and its impacts would look like if it was contained in the 100 m corridor that is needed. ▪ Make the existing highway work – there must 	<p>Stakeholders have provided a number of comments regarding corridor alternatives, including:</p> <p><u>Stakeholder Comments on Presentation of Corridors for widening, local bypasses, new corridors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 1 km corridor width is too wide. • Stakeholders could better understand if they knew what specifically is located within each corridor. • The short list of alternatives appears to be logical.

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
be a way to improve on what is already here.	<p><u>Stakeholder Comments on Traffic Signals</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove traffic signals at main intersection in Shakespeare and put up a stop sign and crosswalks on north and south sides of Highway 7&8, so that Highway 7&8 traffic flow is improved. • Install traffic lights at each end of Shakespeare so that one-way traffic can pass through on an alternating direction basis. • Install traffic signals at each end of Shakespeare so that Highway 7&8 through traffic can periodically be stopped to allow pedestrians and north-south traffic to cross and to unblock driveways. • Change the timing/activation of existing traffic signals in New Hamburg so that there isn't a red signal on Highway 7&8 when there is no north-south cross traffic. • Stop installing traffic signals on existing Highway 7&8. <p><u>Stakeholder Comment on Photo Radar</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use photo radar to control speed of traffic on the highway. <p><u>Stakeholder Comments on Railway Crossings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rebuild the highway bridge to accommodate highway widening. • Avoid level crossing at railway. <p><u>Stakeholder Comments on Intersections, Interchanges, Service Roads</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Widen and redevelop existing Highway 7&8 with interchanges, overpasses, and adjacent service roads. • Limit access to existing Highway 7&8 and use overpasses at "affected intersections". • Limit access to Highway 7&8 by providing service roads. <p><u>Stakeholder Comments on Widening Existing Highway 7&8</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preferred alternative is improving existing Highway 7&8. • Provide passing lanes on existing Highway 7&8. • Make existing Highway 7&8 a three-lane facility (one lane eastbound, one lane westbound, with a continuous central left-turn lane). • Make existing Highway 7&8 a five-lane facility (two lanes eastbound, two lanes westbound, with a continuous central left-turn lane). • Make existing Highway 7&8 a five-lane facility (two lanes eastbound, two lanes westbound, with a continuous central left-turn lane), with local bypasses of Stratford and Shakespeare. • Preferred alternative is widening the existing Highway 7&8. • Preferred alternative is widening the existing Highway 7&8 and living with the bottlenecks in Stratford and Shakespeare.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We agree with highway widening rather than cutting through farmlands. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Widening of Highway 7&8 as opposed to bypass merely forsakes traffic issue. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bypass likely intrusive to farmland, demographics demand solution and bypass is preferred. Continued design provisions will hopefully minimize impact. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposal adjacent to the railway was one of the proposals in 1972 and is the best route. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Best route is to follow railroad track as close as possible. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would it make sense to stay close to the edge of woodlots and property lots to minimize impact on wildlife and farmland – would also apply to bypass on south side of Stratford. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The most practical route is to follow the south side of the railroad – get it done. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The new route looks better all the time. The route along the railway is second best. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why can't traffic be re-routed around Stratford? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bypassing Shakespeare on the south side would have minimal impact to the area. Could the bypass be kept close to the town boundaries? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Keep existing Highway 7&8 Route – widen to four lanes where possible. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bypass long overdue to divert heavy traffic around Shakespeare and Stratford. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Highway 7&8 through Shakespeare should be bypassed. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Our choices in the long list of corridor alternatives are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For Section 1 (West of Stratford to Highway 7): south bypass corridor 1; and ○ For Section 2 (Highway 7 to East of Stratford): south bypass corridor 1 or south bypass corridor 2. ▪ Bypass for Stratford should follow current city 	

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
limits and not go over woods or farmland.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Widening Highway 7&8 through Stratford would cause a bottleneck. • Widening simply delays the needed bypasses. <p><u>Stakeholder Comments on Local Bypasses - General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preferred alternative is bypasses. Use design measures to mitigate impacts. <p><u>Stakeholder Comments on Local Bypass of Stratford</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preferred alternative is a bypass of Stratford. • A ring road around Stratford is archaic. • Utilize the existing hydro corridor south of Stratford for a local bypass of Stratford • Preferred choices at Stratford are south bypass corridor 1 to the west of Stratford and south bypass corridor 1 or south bypass corridor 2 to the east of Stratford. • Best route for a Stratford bypass is on the City boundary. • Use the existing truck bypass on municipal roads as part of a bypass of Stratford. • Need to ensure a proper transition from local bypasses to existing highway. <p><u>Stakeholder Comments on Local Bypass of Shakespeare</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preferred alternative is a bypass of Shakespeare. • Best route for a Shakespeare Bypass is close to town boundaries. • Best bypass corridor for Shakespeare is to the south. • Build a new two-lane truck bypass of Shakespeare, thereby leaving the majority of auto traffic on existing Highway 7&8. • Depress the railroad so that a new two-lane truck bypass of Shakespeare can pass over it at grade. • Move the railroad southerly, so that a new roadway would abut south Shakespeare. • Provide additional Highway 7&8 capacity in a tunnel under Shakespeare. <p><u>Stakeholder Comments on Local Bypass of New Hamburg</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefer a bypass of New Hamburg for future expansion. • Against a bypass of New Hamburg. <p><u>Stakeholder Comments on New Corridor</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preferred alternative is a new corridor. • Preferred alternative is a new corridor south of the railway. • Build a trucks-only lane on either side of the existing rail line. • Best route with a new corridor is adjacent to the railway. • Best route within a new corridor is adjacent to woodlots and property boundaries. • Prefer a new controlled access highway south or adjacent to the railway with no access between Stratford and New Hamburg.
▪ Widening through Stratford would continue to create a bottleneck.	
▪ Agree with proposed bypass west side of Stratford.	
▪ New route south of railway tracks solves many problems: church and cemetery location, Fryfogel Inn structure, does not impact buildings in Shakespeare, corrects location of most number of serious accidents in Perth County (just west of New Hamburg). The suggested routes around Stratford are excellent, to catch a large volume of traffic.	
▪ We need better access to 401 and Stratford, but do not need extensive new corridors/ring roads through South Perth. Existing corridor can be widened and improved at less cost in land acquisition.	
▪ We need four lanes from New Hamburg to Stratford. If Stratford needs more progress, we need four lanes to Highway 401. Farmers do not like to lose their land, but they are going to benefit from it in the long run. Four-laning is a great progress.	
▪ Concept of a ring-road around Stratford is archaic.	
▪ Stop building bypass after bypass around the same town.	
▪ Already enough deaths in New Hamburg when roads goes from two lanes to one lane – going through Shakespeare will only divert problem to more people; go around Shakespeare.	
▪ Many accidents on Highway 7&8, therefore should be a new limited access route south or adjacent to railway tracks with no access between west of New Hamburg until east of Stratford – this would be least disruptive. Close off other perpendicular routes and put overpasses/underpasses. Changing existing route into a four-lane heavily travelled is not safe or a good long-term solution.	

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why are you proposing a new highway if the current road is not maintained? ▪ Highway 7 in New Hamburg should be built on a new alignment to allow future expansion. ▪ Widen to four lanes from New Hamburg to Shakespeare and from Shakespeare to Stratford to make a safer highway. Bottlenecks will not be a big problem. ▪ Go through Shakespeare, widen to four lanes. I am sure it provides enough traffic flow for the next 30-years. Why destroy farmland? ▪ Gravel is a quickly shrinking resource, which is primarily used in existing roadways – to preserve this commodity – we should not build new roads. ▪ Building a road through productive farmland should be forgotten as we all need food and milk. The rail overpass should be widened. A slow down in Shakespeare is only a small hindrance; we do not need 400 style roads at +120 kph. ▪ Use what land we have and expand. If you must, use the land already purchased to expand the two-lane roads to four-lanes. ▪ Make a route following dividing line between Concession 3 & 4 (power line) for less impact. ▪ Short list of alternatives appear logical and least destructive to community. ▪ Grade crossings at railway tracks should be avoided at all cost. ▪ A proper design is required to allow truck traffic to flow onto Highway 7 south of Stratford. ▪ It would a safety issue to cut across two-lanes of traffic to go westbound coming from the south at Shakespeare. ▪ Many states have divided highways sometimes not visible to each other – for sake of cost and land: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Keep Highway 7&8 two-lane highway into Stratford only; and ○ Construct two-lane highway out using 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shouldn't be proposing a new corridor when the existing highway is not maintained. • Against a new corridor. • Convert existing Highway 7&8 to a two-lane westbound facility and construct a new two-lane eastbound highway. • Build a new major highway across northern part of southern Ontario, with more north/south connections provided. <p>The comments above indicate that there is considerable disparity of opinion among stakeholders regarding corridor alternatives, however the following responses are provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response regarding the presentation of corridors for widening, local bypasses, new corridors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The bypasses and new corridors have been generated with a width of up to 1 km (typically) so they are wide enough to provide for the generation of route alternatives with a 100 m wide right-of-way within them. ○ 'Report F (Part 1) – Working Paper – Environmental Conditions and Constraints' was released in June 2008, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca. Report F provides secondary source information on existing conditions that is referenced to assess and screen corridors. ○ The study team appreciates the comment that the short list of alternatives "is logical". • Response regarding traffic signals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The use of traffic lights to restrict or slow traffic on Highway 7&8 would considerably reduce transportation capacity. Since transportation capacity is one of the problems that the study has set out to address, this will not be carried forward. ○ Changes to the timing or triggering of existing traffic signals could provide some short-term improvements, but would not resolve the long-term problems and opportunities that this study set out to address. ○ 'Report A – Study Plan' was released in June 2008, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca. Supporting Document #2 identifies the various alternatives associated with preliminary design. Traffic and electrical engineering is identified to include traffic control signals, major roadside safety infrastructure, traffic signing and pavement markings, and roadway illumination, as appropriate. The specifics cannot be determined until preliminary design. • Response regarding photo radar: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Photo radar would not address the transportation problems and opportunities the study sets out to address. In addition, photo radar is not currently used in Ontario, and this alternative can therefore not be considered. • Response regarding railway crossings:

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008**

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<p>two-lane Pork Road, or two-lane road beside the railway track.</p>	<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. <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. ○ In the information presented at Public Information Centre 2B, held on November 26 and 27, and December 9 of 2008, it was indicated that widening the existing highway through New Hamburg includes modification or closure of existing intersections, with a possible service road. ○ 'Report A – Study Plan' was released in June 2008, 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 in future PICs. ● 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 specific sections if the highway widening alternative is selected as the preferred corridor alternative. ○ 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 –
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Could a "trucks only lane" be built on either side of the existing rail line? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would it be easier and more economical to move railway far enough to south to accommodate roadway on south side of Shakespeare? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prefer Highway 7&8 roadway enhancement on one or both sides as required for four-lanes with divider to Shakespeare, transitioning to a two lane for cars and local/agricultural service with turn lanes through Shakespeare, as well as a two-lane truck only tunnel pass diversion. This alternative will cost less than the Grand River Bridge without destroying farmland or historic Shakespeare. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider a trenched train and an elevated dual truck lane flyover following the existing train around Shakespeare. This would also include a grade level underpass at Highway 59/107 crossing under the flyover and over the rail trench with ramps and interchange for truck transit or a truck fly over from current Highway 7&8 rail bridge to west of Shakespeare. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Widen and redevelop existing route with cloverleaves, overpasses and service lanes – no common sense in creating more roads – existing roads within Highway 7&8 corridors could be improved – economically it would be cheaper to work with existing road. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use existing road and make five lanes when required. Make a bypass around Shakespeare, and south of Stratford to get traffic to London. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The existing corridor could be expanded to three lanes to ease traffic problems. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why have passing lanes not been considered? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Add third lane (for turning traffic) on Highway 7&8 where possible between west of New Hamburg and Stratford. 	

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The land was purchased years ago to widen existing Highway 7&8 – why not use existing road instead of going through 100 acre farms – we are at a critical point especially with current economic downturn. 	<p><i>Study Plan</i>'. These sections of wide right-of-way are not of themselves a corridor alternative. They are part of the existing corridor alternative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 'Report A – Study Plan' was released in June 2008, 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. ○ Based upon input received from stakeholders, including the City of Stratford, a portion of the existing truck bypass on municipal roads will be part of a bypass of Stratford that will be 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 problems and opportunities being addressed by this study, or to mitigate impacts. It will therefore not be carried forward. ○ 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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The railway bridge should be re-built to accommodate increased volume over the next 50-years. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Eventually there could be a major highway across northern part of southern Ontario and more north/south connections provided. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We believe that the corridor passing Stratford should be kept as close to town as possible, hopefully utilizing the existing hydro corridor. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ USA roads are beside hydro lines and railway tracks – we strongly recommend putting road beside hydro lines south of Stratford. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If MTO's reasons for building new route are for safety reasons, why not limit access to highway and use overpasses at affected intersections? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Can over passes through the affected intersections be utilized? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why not use a service road so direct access to Highway 7&8 through New Hamburg is limited? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Remove traffic light at main intersection in Shakespeare. Put up stop sign and crosswalks on north and south sides of Highway 7&8. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Install one way traffic lights at each end of Shakespeare on Highway 7&8 – should be green all the time. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Red lights going into town at each end at the same time, blocking traffic outside of town, giving town quiet interval with traffic out; nothing in and people and cars have time to cross highway. People could safely cross, traffic would be slower, trucks would be quietly rolling through town; driveways would not be blocked. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Photo radar should be considered to control the speed of traffic in the area. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stop putting up traffic lights on Highway 7&8 to 	

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<p>Kitchener while planning on making this a major highway. Not very logical.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lights at New Hamburg (Peel Street.) need flashing warning lights on both sides of sets of stop lights. It is difficult to stop because of grade, especially in bad weather ▪ Minimum time on lights in New Hamburg is too short; stop lights are cycling on own without vehicle actuation. ▪ Traffic light installations to improve safety. ▪ Is an improved four-lane highway necessary? ▪ Is a highway bypass around New Hamburg necessary? ▪ Is a bypass around New Hamburg necessary – a four-lane has increased speeds and causes more accidents. ▪ Would upgrading the existing road be more economical, have less impact on valuable farm land and environmental sensitive areas than building a complete new bypass south of new Hamburg? ▪ There be a bend in the road at Concession 4, Southeast Hope, where the hydro line makes a turn from north to west, is it possible to go north of the hydro line? ▪ What is the proposal to go over Bleams Road? 	<p>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.</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 June 2008, 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. <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 transportation problems and opportunities. ○ 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 June 2008, 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

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008**

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	<p>corridor for a new provincial highway and/or transitway may be selected as a corridor alternative to be carried forward in the study;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. <p>○ The consideration of a new highway across southern Ontario is well beyond the scope of this study, and cannot be carried forward.</p> <p>With respect to the upcoming selection of a preferred corridor/corridor combination, as we indicated in the introductory comments to our covering letter for responses to stakeholder input regarding the information presented at PIC #2B, the study team has not yet initiated the process of evaluating the short list of corridor alternatives and selecting a preferred corridor or combination of corridor alternatives involving inter-regional transit plus, widening the existing highway, local bypasses, and/or new corridors.</p>

SCREENING OF LONG LIST OF CORRIDOR ALTERNATIVES

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There was a lack of data for members of the public to compare how alternatives were generated and how they were compared and evaluated. 	<p>The objective of the screening process was to screen out (remove) corridor alternatives from further consideration which were significantly less desirable than other available alternatives.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require the consultants to provide a revised level of information based upon addressing the points raised in Table 1 for each of the 27 different options for the community to review and comment on prior to the selection of the preferred corridor. • Require the consultants to develop more precise categories of evaluation for use in their selection of the preferred corridor and a higher level of empirical comparative data to be used in their review and presentation of the preferred routes within the selected corridor. • Require the consultants to rank the potential loss of Class 1, 2 and 3 agricultural lands with the same subjective and objective weight as the potential loss of other ecologically recognized landscapes of provincial significance. • Require the consultant to clearly identify and 	<p>The screening criteria for the long list of corridor alternatives included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural factors (terrestrial ecosystems; fisheries and aquatic ecosystems and surface water); • Land use/socio-economic factors (Class 1,2,3 agricultural land; approved land development; existing land development); • Cultural factors (heritage buildings; amenities in heritage downtown areas); and • Transportation factors (minimize out-of-way travel; proximity of corridor to population centres). <p>This screening was based upon environmental information presented in '<i>Report F (Part 1) - Working Paper – Environmental Conditions and Constraints</i>', and transportation information presented in '<i>Report C – Working Paper – Area Transportation System Problems and Opportunities</i>', both of which were presented at PIC #2 in June, 2008, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca.</p> <p>The screening used a “reasoned” approach in which there was no weighting of the screening criteria against one another. This results in all screening criteria having the same weight.</p> <p>The tables presented at PIC#2B to clearly outline the screening results of the long list of</p>

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008**

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<p>recognize the weighting strategy used in their ranking between and among these natural resources for a more transparent community review. Transparency should be there for all factors directing the decision making process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MTO needs to consider need, alternative, cost, maintenance, safety, practicality, environment, drainage, restoration costs and timely feasibility before crossing farm land, farm businesses and woodlots. ▪ Why are fish habitat and woodlots being given more attention than the agriculture required to feed people? 	<p>alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified each corridor segment; • Provided a brief comment with respect to each screening criterion relative to that corridor segment; and • Provided a recommendation and associated rationale on whether or not that corridor segment should be carried forward. <p>These tables can be viewed on the study web site as part of the display material provided at PIC #2B.</p> <p>Potential impacts were not <u>quantified</u> at the corridor evaluation stage, because 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>The short list of corridor alternatives (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 #5 in 'Report A – Study Plan', which was released in June 2008, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca.</p>
CONCERNS ABOUT IMPACTS TO FARMLAND AND FARM OPERATIONS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Value of all impacted farms needs to be compiled and weighed against options. We need our prime farmland. ▪ A four-lane controlled access highway will cut farmers off from potential customers and disrupt the businesses that farmers have already established to market direct to consumers and tourists ▪ Much agricultural machinery is moved across the Highway 7&8 route. Farmers will feel the ever increasing stress of time wasted accessing north-south routes across a controlled access highway. ▪ Keep in mind where low cost food comes from. ▪ If land is taken away it will never be returned to food production; agricultural lands produce food for cities. 	<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 June, 2008, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca.</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

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008**

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I agree that we need to create a safe efficient manner to move people, but not through prime farmland. We have the best land the world has to offer. Can't we expand the highway where it has little disruption to farmland and business? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use the back of lots and not somewhere through the middle – which would leave a big mess and make running our farms near impossible 	<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 splitting agriculture into two evaluation criteria, as follows:</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What about the effect on nutrient management plans? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Canada Land Inventory Class 1, 2, 3 land; and
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It seems environmental concern for bush/forest overrules value of prime agriculture lands. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agricultural farm operations/production and infrastructure (specialty crop, dairy/livestock, field crop, etc.).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ According to UN Food and Agriculture, by 2030 farmers will need to grow 30% more food – projects that propose reducing productive land is not acceptable. 	<p>“Long-term alteration/disruption” will include consideration of potential impacts by nutrient management plans, where this information is provided. “Changes to facilities/utilities/services” will include consideration of tile drainage where this information is provided to the study team.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We have a small Agriculture 1 land in Canada; it needs to be protected. 	<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>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impacting farmland is only considered in terms of economic, not environmental consequences. 	<p>It should be noted that it is premature to assume farm-specific potential agricultural impacts since the short list of corridor alternatives has not yet been evaluated and a preferred corridor has not yet be selected.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will be hard buying locally when cutting straight through farm land! 	<p><i>'Report F (Part 1) – Working Paper – Environmental Conditions and Constraints'</i> was released in June 2008, 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 <i>'Report F (Part 2) – Working Paper – Environmental Conditions and Constraints'</i>, to support the generation and evaluation of widening and/or route alternatives.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stop using farmland as if it's a renewable resource. Trees/forest can be replanted, but once agricultural land is covered with pavement, it can never be recovered. Mr. McGuinty promised to protect farmland and the environment – therefore the route south of the railway line should be a last consideration. Use the existing road with a bypass or not. 	<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 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.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ You are reducing future income for future farming generations. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We have 105 workable acres, and 50 will go towards your proposed road – source of income with nutrient management, crop rotation and drainage will be affected. Our hog operation could never survive. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Families rely on the sharing of machinery, as it is expensive. Farmers prefer moving machinery not along highways. 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
 Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
 Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008**

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposed expansion of Highway 7&8 has potential to negatively impact security of income for farm families adjacent to Highway and in neighbouring farms and communities. Controlled access roads make farm transportation problems worse, not better. 	<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>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Farmers are changing operations to benefit increasing interest from society in local food, including on-farm markets, and growing crops for stores/restaurants in nearby communities. Highway 7&8 expansion will impact production and distribution of local food. We have high value crops like certified organic foods who will be directly affected by the expansion. Assessment needs to consider value of crops in community. Loss of supplying local food in future should be considered during assessment of Highway 7&8 expansion. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Perth East and Perth South has some of the best farmland in Ontario. We have an increase diversity of crops and livestock to meet growing demand of local food. We should be protecting farmland – potential loss of farmland, and local food supply should be given high priority during assessment of highway expansion. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If there are food shortages, you need a local food source to feed local people. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Local Food Plus, 100 Mile Diet – all topics make paving farmland to facilitate more vehicular use seem outdated. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposed highway expansion will impact many generations and assessment should consider costs to future generations of farmers. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposed highway will cut off farmers from potential customers and disrupt business farmers have established to market directly to consumers and tourists. Moving equipment and farm goods across highway will increase costs in both fuel and time, making farming business less economical – this needs to be given a high priority when evaluating 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
 Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
 Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008**

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
alternatives. The disruption will occur long after highway is complete.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Many farmers have built their farms so that their children will be able to continue with the family business. These people need to be protected. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bypass will make economy bad for farmers; limiting their income when farmland is taken away. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I am against this project and our farm no longer exists because of this proposal. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The livelihood of family farms is important. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Only 13.4% of land in Canada can be used for agriculture, of which 4.98% is prime farm land – why are building over it? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If agricultural land is divided by the proposed highway changes how will access to the lands on either side be addressed (access with machinery, livestock)? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose highway going through prime farmland. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not right for trucks to roam through Class 1 Agricultural Land. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about valuable land being used for a bypass. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It looks like the two remaining routes will have less impact on the farmlands in the area than the routes that have been eliminated. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For the stakeholders that wish to continue to operate their farms etc., how will they be able to expand? Finding another small farm will be costly should I be required to give this one up. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some heritage farms eight generations old. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agriculture is an important resource, needing protection by our government and needs a higher rating on the screening criteria – the options at PIC 2B take too much agricultural land out of production. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Options presented have too much impact on day to day operations of farming businesses within study area. 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
 Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
 Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008**

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The preferred corridor cuts through our third generation poultry farm in South Easthope Township. We feel that cutting through this valuable farmland is not productive. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Farmland cannot be replaced; it provides a valuable source of food and will continue to do so in the future – farming is an expensive business. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Farmlands must not be destroyed. People cannot continue to farm after a highway goes through. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Family owned, leased and operated farm, comprised of sustenance farming, annual crop rotation and agricultural cultivation for purposes of 120-head dairy herd and includes 325 acres. We have intention to apply for Ontario Century Farm in 2014. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would using the existing corridor have less impact on valuable farm land and environmental sensitive areas than creating a new route? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is very important to minimize land loss. 	
CONCERNS ABOUT FLOODING, DRAINAGE AND HYDROLOGY; AND SYSTEMATIC TILE DRAINAGE OF FARM FIELDS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What effect will this have on floodplains? Will development increase the risk of flooding in areas not originally affected? 	<p><i>'Report A – Study Plan'</i> was released in June 2008, 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</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Paving this road will affect the drainage of our property. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How will the salt runoff from such a large highway affect our well water, trees etc. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Most of the soils in the study area are highly fertile but imperfectly drained, and extensive farm drainage systems have been installed. The drainage system needs to be protected from damage in planning or construction of any proposed routes. Highway improvements and new construction cut off drainage courses, and concentrate snow and water because hills pushed into hollows to improve sight lines. Can also cause surface flooding in spring runoff and 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008**

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
ponding below highway and erosion/washouts that never existed previously.	and account for the quality and quantity of stormwater runoff.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Will the water run off the pavement into sub-surface, private, and municipal drains? ▪ Will you provide new municipal drains to replace private ones where the drain is not large enough to allow full capacity flow? ▪ What about the contamination of lands from sand, salt etc.? ▪ There are several low lying areas where water pools during heavy rains. ▪ How is stormwater runoff from the potential highway going to be mitigated to avoid damage (i.e. salt, oil, etc.) to agricultural lands? ▪ Farms in study area rely on systematic tile drainage to maximize productivity on farms; new corridor will jeopardize balance and involve significant cost to ensure no negative impact. ▪ Provide money for farmers along route to hire drainage engineer to be part of planning team and inspect during construction (not hired by MTO because of conflict of interest). ▪ Agree that drainage is a serious municipal concern, particularly for any four-lane expansion, and that assurance will be given to municipal councils, before any approval of the selected route, that surface water volumes from the proposed route are manageable and not disruptive to municipal drains. In other words, assurance is needed that surface water can be brought to sufficient outlet. ▪ Agree that for each existing municipal drain impacted by the highway project, the municipality should appoint an Engineer under the <i>Drainage Act</i> to investigate the impacts of the highway project on the municipal drain, specify in the Engineer's report and necessary changes to the drain, and ensure that the drain has the capacity to accommodate the 	<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> <p>While MTO has no concern if a municipality or private individual chooses to hire an independent engineer/contractor to undertake what is essentially a peer review of this work, the ministry would not fund the cost of that work. It should be noted that the Ministry of Agriculture and Food and municipalities are invited to participate in Regulatory Agency Advisory Group meetings prior to each round of Public Information Centres. It should also be noted that they are both expected to be self-funding with respect to their participation in provincial environmental assessment studies.</p> <p>It should be noted that it is premature to assume location-specific potential drainage and hydrology impacts relative to surface water, flooding, drainage and hydrology, and tile drainage of farm fields since the short list of corridor alternatives has not yet been evaluated and a preferred corridor has not yet been selected.</p> <p>The issue of potential impacts and associated mitigation to/for systematic agricultural tile drainage in specific farm fields is addressed during detail design, which would be part of subsequent MTO studies. However, this Class EA study will make commitments for future detail design studies to address potential impacts to agricultural tile drainage, so that this issue is appropriately addressed during construction. Furthermore, where privately owned tiled lands will be affected by the proposed work, MTO will pay for the costs associated with system modifications by licensed drainage contractors.</p>

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
 Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
 Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008**

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<p>additional flows. MTO agrees to pay the full cost of this work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agree to cover the entire costs for every adjacent land owner and agriculturist whose private drains may be affected by the selected route to facilitate them in selecting and hiring the services of an independent tile drainage contractor, licensed under the <i>Agricultural Tile Drainage Installation Act</i>, to assess and resolve any potential impacts on private drainage systems including laterals, ditches, culverts, sub-mains and other items associated with any potential new drainage demands. ▪ While there are many municipal drains in the area, it is possible that the additional runoff generated by this project may create areas that have not suitable drainage outlet into an existing municipal drain. In those situations, MTO agrees to not direct their water onto the adjoining land. MTO agrees to petition under the <i>Drainage Act</i> for a drainage system that will properly drain the water generated from the new highway. ▪ Provide the money for farmers along the route to hire a farm drainage engineer of their choosing to be part of the planning team and to provide inspection during construction. Engineering firms hired by the Ministry are in a conflict of interest when they are expected to make the plans for protecting farm drainage. ▪ Require all planning and construction to be done based on 'Publication 29, 2007, Drainage Guide for Ontario (Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food). Use the drainage coefficient that is recommended for the highest value crops such as vegetables and edible beans. 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008**

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In the past few years the area along Highway 7&8 has been subjected to very severe summer storms. All drainage design for this project needs to meet standards for 100-year events. 	
CONCERNS ABOUT IMPACTS TO BUILT HERITAGE AND CEMETERIES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Upgrade the highway and if the FryFogel Inn is the only problem, pick it up and move it. 	<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.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Four lanes does not have to be in the progress plan for the future – our home is of significance to the area and we have been restoring it for the last eight-years. 	<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 #5 in 'Report A – Study Plan', which was released in June 2008, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose highway going through special buildings. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Any/all buildings can be moved (i.e. Fryfogel Inn/Church), all heritage/cemetery sites should be treated with respect to keep in tact. 	<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"> ▪ The new proposal will affect the restorations being done and completed to various old farms and heritage buildings. This will destroy our lives and all of the work we have done to restore our property to its proper glory. 	<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.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We have lived on a small property for 22-years. Bought the heritage property and raised family – soon nothing will be left. We made major renovations to our home 3 years ago. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More information is required about how heritage issues will be dealt with 	<p>It should be noted that it is premature to assume location-specific potential cultural heritage impacts since the short list of corridor alternatives has not yet been evaluated and a preferred corridor has not yet been selected.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All heritage sites / cemeteries and farm houses must be treated with respect and should be kept intact wherever possible 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Require the consultants to develop screening criteria for rural heritage both representing built rural heritage and cultural rural heritage landscapes and include this evaluation in their screening criteria for the 27 options and in the next steps of this planning process. 	<p>'Report F (Part 1) – Working Paper – Environmental Conditions and Constraints' was released in June 2008, 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</p>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	http://www.raqsbc.mto.gov.on.ca/techpubs/eps.nsf/epsww?openview , and from Publications Ontario.
CONCERNS ABOUT IMPACTS TO TERRESTRIAL AND AQUATIC ECOSYSTEMS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Will wildlife corridors and links to vegetation, aquatics etc. be identified and mitigated? ▪ Stratford bypass will encroach on wildlife, woodlots, peat bogs, and wetlands. ▪ The ring road/truck bypass alternative goes east/west along Line 29, turns down Road 125 to hook up with Highway 8. At this turn lies the Avon River, in a valley. A two-lane highway would have significant impact on the terrestrial ecosystem. ▪ Within our 25 acres, along Haysville road, is the Beisel Municipal Drain (under the jurisdiction of the GRCA) we have a lot of wildlife, flora and fauna, and over 14 species of old-growth trees. ▪ My property has a swampy wet area, bush and 40' cliff at the back of the property. ▪ Adjoining our woods and on the path of your proposed alternate route are two parcels of woodlot deeded to the Township of Wilmot – “Walker Woods and School Woods”. ▪ A tree plantation will be affected by this proposal. ▪ Green cover is less than 8% in Perth County and has been identified as a priority to protect and enhance by all agencies and the County. Perth County ranks as third lowest green cover county in Ontario – we cannot further compromise the landscape. ▪ Loss of valuable wood lots. ▪ Oppose highway going through bush lots and sensitive water holding areas/wetlands (Little Lakes). ▪ Why go through wetlands when there is an open field on the south side of Highway 7 east of Gibbs Road that follows the hydro line? ▪ What watersheds will be affected? 	<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; and • 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 June 2008, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca.</p> <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 June 2008, 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 the short list of corridor alternatives has not yet been evaluated and a preferred corridor has not yet been selected.</p> <p>‘<i>Report F (Part 1) – Working Paper – Environmental Conditions and Constraints</i>’ was released in June 2008, 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</p>

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008**

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is it true that a rare fish was found in one of the local creeks during this past summer? It was recorded at the farm but may not have been included in the official report. ▪ As the project continues what are the plans for a very specific environmental review on the properties affected. 	<p>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.ragsb.mto.gov.on.ca/techpubs/eps.nsf/epsww?openview, and from Publications Ontario.</p> <p>With respect to the question of one stakeholder about the finding of a rare fish in one of the local creeks, a good diversity of fish were found in the watercourse in question but no Species at Risk (e.g. reidside dace) were found. Secondary source information did note that reidside dace have been identified within the Grand River and the Upper Thames subwatersheds that are within the analysis area for this study. However, based on the field work undertaken to-date, no reidside dace have been found in any of the watercourses.</p>
CONCERNS ABOUT IMPACTS TO COMMUNITIES AND BUSINESS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MTO should give a higher priority to impact on social, economic and environmental impacts of farm and rural communities during this study. ▪ Loss of retail business. ▪ Cannot believe disregard for farmlands, homes, culture, lifestyles and people in proposal. ▪ How do you put a dollar value on a lifestyle? ▪ This study is only looking at the movement of people and goods east-west, and not north-south. Communities cross the road to access church and community halls. Family groups will be split by the controlled access route, destroying communities. ▪ Communities will be split by the controlled access route. ▪ Transportation route improvements appear to solve intercity travel issues, while degrading lives of people along route. ▪ MTO options are not acceptable as they either carve up Shakespeare into separate north and south hamlets, gutting the business centre (i.e. four-lane through the heart of Shakespeare), or bypass and divert current business and tourist traffic from Shakespeare to Stratford and beyond, reducing business traffic, decimating 	<p>The screening criteria for the long list of corridor alternatives included "Land Use – Community, Industry – minimize removal of existing development".</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 <i>'Report A – Study Plan'</i>, which was released in June 2008, and can be viewed on the study web site at www.7and8corridorstudy.ca.</p> <p>Urban and rural residential areas, commercial/industrial areas, tourist areas and attractions, community facilities/institutions, and municipal infrastructure and public service facilities are included in the above under the "land use – community" factor.</p> <p><i>'Report A – Study Plan'</i> was released in June 2008, 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>In Supporting Document #5, Report A further indicates that considerations for the "land use – community" sub-factor group 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

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
business centre financially.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change to facilities/utilities/services to the land use – community criteria indicated above. <p>It should also be noted that it is premature to assume location-specific potential impacts to communities and businesses since the short list of corridor alternatives has not yet been evaluated and a preferred corridor has not yet been selected.</p> <p><i>'Report F (Part 1) – Working Paper – Environmental Conditions and Constraints'</i> was released in June 2008, 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 <i>'Report F (Part 2) – Working Paper – Environmental Conditions and Constraints'</i>, to support the generation and evaluation of widening and/or route alternatives.</p> <p>Further details on how MTO addresses community impacts are available in the MTO <i>'Environmental Standards and Practices Documents'</i>, which are available on the MTO web site at http://www.raqsbc.mto.gov.on.ca/techpubs/eps.nsf/epsww?openview, and from Publications Ontario.</p> <p>The Stratford, Shakespeare and New Hamburg business community 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 these business communities because of traffic congestion on the highway, and the associated transportation challenges such as left turns into the businesses and business areas, crossing the highway from one side to the other.</p> <p>The issue of “lifestyle” has been identified by stakeholders. While lifestyle cannot be determined or dollar-valued, the various factors and sub-factors identified above are associated with some elements of lifestyle.</p> <p>The issue of compensation has been identified by stakeholders. Compensation is limited to property acquired, and the impacts related to that property acquisition. Compensation is based on the principle of market value as determined through a real estate appraisal. The appraisal will assess all impacts to the property as a result of the acquisition.</p> <p>Prior to the receipt of environmental approval for the project, MTO has no direct control over properties situated within a proposed or final route, except for properties situated adjacent to or in close proximity to existing Highway 7&8. Upon receipt of environmental approval for the</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A bypass would negatively affect business and restaurants in New Hamburg and with the present economy as it is, they cannot afford to lose business. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How will businesses be compensated if they are bypassed? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We need to keep as many of the small tourist areas/towns as possible. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Widen Highway 7&8 and compensate those affected. Most of the houses in Shakespeare are not worth saving, particularly on the south side of Highway 7&8. The antique dealers could be set up in a new location in Shakespeare. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use present Highway 7&8 – impacted properties in Shakespeare have existed past their usefulness – pay fair market value and have occupant moved to better housing – do not destroy prime agricultural land – I would welcome the new highway in Shakespeare (where I live). 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If the existing corridor is used how are you planning on dealing with access points to New Hamburg? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Widening the existing highway would put the road right up to the doors of buildings. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is not the fault of MTO that Wilmot Township has no foresight in their planning and approved building sites right up to the edge of existing Highway 7&8. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A new bypass around communities of Stratford, Shakespeare and Tavistock will not ensure economic vitality – the economy is suffering enough at present. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We have a B&B and moved Sebringville train station to our property for antique shop – we will lose all that we have worked hard for. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What is the minimum distance to buildings? 	

**Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008**

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
	<p>project and designation of the highway corridor, there will be restrictions on what can be done to properties situated within and adjacent to the approved route.</p> <p>For new development, the minimum setback distance between a proposed new building (or a proposed extension to an existing building), to the edge of the right-of-way of an existing or approved provincial highway is generally 14.0 m. This is subject to formal approvals from MTO.</p>
CONCERNS ABOUT NOISE SENSITIVE AREAS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Those who live on Riverside Drive and Victoria are experiencing far too much highway noise already, we need a sound barrier. ▪ What about noise pollution? 	<p><i>'Report A – Study Plan'</i> was released in June 2008, 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"> • At the detailed planning stage of the study, the potential for increased traffic noise in noise sensitive areas (such as your residential area) will be considered qualitatively for the evaluation of the short list of corridor alternatives and 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.
CONCERNS ABOUT ACQUISITION AND PAYMENT FOR PROPERTY	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Our farm is not for sale. ▪ Concerns about the value of property – will land values drop? How will stakeholders be compensated and when? Are you going to pay fair market price? Could be devastating for younger farmers or people counting on property sales for retirement. ▪ How are those supposed to move forward once properties have been identified, as we know highway will not be constructed for many years? ▪ Need to implement mechanism to address uncertainty for landowners close to the short list of corridors. Uncertainty will impact negatively on value of properties. 	<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>

Highway 7&8 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study
Summary of Input Received and Response Provided
Public Information Centre #2B – November 26, 27 and December 9, 2008

Stakeholder Comments	MTO Action Taken/Response Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If the new highway goes through my property and the value goes down, will the MTO make up the difference in value? 	<p>purchase, the owner is reimbursed for reasonable legal and appraisal costs, and/or a meeting with the Board of Negotiation.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How are the potential land purchases going to take place and when? Are you going to pay fair market value (i.e. replacement costs)? 	<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>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Who compensates for lower real estate value if within the corridor? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Will homes be slated for demolition be given fair market value or allowed to move back on property if there is room? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The exploration that occurred during the 1980's resulted in effected farms receiving unfair market values, what will be the protocol this time? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How does one recover or live in a house (or operate a farm) that is on the chopping block for 5, 10, 15, 20-years? How can they sell? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Compensation for land taken away should be high – we have a century farm. To survive; farming must survive. How will compensation work? 	