APPENDIX P

Summary of Detailed Public Comments and Responses

Waterdown/ Aldershot Transportation Master Plan: Phase 3
East-West Corridor

Master Comments Database

ID# 1 to 199

(November 1, 2007 – Aug 15, 2008)

Section 1: Comments from the General Public 3
Section 2: Comments from Concerned Resident #1 123
Section 3: Comments from Concerned Resident #2 223

Section 1: Comments from the General Public

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
ID# 1 [redacted] Nov 1st , 2007 Email	John, Can you inform me of the progress of a north Waterdown east/west traffic route, has it been decided, what is the proposed route and what would the volume of traffic be?	John Morgante Forwarded to Diana Morreale	Diana Morreale Jan 22, 2008 Email	Good [redacted] Sorry for the delay in response to your e-mail to John Morgante dated November 01, 2007 (it was bounced around before it reached me). In your e-mail to John you inquired on the progress of the Waterdown east/west traffic route. The project team is currently finalizing Phase 2 of the Waterdown/Aldershot Transportation Master Plan (TMP). The Draft Phase 2 report has received approval from the project partners: the Cities of Hamilton and Burlington and the Region of Halton. The project partners are now preparing to commence Phase 3 of the Class EA process, which includes detailed Environmental Assessment studies on the preliminary technically preferred corridors. The Phase 2 report outlined a preliminary preferred east/west corridor. The preliminary technically preferred east/west corridor was based on the results of the Waterdown/Aldershot Transportation Master Plan that was prepared following Phases 1 and 2 of the MEA Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process. Further environmental analysis and evaluation will be completed through Phases 3 and 4 of the Class EA process to confirm the final alignment of the preferred corridor.	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				To conclude the Phase 2 public input a final series of Public Information Centres will be held in March to present the final Phase 2 Report and to outline the project team's next steps. Please let me know if you have any further questions. Thank you for your patience on this matter. ~Diana	
ID# 11 [redacted] Feb 15 2008 Email	Hello, Our Real Estate agent forwarded an email with attachments regarding the proposed changes between Aldershot and Waterdown. Is it possible to be placed on a mailing (email or snail) regarding the Waterdown/Aldershot Transportation Master Plan for such things as below: 1. The Waterdown/Aldershot Transportation Master Plan (WATMP) Notice of Public Information Centres (PICs) 2. The WATMP Introductory Newsletter 3. The WATMP Communiqué 4. The Neighbourhood Advisory Committee (NAC) Application Form Regards [redacted]	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	None required. Added to the mailing list	
ID# 1[redacted] (Niagara Peninsula	Please remove my name and [redacted] name from your mailing list. This project is located outside on the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority's jurisdiction.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Removed from Database Feb 19th, 2008	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
Authority) Feb 19, 2008 Email					
ID# 24 [redacted] Feb 21, 2008 Phone	Map too small on public notice, could not read street names. He would like to see a larger version of the map, especially Parkside Rd and Railway track	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 21, 2008 Email	Larger map was sent	
ID# 25 [redacted] Feb 21, 2008 Phone	What is being done to alleviate the traffic on Highway 5 and with regard to the by-pass? What is the "story" on the by-pass?	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 28, 2008 Email	Dear [redacted] Thank you for your phone call dated February 21, 2008. Please see below for answers to you inquiries. 1. What is being done to alleviate the traffic on Highway 5 with regard to the by-pass? ***The Transportation Master Plan (TMP) recommends the widening of Dundas Street to 6 lanes from the intersection of the new East-West link roadway to Brant Street. We do note that the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) is undertaking a Class Environmental Assessment (EA) on Highway 5 West of Highway 6, however, we do not have any other details as to the progress of this study at this time. In the vicinity of the new intersection of Dundas Street and the new Waterdown Road extension through the Waterdown South development area, intersection treatment options will be examined in Phases 3 & 4 of the Class EA. No other changes to Dundas Street have been recommended as part of this study.*** ***There will be considerable public consultation during Phase 3 of the Class EA. Should you wish to participate in detailed discussions regarding the specific issues to***	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				be addressed and the subsequent routing, we would encourage you to apply to participate in the upcoming Neighbourhood Advisory Committee (NAC). The NAC Recruitment Strategy and the NAC Application Form are both available online at www.hamilton.ca/WaterdownTMP. 2. What is the plan for the by-pass? ***The recommendations of the Waterdown / Aldershot TMP were based on the transportation system needs to support growth in Waterdown as defined by OPA 28. A new East-West roadway that will pass to the North of the existing Waterdown community and through the planned Waterdown North development area has been proposed. This roadway is not a by-pass.*** 3. What are the timelines (i.e when will this be implemented)? ***The phasing of the transportation system recommendations are approved in Section 9 "Staging Plan" of the Phase 2 Final Report. OPA 28 lands will be built out by 2018, therefore, the infrastructure must be in place before this time.*** ***We refer you to www.hamilton.ca/WaterdownTMP to view links to the Phase 2 Final Report and the Path Forward report.***	
ID# 26 [redacted] Feb 21, 2008 Phone	Map too small to read, please send a larger version	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 21, 2008 Email	Larger map was sent	
ID# 27	Live on Parkside Drive, but we are elderly and will not	Waterdown-	Waterdown-	Larger map was sent. Will send relevant materials on	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
[redacted] Feb 21, 2008 Phone	be able to make it to the PICs in March. Can you please mal us any relevant information? Also, the map that was sent out is too small, please send out an enlarged version. We have no access to a computer so mail is the best way to contact us and send us materials.	Aldershot Information	Aldershot Information Feb 21, 2008 Email	an ongoing basis	
ID# 28 [redacted]r Feb 22, 2008 Phone	Map in notice of PIC is too small to read	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 22, 2008 Email	Larger map was sent	
ID# 29 [redacted] Feb 22, 2008 Email	Hi Is there a meeting scheduled for city councilors re: the transportation plan- on Feb. 28th, 7pm? Please confirm Thanks Linda Waterdown BIA	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 22, 2008 Email --- Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 25, 2008 Email	Good morning [redacted] Thank you for your email. There is a Waterdown/Aldershot Transportation Master Plan (WATMP) Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting on Thursday, February 28, 2008 at 7:00 p.m. at St. Thomas the Apostle Parish Hall in Waterdown, ON. If you have any additional questions or comments please do not hesitate to contact us. --- Dear [redacted] Further to your e-mail request dated February 22, 2008, I wish to clarify the purpose of the meeting on February 28, 2008. The SAC was formed at the outset of this project. It is comprised of representatives from the local community, recreation and environmental organizations, and businesses, and its purpose is to provide advice to the project. The SAC is not a meeting of councillors, but is comprised of interested stakeholder group representatives. As such, the	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				meeting on February 28, 2008 is not a Council meeting. Members of the public are able to attend in an observer capacity. I hope this clarifies our previous response.	
ID# 30 [redacted] Feb 25, 2008 Phone	Where is the railroad track on the map? Where is the wetland on the map (North of Parkside Dr. between Centre Rd and Robson)? It should be shown clearly on the map in relation to the new East-West Road. What is the name of the street that goes North from Mountain Brow?	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 29, 2008	Dear [redacted], Thank you for your call dated February 25, 2008. We have received responses for your questions from the Waterdown/Aldershot Transportation Master Plan Project Team and have provided them below. 1. Where is the railroad track on the map? (*currently not shown*) ***The railway crossing at Parkside Drive is East of the bend where the new East/West corridor connects with Parkside Drive. The attached figure presents this crossing.*** 2. Where is the wetland that is located near to Parkside Dr. between Center Road and Robson on the map? (*currently not shown*) ***Please see attached Figure 5.1 of the Final Phase 2 Report (identified as "Centre Rd Woodlot Candidate ESA/PSW").*** 3. What is the name of the street that goes North from Mountain Brow? (*currently not labeled on the map*). ***We understand this to be the link in the Waterdown South secondary area connecting Dundas Street with Mountain Brow Road. A formal name for this link is not currently available as this will form part of the secondary area approval process.***	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				If you have any additional questions or comments please do not hesitate to contact us.	
ID# 31 [redacted] Feb 22, 2008 Email	I tried your website at www.hamilton.ca/Waterdown TMP. which was unavailable or moved., can you please direct me to how to obtain information regarding the phase 2+3 report for the Waterdown/ Aldershot Transportation Master Plan. I received a single piece of paper in the mail but cannot see any street names to get a clearly picture., I am mostly interested in any plans for the East/West route plans. I am not able to attend meeting on the 5th/6th of March and therefore would appreciate any information that could be supplied or perhaps a link to the correct website. Thank you for your assistance. [redacted]	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 22, 2008 Email	Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email. Please try the following link to access information on the Waterdown/Aldershot Transportation Master Plan: www.hamilton.ca/WaterdownTMP In the meantime, if you have any additional questions or comments please do not hesitate to contact us.	
ID# 33 [redacted] Feb 21, 2008 Email	Hi Diane, Can you please advise me if the proposed East West route for the Waterdown/Aldershot Transportation study is being built on a 4 lane platform? If this is the case, I am concerned that the future (long term) traffic demands on the eastern portion of Parkside have not been adequately addressed. As you are aware, Parkside Dr is an existing 2 lane road which is handling both town and through traffic. The consultants are saying that we need to expand an additional 2 lanes on the eastern portion of Parkside to handle the anticipated increase in traffic from the population explosion as well as the increased amount of through traffic which will result from the	Diana Morreale cc. [redacted] Forwarded to Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 26, 2008 Email --- Waterdown-Aldershot	Dear [redacted]. Diana Morreale has forwarded your e-mail regarding capacity issues on Parkside Drive to our office. As you may know, the project partners have established a "one-window" communications protocol to ensure that all questions and comments from stakeholders receive timely responses. Please be advised that we will be in touch with you regarding your enquiries within 10 business days. Please do not hesitate to contact us at info@waterdown-aldershot.ca or call us at (905) 818-8464 should you require any further information in the meantime. ---	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	"bypass". If the two lane east-west road, which is being linked to the eastern portion of Parkside, is being built on a 4 lane platform in anticipation of even greater traffic in the future, how will the proposed 4 lane road on Parkside handle the increased traffic demands? Would you then consider expanding the eastern portion of Parkside to a 6 lane road? Also, please provide me with the justification as to why the residents on the eastern portion of Parkside need to bear the burden of two busy roads (Parkside and the Bypass), especially when there is record of an existing social concern regarding truck traffic from the facility formerly known as "Barnes". It appears that you continually address this concern from a legal perspective rather than a social environmental concern. Although these concerns have been brought to your team's attention early in the process, it appears that they have been ignored. In fact the social environmental concerns have now increased greatly. In addition to the "Barnes" truck traffic not being resolved, we have to deal with a substantial increase in traffic, including more trucks, as this east-west route may be used as a truck "bypass". This again was downplayed throughout the study. We had brought this possibility to the city's attention, the potential for the substantial increase in truck traffic due to the quarry expansion, which the city had initially denied up to and including the public works meeting on Feb 20, 2006. This was critical information that should have		Information Apr 1, 2008 Email	SEE ID# 81 Response (GP-Section)	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	been disclosed during the study. Your response would be greatly appreciated prior to the upcoming SAC meeting.				
ID# 34 [redacted] Feb 26, 2008 Phone	[redacted] thanked the team for the received enlarged map and inquired about the railroad location on the map.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 26, 2008 Phone	He was advised that the railroad track runs slightly East of the new road that moves North from Parkside. Dr. [redacted] was satisfied with the response.	
ID# 35 [redacted] Feb 26, 2008 Phone	[redacted] left a follow-up voicemail asking about the clarity of the maps	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 26, 2008 Phone	The call was returned and he was informed that the maps will be printed on Thursday Feb 28, and sent to him at the end of the week	
ID# 36 [redacted] Feb 26, 2008 Phone	[redacted] requested to be removed from the database as she no longer resides in Waterdown	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 26, 2008 Phone	She was removed from the database Feb 26.	
ID# 38 [redacted] Feb 27, 2008 Email	Hi there. I am a resident of Boulding Ave. in East Waterdown. Do you have a clear map (PDF) ?) for theWaterdown/Aldershot Master Plan Phase 2 that you can send me ? The street names on the printed map in the most recent information sheet are illegible and I can't see exactly where the bypass will merge North and meet Parkside Dr.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 28, 2008 Email	Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email. You can find an enlarged version of the map at www.hamilton.ca/WaterdownTMP. Please let us know if it meets your needs. Your questions will be passed on to the appropriate member(s) of the Waterdown-Aldershot Transportation Master Plan Project Team and a response will be sent to you by the Neutral Community Facilitator's Office	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	That last I heard, the bypass at the East end will take Dundas up through a field just East of the new home development and connect it to Parkside. Are there any plans to widen Boulding Ave. and/or use it as an additional throughfare to connect Dundas to Parkside ? Will it dead-end at the top or will there be a T intersection onto the new bypass ? Thank you. [redacted]. Waterdown.			within 10 business days. In the meantime, if you have any additional questions or comments please do not hesitate to contact us. SEE ID#80 Response (GP Section)	
ID# 39 [redacted] (CN) Feb 28, 2008 Email	Thank you for your letter dated February 15, 2008 regarding the above noted project. This project does not affect any CN rail line or property and CN requests to be removed from the project mailing list.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Removed from database	
ID# 40 [redacted] Feb 28, 2008 Email	Hi - Is the crossroads centre accessible by public transit? Thanks, [redacted]	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Mar 5, 2008 Email	Email was acknowledged Feb 29, 2008. Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email. Please find the Burlington Transit map at the following link http://cms.burlington.ca/Asset7583.aspx. Route 7 will take you to the Crossroads Centre at 1295 North Service Road. For details about the bus schedule for Route 7 please see http://cms.burlington.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=7588. In the meantime, if you have any additional questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.	
ID# 41 Unknown Feb 29, 2008 Phone	The caller enquired about the railway tracks location on the map and did not believe that the map is not detailed enough. The caller looked at the enlarged map available on the website and that map could not answer his inquiries either.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 29, 2008 Phone	The caller was advised that the neutral community facilitator's office could request a more detailed map from the appropriate team member and could not answer his inquiry as they are not the technical experts. It was decided that the caller preferred to wait for the PIC for response to his inquiries.	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
ID# 42 [redacted] Feb 29, 2008 Phone	The caller enquired about the construction schedule for the transportation master plan and the phases' timing.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Mar 11, 2008 Email	Dear [redacted], In response to your phone inquiry, dated February 29, 2008, please find the following responses from the Project Team: --- *1. What is the schedule for the Transportation Master Plan (TMP)? What is the timing of the phases?* <u>Project Team Response</u>: The Transportation Master Plan (TMP) is now complete. As Phase 2 of the Waterdown/Aldershot Transportation Master Plan is now complete, the Study will proceed to Phases 3 and 4 to examine two distinct roadway projects. They are identified as the North-South Road (Waterdown Road) Class Environmental Assessment project and the East-West Road Class Environmental Assessment project. This work is commencing in March and will continue for about 1 year. *2. When will it be completed?* <u>Project Team Response</u>: Please see draft schedule attached. *3. When will construction begin?* <u>Project Team Response</u>: The timing of construction is dependent on: • When the EA process of the Waterdown/Aldershot TMP is complete;	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				• Receiving endorsement from the Cities of Hamilton and Burlington Councils as well as Halton Region Council on the Phase 3 and 4 results (including approval of construction costs, cost sharing arrangements, etc.); and • Whether or not the MOE receives a bump up request on the Environmental Study Reports that are filed as part of the Waterdown Road Class EA and the East-West Road Class EA. The Waterdown/Aldershot Transportation Master Plan Phase 2 Final Report includes a staging plan in Section 8.0 that includes construction in year 2011. This is only an estimate and we do not foresee construction starting any earlier than 2011. In the meantime, if you have any additional questions or comments please do not hesitate to contact us.	
ID# 47 [redacted] Mar 2, 2008 Email	Please let me know of the qualifications required for committee member for the proposed WATMP	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Mar 3, 2008 Email	Dear [redacted] Thank you for your question in regard to the Waterdown Aldershot Transportation Master Plan. In response to your question below, please find attached the Recruitment Strategy and Application Form for the Neighbourhood Advisory Committee which should provide you further information around the NAC. Please let us know if you would like additional information.	
ID# 49 [redacted] Mar 2, 2008	Good Day: I am writing in response to the notice that I received in	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Email was acknowledged Mar 3, 2008. Dear [redacted]	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
Email	the mail regarding the Waterdown/Aldershot Transportation Master Plan. Since I will not be able to attend either of the public information sessions I was hoping that you could find time to answer a few questions that I have at the present time. I live in Hunter Park Survey which is, as I'm sure that you know, east off Centre Road and north of Parkside Dr. I have perused the information available on the internet and have been unable to determine: a) How far north of Northlawn Ave, (northern most street in the survey), will the new road be located and will any of the wooded area that is there now be left to act as a buffer zone? b) I have heard that the intersection of Northlawn and Centre Rd. would be closed thereby creating no exit from Northlawn onto Centre Rd. Is this true – hopefully not? c) What kind of access will there be to the trails just east of the survey, i.e. by Allan's Lane? d) Is the information, text and maps, presented a 'done deal'? Thank you for your help in clarifying these queries. [redacted]		Mar 13, 2008 Email	Thank you for your e-mail dated March 2, 2008. We have received a response from the project team and provide it below. We have organized it by issue and for ease of reference, we have included excerpts of your e-mail in italics, with the project team response following. *I live in Hunter Park Survey which is, as I'm sure that you know, east off Centre Road and north of Parkside Dr. I have perused the information available on the internet and have been unable to determine:* *a) How far north of Northlawn Ave, (northern most street in the survey), will the new road be located and will any of the wooded area that is there now be left to act as a buffer zone?* <u>Project Team Response</u>: The proposed new East-West roadway is to be located immediately north of Northlawn Ave. within the wooded area. The precise distance of the roadway from residences along Northlawn Ave. will be established in the Phase 3 work. The possibility of leaving a vegetated buffer strip will be considered in Phase 3. Input from residents on this issue will be sought. *b) I have heard that the intersection of Northlawn and Centre Rd. would be closed thereby creating no exit from Northlawn onto Centre Rd. Is this true – hopefully not?* <u>Project Team Response</u>: There have been no proposals	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				to close the intersection of Northlawn Ave. and Centre Rd. We do note that there is a possibility for the closure of the Main St. N/Centre Rd. intersection which is identified in the Stage 2 Report (page 131). More detailed study would be required prior to the closure of this intersection. c) *What kind of access will there be to the trails just east of the survey, i.e. by Allan's Lane?* Project Team Response: Access to existing trails will be examined in the future Phase 3 work. d) *Is the information, text and maps, presented a 'done deal'?* Project Team Response: The recommendations of the Phase 2 report have been accepted by Hamilton Council. There is still the need to undertake the Class EA Phase 3 work and prepare the Environmental Study Report (ESR) which would also need to be approved by Hamilton Council and the Ministry of the Environment. The public will have the opportunity to review the ESR and request an "elevation" or "bump-up" to an individual EA, which the Ontario Ministry of the Environment would need to consider. As such, the road recommendations are not yet finalized. In the meantime, if you have any additional questions or comments please do not hesitate to contact us	
ID# 50 [redacted] Mar 3, 2008	Hello, My name is [redacted] I am writing to you because I am interested in being involved with the committee	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Dear [redacted] Thank you for your question in regard to the	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
Email	for the Waterdown-Aldershot transportation plan. I would like to find out how to submit my application and what would be involved. I look forward to hearing back from you.		Mar 3, 2008 Email	Waterdown Aldershot Transportation Master Plan. In response to your question below, please find attached the Recruitment Strategy and Application Form for the Neighbourhood Advisory Committee which should provide you further information around the NAC. Please let us know if you would like additional information.	
ID# 51 [redacted] Mar 3, 2008 Phone	Caller requested information on how to find the Path Forward report on the website	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Mar 3, 2008 Phone	Caller advised on Path Forward location on the website	
ID# 52 [redacted] Mar 3, 2008 Email	As requested at the SAC meeting of February 28, 2008, I would appreciate receiving the following as soon as possible: 1. The black-lined version of the Final Phase 2 Report prepared by Dillon Consulting. This should be the draft Phase 2 Report prepared by Dillon Consulting with sections highlighted by underlines and cross-outs indicating additions to and deletions from the draft Phase 2 Report. It is a reconciliation from the Draft Report to the Final Report; 2. A listing of all SAC members including who they represent; 3. A copy of Dillon Consulting's presentation materials from February 28, 2008. I believe it was a powerpoint presentation. I realize this is quite a bit of information and I greatly	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Mar 13, 2008 Email	Email was acknowledged Mar 4, 2008. Dear [redacted] Thank you for your e-mail dated March 3, 2008. We have received a response from the project team and provide it below. We have organized it by issue and for ease of reference, we have included excerpts of your e-mail in italics, with the project team response following. As requested at the SAC meeting of February 28, 2008, I would appreciate receiving the following as soon as possible: 1. The black-lined version of the Final Phase 2 Report prepared by Dillon Consulting. This should be the draft Phase 2 Report prepared by Dillon Consulting with sections highlighted by underlines and cross- outs indicating additions to and deletions from the draft	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	appreciate the efforts involved to get these. Many thanks in advance [redacted]			Phase 2 Report. It is a reconciliation from the Draft Report to the Final Report; **Project Team Response:** A black-lined version of the Final Phase 2 Report is currently being reviewed, and will be available shortly. 2. A listing of all SAC members including who they represent; **Project Team Response:** Please find the most recent list of SAC members attached. 3. A copy of Dillon Consulting's presentation materials from February 28, 2008. I believe it was a PowerPoint presentation. **Project Team Response:** The PowerPoint presentation from the February 28, 2008 SAC Meeting was emailed out to SAC members and interested participants on March 4, 2008 at 10:50 a.m. In the meantime, if you have any additional questions or comments please do not hesitate to contact us.	
PIC Mar 5, 2008 Workbook	Please reconsider the new 4 lane Parkside Drive to cut up above the old Bannes Environmental plant. This would cause much less impact on all the homeowners on Parkside Drive between Up Country Estates and the rain line. P.S. I do not live on Parkside Drive.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	
PIC Mar 5, 2008 Workbook	I would strongly prefer you look closely at Option 5 to the Parkside Road widening. Less disruption to current homeowners (ones who want to live in Waterdown, not new subdivision owners who are looking at	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	turnover). Move the traffic outside of the residential areas.				
PIC Mar 5, 2008 Workbook	Again I prefer Option 5, if the option is to progress as set-out along Parkside, consideration has to be give to: 1) Noise: increased traffic and addition of more trucks 2) Safety: Houses mostly affected to have 4 lane addition have small children, their safety is paramount 3) Look - You will have to change the look of Parkside with new walls or fences and ruin the "Waterdown" vision. 4) Comfort: Houses getting a 4 lane addition behind them are concerned about lights shining in our bedrooms. 5) Safety: Already a high area of collisions (Parkside, Boulding) you are increasing that risk These items can add additional cost to City!	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	
PIC Mar 6, 2008 Workbook	Technical Plan: In my opinion your "work" won't work - this road/roads will never be wide enough! You/your planners should/must zone lands for work related uses/buildings so that residents would not have to travel to Toronto/Hamilton etc. Look 50 years ahead not 15 min!	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	
PIC Mar 6, 2008 Workbook	Technical Plan: Assuming the studies are accurate, I think the plan is realistic and viable. It does not "cut-off" the town, allows options for travel, and will accommodate growth (for how long I don't know). It Waterdown, we already have bottlenecks and traffic jams. It is unfortunate for some of those directly affected but there are not many choices. Progress is important - we grow or we die. The King road fuss is much ado about nothing. Try a tunnel - it is done worldwide, otherwise widen it to make it safe. The quarry is [...] [...] and much of the escarpment has been saved. We need the access.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
PIC Mar 6, 2008 Workbook	Technical Plan: Garbage.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	
PIC Mar 6, 2008 Workbook	Technical Plan: 1) I believe there will be a considerable amount of traffic connecting between the east/west and north/south routes using the residential streets in between. I would like to see some estimate of these volumes. There is an obvious disconnect between these two routes that motorists will connect through their own initiative, probably using Burke and Boulding. 2) I would like to see more detail on how Parkside will cross the CPR Hamilton subdivision. Will it be grade separated? If so, will Parkside go over or under? 3) How is the wetlands trail going to cross the east/west route? Tunnel = security issues; bridge = bike and rollerblade issues.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	
PIC Mar 6, 2008 Workbook	Technical Plan: The planned route should not end at Hwy 5 and then pick up again later at Hwy 5 -> it should be one continuous road. Mill S&N traffic is too busy and will continue to be a shortcut for those wanting to get to Carlisle, [May?] etc. A31	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	
PIC Mar 6, 2008 Workbook	Technical Plan: The road plan does not satisfy the traffic needs of this community. 2 prior studies have identified the need for a proper bypass. Residential concerns (social environment) were not taken into consideration during the early stage of the study. [Barnes-Opta Coa?] quarry traffic. Phase 2 was approved by council before these issues could be addressed.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	
PIC Mar 6, 2008	Technical Plan: 1) Assessment of noise and air quality in residential areas of east-west corridor especially	Waterdown-Aldershot	Waterdown-Aldershot	Comments were recorded	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
Workbook	through the subdivisions of Waterdown is critical 2) Drainage and water services to areas of Waterdown affected by east-west corridor must be fully explained to residents. Homeowners should have the right to not have water wells affected by the change in landscape. 3) Option 5 is the preferred route for Waterdown residents since it bypasses a large portion of the subdivisions.	Information	Information		
PIC Mar 6, 2008 Workbook	The Consultation and Outreach Plan: Stink! Your maps are just pictures - the roads (if they are noted) have names so small I/you can't read them 36" away! What have you to hide!	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	
PIC Mar 6, 2008 Workbook	The Consultation and Outreach Plan: Roadway through Upcountry Estates should be 4 lanes, not 2 lanes to provide badly needed traffic relief from Boulding Ave and Evans Road.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	
PIC Mar 6, 2008 Workbook	The Consultation and Outreach Plan: The evening was well planned and well laid out. Staff were courteous and helpful. The did not overreact to some 'temperamental' citizens who seemed bent on arguing. The aerial/satellite pictures with road overlays were especially helpful.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	
PIC Mar 6, 2008 Workbook	The Consultation and Outreach Plan: Contact the project manager for the Joe Sam's Park project. Don McKinnon from [Dillon] suggested the possibility of having someone from the TMP team attending one of the meetings with the Joe Sam's Steering Committee. This is an excellent idea to help with input on alignment of the east/west road going through parkland and to discuss options for crossing the road at the existing wetlands path. We are meeting on April 2, 2008.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
PIC Mar 6, 2008 Workbook	The Consultation and Outreach Plan: The study team has at times delayed getting back to us with timely information requests. Sent us a table with our option several weeks after the council vote in Feb/07. There has been 3 different city employees on this project which makes it difficult to discuss prior concerns.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	
PIC Mar 6, 2008 Workbook	The Consultation and Outreach Plan: It would be helpful to have a PIC with a formal presentation and explanation along with opportunity for questions.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	
PIC Mar 6, 2008 Workbook	The Consultation and Outreach Plan: the More information sessions are needed.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	
PIC Mar 6, 2008 Workbook	We ask for a fair assessment of Option 5 and consideration of previous validity [?] provided by us. To explore the value of Option 5 to enhance business operation and access to connect Connor East and West properties and same for Opta Minerals. O.M subdivided might create more value in the event O.M. wishes to sell all or a portion of its property.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	
PIC Mar 6, 2008 Workbook	1.The alignment of the east/west road where it bisects the Joe San\m's Park land or the north side of the Alexander Place Seniors Residence should be pushed as far south as possible to retain as much usable park space as possible. Entrance to future parking at this location should also be included in the road design. 2. The east' west road should have bike paths on both sides to allow safe cycling to/from the Joe Sam's trail system.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	
PIC Mar 6, 2008 Workbook	As residents of X Fellowes Crescent we strongly support the citizen option 5 which seems to be a very efficient way to reroute the traffic and cause the least problems and discomfort to the residents of Parkside	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Drive. Our yards back onto Parkside Drive and we are very concerned with the widening of this street to four lanes. Issues that are of grave concern to use are: 1. Our enjoyment of sitting in our back yard will be lost of greatly diminished with all the increased noise and fumes 2. Our privacy will be greatly reduced as the road will be too close to our backyard 3. Will streetlights be installed and how bright will they be? If too bright it will be very disturbing. 4. Will trees that are growing behind our fence, which are acting as a noise buffer presently and are providing extra privacy, will they be removed? 5. Will a sound barrier be installed to reduce the noise from the traffic? 6. Will a bike path be added to give cyclists a safe riding lane? 7. Resale value of our property will decrease. 8. Boulding and Parkside Intersection - It will be almost impossible to cross Parkside from Boulding during rush hour.				
PIC Mar 6, 2008 Workbook	It is not clear at this time how recreational trails crossing the Parkside Rd Bypass (Waterdown wetland trails) will be impacted by the bypass. Noise issues should also be considered in addition to crossing safety.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	
PIC Mar 6, 2008 Workbook	Garbage. What happens to the town of Waterdown when traffic is diverted from 403 during rush hour?	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	
PIC Mar 6, 2008 Workbook	Option 5 is the better route. A road is needed to avoid bottlenecks in the core of the village and to avoid safety concerns of residents in the immediate vicinity of the proposed road.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	
PIC Mar 6, 2008	I am concerned about the impact of the road on the wetland trails which are well used between Parkside	Waterdown-Aldershot	Waterdown-Aldershot	Comments were recorded	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
Workbook	and Concession 5.	Information	Information		
PIC Mar 6, 2008 Workbook	As a new resident of Waterdown who came here for its "small town feel" I am very upset that Parkside will potentially be widened to 4 lanes. My house backs on to Parkside near Boulding and widening the road would increase noise, pollution, and would cut down on a lot of beautiful trees that currently block the road from being seen. This would also decrease the value of my house. If something has to be done to Parkside, I believe it is in the best interest of the people and the "small town feel" of Waterdown to build a turning lane to allow more cars to move along Parkside and reduce traffic congestion during rush hour. It will cut through a beautiful park that has many trails and will impact the animals (sustainability would decrease). If the city decides to go through with widening Parkside to 4 lanes or with a center lane, we would like to see the following happen: 1) A sound proof fence installed by the City 2) Replace back and side windows to sound proof 3) No trees to be removed. If certain branches are to be cut, they must be identified with tags and approved by owner. Trees replanted closer to property. 4) Notification if any street lights will be installed and where they would be 5) Removal of hydroline to underground 6) No trucks be allowed to use road 7) Compensation for reducing the value of my house.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	
PIC Mar 6, 2008 Workbook	Additional cost and compensation for noise and air quality issues arising from high traffic areas along route through residential areas should be fully explained to citizens. Option 5 should have been explained further to the public at this information session.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
ID# 58 [redacted] Mar 6, 2008 Phone	[redacted] requested to know if the street (East-West) that drops down to Dundas from Parkside is Evans road.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Mar 11, 2008 Email	Dear [redacted] In response to your phone inquiry, dated March 6, 2008, please find the following answer from the Project Team. Question: Is the road that drops down from Parkside Dr. to Dundas St. a new street or is it Evans Road? Response: The road that drops down from Parkside Dr. to Dundas St. as part of the East-West recommended route is a proposed new road. Please see the attached map for details. In the meantime, if you have any additional questions or comments please do not hesitate to contact us.	
ID# 59 [redacted] Mar 6, 2008 Email	Hello, My name is [redacted]. I live at X Fellowes Cres. I back directly onto the section of Parkside Dr. that will be affected by this plan. I am a concerned citizen with the Parkside Drive East Citizens Group. I am greatly concerned that the city is even considering to disrupt the lives / alter the living conditions of approximately 35 home owners in north east Waterdown when the previous Stantec study had the perfect solution to keep the proposed east-west road north of Parkside Dr. by-passing all current developments. How is it that only we in the north east section get to suffer with the increased traffic (noise, speeding, pollution, expected large truck volume from the quarry expansion) and not everyone along	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Mar 20, 2008 Email	Email was acknowledged Mar 7, 2008. Dear [redacted], Thank you for your e-mail dated March 6, 2008. We have received a response from the project team and provide it below. We have organized it by issue and for ease of reference, we have included excerpts of your e-mail in italics, with the project team response following. *I am greatly concerned that the city is even considering to disrupt the lives / alter the living conditions of approximately 35 home owners in north east Waterdown when the previous Stantec study had the perfect solution to keep the proposed east-west road north of Parkside Dr. by-passing all current*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Parkside? I urge that the city consider and choose Option 5 which will keep this east-west roadway north of our homes where is will have less impact to homes in the area and provide more room to expand and build the safe road that you require. For an expanded roadway, that will handle a large amount of speeding vehicles in a hurry to get to work and then home again and heavily laden noisy dump trucks to and from the quarry, that will back right next to my existing property line, I have many concerns: 1) The increased noise: - how can this be minimized so as not to disrupt our lives? - what sort of sound barriers will you install? - what compensation will we receive to install proper windows (triple pane / insulated frame) to reduce this noise in our homes 2) The large volume of speeding traffic: - we all know this it is now a fact of life that a large number of drivers frequently will do 80-90 in a 60k zone (some faster) that is open and does not have frequent stops. How will you ensure the safety of our children playing in our back yards where safety is expected? 3) What is the expected posted speed limit for this road? How will it be enforced? - relates back to point 2 regarding safety concerns.			*developments. How is it that only we in the north east section get to suffer with the increased traffic (noise, speeding, pollution, expected large truck volume from the quarry expansion) and not everyone along Parkside?* *I urge that the city consider and choose Option 5 which will keep this east-west roadway north of our homes where is will have less impact to homes in the area and provide more room to expand and build the safe road that you require.* *For an expanded roadway, that will handle a large amount of speeding vehicles in a hurry to get to work and then home again and heavily laden noisy dump trucks to and from the quarry, that will back right next to my existing property line, I have many concerns:* *1) The increased noise:* *- how can this be minimized so as not to disrupt our lives?* *- what sort of sound barriers will you install?* *- what compensation will we receive to install proper windows (triple pane / insulated frame) to reduce this noise in our homes* **Project Team Response:** Any areas that may experience noise increases as a result of the New East-West Road have not been determined as yet. A detailed noise assessment will be undertaken in the upcoming Phase 3 work. There are numerous ways of addressing traffic noise ranging from moving the road further away from the noise sensitive area, reducing	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	- relates back to point 1 regarding noise concerns - We all know large traffic volume will be noisy. Speeding traffic will be louder. Is there a sound level that is considered acceptable? How will this be tested or proven / enforced if a road is built? How will we be protected? 4) How will the increased dump truck traffic to and from the quarry be addressed? Can they be forced North (to 401) or South (to QEW) and prevented from our streets? - I think it's pretty obvious that if you give them a quick short cut to Dundas and the 407, we will see a great number of vehicles on this new roadway. They will be a constant concern for road damage, speeding, noise and safety in our community. 5) Will street lights be installed with this new roadway? - We currently enjoy a somewhat country feel with the darkness behind our homes at night. This was one of the reasons for purchase. I do not want to loose this to light pollution. If lights are installed, who decides where, how many, how intense? Can we choose to decline them? 6) How close will the road be to our existing fence line? - We currently enjoy approximately 25-30 mature cedar hedge trees approximately 20 feet tall right behind our fence line. The original homeowner unfortunately planted them on the other side of our			the traveling speed, adjusting the profile of the road (lowering it), constructing earth berms between the edge of pavement and the property line, installing noise barriers along the property line and on-site measures such, as you suggest, modifications to existing window treatments. Once we have determined if there are any areas that may require noise mitigation, we can address how best to reduce the impact. This will be different for each affected site. *2) The large volume of speeding traffic:* *- we all know this it is now a fact of life that a large number of drivers frequently will do 80-90 in a 60k zone (some faster) that is open and does not have frequent stops. How will you ensure the safety of our children playing in our back yards where safety is expected?* **Project Team Response:** The safety of users of the road and adjacent properties is of paramount importance in the planning and design of road improvements such as this. During the next phase of the study we will be reviewing road safety and operations and, if we identify any concerns, we will investigate design and road operating changes to address those concerns. *3) What is the expected posted speed limit for this road?* *Project Team Response: The work completed to date uses a speed of 60 km/h. This will be confirmed or adjusted (if considered necessary) during Phase 3 work.* *How will it be enforced?*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	property line obviously not expecting the sort of development that is occurring. Will this hedge be affected by the new road? Will it be removed? **Please let me know what will happen to these. If they are to be removed, Can I be notified? Can these be replanted within my property line? I think that the growth, if well planned and properly layed out, will economically be a good thing for the area. The well layed plan lies with Option 5. Keep this road north of the existing community and you will have room to properly plan this road keeping in mind safety, noise and the large volume of traffic. I hope you can respond to my dire concerns.			Project Team Response: The enforcement of the speed limit will be the responsibility of local police. - relates back to point 2 regarding safety concerns. - relates back to point 1 regarding noise concerns - We all know large traffic volume will be noisy. Speeding traffic will be louder. Is there a sound level that is considered acceptable? How will this be tested or proven / enforced if a road is built? How will we be protected? **Project Team Response**: Ontario Ministry of the Environment's (MOE) standard methodology will be used to assess noise levels adjacent to the road improvements/widening. As a part of this assessment, an MOE developed road noise model will be used to predict existing and future traffic generated noise. During this work the criteria used to determine the need for noise mitigation will be finalized / recommended. Review and monitoring the actual noise levels after construction will be considered as part of the monitoring program developed for this project. *4) How will the increased dump truck traffic to and from the quarry be addressed?* Project Team Response: We have committed to addressing the issue of truck traffic in the next phase of the work. There are options to limit/prohibit trucks from using specific roadways. *Can they be forced North (to 401) or South (to QEW) and prevented from our streets?* *- I think it's pretty obvious that if you give them a*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				quick short cut to Dundas and the 407, we will see a great number of vehicles on this new roadway. They will be a constant concern for road damage, speeding, noise and safety in our community. *5) Will street lights be installed with this new roadway? We currently enjoy a somewhat country feel with the darkness behind our homes at night. This was one of the reasons for purchase. I do not want to loose this to light pollution.* *If lights are installed, who decides where, how many, how intense?* *Can we choose to decline them?* **Project Team Response:** Sections of the new East-West Road requiring street lights have not been finalized. At the very least, street lights will be installed at intersections. As part of the Project Team, lighting designers will be responsible for assessing the street light requirements based on safety considerations and operating requirements. Lighting level requirements will be addressed and recommendations submitted to the City of Hamilton for review and approval. Street lighting will be installed along the new road where required for safety reasons and, if they are required, they cannot be declined by the adjacent property owner. However, light spillage and intrusion onto adjacent lands can be addressed to minimize negative impacts. *6) How close will the road be to our existing fence line?*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				- *We currently enjoy approximately 25-30 mature cedar hedge trees approximately 20 feet tall right behind our fence line. The original homeowner unfortunately planted them on the other side of our property line obviously not expecting the sort of development that is occurring.* *Will this hedge be affected by the new road? Will it be removed?* ***Please let me know what will happen to these. If they are to be removed, Can I be notified? Can these be replanted within my property line?* **Project Team Response**: This kind of effect (e.g. vegetation removal) is not known at this stage in the study. Phase 3 work will determine the precise location of the road and the areas that will be disturbed with the new facilities, including this hedge. *I think that the growth, if well planned and properly layed out, will economically be a good thing for the area. The well layed plan lies with Option 5. Keep this road north of the existing community and you will have room to properly plan this road keeping in mind safety, noise and the large volume of traffic.* **Project Team Response:** As referenced in the Path Forward Report, the approach to evaluating Option 5 includes: - discussing and proposing an alignment with residents and businesses in the area for consideration; - collecting data and costing the land acquisition/business displacement costs of the alternative;	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				- assessment of community and business impact; - determination of feasibility; and - if feasible, evaluating the alternative against the current recommendation. Your participation in these discussions is welcome. In the meantime, if you have any additional questions or comments please do not hesitate to contact us.	
ID# 60 [redacted] Mar 7, 2008 Email	To Neutral Community Facilitator's Office and Diana Morreale at City of Hamilton Public Works Dept.: Hamilton Conservation Authority (HCA) has just recently received a copy of a letter from Conservation Halton to the Neutral Community Facilitator's Office, dated March 6, 2008 advising that they have some concerns with the Phase 3 and 4 and that there has been no discussions to date between the Secondary Plan Team and the EA Study Team which includes Conservation Halton. We wish to advise that HCA is also part of this EA Study Team and we too have not been involved with these discussions. As well, a copy of the Phase 3 and 4 report was not submitted for our review. Please be advised that we have had problems in the past with not being circulated documents for review and have not been invited to some discussion meetings. We request that a copy of the report be submitted to HCA and that we be added to the circulation list if we were inadvertently removed.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information & Diana Morreale	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Mar 26, 2008 Email	Email was acknowledged Mar 10, 2008. Dear [redacted] Thank you for your e-mail dated March 7, 2008. We have received a response from the project team and provide it below. --- The Project Partners are aware that Conservation Halton and Hamilton Conservation Authority are a part of the Waterdown/Aldershot Transportation Master Plan (WATMP) EA Study Team. We also look forward to working with the two conservation authorities in the upcoming Phases (3 & 4). The Project Partners have finalized the Phase 2 Report for the WATMP, a copy of the final report will be sent to all agencies that have been a part of the EA Study Team. As Phase 2 of the Waterdown/Aldershot Transportation Master Plan is now complete, the Study will proceed to Phases 3 and 4 to examine two distinct roadway projects. They are identified as the North-South Road	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				(Waterdown Road) Class Environmental Assessment project and the East-West Road Class Environmental Assessment project. The Project Partners will continue to meet with the WATMP EA Study Team at key stages of the Phase 3 and 4 work. We look forward to HCA's continued participation in the next phases. Please note, the City of Hamilton staff meet once a month to discuss all studies that are going on in Waterdown. In addition to these monthly meetings staff working on the WATMP and the Waterdown South Secondary Plan meets regularly to ensure the two studies are coordinated with one another. The project team will be contacting you in the next little while to set up agency consultation dates for Phase 3 work. --- In the meantime, if you have any additional questions or comments please do not hesitate to contact us.	
ID# 61 [redacted] Mar 7, 2008 Email	Dear Lura Consulting, I attended the Public Information meeting last night, and hoped to get a copy of the presentation material, particularly the timeframes and proposed alignment for North Waterdown. Please send a digital copy. Also, could you provide the contact names of the staff at Dillon? Thank you.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Mar 11, 2008 Email	Email was acknowledged Mar 10, 2008. Dear [redacted] Please find attached the presentation materials from the March 6th Public Information Centre (PIC). Please note the map for slide 5 and slide 16 is attached separately. There are also 5 additional plates (maps) that will be	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				sent to you today in a separate email due to the large size of the files. The contact information for Dillon Consulting is as follows: Paul MacLeod, Dillon Consulting Phone: 416-229-4647 #317 E-Mail: pmacleod@dillon.ca In the meantime, if you have any additional questions or comments please do not hesitate to contact us.	
ID# 67 [redacted] Mar 13, 2008 Phone	Caller wanted to verify that the Neutral Facilitator's office had received his NAC application by fax	Waterdown-Aldershot Information,	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Mar 13, 2008 Phone	The fax machine was checked and the caller received receipt confirmation of the application	
ID# 68 Sally Leppard Mar 13, 2008 Email	Dear [redacted] Further to our recent discussions, and correspondence from you, this is to advise you that we are currently reviewing the material and correspondence relating to this issue. We hope to have this review completed by the end of March. We are creating a correspondence log for this specific aspect of the project. I will be forwarding this to you for confirmation that we have all the relevant information. Regards, Sally M. Leppard	To [redacted]	Waterdown-Aldershot Information May 26, 2008 Email	See Response to ID# 107 (SO-Section)	
ID# 69	Caller lives on Parkside Dr. in Burlington which turns in	Waterdown-	Waterdown-	She was asked to still send in an application and that	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
[redacted] Mar 13, 2008 Phone	#1 side road, she is right outside the study area and was wondering is she could apply as she believes that she will be directly affected by this project	Aldershot Information,	Aldershot Information Mar 13, 2008 Phone	someone will contact her about her eligibility.	
ID# 70 [redacted] Mar 13, 2008 Phone	Requested the presentation materials to be sent (mailed) as Mr. Harvey was not able to attend the two PICs.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information,	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Mar 13, 2008 Phone	Hardcopies to be sent by March 20th, 2008	
ID# 72 [redacted] Mar 13, 2008 Email	Hi Sally: We will not know until March 21st whether anyone on our committee wants to participate. Would that be all right?? Take care, Guy	Waterdown-Aldershot Information,	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Mar 14, 2008 Email	Dear [redacted] Thank you for letting us know, March 21st will be fine.	
ID# 73 [redacted] Mar 13, 2008 Email	I can't fill out the form it will not come up. So I am interested in the east-west portion and would like to be considered for the committee. I am the chair of the Waterdown-North Wetland Trails Committee and have been interested in the area for many years. So I guess I am on e of the environmental people you might be looking for. John MacLennan Address was provided	Waterdown-Aldershot Information,	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Mar 13, 2008 Email	Dear [redacted] This email is to confirm that your NAC application has been received. Please provide your mailing address and fax number (i f available) to complete the application process.	
ID# 78 [redacted] Mar 25, 2008 Phone	I was reading through the Staging Plan for the TMP, and it refers to 6500 units to be built by 2018 but it also says that nothing can be built until the infrastructure is in place to support this growth. Can you tell me what is the timeline for the build out of these 6500 units?	Waterdown-Aldershot Information,	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Apr 15, 2008 Email	Email was acknowledged Mar 25, 2008. Dear [redacted] Thank you for your inquiry of March 25, 2008. We have obtained a response from the project team as follows: _____	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				Project Team Response: The timing of the build-out for the 6500 residential units is subject to the following municipal projects: • The completions of the secondary plans (Waterdown North and Waterdown South) • The availability of servicing for water and wastewater for the Waterdown Area • The approval and construction of the road improvements for the Waterdown/ Aldershot Area It is also dependant on the individual builder and when they plan to proceed with development. The Waterdown/Aldershot Transportation Plan identified two road projects as part of the road improvements for the Waterdown/Aldershot that are required to support the additional 6500 residential units. These two road projects are the Waterdown Road Class EA and the East-West road Class EA. The project team plans to complete Phases 3 & 4 of the Class EA in spring 2009. Once Phases 3 and 4 have been completed the project team will file the Environmental Study Report (ESR) to the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) in Spring 2009. The Ministry may approve the Environmental Assessment (EA), approve the EA with changes, or issue a Part II order for an individual Environmental Assessment. Should the Ministry approve the ESR in 2009, we anticipate completion of the new roadways by 2016 (this date is contingent upon approvals and	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				funding from the project partners – City of Hamilton, City of Burlington and the Region of Halton) The timing of the build-out is subject to the developers' plans along with the completion of the additional municipal projects listed above	
ID# 81 [redacted] Mar 27, 2008 Email	Hi Sally, It has been 22 business days since I received this email. When do you anticipate that I will get a response? thanks[redacted]	Waterdown-Aldershot Information, [redacted] &[redacted]	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Apr 1, 2008 Email	Dear[redacted]: Thank you for your e-mail dated March 27, 2008. We are tracking the status of your response, and will get back to you within a few days. Best regards, --- -- Dear[redacted] Thank you for your e-mail dated February 21, 2008 addressed to Ms. Morreale. We have received a response from the project team and provide it below. We have organized it by issue and for ease of reference, we have included excerpts of your e-mail in italics, with the project team response following. *1) Can you please advise me if the proposed East West route for the Waterdown/Aldershot Transportation study is being built on a 4 lane platform?* **Project Team Response:** The East-West link has been identified as a two lane roadway West of the connection to Parkside and a four lane roadway on	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				the Parkside Drive section as illustrated in Figure 9.1 of the Final Report. Currently, it is not envisioned to build this roadway on a 4-lane platform West of the Parkside Drive connection. The section along Parkside Drive is a four lane section – one lane per direction representing the current demand and the other lane in each direction is required to address OPA 28 demand. The right of way for this roadway will be consistent with City standards for arterial roads. Any new future road widening not identified in this study would be subject to the appropriate environmental assessment. *2) As you are aware, Parkside Dr is an existing 2 lane road which is handling both town and through traffic. The consultants are saying that we need to expand an additional 2 lanes on the eastern portion of Parkside to handle the anticipated increase in traffic from the population explosion as well as the increased amount of through traffic which will result from the "bypass". If the two lane east-west road, which is being linked to the eastern portion of Parkside, is being built on a 4 lane platform in anticipation of even greater traffic in the future, how will the proposed 4 lane road on Parkside handle the increased traffic demands? Would you then consider expanding the eastern portion of Parkside to a 6 lane road?* **Project Team Response:** The study was required to address demands until 2021, and it has addressed that. The current projected demand for the east-west route is the equivalent of one additional lane of traffic in each direction. The need for any additional lanes of traffic along Parkside Road (i.e. 4 to 6 lanes) is beyond	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				the planning period of this study and would be subject to new environmental assessments. *3) Also, please provide me with the justification as to why the residents on the eastern portion of Parkside need to bear the burden of two busy roads (Parkside and the Bypass), especially when there is record of an existing social concern regarding truck traffic from the facility formerly known as "Barnes". It appears that you continually address this concern from a legal perspective rather than a social environmental concern.* *Although these concerns have been brought to your team's attention early in the process, it appears that they have been ignored. In fact the social environmental concerns have now increased greatly. In addition to the "Barnes" truck traffic not being resolved, we have to deal with a substantial increase in traffic, including more trucks, as this east-west route may be used as a truck "bypass". This again was downplayed throughout the study. We had brought this possibility to the city's attention, the potential for the substantial increase in truck traffic due to the quarry expansion, which the city had initially denied up to and including the public works meeting on Feb 20, 2006. This was critical information that should have been disclosed during the study.* **Project Team Response:** The Phase 2 study evaluated all options in accordance with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process – which included public consultation in the development of the	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				evaluation criteria. This approach included balancing a number of criteria, and weighting them to arrive at an ultimate conclusion. Social impacts were considered in this process along with natural environment impacts, economic impacts, costs and technical considerations. The Phase 2 Report outlines how it was concluded that the East-West hybrid corridor is the preferred corridor for the needed capacity. Numerous meetings and correspondence have taken place with the Parkside residents' representatives including meetings with the Ministry of the Environment to discuss and consider these concerns. As you may know, we are proposing early in Phase 3 to evaluate "Option 5" in more detail. The approach to evaluating this option includes: - discussing and proposing an alignment with residents and businesses in the area for consideration; - collecting data and costing the land acquisition/business displacement costs of the alternative; - assessment of community and business impact; - determination of feasibility; and - if feasible, evaluating the alternative against the current recommendation. Thank you for your continued interest and participation in the Waterdown/Aldershot	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				Transportation Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment studies. Please do not hesitate to contact our office should you need any further information.	
ID# 83 [redacted] Mar 31, 2008 Email	To whom it may concern, We are landowners in the area. Our property consists of 64 acres fronting on the north side of Parkside, stretching north from there with Centre Street a few hundred yards to the West. According to the Waterdown/Aldershot TMP, you are planning to build a roadway right through our property. This seems to go against the direction we have received from other departments in regards to the proposed planning/uses of this area. Firstly, we have been informed that this area is now within the designated Greenbelt area. Any sort of high density development within the Greenbelt is discouraged. Secondly, we have been informed by the local Conservation Authority that about 1/3 of our property has been designated as an important and sensitive wetland area. Since we, as landowners, are not in any position to use this land for high density development, it seems unjust that the city is willing to step in and disrupt this area with a project so extreme in its environmental impact.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Apr 11, 2008	Email was acknowledged Apr 1, 2008. Dear [redacted], Thank you for your email dated March 31, 2008. In order to address your concerns the project team would like to request the exact address and location of your property. Please provide this information at your convenience. --- - Dear [redacted] Thank you for your e-mail dated March 31, 2008. We have obtained responses from the Project Team to your inquiries, and have inserted them into the e-mail below. For ease of reference, we have included excerpts of your e-mail in italics, with the project team response following in blue. --- *To whom it may concern,* *We are landowners in the area. Our property consists of 64 acres fronting on the north side of Parkside, stretching north from there with Centre Street a few hundred yards to the West.* *According to the Waterdown/Aldershot TMP, you are planning to build a roadway right through our property.*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
---------- - [redacted] Apr. 3, 2008 Email	Parkside, to the south, and 4th Concession, to the north of your proposed roadway, are already existing roads which are no more than 2 kilometers apart. These roads should be improved as part of this plan. This strategy would be more cost effective and have a much lesser environmental impact on the area. Why build a new road in between? Regards, [redacted] ---------- --- Address was provided			*This seems to go against the direction we have received from other departments in regards to the proposed planning/uses of this area.* *Firstly, we have been informed that this area is now within the designated Greenbelt area. Any sort of high density development within the Greenbelt is discouraged.* *Secondly, we have been informed by the local Conservation Authority that about 1/3 of our property has been designated as an important and sensitive wetland area.* *Since we, as landowners, are not in any position to use this land for high density development, it seems unjust that the city is willing to step in and disrupt this area with a project so extreme in its environmental impact.* *Parkside, to the south, and 4th Concession, to the north of your proposed roadway, are already existing roads which are no more than 2 kilometers apart. These roads should be improved as part of this plan. This strategy would be more cost effective and have a much lesser environmental impact on the area. Why build a new road in between?* **Project Team Response**: Thank you for your interest regarding this project. Our response to your questions are presented below: You have indicated that the portion of your property	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				affected by the project is designated within the Greenbelt and important wetland habitat. While not obviously encouraged, the development of utility corridors and roads are permitted uses within the Greenbelt. While we have attempted to minimize impacts to the natural environment as much as possible in the routing of the road alternatives, it has not been possible to avoid all features. During the Class EA Phase 3 and 4 work, we will better define the roadway alignment and identify mitigation measures to avoid/minimize effects to natural features. Affected property owners will be contacted to obtain their input. Alternative routes were examined including the widening of Parkside Dr. While the widening of Parkside Dr. would result in limited effects to the natural environment, a significant number of homes would need to be removed as a result of road widening. As such, it was not considered to be a preferred option. The use of the 4th Concession was not deemed to be desirable as it is located too far north and away from the lands to be developed (the Waterdown North lands which the preferred road route passes through). It is the development of these lands that is created the need for this new east-west roadway. We note that the alternative routes that were identified and evaluated are documented in the Waterdown-Aldershot Transportation Master Plan Phase 2 Report which is publicly available. Again, should the final route pass through your	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				property, we will be contacting you in the near future to review the road design alternatives and obtain your input. We hope that we have answered your questions. If further clarification is required please let the Neutral Community Facilitator's Office know and we will initiate further inquires.	
ID# 87 [redacted] Apr 9th, 2008	Project Team. thank you for replying to my email. At this point I am finding it difficult to believe that you are in the process of evaluating Option 5 in a fair manner when you keep on defending Option 4. You continue to contradict yourselves by disregarding the social concerns that we have brought to your attention and that you have not included in your evaluation. For example, your response continues to be that the "study evaluated all options in accordance to the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process -which included public consultation on the development of evaluation criteria". Furthermore, you state that "this approach included a number of criteria, and weighting them to arrive at an ultimate conclusion". However when the justification tables were recently questioned with possible errors which strengthen the argument that Option 5 is the better choice, you take a complete turnabout by saying that the "SAW method was intended to assist the decision making process as it is useful to condense large data sets-it was not intended to be the decision making process itself." Then you go on to add additional impacts which would affect Option 5, such as the removal of major businesses, risks	Waterdown-Aldershot Information,	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Oct 24, 2008 Email	See Response to ID# 114 (GP-Section)	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	related to contamination and associated costs despite the fact that these impacts should have already been included in your original weighting. We asked you to evaluate our Option 5 route along the studies original Northern Route option up to the area east of Robson where the road could be routed south and aligned with the north south portion of Option 4.I do not understand how your team is coming up with these additional impacts that "tip the preference to Option 4." In other words, the project team allows for additional impacts to be considered when it strengthens Option 4(despite the fact that these impacts should already be accounted for) and dismisses the impacts that we have brought to their attention, which strengthen the argument for Option 5. Also, the original evaluation criteria and the results from the justification table are used to justify why Option 4 is preferred, but when these results are questioned and favour Option 5 they are only used to "assist" in the decision making process. Needless to say, I am not surprised by your answer regarding future expansion of the East West route. Again, common sense dictates that the future expansion of the Option 5 road would not only be much easier to construct but it would be much more effective in solving future transportation issues. Since the future expansion possibilities favour Option 5 over Option 4 you dismiss the argument altogether by making a blanket statement that "the study was required to address demands until 2021, and it has addressed that". Proper planning should take future growth and transportation				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	issues into consideration and options that favour longer term solutions should be preferred. You state that "numerous meetings and correspondence have taken place with the Parkside residents' including meetings with the Ministry of the Environment to discuss and consider these concerns". However you, to this day, still disregard our social concerns that we have brought to your attention. At this point I would like to see the minutes from the MOE meetings to get clarification on what has actually been discussed as the conclusions from our meetings with the MOE seem to be completely different from yours. Please advise if you can provide me with the minutes of your meetings				
ID# 88 [redacted] Apr. 7th, 2008 Phone ---------- - Aug 29, 2008 Phone	Inquired to know about option 5 (heard about it from neighbors) is concerned because this will impact his home significantly and how long the decision would take Mr. Kikauka requested to know about the process. ---------- ---I was sent a response and a map from the project team and the letter (attached) states that since my property is West of Centre Road it is not affected but my property is in fact East of Centre Road, and from the map it looks like the road runs right through my house. I would like to speak to someone about this. It would also be helpful to receive a zoomed map of my property and the proposed road alignment	Waterdown-Aldershot Information,	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Apr 7, 2008 Phone ---------- - Aug 26, 2008 Email ---------- -Dillon	Directed person to project website, walked him through schedule, directed him to the Path Forward Report, and let him know about timelines and explained the EA process. Dear [redacted], ---------- -- Further to your telephone call of April 7, 2008 to Ms Liz Nield of the Neutral Community Facilitator's Office we are writing to follow up regarding your inquiry. We enclose a map of the preferred alignment of the East/West roadway. As you can see your property, which is located west of Centre Road should not be affected by any option. Please do hesitate to contact our office should you have any questions. Please refer to the project website at: www.hamilton.ca/WaterdownTMP for more	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
			Consulting Apr 27, 2009 Phone	information. --- --I spoke to [redacted] today over the phone. He and his wife, Tammy didn't attend the last round of PICs and he wasn't aware that we were proposing a roundabout in front of his property. He reviewed the most current plans on the city's website and is not pleased with the recommendation of a roundabout in front of his property. I explained that we have decided to shift the roundabout to the west approximately 20 meters to give him better access to the roadway. I also explained that traffic will operate much more efficiently than a conventional intersection and that traffic will be forced to slow down upon entering the roundabout. He would like me to send him a copy of the updated plan to his email address once it is completed. I agreed to do so. Amanda	
ID# 89 [redacted] Mar 7, 2008 Email	Mrs. McCarthy, I attended the information session of the transportation master plan last night but did not get a chance to talk to you. I am concerned about the east-west bypass indicated on the planning documents and will express my concerns to the folks at the City but I wanted to inform you as well. My wife and I are 14 year residents of Waterdown. We moved here for the usual reasons mentioned: a small-town feel while still in reasonable driving distance to Hamilton, Burlington, and Toronto. As we are outgrowing our starter home we have recently	Margaret McCarthy Forwarded to Diana Morreale to Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Kirsten McCauley Mar 19, 2008 Email	Hi [redacted] I appreciate your concern and thank you for you comments. I am the planner that has been working on the Waterdown North Secondary Plan at the City. I have forwarded the comments regarding the Transportation Master Plan to the project team. If you have further concerns or questions, please contact Diana Morreale, Senior Project Manager for the Transportation Master Plan, at dmorreal@hamilton.ca. The Waterdown North Secondary Plan has been adopted by City Council but has not received final approval because it was appealed to the Ontario	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	purchased a new house to be built in the North Waterdown area by Rosehaven Homes. We are scheduled to move in August 2009. We chose (and paid a considerable upgrade fee) for a lot that backs onto the pond. We are the northernmost lot in Phase 1 of the development and understood from the builder that there were many homes to be built to the north of our lot in phase II. I was dismayed at the information session to see an east-west road shown crossing the pond at the northern end. This is a beautiful natural area with plant and wildlife that needs protection. The Dillon representative assured me that the east-west road shown as a straight line indicates a corridor only and that the final routing will be determined in the next several months. I would strongly encourage that if this road must be built, it follow the northern boundary of the Town to keep the sound and air pollution away from residential areas and to protect the pond. Also, the road planners should include noise barriers to be placed to the south of such a road. I will interested in the results of the environmental study. I will be speaking to the builder about the information (or lack thereof) they are providing to potential purchasers. The Dillon representative said the builders are gambling on the land being available for residential development until the City completes the east-west plan. With the concerns over the location of this east-west		---------- Diana Morreale	Municipal Board. Please visit the project website www.hamilton.ca/waterdownnorth and under the links at the side is the report to Economic Development and Planning Committee. Here is the link to the Waterdown North Secondary Plan Policies - http://www.myhamilton.ca/NR/rdonlyres/256CC9A0-2453-4C88-82C5-B5237058D959/0/WNPED07092AppA.pdf Here is the link to the final adopted land use plan - http://www.myhamilton.ca/NR/rdonlyres/F058BEAB-7CD3-4808-9D3E-EAF71E779156/0/WNPED07092AppASchB.pdf The Waterdown North Secondary Plan was developed through an integrated process to deal with a number of issues including servicing. Since the plan was appealed the water tower is unable to be built until the appeal is resolved. No building permits can be issued until the water tower has been constructed and is operational. Planning staff is working with all parties to try and resolve the issues in a timely manner. In regards to the road location, through the Secondary Plan process we are unable to specifically delineate the east/west arterial roadway which is why it is shown in a relatively straight line at the northern end of the Secondary Plan. The road is being designed through the Waterdown/Aldershot Transportation Master Plan Environmental Assessment Process. Phase 2 of this process was recently completed and Phase 3 and 4 will deal with the detailed design of the road.	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	road and the uncertainty of whether my children will have a high school in Waterdown to attend in a few years, I am second-guessing if Waterdown was the right place to call home.		Apr 8, 2008 Email	If you have any questions or need further information, please call me or email me back. Thanks,Kirsten --- -- [redacted], Thank you for taking the time to attend our Waterdown/Aldershot Transportation Master Plan (WATMP) Public Information Centre back in March. The Project Team has reviewed your e-mail dated March 7, 2008 and has the following response related to your inquiry on the Transportation Master Plan. The Project Team has completed Phase 2 of the WATMP. Phase 2 work identified two roadway projects to provide additional capacity to the existing Waterdown transportation system. They are identified as the North-South Road (Waterdown Road) Class Environmental Assessment project and the East-West Road Class Environmental Assessment project. The Project Team is starting work on Phases 3 & 4 of the Environmental Assessment process for both road projects; this will entail the development of the final routing for the East-West Road. Phases 3 & 4 will involve the development of the design alternatives for the preferred East-West Road Corridor. When developing the designs for the East-West Road the project team will attempt to mitigate	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				as many impacts to the existing social, cultural and environmental conditions in the Waterdown Area. Work in the Phase 3 and 4 work plan for the East- West Road Class EA includes assessing the existing natural features in Waterdown North (i.e. aquatic/fisheries assessment, terrestrial features assessments, ecological land classification, amphibian assessment, etc). These assessments/studies will form the baseline information that will support the possible design options for the East-West Road alignment. Phase 3 and 4 works will also look at the need/requirement for noise attenuation measures as part of the possible design options. The project team looks forward to working with you during Phases 3 and 4. I apologize for the delay in our response to you. Please feel free to e-mail the project team with any further questions at any time during Phases 3 & 4. For my information purposes, I have also included the response that Kirsten McCauley provided you on the planning side of things. Thank you for your e-mail and I look forward to working with you in the future.	
ID# 90 [redacted] Apr 11, 2008	Would like to meet with someone from the NCTO to discuss the WATMP project further, (Sally Leppard).	Waterdown-Aldershot Information,	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Apr 18, 2008	Done	
ID# 91	Please fax me a clear map of the 2 road alignments	Waterdown-	Waterdown-	Map was faxed Apr 16, 2008	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
(Unidentified) Apr 16, 2008 PHone	for the project. The map in the public notice is too small. I had issues finding it on the website as well.	Aldershot Information,	Aldershot Information Apr 16, 2008		
ID# 92 [redacted] Apr 16, 2008 Phone	When watertower would be built in the new development? Corner of Centre Rd. and Parkside Drive. Would like to go to the NAC meetings if they are open to the public. Please let me know if I can attend April 22nd meeting.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information,	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Aug 26, 2008 Mail	Dear [redacted] In reference to your telephone conversation on April 16th, 2008 with Ms. Patricia Prokop of the Neutral Community Facilitator's Office we are pleased to provide a response from the Project Team as follows. *When will the tower be built in the new development? At the corner of Centre Road and Parkside Drive.* **Response**: The Waterdown North Secondary Plan was developed through an integrated process to deal with a number of issues including servicing. Since the plan was appealed the water tower is unable to be built until the appeal is resolved. No building permits can be issued until the water tower has been constructed and is operational. Planning staff is working with all parties to try and resolve the issues in a timely manner. The Waterdown North Secondary Plan has been adopted by City Council but has not received final approval because it was appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board. Please visit the project website www.hamilton.ca/waterdownnorth and under the links at the side is the report to Economic Development and Planning Committee. Here is the link to the Waterdown North Secondary Plan Policies - http://www.myhamilton.ca/NR/rdonlyres/256CC9A0-	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				2453-4C88-82C5-B5237058D959/0/WNPED07092AppA.pdf Here is the link to the final adopted land use plan - http://www.myhamilton.ca/NR/rdonlyres/F058BEAB-7CD3-4808-9D3E-EAF71E779156/0/WNPED07092AppASchB.pdf If you cannot access the website please do not hesitate to let us know. Should you wish to observe the Neighbourhood Advisory Committee you will be more than welcome the next meeting for the East/West corridor is currently scheduled for September 9, 2008. Sincerely, Sally Leppard	
ID# 93 [redacted] Apr 22, 2008 Phone	Where does the east-west route link to highway 6? What is the location of the proposed intersection What is the timeline for the completion of the bypass	Waterdown-Aldershot Information,	Waterdown-Aldershot Information, Aug 27, 2008 Email	Dear [redacted]. Thank you for your telephone inquiry of April 22, 2008. We have obtained a response from the Waterdown-Aldershot Transportation Master Plan Project Team as follows: *Question 1: Where does the East-West route link to Highway 6? What is the location of the proposed intersection?* Project Team Response: The location of the connection of the proposed new roadway to Highway 6 is currently being assessed. The Phase 2 recommended connection was at Highway 6 at the intersection of Concession 4. An alternative connection north of Concession 4 is currently under study. Please find attached a map which denotes A:	

	Follow-up
m ds ion of the ove ars ent ne d	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				Members, dated October 27, 2008, Dillon Consulting. Also please take into consideration the following concerns that were discussed at the last meeting. >Well Water: Please include the potential impacts to the quantity and quality of water for the many residents who are currently on wells. > Septic Systems : Please include the potential impacts to Septic Systems for those residents that are not hooked up to City sewers. **Response**: The potential for effects on well water and septic systems will be considered in the EA work. Kind Regards, Patricia Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard	
ID# 135 [redacted] Jun 9, 2008 Phone	He was away on June 2nd and would like a copy of the materials. He also notified a change of email address	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Jun 9, 2008 Phone	He was notified that the next NAC meeting g is to be held on June 11th at the Travel Lodge in Burlington, and hard copies of all materials will be made available at that meeting	
ID# 137 [redacted] Jun 12, 2008 Email	**Subject:** Waterdown Road Corridors SIR, A couple of observations about the plan for the waterdown corridors. 1 For long term and overall traffic flow I believe it would make sense to align the north/south line so that it intersects with the east / west corridor at highway	Syeda Banuri to Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Jun 12, 2008 Email	Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email. Please note that we have sent your comments to Dillon Consulting and the Project Partners for their review and consideration. Regards, Patricia Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	#5. Under the proposed set up there would be be traffic congestion with the traffic transferring between the two corridors clogging Highway 5 between the two corridors with a certain percentage choosing to travel through Waterdown rather than jogging over to the other corridor. 2 I understand the construction cost saving route of the north/ south plan, but to prevent disturbing an established neighbourhood, how about turning the route east about a quarter mile before it reaches Mountain Brow Blvd. and tying in to the boulevard east of the older established homes. GOOD LUCK, [redacted]				
ID# 139 [redacted] Jun 13, 2008 Phone	How far (distance) does the new proposed east-west road run from Northlawn. What is the approximate distance from the residential backyards on the North side of Northlawn to the new East-West route?	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Oct 9, 2008 Email	Dear [redacted] Thank you for your phone call dated June 13, 2008. We have obtained responses from the Project Team to your inquiry, and have provided it below. The Project Team has responded to your inquiry in blue. What is the approximate distance from Northlawn Avenue to new east-west route? **Response**: Three options for the mid block alignments are being considered: an option to the north (290m away from Northlawn Ave.); an option in the middle (190m away from Northlawn Ave.); and an option to the south (100m away from Northlawn Ave.). The recommended option is to be presented at the upcoming Public Information Centre in early	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
			---------- - Waterdown-Aldershot Information Oct 24, 2008 Email	November. Regards, Patricia Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard, ---------- -- Dear [redacted] Please find an updated response from the Project Team below to your inquiry of June 13, 2008. *What is the approximate distance from Northlawn Avenue to new east-west route?* **Response**: Four road alignment options have been identified for the mid block alignments that run through the woodlot/PSW on the east side of Centre. The most southern alignment is about 140 m north of the residences on the north side of Northlawn Ave (measured from the homes). We note that a 100 m treed buffer would be maintained between the road and the back of the residential properties. The next closest alignments are about 190 m and 290 m away. The most northern alignment is about 320 m away at its closest point to the Northlawn Ave residents. Kind regards, Patricia Halajski née Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard	
ID# 141 [redacted] Jun 13, 2008 Email	This e-mail is in regards to your proposed "east west corridor" that will run through a stretch of land, directly north of Parkside, to link Highway 6 and Centre Road. I live at 732 Highway 6 North - north of Parkside Drive. I am just below 5th concession, on the east side of the highway. In fact, my property is adjacent to Terra	Syeda to Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Aug 25, 2008 Email	Email was acknowledged Jun 13, 2008. **Subject:** I.D.# 141 - RE: Phase 3 & 4 Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Dear [redacted],	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Greenhouse. How will this new east west corridor affect the value of my property. My house sits on a 5 acre piece of land. Will the east west corridor cut through any properties south of my home; and, if so, how close will my home be to this new intersection? I am not able to attend the public information centres, so I would appreciate your feedback. Respectfully Yours, [redacted]			Thank you for your e-mail dated June 13, 2008. We have obtained a response from the Project Team to your inquiry, and have inserted it directly into your e-mail below. The Project Team has responded to your email in blue. *This e-mail is in regards to your proposed "east west corridor" that will run through a stretch of land, directly north of Parkside, to link Highway 6 and Centre Road. I live at 732 Highway 6 North - north of Parkside Drive. I am just below 5th concession, on the east side of the highway. In fact, my property is adjacent to Terra Greenhouse.* *How will this new east west corridor affect the value of my property? My house sits on a 5 acre piece of land. Will the east west corridor cut through any properties south of my home; and, if so, how close will my home be to this new intersection? I am not able to attend the public information centres, so I would appreciate your feedback.* **Response**: Please find attached, a map showing the location of the 2 alternatives that are currently being considered in the Highway 6 area. Both of these are well south of your property. Regards, Patricia Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard,	
ID# 143 [redacted] Jun 16, 2008 Email	Dear Sirs, I have been a resident of Waterdown area off and on for over 40 years. Ever since I was a teen a bypass has	Syeda Banuri & Paul Macleod (Jun 15,	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Aug 25, 2008	Email was acknowledged Jun 18, 2008. --- Subject: ID# 143 - RE: Waterdown`s bypass...	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
(Same as ID# 168)	been discussed. The so-called roadway improvements DO NOT solve many of our little town road problems! Firstly the bypass should be much further out. Surely Parkside is IN Waterdown !?? With all the new homes being built on the East side all Merging unto Parkside or Dundas we need to move it further out! Surely a bypass should circle the town NOT go through it? Also the North - South corridor will also merge onto an already busy #5! ALL you are really doing is shuffleing the traffic mess a few blocks over?!! The busy corridors will encircle all the lovely new homes in the east end surely?! The noise? The safety issues? My Gosh have we not butchered our lovely Victorian Village enough without adding to it! Find another solution please.....AWAY from our town! Regards, [redacted] --- **Sent:** Monday, August 25, 2008 11:13 AM **Subject:** Re: ID# 143 - RE: Waterdown`s bypass... Thanks for the response.....all I can say its a shame that we have to have yet another 4 lane road right through our little town! What a butcher job they have made of our victorian village and it still continues! I for	2008, forwarded to Waterdown-Aldershot Info	Email	[redacted] Thank you for your email dated June 16, 2008. We have received a response from the Project Team and provide it below. For ease of reference, we have included excerpts of your e-mail in italics, with the project team response following. *Dear Sirs,* *I have been a resident of Waterdown area off and on for over 40 years. Ever since I was a teen a bypass has been discussed.* *The so-called roadway improvements DO NOT solve many of our little town road problems!* *Firstly the bypass should be much further out. Surely Parkside is in Waterdown !?? With all the new homes being built on the East side all Merging unto Parkside or Dundas we need to move it further out! Surely a bypass should circle the town NOT go through it?* *Also the North - South corridor will also merge onto an already busy #5!* *ALL you are really doing is shuffleing the traffic mess a few blocks over?!! The busy corridors will encircle all the lovely new homes in the east end surely?! The noise? The safety issues?* *My Gosh have we not butchered our lovely Victorian Village enough without adding to it! Find another solution please.....AWAY from our town!* **Response**: Thank you for your comments. The new Waterdown east-west roadway is not intended to be a "By-pass" roadway. Rather the road is to be developed to serve the needs of new development	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	one am tired of trying to fight an every losing battle. Regards [redacted]			that has been approved (by the Province) for Waterdown. As such, the roadway needs to be in proximity to these development areas (e.g. the North Waterdown Development Area located north of Parkside Dr.). Moving the new road to the north and outside of Waterdown would not address the future road capacity demand that will be created within the town. Regarding the improvements to Waterdown Rd. (new north-south road), connection to the Waterdown South development area and Dundas St is needed to service the road demands of this new development. As such, the new connection to Dundas St (Hwy 5) cannot be avoided. Kind regards, Patricia Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard	
ID# 144 [redacted] Jun 16, 2008 Phone	He receives 3 copies of the Waterdown-Aldershot information and would like to cancel the following two of them.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Jun 16, 2008 Phone	He was advised that the database would be corrected.	
ID# 145 [redacted] Jun 16, 2008 Email	[redacted] visited Main street Closure PIC and asked that someone should give him a call to discuss the Waterdown Aldershot TMP EA and Phase 3 and 4. Please, give him a call.	Syeday Banuri to Waterdown-Aldershot information	City of Hamilton Jul 24, 2008 Phone	Someone called [redacted].	
ID# 148 [redacted] (Halton Conservation) Jun 19, 2008	[redacted] (Halton Region) would like feedback on whether or not she should prepare the one page memo/list for the upcoming Public Information Centres from the Conservation of Halton as discussed with Liz Nield.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Sally Leppard Jun 19 & 23, 2008 Email & Phone	Hello [redacted]. Thank you for following up on Halton CAs offer to provide a memo to the NAC outlining the CAs area of interest vis a vis the Waterdown-Aldershot Transportation Master Plan and the resulting Class EA road projects.	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
Phone [redacted] [redacted]				At the NAC meetings last week, we conveyed Halton Conservation's offer to prepare this memo. From our understanding of the NAC perspectives, they have indicated that they would appreciate receiving more knowledge about the natural environment aspects to assist them with the evaluation of alternatives. I think it would be useful to describe Halton Conservation's approach to participating/providing knowledge in projects such as this. If you would like to discuss this further with me, I would be happy to call you on Monday, since I am away tomorrow. Regards, Sally --- -- [redacted] was contacted and a time was set up to discuss the matter with Sally Leppard on Monday June 23.	
ID# 149 [redacted] Jun 19, 2008 Unknown	**Subject:** Inquiry regarding potential expansion of parkside dr. Waterdown Hi Syeda, Further to our phone conversation, you will find the gentlemen's contact below. He has heard rumblings of a potential expansion of parkside dr and hollybush road intersection and would like so more details. If you could kindly get back to him at your leisure, it would greatly be appreciated. Much thanks for your time	Forwarded to Syeda from Alvin Chan Forwarded to Waterdown-Aldershot Information June 19th, 2008	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Oct 17, 2008 Email	Email was acknowledged Jun 24, 2008. Dear [redacted] Thank you for your phone call June 19, 2008. We have obtained a response from the Project Team to your inquiry, and have included it below. The Project Team has responded in blue. --- *Please provide more details about the expansion of Parkside Drive and Hollybush Road intersection.*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	and consideration. Alvin			**Response**: No changes are being proposed for Hollybush Drive as part of the Class Environmental Assessment being undertaken for the new East-West Roadway in Waterdown. Improvements proposed to Parkside Dr. are well east of Centre Road from approximately the rail crossing to the eastern edge of the UpCountry Development Lands. Kind regards, Patricia Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard,	
ID# 150 [redacted] Mar 8, 2008 Email	**Subject:** Squirrel Pictures Paul It was a pleasure to meet you on Wednesday night and thanks for taking the time to explain the project to us. As promised, I've attached some pictures of 'our' flying squirrel. We'd be interested to hear what your environmental team thinks and whether they had already catalogued this species in the area. We do have some more pictures if needed. Thanks and regards, [redacted]	Forwarded to Patricia Prokop from Paul MacLeod	Paul MacLeod Mar 10, 2008 Email --- - Waterdown-Aldershot Information Jun 25.2008 Email	Thanks [redacted] I will pass these along to our terrestrial biologists for comment and let you know their comments. Paul --- -- Dear [redacted] Please find attached a memo from Dillon Consulting in response to your inquiry regarding the presence of a flying squirrel in the WATMP Study Area. Kind regards, Patricia Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard Paul, We have examined the photos sent by Neil Ashmore of Waterdown, Ontario. Based on the fur colouration, relative size, habitat preference (i.e. mature hardwood forests) and range, we have determined that Mr. Ashmore has documented a southern flying squirrel	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
[redacted]				(*Glaucomys volans*). In April 2006, southern flying squirrels were reassigned by the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC) and are no longer a federal species at risk under the Species at Risk Act; however, they are listed as *Special Concern* by the Committee on the Status of Species at Risk in Ontario (COSSARO) under the provincial Endangered Species Act. The southern flying squirrel is also a *Common - Species of Interest* in Halton Region and is not well documented in the Hamilton-Wentworth Region. Recent scientific literature on the southern flying squirrel suggests that this species had experienced a significant northern geographic range expansion between 1994 and 2004 (Bowman et al., 2005). This geographic range expansion was likely initiated by a warmer climate in Ontario during this expansion period. Colder winters and deficiencies in tree mast production since 1994 have resulted in a range contraction for southern flying squirrels; however, the Waterdown Aldershot Transportation Master Plan study area remains within the accepted geographic range for this species. The habitat suitability for southern flying squirrels is dependant on a few factors, including climate, tree species composition, availability of nest cavities, food resources and species competition. These squirrels primarily nest in the cavities of live, declining mature deciduous tree stands and prefer habitat with snags and multilayer canopies. A recent Ontario study found that southern flying squirrels nested in the cavities of five tree species; sugar maple, American beech,	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				yellow birch, red maple and trembling aspen (Holloway and Malcolm, 20071). Further, large cavity trees appear to be important for reproductive females and as winter den sites (Holloway and Malcolm, 20071). Food availability strongly influences flying squirrel densities and movement patterns: flying squirrel activity is associated with areas of high mast tree densities, abundant understory shrubs and high hypogeous fungi biomass (Holloway and Malcolm, 20072; Taulman and Smith, 2004) Southern flying squirrel's home range averaged 5.1 ha in Central Ontario (Holloway and Malcolm, 20072); however, home ranges may be larger in fragmented forested landscapes, depending on resource availability. The core habitat areas for southern flying squirrels appear to be centred on nest sites. The WATMP study area meets the habitat requirements for the southern flying squirrel, therefore, it is probable that larger forested tracks in the study area and woodlots contiguous to large forests contain habitat for this species. **Impact and Mitigation** Flying squirrels use trees and snags for food, travel and nesting; therefore, they can be impacted by largescale tree removal. Removal of large forested areas with significant (>25 cm DBH) and declining deciduous trees in the study area, especially those with suitable nesting cavities, could have an impact on southern flying squirrel populations. Avoidance of the extensive removal of this type of forest habitat will eliminate this potential impact. In the event that the loss of potential southern flying	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				squirrel habitat is unavoidable, as in the tree removal in the Centre Street Woodlot Candidate PSW along the East-West Corridor, mitigation strategies could be employed to offset this impact. Mitigation could include: 1. Minimizing the removal of large declining target tree species and large snags to reduce the loss of cavity nesting sites; 2. Use of squirrel nest boxes to mitigate the loss of cavity nesting sites; 3. Planting of target tree species as potential future nest site locations to mitigate the loss of cavity nesting sites; 4. Planting of target mast tree species to mitigate the loss of food resources; and 5. Planting soft-mast food producing shrubs (i.e. raspberries and pin cherries) to mitigate the loss of food resources. **Conclusions and Recommendations** Southern flying squirrels require large tracks of deciduous or mixed forest habitat for their life processes (nesting, foraging, over-wintering, etc.). The WATMP study area contains forest habitat suitable for the southern flying squirrel. Flying squirrel usage of the study area depends on the size and quality of the forest environment. For example, primary habitat for southern flying squirrels would have large contiguous areas of suitable nesting trees and mast producing trees. Primary habitat for this mammalian species in the WATMP study area can be found in Sassafras-Waterdown Woods Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) and the Former National Sewer Pipe Lands	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				Candidate ESA along the Waterdown Road Corridor and King Road Corridor. The Sassafras-Waterdown Woods ESA is a provincial Life Science Area of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI) and is comprised of two former regional ANSIs; the Sassafras Woods ANSI and the Waterdown Escarpment Woods ANSI. Primary habitat for southern flying squirrels also exists in the East-West Corridor; specifically, in the Lake Medad Swamp Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW) and the Parkside Drive PSW Complex, which includes the Centre Street Woodlot Candidate PSW. The preferred WATMP route avoids removal of significant forest in potential primary habitat of the southern flying squirrel in the Sassafras-Waterdown Woods ESA and other woodlands in the Waterdown Road Corridor. Similarly, avoidance is the preferred strategy for eliminating impacts to other forest habitat in the study area; however, forest habitat in the East-West Corridor will be removed in the Centre Street Woodlot Candidate PSW. The loss of this forest habitat could be mitigated using some of the mitigation strategies discussed in the previous section	
ID# 151 [redacted] Jun 20, 2008 Email	Is it possible to get a copy of the alignments that are discussed below? I did see them at the meeting on a board, but there was no copies of this specific area. (ID # 146 Materials)	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Email was acknowledged Jun 23, 2008. Copies of map were distributed at the following NAC meeting	
ID# 153 [redacted] (Niagara Escarpment	**Subject:** RE: NAC meeting #4 - Review of E-West Alternatives on June 12th 2008 Sally - Thank you for keeping me in the loop. Could you send a copy of the alternative alignment that was	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Jun 26, 2008 Email	Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email. The attached display panels provide an explanation of the work Dillon Consulting is undertaking relating to the evaluation of	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
Commission) Jun 23, 2008 Email	suggested at the meeting that [redacted] is referring to. Thanks[redacted] [redacted]		---------- - Jun 26, 2008 Email	the alignment in section N3, that includes the option proposed by the NAC, and as referred to in [redacted] e-mail below. Please note that Dillon Consulting will be adding a line to show where this northernmost alignment could go. As well, Dillon is preparing a memorandum to the NAC and members of the public, that will provide an explanation of the evaluation procedure and data collection activities that they will be using to evaluate this, along with other outstanding issue areas in other parts of the road. We will ensure that your receive a copy of this memo when it is available in early July. Please note the EW NAC Meeting #4 Minutes (June 12, 2008) will also provide a summary of the discussion around this alternative alignment, and these will be available later this week. Kind Regards, Patricia Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard ---------- -- Dear [redacted], In addition to the previous email please find attached the display panels from the East-West PIC	
ID# 155 [redacted] Jun 24, 2008 Email	Sally Just a short message. I wish to remove my self from the NAC. I am tried of ALL those who suck and blow at the same time [redacted]	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Jun 24, 2008 Email	Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email. We have removed you from the Neighbourhood Advisory Committee. Regards, Patricia on behalf of Sally Leppard	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	p.s. [redacted] all I see is NIMBY. Do your wants go for ALL of Parkside? Maybe Northlawn should be part of the new E-W road? (talk to those on Parkside between the tracks and Robinson) This would not touch the land north of you, so it should make you happy. [redacted], former member of the NAC, "We are being used" waiting for the storm, It's going to come, like it, or not. Free Flamborough.		---------- - Waterdown-Aldershot Information Jun 25, 2008 Email	---------- Dear [redacted] Thank you for your contribution to the NAC and the project team's work to date. I will advise the Project Partners of your decision to resign from the NAC. Since your remarks are also addressed to [redacted] would you like me to pass them on to him? Please let me know if you wish to continue receiving the minutes of the meetings. Best regards, Sally Leppard	
East-West PIC June 24, 2008 Workbook	[redacted] - Please send me a detailed review of floodplain on Stantec Study with real-time data i.e. burm/dike on North of Opta property. How to mitigate flood plain?	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	
East-West PIC June 24, 2008 Workbook	[redacted] Throughout this study we have been advised that this is not a bypass. As such every effort should be made to calm traffic through a residential area. Non Waterdown destined traffic including trucks should therefore be discouraged from using the road. The road design can help mitigate non Waterdown destined traffic. Commuters will have options to use other concessions such as Concession 5 or Robson Road, instead of making this an attractive road for non Waterdown destined traffic.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	
East-West PIC June 24, 2008 Workbook	[redacted] In spite of all that will be done, with roads in the area, the real issue is being addressed i.e. a bypass around	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Waterdown to take care of traffic that comes from GTA – and goes to Ancaster, Capetown, Brantford etc.				
East-West PIC June 24, 2008 Workbook	[redacted] A highway by-pass was suggested over 30 years ago, when Waterdown's population was only 2,000 or less. What is being proposed is not a by-pass. The traffic trying to get through Waterdown now is probably 10-20 more than 30 years ago.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	
East-West PIC June 24, 2008 Workbook	[redacted] Would like to know if water and sanitary sewers would be available and if I can get access to the new road between Dundas Street and Parkside.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	
East-West PIC June 24, 2008 Workbook	[redacted] Why does the north/south not line up with the east/west at Highway 5 (Dundas Street)? The present map does not make sense. All maps should be better identified.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	
East-West PIC June 24, 2008 Workbook	**Councillor McCarthy** Link upcountry to Waterdown South (Official Position)	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	
East-West PIC June 24, 2008 Workbook	[redacted] My understanding is that Option 4 is now preferred to Option 5. Alexander Place has 128 people who reside there and they chose that location due to quietness, beauty and small town feel. I as well as the owners of Alexander Place understand that putting the bypass behind Parkside Drive is the least of the evils, however going with Option 4 brings the highway closer once again. I get the fact that wetlands and nurseries need to be protected but what about the people who have to live there, they deserve equal treatment.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Downfalls to Option 4: • The sound barrier will not minimize noise further if the highway is closer. • Walking trail. I brought up at either end of Phase 1 and early Phase 2, the walking trail adjacent to Alexander Place and saving it as it was a well used community project. Advisors said an over pass would have to go in, no mention of that anywhere now! Also, a sound barrier can't deflect overpass noise. • Future development – whatever gets put in will most likely have to be increased in size causing further loss of land! What are future plans? • What is the sound impact going to be? Probably more than we are told or understood. • Curb appeal – we are all going to lose a lot of our curb appeal and even more if option 4 goes in. We house 128 residents and pay almost ½ million dollars in taxes. If we cannot fill the facility because it has zero appeal, it not only affects those who live there but the 130 employed and the City of Hamilton. RETHINK OPTION 5 WE DESERVE IT!				
East-West PIC June 24, 2008 Workbook	[redacted] NAC Opinion and the Nortlawn section alternatives should have been made clearer. The importance of cost on "Option 6" being preferred to "Option 5" was not highlighted, it has clearly been the major facto in NAC meetings.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	
East-West PIC June 24, 2008	[redacted] It makes no sense to me not to continue across	Waterdown-Aldershot	Waterdown-Aldershot	Comments were recorded	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
Workbook	Mountain Brow Road East to make a direct connection to Dundas Street / Evans Avenue.	Information	Information		
East-West PIC June 24, 2008 Workbook	[redacted] We believe by making Barton Street and Griffin Street one way east to Mill Street from Hamilton Street. Making it no left turn from Mill street onto Griffin, and increasing the stop light time to favour East/West and West/East flow forcing people to use the new alternative route at Mountain Brow (delaying the time North).	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Comments were recorded	
ID# 158 Transport Canada Jun 24, 2008 Email	Syeda, Thank you for your letter regarding the above referenced environmental assessment. We have reviewed the information, and note the following: Transport Canada is responsible for the administration of the Navigable Waters Protection Act, which prohibits the construction or placement of any "works" in navigable waters without first obtaining approval. If any of the related project elements or activities may cross or affect a potentially navigable waterway, you are requested to prepare and submit an application in accordance with the requirements as outlined in the attached Application Guide. Any questions about the NWPA application process should be directed to Suzanne Shea, NWP Officer at (519) 383-1866. Please note that certain approvals under the Navigable Waters Protection Act or Railway Safety Act trigger the requirement for a federal	Forwarded to Waterdown-Aldershot Information from Syeda Banuri	N/A	No response required. Updated Database.	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	environmental assessment under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act. You may therefore wish to consider incorporating CEAA requirements into your provincial environmental assessment. <<Annex A Navigable Waters Protection Act Application Addresses.doc>> <<TC Application Form.pdf>> <<TC Application Guide.pdf>> We would also appreciate if your agency distribution list could be updated by removing the Navigable Waters Protection Program. All correspondence should be directed to the Environment and Engineering Section to review projects against all of Transport Canada's potential interests. The contact information should be changed to: Environmental Assessment Coordinator Environment and Engineering Transport Canada 4900 Yonge Street Toronto, ON M2N 6A5 Please contact me should you wish to discuss this further. Regards, Haya Finan Environmental Officer Environment and Engineering Transport Canada				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
ID# 159 [redacted] Jun 25, 2008 At PIC	Requested a copy of the comment form and address for the Niagara to GTA EA	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Jun 25, 2008 Email	**Subject:** PIC for the East-West Road Class Environmental Assessment - Responses Hello [redacted] Thank you for attending the Public Information Centre for the st-West Road Class Environmental Assessment yesterday, as per your request please find attached the comment form. You can access the Waterdown Aldershot Project Website at: www.hamilton.ca/WaterdownTMP In addition the Niagara to GTA Corridor Planning and Environmental Assessment Study website address is: www.niagara-gta.com Please provide your contact information if you would like to be part of our mailing list and do not hesitate to contact us if you have additional questions or comments. Regards, Liz Nield on behalf of Sally Leppard	
ID# 162 [redacted] Jun 24, 2008 At PIC	Requests final copy of the display boards from the June 24th PIC	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Jun 26, 2008 Email	Dear [redacted] As per your request please find the final copy of the display boards from the June 24th PIC attached for your information. Please disregard the email sent yesterday morning. Thank you,Patricia Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard	
ID# 163 [redacted]	Requests final copy of the display boards from the June 24th PIC	Waterdown-Aldershot	Waterdown-Aldershot	Dear [redacted]	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
Jun 24, 2008 At PIC		Information	Information Jun 26, 2008 Email	As per your request please find the final copy of the display boards from the June 24th PIC attached for your information. Please disregard the email sent yesterday morning. Thank you, Patricia Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard --- Dear [redacted] We have incorrectly sent you the North-South PIC panels for tonight's PIC, please find the East-West PIC panels attached. Thank you, Patricia Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard	
ID# 164 [redacted] Jun 24, 2008 At PIC/Email	Thanks. I have to leave shortly, I would appreciate the plans as soon as possible. Regards, [redacted]	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Jun 26, 2008 Email	**Subject:** East-West PIC Panels (June 24) Dear [redacted] Please find the East-West PIC panels from the meeting held on June 24, 2008, we will send you the maps shortly. Thank you, Liz Nield on behalf of Sally Leppard	
ID# 165 [redacted] Jun 25, 2008 At PIC/Email	**Subject:** PIC - E-W Corridor & Waterdown Road Corridor Syeda/Paul, I received the notice for the PIC and am interested in obtaining more information. Are you able to send me any reports or studies regarding the proposed New E-W corridor and Waterdown Road Corridor?	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Jun 26, 2008 Email	Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email. Your contact information will be added to the project contact database. For more information about the project - please take a look at the project website: www.hamilton.ca/waterdowntmp. The Phase 2 Report and information and materials from the Public Information Centres (PICs) being held in June are	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Please add me to the study mailing list. Thanks, [redacted] Canadian Tire Real Estate Limited			available on the website. In addition, please find attached the Path Forward Report (Feb 08). This report sets out the current status and proposed Path Forward for the Waterdown/Aldershot Transportation Master Plan and the environmental assessment process. If you have any additional questions or comments please do not hesitate to contact us. Regards, Patricia Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard	
ID# 166 [redacted] Jun 24, 2008 Note At PIC	We believe by making Griffin St and Barton St on way East from Hamilton St and increasing the length of lights on both Mains and Mill St North will encourage the motorist going North to use the by-pass to go fast	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Jun 24, 2008	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	No response required. Suggestion was recorded	
ID# 168	Same as ID # 143	Same as ID # 143	Same as ID # 143	Same as ID # 143	
ID# 170 [redacted] Jun 29, 2008 Email	**Subject:** east-west road I am very pleased that on your decision to include a separate level passage way for the Waterdown-North Wetland Trail. I can assure you that the many many people that use the trail are happy they will not have to try and cross the busy road. As part of the landscape of the new road it would make sense to include a path along one side of the road from Parkside to Center Road. And show a continuation of that path across Center Road to the	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Aug 25, 2008 Email	Email was acknowledged Jun 30, 2008. Dear [redacted], Thank you for your email dated June 29, 2008. We have obtained a response from the Project Team to your inquiry, and have inserted it directly into your e-mail below. The Project Team has responded to your email in blue. --- *I am very pleased that on your decision to include a*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	east branch of the "Borer's Creek fallowing the creek to Parkside and also to the west end of the creek. I realize that most of this extension of the path is not not in your mandate ,except for the bridge across the north end of Black's Pond, but it might help in including this in the development of a trail system with city, CA. or fundraising money in the new future. I have fond in the past that if you can get a potential trail on a map it helps in the eventual building of that path. If you were to include a dotted line and identify it as a potential trail it would be doing the neighbourhood a favour in the future. I am presently starting talks with the city and the CA concerning this idea, I hope you can be of some assistance. If you need further information please do not hesitate to call. 905-628-8353 [redacted]n			*separate level passage way for the Waterdown-North Wetland Trail. I can assure you that the many many people that use the trail are happy they will not have to try and cross the busy road.* *As part of the landscape of the new road it would make sense to include a path along one side of the road from Parkside to Center Road. And show a continuation of that path across Center Road to the east branch of the "Borer's Creek fallowing the creek to Parkside and also to the west end of the creek. I realize that most of this extension of the path is not not in your mandate ,except for the bridge across the north end of Black's Pond, but it might help in including this in the development of a trail system with city, CA. or fundraising money in the new future. I have fond in the past that if you can get a potential trail on a map it helps in the eventual building of that path.* *If you were to include a dotted line and identify it as a potential trail it would be doing the neighbourhood a favour in the future.* *I am presently starting talks with the city and the CA concerning this idea, I hope you can be of some assistance. If you need further information please do not hesitate to call. 905-628-8353* **Response**: Thank you for your comments. The provision of pathways/trails will be reviewed further in discussion with the City's recreation staff and the Hamilton Conservation Authority. Your suggestions will be part	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				of those discussions. Kind regards, Patricia Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard,	
ID# 171 [redacted] Jun 15, 2008 Email	**Subject:** Re: East-West NAC Meeting (June 12, 2008) Here are my written comments on E/W options discussed June 12th 1) Western Alignment N1 I support Option 1 - Northern Option A-C as it will result in improved road safety at the junction of Hwy 6 2) Mid block Alignment - location of Centre Rd crossing Option 1 DF North Option 2 DF Middle Option 3 DE South I can understand the desire of Northlawn residents who are seeking to push the E/W road as far North as possible (even past Option 1) However, if they are successful it could decimate some the houses on Centre Rd immediately above option 1. It would also bring the E/W much closer to a large Catholic Junior Elementary School (approximately 560 students) and soon to be opened day care nursery (capacity 150 students) I support Option 3 DE South because it would attribute to the lowest disruption of the interior forest habitat 3) E/W road between N3 -N4 Option 4 vs. Option 5: I support Option 4 which	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Jun 18, 2008 Email	Dea[redacted], Thank you for your input which we received on Monday June 16th. We have forwarded your comments to the Project Team for consideration. We appreciate your continued interest and participation in this project. Regards, Sally Leppard Neutral Community Facilitator's Office	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	makes for good fiscal sense Waterdown Ratepayers have just been hit with a large 9.9 % tax increase from the City of Hamilton. The high cost of Option 5 would have a crippling effect on the general tax levy which will hurt our budgets us even more. See you on the 24th Sincerely [redacted]				
ID# 173 [redacted] Jul 2, 2008 Phone	Please post the maps on the Project's Website that were displayed at the June 24 and June 26th PICs	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Jul 2, 2008 Phone	We will do so in the next two business days	
ID# 177 [redacted] Jun 26, 2008 At PIC	Request for a CD of EW route maps.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Jul 3, 2008 Mail	CD sent by Mail	
ID# 179	NOT ASSIGNED	N/A	N/A	N/A	
ID# 180 [redacted] Jul 9, 2008 Email	**Subject:** Re: PIC for the East-West Road Class Environmental Assessment - Responses Thank you very much for your e-mail. I apologize for the delay in responding. Please note that my comments are below : My main concern is the **NOISE this road will produce**. I understand that the EW road will be approximately 150 feet from the Northlawn Avenue residents' backyards. I would like the road to be further north of Northlawn Avenue. As well, the road will spoil the	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Aug 27, 2008 Email	Email was acknowledged Jul 10, 2008. Dear [redacted], Thank you for your email dated July 9, 2008. We have received a response from the Project Team and provide it below. For ease of reference, we have included excerpts of your e-mail in italics, with the project team response following. *Thank you very much for your e-mail. I apologize for the delay in responding.* *Please note that my comments are below:*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	nature trail at Joe Sams Park and create noise for the nursing home nearby. I have a few questions which I thought of after the PIC for which I would appreciate a response to. 1. Will anything be done to keep the traffic noise level to a minimum? (e.g. noise barrier walls) 2. Who will mainly be using the road? (e.g. local residents, trucks or commuters west of highway 6 going towards Toronto)? Any idea of the volume of traffic? Will it be traffic that will die down at night? - I would not like to hear trucks barrelling down the road at 3 am. 3. What will the speed limit be? (I certainly hope similar to Parkside Drive - 50 km/hr - not 80 km/hr!) 4. Will there be bike paths, sidewalks put in? I hope the EW road will impact minimally the lives of current residents in terms of noise. I hope it does it job of getting the bottleneck traffic off of Dundas Street and reduce traffic on Parkside Drive as well. I would like to be kept informed of any further meetings, etc. regarding this road. Thank you. [redacted]			*My main concern is the **NOISE this road will produce**. I understand that the EW road will be approximately 150 feet from the Northlawn Avenue residents' backyards. I would like the road to be further north of Northlawn Avenue. As well, the road will spoil the nature trail at Joe Sams Park and create noise for the nursing home nearby.* *I have a few questions which I thought of after the PIC for which I would appreciate a response to.* *1. Will anything be done to keep the traffic noise level to a minimum? (e.g. noise barrier walls)* **Response**: The project team is still reviewing the various routing options through the Centre Road woodlot. The minimization of noise is a key consideration and it will be necessary to meet MOE noise level criterion. Depending on the location of the roadway, it may be necessary to install noise barriers along the roadway. *2. Who will mainly be using the road? (e.g. local residents, trucks or commuters west of highway 6 going towards Toronto)? Any idea of the volume of traffic? Will it be traffic that will die down at night? - I would not like to hear trucks barrelling down the road at 3 am.* **Response**: The new east-west road/road widening is needed to meet future transportation demands as a result of the new planned developments in	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				Waterdown (primarily Waterdown North). We note that Parkside Drive is currently designated as a truck route. The decision regarding the designation of the new east-west roadway as a truck route will be made by the City once the road is built. *3. What will the speed limit be? (I certainly hope similar to Parkside Drive - 50 km/hr - not 80 km/hr!)* **Response**: It is proposed that the section of Parkside Drive to be widened will be posted at 50 km/hr and the rest of the roadway would be posted at 60 km/hr. *4. Will there be bike paths, sidewalks put in?* **Response**: Sidewalks and the provision for on-street bike lanes are proposed along the affected section of Parkside Drive. *I hope the EW road will impact minimally the lives of current residents in terms of noise. I hope it does it job of getting the bottleneck traffic off of Dundas Street and reduce traffic on Parkside Drive as well. I would like to be kept informed of any further meetings, etc. regarding this road.* **Response**: You have been added to our mailing list. Kind Regards, Patricia Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard	
ID# 183 [redacted] Jun 26, 2008	Subject: WATMP, East-West corridor Hi Syeda,	Forwarded to Waterdown-	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Dear [redacted] Please find the display boards from the June 24th PIC	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
Email	Can you please forward to me (by email or mail) the presentation information and plans that were available at the PIC, June 24th. Thanks, [redacted] P. Eng,	Aldershot Information from City of Hamilton Jul 21, 2008	Jul 21, 2008 Email	attached for your information. Please note the detailed maps of the New East-West Corridor are available on the project website at the following link: www.hamilton.ca/WaterdownTMP Kind regards, Patricia Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard	
ID# 184 [redacted] [redacted]k Jul 2, 2008 Email	**Subject:** Re: Parkside Drive, Waterdown A constituent, [redacted], contacted our office on behalf of a friend who was inquiring whether Parkside Drive was going to be widen and if so when that would start. Another question was if this would be a truck route; he would also like to know if Boulding and Parkside would have a stop sign. If anyone could let me know the answers to this inquiry it would be very much appreciated. Thank you.	Forwarded to Waterdown-Aldershot Information from City of Hamilton Jul 24, 2008	Antonino Spoleti Jul 23, 2008 Email	**Subject:** Parkside Drive and Boulding Avenue - All-way stop control request Good Morning Rita, I'm responding to Mr. [redacted] request for an All-Way Stop Sign Control at the T-intersection of Parkside Drive and Boulding Avenue. Parkside Drive is an arterial roadway with a posted legal speed limit of 60 km/hr and currently is a full-time truck route. Boulding Avenue is a local residential road and traffic is stop controlled at Parkside forming a T-intersection. A total of five collision had occurred at this intersection in the past five years, of which only one may have been prevented through the use of an all-way stop control. These type of traffic and roadway conditions make it unfavourable to consider an all-way stop control and we would not recommend or support its installation. If you have any further concerns or questions please contact me. Antonino Spoleti , Ext. 5496	
ID# 185 [redacted]	Please send a copy of a map, or let him know by phone if his property would be impacted.	Forwarded to	City of Hamilton	Response: Syeda called, left a message on June 16, 2008 stating that there will be no direct impacts to his	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
[redacted] (Remax Agent) Jun 9, 2008 Phone		Waterdown-Aldershot Information from City of Hamilton Jul 24, 2008	Jun 16, 2008 Phone	property but there may be indirect impacts due to Parkside widening considering its close proximity. Told him to come to the upcoming PIC on June 24th.	
ID# 186 [redacted] Jun 13, 2008 Phone	Please send a map which is legible for properties being affected at the fax number X.	Forwarded to Waterdown-Aldershot Information from City of Hamilton Jul 24, 2008	City of Hamilton Jun 17, 2008 Fax	Response: Map was faxed by City of Hamilton June 17th.	
ID# 187 [redacted] (Burlington) Jun 16, 2008 Phone	Please print the map big enough so that the street names are big enough to read.	Forwarded to Waterdown-Aldershot Information from City of Hamilton Jul 24, 2008	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Jul 28, 2008	Response: Complete address obtained July 28, map sent the same day.	
ID# 188 [redacted] Jun 16, 2008 Phone	Please add the P.O. Box number to all future correspondences and change it in your contacts database.	Forwarded to Waterdown-Aldershot Information from City of Hamilton Jul 24, 2008	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Jul 24, 2008	Response: Changes were made by NCFO on July 24.	
ID# 190 [redacted]	Map attached is not legible, please send another map that is good quality or provide a link to the	Forwarded to	City of Hamilton	Response: The information was sent via email by the City of Hamilton on July 19.	

Correspondence	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
Jun 19, 2008 Phone	project website.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information from City of Hamilton Jul 24, 2008	Jul 19, 2008 Email		
ID# 191 [redacted] Jun 20, 2008 Phone	Question regarding the public notice. She is a cyclist and lives in Waterdown, has concerns regarding a portion of road from Boulding to Robson, which is very busy. Would like to know what, if any, accommodations for cyclists will be made with the widening of Parkside Drive. She feels it is important as there are many cyclists using Parkside and Robson to get to country cycling roads, and right now it is absolutely unsafe with the state of Parkside Drive. She would also like to know if in the area where the highway crosses there will be a bike lane.	Forwarded to Waterdown-Aldershot Information from City of Hamilton Jul 24, 2008	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Sep 16, 2008 Email	Dear [redacted] Thank you for your phone call dated June 20, 2008. We have obtained a response from the Project Team to your inquiry, and have inserted it below. The Project Team has responded to your inquiry in blue. *Question: What, if any, accommodations for cyclists will be made with the widening of Parkside Drive, specifically in the area of road from Boulding Avenue to Robson Road?* **Response**: Thank you for your question. We are recommending a wider road to provide additional pavement width to accommodate cyclists along the section of Parkside Drive that is to be improved. Kind regards, Patricia Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard,	
ID# 192 [redacted] Jun 24, 2008 Phone	Wondering about the PIC at St. Thomas Parish on June 24th. Is it come and go or a 2 hour formal presentation? What is the agenda time wise?	Forwarded to Waterdown-Aldershot Information from City of Hamilton Jul 24, 2008	City of Hamilton Jul 24, 2008	Response: NCFO did a follow up with the Hopcrofts on July 24th. They attended the PIC on June 24th and have no further questions at this time.	
ID# 193	Had owned Lot X on Concession 4 in East	Forwarded	Waterdown-	Dear [redacted]	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
[redacted] Jun 25, 2008 Phone	Flamborough in the past. Could you please mail information regarding the plans for the arterial East/West Road, north of Waterdown?	to Waterdown-Aldershot Information from City of Hamilton Jul 24, 2008	Aldershot Information Jul 24, 2008	Please find a copy of the display boards from the New East-West Corridor Class Environmental Assessment Public Information Centre (PIC) held on June 24, 2008, and display boards from the Waterdown Road Widening Class Environmental Assessment Public Information Centre (PIC) held on June 26, 2008 attached for your information. For detailed maps and/or more information about the project, please visit the following link: www.hamilton.ca/WaterdownTMP	
ID# 194 [redacted] Jun 25, 2008 Phone (to Mayor Fred Eisenberger's Office)	Request for a legible map o the East-West corridor.	Forwarded to Waterdown-Aldershot Information from City of Hamilton Jul 24, 2008 Phone	City of Hamilton Jul 24, 2008	City of Hamilton sent map. Hart Solomon also phoned [redacted]	
ID# 195 [redacted] Jun 25, 2008 Phone	[redacted] would like the project team to seriously consider drainage issues in the study area, and how these will affect the road alignments. He feels that the drainage is not being dealt with appropriately and will flood local basements causing fungus. He has a history with the land; he was born in Waterdown and has been working the land for over 50 years. (Attached fax to email) He also feels that there is no point in saving the local woodlot since it is predominantly ash	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Jul 29, 2008 Phone	Comments were recorded.	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	trees, and the emerald ash borer from Toronto will likely spread to Waterdown shortly, and this pest is impossible to control				
ID# 196 [redacted] Jul 29, 2008 Email	**Subject:** no emails for a while now hello Sally – I haven't received any emails for some time now and would like to make sure I'm not missing any meetings. Thanks! [redacted]	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Jul 29, 2008 Email	Dear [redacted], Thank you for your email. The last round of NAC meetings took place on June 11th and June 12th. Please note the next round of NAC meetings and Public Information Centres (PICs) will occur in September 2008. The following details the dates and times of the September meetings: Date: **September 9, 2008** East-West NAC Meting #5 Time: 6:30 pm - 9:00 pm Location: The Bohemian Banquet Centre Date: **September 10, 2008** North-South NAC Meeting #5 Time: 6:30 pm - 9:00 pm Location: The Crossroads Centre Date: **September 17, 2008** East-West Public Information Centre Time: 6:00 pm - 8:30 pm Location: St. Thomas Church Date: **September 18, 2008** North-South Public Information Centre Time: 6:00 pm - 8:30 pm Location: The Crossroads Centre	
ID# 198 [redacted]	I would like to know what is the approximate distance from the end of the property line at Northlawn Avenue	Waterdown-Aldershot	Waterdown-Aldershot	Dear [redacted],	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
[redacted] Aug 6 & 7, 2008 Telephone	to the new East-West road. What is the best case scenario, and what is the worst case scenario? Also, when would the construction of the East-west road start? How long will the construction take? (17 Northlawn)	Information & City of Hamilton	Information Feb 10, 2009 Email	Thank you for your phone call dated August 7, 2008. We have obtained responses from the Project Team to your inquiries, and have provided them below. The Project Team has responded to your inquiries in blue. What is the approximate distance from Northlawn Avenue to new east-west route? What is the best case scenario, and what is the worst case scenario? **Response**: Four road alignment options were identified for the mid block alignments that run through the woodlot/PSW on the east side of Centre Road. The most southern alignment is approximately 140 m north of the residences on the north side of Northlawn Avenue (measured from the homes). We note that a 100 m treed buffer would be maintained between the road and the back of the residential properties. The next closest alignments are approximately 190 m and 290 m away. The most northern alignment is approximately 320 m away at its closest point to the Northlawn Avenue residents. If you have access to the web, you can check the project team's preferred alignment (the southern most alignment) at www.hamilton.ca/WaterdownTMP. When would the construction of the East-west road begin, and how long will the construction take? **Response**: The construction schedule is dependent upon obtaining approvals from the Ministry of the Environment for the Environmental Study Report, obtaining permits from other agencies, and then	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				tendering the project. Construction would not likely start until 2013 at the earliest. Regards, Patricia Halajski née Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard,	

Section 2: Comments from Concerned Resident #1

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
ID# 216 [redacted] Oct 5, 2008 Two initial emails + follow-up Oct. 17	Dear Sally, It has been over 3 months now since the NAC # 4 meeting and PIC meeting of June 24th and we have yet to hear from on plans to have [redacted] and myself to have a meeting with you and Dillon Consulting on the various Option 5 options including the Stantec version of Option 5. In fact, You have listed this potential meeting in Item 4.4 on Action Steps in the Draft Minutes of NAC 4. This action step has yet to be fulfilled. As background, the informal 10 minute discussion we had at the PIC meeting with the Project Team can be characterized as no more than exploratory. The Project Team indicated it would get back to me on an analysis of 'flood plane' characteristics and, to date, we have received no information. I suggest further below, that we need to have a meeting with Dillon Consulting to discuss all aspects of the Stantec Option 5 such as the legal requirements around railway crossings as well. We are anxious to sit down and review with the Project Team the pros/cons and analysis and study of a northern Option 5, that can run, in part through the northern edge of Opta Minerals and perhaps slightly transect the property on the north easterly side. We	Waterdown Aldershot Information	Waterdown Aldershot Information Nov 19, & Dec 1, 2008	Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email. Please note that we have sent your comments to Dillon Consulting and the Project Partners for their review and consideration. --- Meetings were held Nov 19th and Dec 1st, 2008	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	are not convinced that there is a significant flood plain that cannot be mitigated, since burms and dikes have already be been built on the north easterly edge of the property. Halton Conservation is fully aware of these burms and dikes and have not commented on how dikes and burms can be used to mitigate flood plane issues around a road alignment in that area. Further, the fact that the Consultants would state that there would be 3 creek crossings to overcome in Option 5 seems to us as 'over-stating' the obstacle. These creeks are actually small streams, in which we have been provided very few details as to their flow-rates and width. They may in fact be quite small impediments that can be easily mitigated. Last, you and Dillon Consulting provided an analysis of Option 5 (through Opta Minerals) vs. Option 4 in the June 12th minutes. As you know, this is not an option advised by the Al Seferiades or myself and we raised this very strongly at the NAC # 4. That route, was selected by the Project Team without consultation with us and we believe it was doomed to fail unless the Project Team had other information that we were not aware of that lead the Project Team to choose it in the first place. Please advise us as to when we can have a meeting to build on this analysis further. We would like to meet with Dillon to discuss all aspects of a northern alignment so that we can ensure that all the facts have been developed on this potential alignment. Only with a thorough analysis of that alignment, can				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	an effective recommendation be made as to its utility and comparison with Option 4. Regards, [redacted] Please copy [redacted] and [redacted] on all correspondence. Dear WAI, Your response comment that the Option 5 assessment had always gone through Opta Minerals is not true in our opinion. Option 5 evaluation, conducted by the City, was to utilize data from its original Option 1, (which did not go through Opta Minerals) and that section of Option 1 was to be spliced into Option 4. Neither myself, [redacted] nor [redacted] had ever suggested that you do an evaluation of Option 5 through Opta Minerals. We had originally presented to the former Project Team Managers, in Dec 2005, that the area that the Project Team should consider is anywhere from the northern aspect of Option 1, to the south side of the Opta Property. When the Project Team presented Option 5 to the City on Feb 2006, they described it exactly as I have. Option 5 was simply splicing the northern aspect of Option 1, and running it east to a point in alignment with UpCountry Estates, and then running it south from that point to connect with Upcountry Estates. Where we need to go from here, I suggest, is to have a				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	meeting to review the proper alignment of Option 5 that the City first evaluated which ran north of the Opta property and may, in fact, be similar to the Stantec alignment. We look forward to your quick response to have the meeting that we suggested in our previously email sent today. Please copy [redacted] and [redacted] on all replies. Regards,[redacted] Dear Sally,(Lura Consulting) I have not had a response from you to my email dated October 5th. It is now October 17th. It is unfortunate that I now have to go back to copying the MoE to ensure you take our communications seriously. We are on the eve of the last NAC meeting on October 28th. It appears that we have lost valuable time in your delay of responding to a serious concern we have. You and the Project Team have incorrectly stated in your email below, dated Aug 25, that we requested that you evaluate a route through the Opta facility, that I will call Option 5-Opta, and that this was the original route that was indicated in the Phase 2 study and requested by us. This is simply not true. This was never our route that we proposed to the Project Team. We are not sure why this has been stated to us, when				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	your own diagram above, that you sent in the same email, indicates that where the orginal Option 5 has run. Your diagram also indicates that we requested the new route through Opta Minerals. We object to this remark as it is false and we wish that it be stricken from the record that we have any ownership to it. You commented: "**Response**: The Option 5 route has not changed as compared to what was evaluated as part of the Phase 2 process. **The route has always passed through the Opta property**. The alternative route suggested in Dec 07 by the Parkside Dr residents passes through the Opta property. The route presented to the project team in Feb 08 is north of the OPTA facility but is very similar to Option 1 that was evaluated and discounted due to its impacts on the ESA/PSW lands (Option 1 and your suggested Option 5 differed only to the east of Robson Rd.) Refer to the attached figure." Your statement from the above quote, "**The route has always passed through the Opta property**." is incorrect as I previously stated. Further, In the NAC # 4 minutes that you published, you committed to: -setting up a meeting with us to further discuss our Option 5 to the northern edge of the property, not the Project Team's Option 5 -through the center of Opta Minerals that was cost prohibitive because it would				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	require Opta Minerals to close down; - the consultants were to walk the property to the north and northeast of the Opta property to explore the significance of possible, but not proven,'flood plain', and to see what measures could be taken to mitigate any concerns; - to identify on your maps the significant amount of dykes and berms that the previous Opta site owners built on the north of the property that may have already mitigated any concerns about flooding; -to identify if any flooding has occurred; - to properly identified the correct location of a flood plain which I believe may not be in the location you have identified. I will further exam documents that Halton Conservation has provided that indicated that the flood plain was on the west side of Grindstone Creek. As we said during the PIC and during NAC # 4, Option 5 original, can be altered to navigate around the Opta property on the northside and at the same time, there was potential to reduce its impact by avoiding the ESAs. The route could have bern run on the south side of the northeasterly side of berm/dyke that we identified. Dillon was to visit the site and walk the route and provide back to us a report. We were to have a meeting with you to discuss further. We look forward to the next steps that you committed				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern
	to us in this review process. Please copy [redacted] and [redacted] replies. Regards, [redacted]
ID# 239 [redacted] Oct 23, 2008 Phone Oct 26, 2008 Email	Phone call: Would like to speak Follow-up Email in response to r Dear Sally, I am confused as to why the me promised to us to have occurre and which should have occurre upcoming NAC 5 meeting on C being proposed now because Oct 23rd and asked about the occur one hour prior to the Oct During the NAC 4 meeting on J discussion period, you stopped Project Team and asked that w meeting to discuss our concern the alternative northern route a Stantec alignment. You subsec indicating that the Project Tear those alternatives and meet wi this instance, we though we stil discuss the issues with the Proje to a final conclusion. Then, in l we received from WAI, we hea was going to meet with us in Se 23rd and the Project Team has

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	speeds to 50 km/hr on Parkside Dr. would only mitigate the noise, to a level acceptable to us, if we much further back from the planned road. This will not be the case due to the narrow roadway allowance that exists on Parkside Drive. As you know, we are very close to the road, my home will be as close as 57 feet from the nearest lane of the new road. Therefore, noise will be much greater in my rear yard, than a home backing onto Dundas St. even though the speeds are greater. Another example in Waterdown exists on Parkside Drive West at Hollybush where the City owns the noise-attenuation fence that is up to 8 feet high in sections. Why is it that the Town of Flamborough ensured that this fence was built by the developers, and maintained by the town (now the City of Hamilton) and yet the noise levels there are not as severe as will exist, based on traffic studies, on our section of Parkside Drive? No doubt the costs of such fences were born by the developers at no cost to the City. We have also attached photos that have been previously sent to the Project Team. Also included is the Thompson Road fence in Milton in which the Town of Milton built for the homes there when Thompson Road was expanded from a 2 lane to a 4 lane road, even though the nearest lane is more than 46 feet away from the fence - clearly less noise than we will experience on Parkside Drive - even at a reduced speed of 50 km/hour. Please answer these questions as soon as possible.			*Team to at least provide us its data within 10 days and we have had no response as of it. In a subsequent meeting on Dec 8th with the Project Team, it indicated that it would take it another two weeks to provide us this data. More recently, you have advised us that we will now have to wait until January. May I ask how is it that the Project Team can make statements and claims in its reports without having the data available at that time? How can the Project Team expect us to trust its conclusions when no data is available at the time it makes its conclusions?* ***How is it that the City and Project Team can deny us our requests for a noise attenuation fence when it has provided this type of barrier in other parts of Waterdown?*** *In Waterdown, a noise barrier fence exists, that is owned by the City, which exists behind homes on Dundas St. west of Bayview Ave on both the north and southsides of Dundas St. This fence was built even though the homes are much further away from the nearest lane by at least 100 feet. Even though the roads there have speed limits of 60 KM/hour, they are well back from the homes and would not experience the intensity of noise that we do now and will experience in the future. In our situation, reducing speeds to 50 km/hr on Parkside Dr. would only mitigate the noise, to a level acceptable to us, if we much further back from the planned road. This will not be the case due to the narrow roadway allowance that exists on Parkside Drive. As you know, we are very close to the road, my home will be as close as 57 feet from the*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Regards, [redacted]			*nearest lane of the new road. Therefore, noise will be much greater in my rear yard, than a home backing onto Dundas St. even though the speeds are greater.* *Another example in Waterdown exists on Parkside Drive West at Hollybush where the City owns the noise-attenuation fence that is up to 8 feet high in sections. Why is it that the Town of Flamborough ensured that this fence was built by the developers, and maintained by the town (now the City of Hamilton) and yet the noise levels there are not as severe as will exist, based on traffic studies, on our section of Parkside Drive?* *No doubt the costs of such fences were born by the developers at no cost to the City.* *We have also attached photos that have been previously sent to the Project Team. Also included is the Thompson Road fence in Milton in which the Town of Milton built for the homes there when Thompson Road was expanded from a 2 lane to a 4 lane road, even though the nearest lane is more than 46 feet away from the fence - clearly less noise than we will experience on Parkside Drive - even at a reduced speed of 50 km/hour.* *Please answer these questions as soon as possible.* **Project Team Response**: The Project Team has considered the Halton Policy on Noise Abatement and has applied it to the understanding of your concerns. The City of Hamilton does not currently have a policy on noise abatement. The project endeavours to	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				address provincial protocols when assessing the requirement for noise mitigation measures. In order to assess the potential noise and pollution impacts of this project, issues have been addressed by undertaking an Air Quality Study and Noise Study to ensure that sensitivity and traffic issues have been addressed. The Noise Study will be sent out later today, and the final studies will be made available when the East West Corridor Class Environmental Assessment Environmental Study Report is filed on Public Record in the summer of 2009. After an thorough examination of The City of Hamilton's Fence Inventory, Plan of Subdivision engineer's drawings, Township of Flamborough and Region of Hamilton Wentworth Subdivision Agreements, and Maintenance records for subdivisions along Parkside Drive, the City of Hamilton has found no evidence that the fencing between Hollybush and Duncan Avenue or between Boulding Avenue and Robson Road along Parkside Drive was installed for the purpose of noise attenuation mitigation. The project partners would not recommend any noise attenuation mitigation for areas that do not warrant it. The owner of X Strathroy Crescent went to the Flamborough Building Department to obtain a permit to put a swimming pool in their backyard. Due to the minimal distances between houses etc. the only way to move equipment into the backyard to install the pool was to construct a temporary access (driveway) from Parkside Drive and remove the fence, install the culvert, etc. The only way into the backyard was for	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				the resident to remove a portion of the fence on Parkside Drive and reinstall it when the construction was complete. This was done by acquiring a Temporary Access Permit (Driveway Permit) issued April 9, 1999, to X Strathroy Crescent, to install a culvert in the ditch (in City of Hamilton road allowance so drainage would not be blocked) on Parkside Drive so the homeowner could bring the heavy machinery into the backyard through the temporary access from Parkside Drive. The owner paid an Inspection Fee to the Region since he was doing the culvert work himself. The Township of Flamborough inspected to make sure the temporary access was installed correctly and also to make sure it was removed when the construction of the pool was complete. The requirement for the Temporary Access Permit does not imply that the fence was owned and maintained by the City. Kind regards, Patricia Halajski on behalf of Sally Leppard,	
ID# 361 [redacted] Jan 2, 2009 Email	**Subject:** Fw: Concerns with Oct 27th 2008 memo from Project Team to East West NAC members. Dear Christine and the WAI, I have had to resend this to you as your servers have sent me notices that it won't accept the size the same pdf file that WAI sent to us of the Oct 27th memo. Not sure why nether of you can accept a small 6.63 MB file. Thanks, [redacted]	Waterdown-Aldershot Information & large list	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Email was acknowledged Jan 2, 2009.	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	----- Original Message ----- **From:** [redacted] **To:** Christine Lee-Morrison ; WAI **Subject:** Concerns with Oct 27th 2008 memo from Project Team to East West NAC members. Dec 31, 2008 Dear Ms. Lee- Morrison, [redacted] and I are responding, with some of our concerns, to your Project Team's memo of Oct 27th, 2008. We also expressed these concerns during a meeting with you and the Project Team on Dec 8th, 2008. In addition, we are also requesting a data analysis to be completed for all of us that was committed to by Mary Lou Tanner, in Dec 2005, of Option 5 (a hybrid of Option 1 and Option 4) vs. Option 4. Justification for this, if necessary is provided below. In addition, we have been waiting for a 'Minutes of the Dec 8th, 2008 Meeting' that the Lura Consulting representative was going to provide of which we have had no response or acknowledgement that these minutes are being prepared. The minutes would be important as they would document your level of understanding of our concerns List of some concerns: 1. Concerns with your latest definition of Option 5				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	in the Oct 27th memo. 2. Concerns with the lack of detail and the low-tech approach to analyzing Stantec version of Option 5. 3. Concerns that you are not providing noise-attenuation fencing for residents of Fellowes Cres. who back onto Parkside Drive. 4. Concerns about new alignment change of Option N1 of the East West Roadway to have Concession 4 rebuilt and moved north to join N1. 5. Publishing of our Names and Addresses of this Memo's attachments on your website - please remove **Concerns with your latest definition of Option 5 in the Oct 27th memo.** • The latest Project Team (as you represent the 3rd Manager over the past 3 years) has clearly misunderstood what the original Project Team, (Mary Lou Tanner and Andrew Head) had committed and provided to us as part of an analysis of a hybrid of Option 1 and Option 4, which became the original Option 5. Ms. Tanner described not only to us, but to the Public Works Committee on Feb 20, 2006, that our hybrid route of Option 1 and Option 4, called Option 5, was reanalyzed by Dillon Consulting and that the revised data placed it 2nd to the Preferred Route Option 4.				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	• As you are aware, Mr. Breznik completed a data-integrity and a route comparison validity test which subsequently showed that the Option 5 hybrid was now the most preferred route based on the criteria and rules the Project Team published in its Phase 2 Draft report. Subsequent to us providing you this validity test proving Option 5 as now preferred, the Project Team changed the rules in how it selects the preferred route from a quantitative analysis to a combination of quantitative analysis and 'reasoned argument' to support its original preference for Option 4. In our opinion, changing the rules was not justified, nor fair to the public and lacks credibility. • In addition the Project Team, is now introducing additional complexity and confusion by now maintaining that the data analysis, that was done in Feb 2006 on our Option 5 route, and talked about by Ms. Tanner to the Public Works Committee, was for a route through Opta Minerals. We challenge this new assertion of the Project Team as this was never a route that Ms. Tanner and we discussed. Given that she described the correct route, - a hybrid - on Feb 20th, 2006 and tied the new data analysis to it at that time, how can we now accept that the new Project Team is contending, almost 3 years later, that the data analysis was for an Option 5 route through Opta Minerals which would make the route prohibitively expensive? How can you justify this and not have those costs built into the revived analysis at that time and make no mention of it to the Public Works				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Committee, or us, on Feb 20, 2006? Why did Ms. Tanner not tell anyone that there would be additional costs? We believe she did not because the route was not through Opta Minerals and that there would be no additional costs. • Although you mention in your Oct 27th 2008 memo that this hybrid Option 5 route was not first documented until Feb 1, 2006, in fact it was understood and agreed upon by Ms. Tanner during our first meeting with her on Dec 16th 2005. Shortly after that meeting, she committed to do an analysis of this hybrid for us -she said it was clearly a new option worth considering that was different from the original 4 options. She announced the results of this hybrid at the Public Works Meeting on Feb 20, 2006 and then met with us to further discuss in March 2006. She said it had moved to 2nd place in the rankings. She later agreed to provide us the new data of Option 5 vs. Option 4-Preferred. LURA consulting provided us the data in May 2006 – 3 months after announcing the conclusions to the public and the Public Works Committee. • At no time did we ever discuss a route through Opta Minerals. Although you have attached a sketch and memo that I had provided to Andrew Head on Dec 14, 2005, that shows a band across a region that includes Opta Minerals, this was only a preliminary sketch in preparation for our meeting with them that occurred Dec 16th, 2005. Further, my memo named the sketch EW5, not Option 5. EW5,				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	as you know, applies to the original Stantec Study which took the road around Opta Minerals on the north side. I describe Option 5 further in the petition dated Feb 1, 2006, that you attached and the description does not say anywhere on it that it runs through Opta Minerals. Through discussions at that meeting on Dec 16th, 2005, we modified the route to be a hybrid of Option 1 and Option 4. • Below is a copy of some slides I presented to the Public Works Committee on Feb 20th, 2006. The purpose of these slides was to describe to the Committee what we were talking about in terms of Option 5. I have included slide 14, 20 and slide 21. • You have also described in your memo that you would not review a northern Option 1/4 hybrid (new Option 5) because Option 1 had already been explored and was turned down by Halton Conservation Authority. We feel the analysis of this hybrid option was always very justified as it removes the majority of affects of the natural environment because of its shorter distance across the total affected areas of Option 1 – most notably it would review large affects on the Lake Medad Watershed. It also does not require the closure of Opta Minerals and this reduces the total cost of the project to be almost identical to that of Option 4. • If you still maintain that your data of Option 5 is, in fact, Option 5 (through Stantec), we ask that you redo the data analysis , that was committed to by the Project Team leader, Mary Lou Tanner – in Dec				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	2005, and provide us a report of it. We believe it will be virtually identical to the data you provided to us on what you describe as a different Option 5 analysis. With this in mind, the Project Team has to be open to presenting, to Halton Conservation Authority, a hybrid route that goes through, or near the wetlands. This should not be anymore concerning that the PSWs that the Project Team is already taking the route through near center road. That PSW is the wettest area in the entire project route – behind Northlands Subdivision. That forest – a PSW, is almost entirely under water during fall-winter-and spring, yet the Project Team is not looking at other routes to avoid these PSWs. • In addition, I first wrote to Andrew Head on Nov 25th, 2005, regarding a hybrid Option, well before the email dated Dec 14, 2005, that you attached of mine in your report. In fact, in my Nov 25th 2005 email, I discuss a hybrid of EW5 and Option 1 – the purpose of EW5 was to reconnect the roadway to Parkside Drive at Hwy 6, which is what Stantec advised in 1999 with its EW5 route. I further discuss how we need to work with Halton Conservation Authority to minimize affects on ESAs and PSWs and this statement was intended to look more closely at minimizing impacts within the wet areas. The statement was not intended to be interpreted to take the route through Opta Minerals. No where in my Nov 25th memo do I suggest that it go through Opta Minerals. Further, my Nov 25th email, was referred to by Mr. Alvero Alumni of Dillon Consulting in an email he sent to me. He also copied Mr. Don				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	McKinnon of Dillon Consulting and it was Don, who told us on Dec 8, 2008, that it was his understanding that Option 5 had always gone through Opta Minerals. Yet, there is no information in my Nov 25, 2005, or Dec 14, 2005, that suggests this be done. The sketch in the Dec 14th email was intended for discussions with Andrew Head for a Dec 16th meeting. It was not a formal proposal to analyze a route through Opta Minerals. See emails below. ---------- ----- Original Message ----- From: "[redacted] Sent: Friday, November 25, 2005 1:23 PM Subject: Request from Parkside Dr East Waterdown Residents to present alternative transportation proposal to council and to planning dept. Hi Andrew, Our neighbourhood committee, which consists of concerned residents along Parkside Dr East, have met to review the Dillon Proposals for East West Transportation in Waterdown. We have also looked at the finding of the former Stantech Study. **It is our conclusion that the best route of choice is a hybrid of the former EW5 modified and the Dillon Option 1 proposal.** We would like to present our finding to council and to the planning department at the earliest possible convenience. Please advise us if this option is available to us.				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	We are also completing a petition which will be signed by the residents along this stretch of Parkside Dr. East, who would be affected by a four lane bypass running through home area. Would you kindly advise us as to how to get on council's agenda a the time you are expecting council to vote on the Phase 2 findings of the Waterdown Transportation Study? If you would suggest an earlier time, this would be open to us. We could summarize our concerns within the expected 5 minuted usually allotted to present. We have illustrations to help with the presentation. We believe that the less costly Dillon Option 1 is in the best interest of all neighbours on Parkside, not only residents to the west of Grindstone Creek but to the East of Grindstone Creek as well. We believe that the Option 1 roadway can be built to minimize impact on the ESAs and ANSIs to the north of us. It is also the least costly of routes based on the Dillon study findings. It would be the least disruptive construction project to current transportation demands as well by avoiding a such a major construction project on Parkside Dr. We believe the the Option 1 road can be built to also address the concerns of the Halton Conservation Authority. Based on the geographical nature of Flamborough, where numerous roads throughout the region already exist and already come near or transect wetlands, ESAs, or ANSIs, it is unreasonable to				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
[redacted]	Yet, you have not explained why the City of Hamilton owns this fence and why a noise attenuation fence was constructed. The fact that the City owns it, and that the former Town of Flamborough owned is the precedent. You cannot deny your responsibility that it was there and it was placed there to deter noise. Its a two lane road that is currently set at 60 km per hour. The road will be upgraded in the future to a 3 or 4 lane road by the City of Hamilton to accommodate the new northern subdivision development. I am concerned of the Project Team's denial that this fence exists for the purpose of noise attenuation? What else is a heavy gauge wood fence, with no slots between boards, its sealed to the ground and is as high as 8 feet in sections, owned by the City and maintained by the City, is not a precedent ? Regarding your comments on the Town of Milton noise policy, you admit Hamilton has no such policy. In other words it has no policy at all to assist citizens who live on roads that grow in noise intensity due to urban development. We ask why it would not show some empathy and concern and take the leadership step and provide the noise attenuation fence that our neighbours deserve? In terms of light standard placement, you have not give me any reassurance that the light standard will not be placed directly off the homes that are closest to the road? Can you at least indicated that everything				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	that can be reasonably done will be done to avoid the homes at X and X Fellowes? These two homes are closest to the road by 15-20 feet and have bedrooms backing on to them? Please advise?				
ID# 392 [redacted] Mar 16, 2009 Email	Dear Project Team, Whether or not Dillon Consulting would agree that a noise attenuation fence should have been built at Hollybush and Parkside Drive is not the issue here. The issue here is that it was built and that it is a noise attenuation fence that is now owned by the City of Hamilton. Obviously the former Town of Flamborough supported its ownership and approved that it would be built. We ask for the same fairness. The traffic at Hollybush and Parkside is not at a level of what exists behind our homes. I ask why the Project Team is treating us in this unfair manner compared to what has been set up at Hollybush and Parkside? Regard, [redacted]	Waterdown-Aldershot Information		*In-progress*	
ID# 393 [redacted] Mar 18, 2009 Email	Dear Project Team, How is it that the Project Team states in its response to my inquiry that Dufferin Quarries is not planning to expand when I have sent you the 'City of Hamilton Planning and Economic Development Deparment Report' about the approved application dated Nov 18, 2005 ? We have been sending you this report several times a year for the past 3 years and it has been presented to	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	City of Hamilton June 26, 2009 Email	***Project Team Response:*** The original response was: "*In regards to the Dufferin quarry, the City is not aware of any planned expansions at this site and has not received any information from Dufferin regarding truck rerouting.*" This comment pertained to a possible newly planned expansion to the quarry and not the 2005 expansion that the City is certainly aware of and, in fact, references in the same e-mail. In the past there have been numerous questions raised on the Quarries in the Waterdown Area. Attached we have completed a brief background on the Dufferin	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	the Project Team leaders, by the Parkside Drive Citizens Group, going back to Andrew Head and Mary Lou Tanner in 2005, to the City Council in Waterdown in Feb. 2006, and also with Christine Lee Morrison in late 2007? This quarry is approved for a massive 300% increase from 750,000 tons of stone output to 3,000,000 tons. The proposed increase is to occur over a 5 year period. It is not clear when the quarry intends to ramp up the operation. Although the quarry proposal intends to use the current truck route, at the time of their application, the WATMP East West route was only in preliminary stages. We believe with the new East West Route available and being a shorter route to Hwy 407 than their current route by several kilometers, that any reasonable individual would suspect that any reasonable business would want to select the shortest of routes available. Therefore, we are very concerned that your noise modeling studies do not take into consideration the possibility of a large number of trucks running behind our homes at Parkside Drive between Boulding and Robson Rd. As citizens, we have no confidence that City Council would act in our interests to block the East West route from becoming a quarry truck route. The proposed increase in traffic, predicted by the City of Hamilton in its Traffic Impact Analysis dated March 21, 2005, would see an increase to 66 trucks per hour going both in and out of the quarry. This is a tremendous number of trucks and we feel threatened			and Lafarge Quarry. See *Appendix A Quarry Truck Information*.	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	by such a magnitude of trucks since it makes perfectly good sense for the quarry to apply to use the East West bypass rather than taking a longer route either through Waterdown on Dundas St. or easterly on Hwy 403. Please help us understand why you have not acknowledge the Dufferin Aggregates plans to expand based on your own internal memos attached? Regards, [redacted]				
ID# 403 [redacted] May 14, 2009 Email	Dear WAI, Ms. Lee-Morrison (City of Hamilton) and Paul MacLeod (Dillon Consulting). Subject: New East-West Road Corridor (Highway 6 to Brant Street) Acoustic Assessment Draft Report, February 2009 Request: For the City of Hamilton to include noise reduction fencing for the 10 homes of Fellowes Cres, houses, 211, 213, 215, 217, 219, 221, 223, 225, 227, 229, and 170 Boulding Ave to mitigate noise from Parkside Drive. As you know, I live at [redacted] Fellowes Cres., in Waterdown, and my home backs onto Parkside Drive, along with 9 other homes on Fellowes Cres. In addition to these homes, the home at [redacted] Boulding Ave., which is at the corner of Parkside Drive and Boulding Ave., is only 62 feet from the current lane. We believe that this home, along with the 10 homes on Fellowes Cres., should be offered noise reduction fencing to help offset the noise of both the current road condition and future road	Waterdown-Aldershot Information		*In-progress*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	condition. As you know, your East West Roadway plan, intends to increase traffic from the current 8,000 vehicles per day to over 14,500 vehicles per day by year 2021. You are also expanding the road to 4 lanes, from two lanes, and bringing one of those lanes 10 feet closer to our homes. I have also pointed out to you in the past, that my home, and rear facing master bedroom window and outdoor patio, is already within 72 feet of the edge of the current nearest lane. My home is the closest rear facing home of all homes on Fellowes Cres due to the fact that my home is back-set on the property due to the curve on Fellowes Cres. **I believe its is time that the City of Hamilton come to terms with the noise that we endure, and that is already modeled in your study, some 58.9 continuous decibels of noise (daytime), and that we are forecasted to go to over 62.4 decibels of continuous noise (daytime) with the roadway expansion. We believe it is warranted that the City of Hamilton build a noise reduction fence along the back of our homes.** **I will also challenge these noise modeling estimates in a subsequent email.** I have reviewed your noise evaluation study that you sent to us on March 12th 2009. You have raised some interesting facts including the Ministry of Environment Guidelines that state that noise should not exceed 55 continuous decibels in an outdoor living area. You have also shown from your recent noise model, that				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	noise in my backyard (sensor EW 11) is currently 58.9 continuous daytime decibels. Our homes were built in 1994, just a few years before the homes that were built where noise reduction fencing, owned by the City of Hamilton, was built on Parkside Drive. (at Hollybush (60 km/hr two lane zone); at Keewaydin St. (50 km/hr two lane zone). No doubt, that when noise modeling was done at those sections of Parkside Drive by the developer, it was predicted that the noise for those homes, without a noise reduction fence, would be over 55 decibels and exceed the M of E Guidelines. The City of Hamilton or the former Town of Flamborough was a party to this process and took ownership and maintenance of those fences. For our situation, to not have had a fence built by the developers and ownership transferred to the former Town of Flamborough, it appears to have been a mistake as the noise issues in this area is worse than exists at Hollybush or at Keewaydin. It is now clear that we warrant noise mitigation fencing and that the noise is at a level that is impairing our quality of life. How is it impairing our Quality of Life? First, the City of Hamilton has now scheduled bus service, Monday to Friday, beginning at 5 am in the morning. Every 20 minutes, beginning at about 5:20 am, for 3 hours continuous, a bus speeds behind my house, on the southerly and closest lane to my home, at approx 40 to 50 km/hr. I have measured the noise level, during the afternoon rush hour time as well , and the bus noise ranges from 75 to 80 decibels. It is most				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	deafening in my patio when I am outside, and it awakens me every morning, beginning at 5:20 am, and continuous to awaken me every 20 minutes. This disturbance in my sleep is very stressful. In addition, the traffic noise, when measured during rush hour, is in ranges of 65 to 80 decibels and it is virtually continuous since vehicles go by at a rate of approximately 800 per hour one way, and about 30-40% of that rate from the other direction. A total of approx 1200 vehicles per hour or 20 vehicles per minute. One every 3 seconds. The noise from these vehicles, some often very large trucks and buses, is unacceptable and could be mitigated substantially by the installation of a noise reduction fence. Your East West roadway plan, has ignored our previous requests for a plan for additional noise mitigation that would include noise reduction fencing at least similar in design and quality as that exists and is owned by the City of Hamilton on other parts of Parkside Drive. These homes exist at Parkside Drive at Keewaydin St. area, and Parkside Drive at Hollybush Ave. area. (See attached photos). Your study is also suggesting that noise reduction fencing be installed behind homes in the UpCountry Estates area and in areas near Center Road where the East West roadway will cross. It appears that your preferences are to mitigate noise for homes of new construction, but not for homes of existing areas like ours. We object to be treated differently, in view of the fact that the roadway expansion, will bring more noise				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	and noise sources, closer to our homes by an additional 10 feet. We believe that if you can require builders to provide noise reduction fencing, and take ownership of them, at Parkside Drive and Hollybush, and at Parkside Drive at Keewaydin that you should then be obligated to provide the same for us through a charge to the developers of the new subdivision. Examples of such assistance to existing homes is throughout Ontario. I have provide you examples in the past such as the new cedar fence on Thompson Road in Milton.(see photos of Thompson Road fence) That fence was built, at no charge, behind existing homes. It is also clear to us that you are intending to charge the developers of the residential expansion in North Waterdown, and other parts, 100% of the cost of the road expansion, including the road section behind our homes. So why is it that our 10 homes cannot be given what should have been installed here, in 1994? The fact that you have no plan in your study to provide noise mitigation fencing for us, is a major concern that we will express in an appeal to the Ministry of Environment unless you are prepared to mitigate or negotiate in regards to our concerns. Thanks very much for reviewing our concerns in this email. I would appreciate a response as to why the contrast exists for homes at Parkside Drive at Hollybush and at Keewaydin relative to our situation and why we have been left out. Please provide proof to us as to				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	how different we are, how much less noise we have, in comparison to those areas. As you realize, Parkside Drive is expected to be closed at Hwy 6 and those homes will have substantially less traffic in coming years. It was understood from your many traffic evaluations, that 75 % of daytime rush hour traffic concentrates in our area, the eastern part of Parkside Drive, making it the noisiest section of Parkside Drive during rush hours. **We ask that you please provide a budget for the cost of such a fence prior to the submission of your Notice of Completion and include it in your budget for the roadway. I suspect that it will be a very small charge relative to the $ 14 million budget you have made for the entire roadway. I would suspect the fence would cost less than a few thousand dollars per home.** Regards, [redacted] Fellowes Cres., Waterdown, ON L0R 2h3				
ID# 404 [redacted] May 14, 2009 Email	Dear WAI, In your report sent to me March 12, 2009, you present actual noise model estimates for the EW 11 noise sensor, which refers to my home. However, you have not provided the actual data and calculations for EW 11 in your appendix D as you have for other sensors. Would you please send me the data for EW-11 for my evaluation so that I may consider to comment on it to you.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information		*In-progress*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Regards, [redacted] [redacted] Fellowes Cres. Waterdown, ON L0R 2H3				
ID# 405 [redacted] May 14, 2009 Email	Dear Project Team, I have consulted with the Ministry of Environment local offices and I was advised that it would not be unreasonable to request that you do actual live' noise measurement from my home during typical rush hour days. I am asking that you conduct live noise monitoring from my home since I am significantly closer to Parkside Drive (26 meters from house wall) and will be much closer after the 4 lane expansion (23 meters). Your theoretical models are estimating that my current daytime continous noise levels are at 58.9 decibels and will increase to 62.4 decibels with expanded traffic and by adding 2 lanes to the roadway. My concern is that the highest levels of noise exist during the early morning rush hour and afternoon rush hour when I am either try to sleep or am enjoying my backyard. These are critical times in our daily lives and more emphasis should be placed on reducing noise at peak rush hour times, than trying to average the noise intensity. Our sensitivity to sound is not based on noise averages, our sensitivities are based on actual noise levels. I feel it is more important to reduce peak noise, especially when I am trying to sleep at 5:20 am in the morning, when a bus is roaring by, and when I am trying to relax at my backyard patio, when trucks and buses and high	Waterdown-Aldershot Information		*In-progress*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	volumes of traffic are roaring by. In addition to the high traffic which travels on lanes that are closest to my home in the morning (the southerly lanes), the City of Hamilton has initiated bus service and the buses now travel every 20 minutes and first pass my home at 5:20 am. Their passage every 20 minutes wakes me up over and over and is disturbing my sleep as I do not need to wake up most work days until 6:30 to 7:00 am. I have measured the noise of these buses to be between 72 and 80 decibels, standing only 2 meters outside from my patio door. The vehicle traffic is continous for up to 3 hours during each rush hour as well. The noise level at my patio is in the 65 to 70 decibel range for most cars, and in the 65 to 80 decibel range for most trucks. As you are already aware, the City of Hamilton owns and maintains noise reduction fences at Parkside Drive at Hollybush and at Keewaydin. We ask that you ensure that myself and my neighbours be offered the same level of support and understanding. I would appreciate hearing back on my request as soon as possible. Regards, [redacted] Fellowes Cres. Waterdown, ON L0R 2H3				
ID# 408 [redacted] May 28, 2009	Dear Paul, A number of months ago, you had asked me to send	Paul MacLeod (Dillon	City of Hamilton June 26, 2009	***Project Team Response:*** The proposed grading for the New East-West Road is very close to the current fence. The existing fence may be threatened by this grading	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
Email	you a picture of the Hawthorne tree behind my home which I have. As you know this tree, provides us a great deal of enjoyment in the spring and fall when it has leaves, blossoms and birds in it. It likely reduces the roadway noise to some extent as well. I had asked if you could ensure that new road and potential sidewalks be moved north enough to not allow for this tree to be removed. We have not heard from you as to whether this would be possible or not. This tree provides a beautiful divide between my home and the road. It is the home of many birds, cardinals, bluejays, and finches. This tree has beautiful blossoms every spring, (see picture), and provides fruit for the birds in late summer with red berries. I learned from you noise modeling study that the center of the new lane will be 3.1 meters closer to my house. From what I can tell, this would put the tree very close to the edge of the road and would certainly not accommodate a sidewalk. Therefore, I am assuming that you intend to remove this tree. Is there something you can do to maintain the beauty of this street but either replanting with similar trees closer to my property or by moving the road one or two meters further north in order to keep this tree from being removed? I have attached these photos and presentation we sent you previously for your comment and review.	Consulting) and Waterdown Aldershot Information	Email	and may be damaged by the removal of the existing vegetation (including the Hawthorne Tree). The project team may have to recommend that the existing south side fence throughout this section of Parkside Drive be replaced. Currently a comprehensive landscaping plan is being developed for the proposed works. Once the landscape plan is complete the project team will be able to determine if the fence will need to be replaced. This will be documented in the project's Environmental Study Report and be presented to Council. We will provide you with a copy of the landscape plan for this area when it is available.	

	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
tine Lee-Morrison, n with your Oct 28, 2008 lysis of a new Option 5 eam, that runs through ot the hybrid route of hat we described to the You also describe the mething that we vith. Your report goes on petition, and some w Head and Mary Lou ssion with them in Dec l. Unfortunately, it ws have interpreted t, Don McKinnon told us he was not clear what the sketch we provided, decided that the best te through Opta est at this juncture again roject leaders in 2005 road of Stantec EW5 y did the data analysis Unfortunately, you have 'e do not agree that the ed, pertained to your anner and Andrew Head ed that they give	Paul MacLeod (Dillon Consulting) Waterdown Aldershot Information	City of Hamilton June 26, 2009 Email	***Project Team Response:*** Thank you for your comments. They will be documented in the ESR. The project team stands behind our analysis of the East-West Alternatives. Back in 2005/06 it was the project team's understanding that the residents were requesting a route either through Opta (shown in blue on page three of Attachment 2) or to the north of Opta (the red route that was already developed and evaluated in Phase 2 Master Plan work. The project team also considered additional route refinements to the "through Opta" alignment in order to minimize impacts to Opta (orange route) and also consider the resident's suggestions to modify Option 1 to swing south. This was presented to the E-W NAC. It is the opinion of the Project Team that all possible alignments through this area have been evaluated. For all these evaluations, Option 4 has been identified as the preferred alternative. This information has been previously communicated to you through the NAC/PIC meeting process. The project team believes that there are no more reasonable options that we could possibly look at. ***Comment from your e-mail : "My intent by this comment was to take the exact alignment of Stantec EW 5, which aligns itself around Opta Minerals, and reconnect in an area around UpCountry Estates"***	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	own report on page 4 where their guidelines state: "In order to be cost effective and efficient, the Transportation Master plan was geared to the City of Hamilton's financial capability". Further more, even the City's own Official plan clearly states in Section 4.3: "The Region must assure efficient use of existing transportation resources and infrastructure and the best utilization of available public funds to provide a fully integrated transportation system". And even the Provincial governments Smart Growth Policy states the requirements for the efficient and effective use of existing road infrastructure. In other words they should have been looking at using not only single road solutions but multiple road solutions for their options. So to recap: - Project Team states that the widening of downtown core to 4 lanes will not solve transportation problem - The Project Team still presents an option 3 of Widening Dundas Street (still with a 4 lane downtown core) but with the un-required additional road expansion on an additional 7 Km of road. - The option 3, when evaluated in the Justification table, appear as the "worst option" and is no longer a consideration. The Project Team's mandate in determining the options were to create corridors. This raises the question of why the Project Team simply did not consider a "wider corridor" through the Downtown core, in combination with the existing capacity of Dundas Street and the existing capacity of Parkside Drive as a corridor solution option.			*order to be cost effective and efficient, the Transportation Master plan was geared to the City of Hamilton's financial capability". Further more, even the City's own Official plan clearly states in Section 4.3: "The Region must assure efficient use of existing transportation resources and infrastructure and the best utilization of available public funds to provide a fully integrated transportation system". And even the Provincial governments Smart Growth Policy states the requirements for the efficient and effective use of existing road infrastructure. In other words they should have been looking at using not only single road solutions but multiple road solutions for their options.* *So to recap:* *- Project Team states that the widening of downtown core to 4 lanes will not solve transportation problem* *- The Project Team still presents an option 3 of Widening Dundas Street (still with a 4 lane downtown core) but with the un-required additional road expansion on an additional 7 Km of road.* *- The option 3, when evaluated in the Justification table, appear as the "worst option" and is no longer a consideration.* *The Project Team's mandate in determining the options were to create corridors. This raises the question of why the Project Team simply did not consider a "wider corridor" through the Downtown core, in combination with the existing capacity of Dundas Street and the existing capacity of Parkside Drive as a corridor solution option.*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	While we might be the first to object on the widening of the downtown core to more than 4 lanes, we have to remember that the justification tables, when fairly populated, are used as a non-bias method to weigh the road widening effects against not only the Social, but also the Environment, Natural, Transportation and Costs. If the proper information was put in the Justification Table for Option 3, to just widen the downtown core, and the effects it would have on the 5 major categories, then its those results that should have been evaluated against the other Options. If a multilane Dundas Street was considered through the 1 km downtown core, then the Justification table results for the Option of widening Dundas Street would have indicated it as having the "lowest overall effects", therefore the preferred corridor. (We have previously provided these numbers to the Project Team.) This scenario is no different that the Project Teams N-S recommendation where their justification table results indicate that the expansion of the Waterdown Road corridor has the "lowest overall effects", and was therefore their recommendation even though the residents of Waterdown Road strongly protest to that recommendation. The Justification tables are used to objectively solve issues. Yes there would be social and economical impacts (only for the 1km downtown core) but the Natural, Transportation and the Costs would remain the lowest of all options. We have been asking questions and offering information to the Project Team for 3 years about the			*While we might be the first to object on the widening of the downtown core to more than 4 lanes, we have to remember that the justification tables, when fairly populated, are used as a non-bias method to weigh the road widening effects against not only the Social, but also the Environment, Natural, Transportation and Costs. If the proper information was put in the Justification Table for Option 3, to just widen the downtown core, and the effects it would have on the 5 major categories, then its those results that should have been evaluated against the other Options.* *If a multilane Dundas Street was considered through the 1 km downtown core, then the Justification table results for the Option of widening Dundas Street would have indicated it as having the "lowest overall effects", therefore the preferred corridor. (We have previously provided these numbers to the Project Team.) This scenario is no different that the Project Teams N-S recommendation where their justification table results indicate that the expansion of the Waterdown Road corridor has the "lowest overall effects", and was therefore their recommendation even though the residents of Waterdown Road strongly protest to that recommendation. The Justification tables are used to objectively solve issues. Yes there would be social and economical impacts (only for the 1km downtown core) but the Natural, Transportation and the Costs would remain the lowest of all options.* *We have been asking questions and offering information to the Project Team for 3 years about the Dundas Street Option. All of the Project Teams replies*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Dundas Street Option. All of the Project Teams replies have been to simply try and justify and reinforce their premature recommendations. This leads us to believe that either: - the Project Team did a poor job in the evaluation of possible options or - the Project Team already had their mind made up to pick option 4 (a new northern route) and wrote their study around that recommendation. Over the past 3 years of this study, we have uncovered and advised the Project team of a multitude of other issues including mistakes and mis-leading information in their study. For example: - Mis-leading the public and councillors about the Ministry of Transportation closing Parkside Drive at highway 6 - The Project Team not taking the Dufferin Quarry expansion and truck traffic requirements into consideration in their report - The ignoring of the MOE requirements against Barnes Environmental (now called Opta Mineral) - Refusing to advise the public if any of the options were going to be a truck route - Ignoring the inclusion of Hamilton Conservation Authority in the Phase 2 study (only after there recommendations were published, were HCA consulted) - Costing errors in their report - Unbalanced and unrepresentative SAC committee - ... It is obvious that there are major problems with the			*have been to simply try and justify and reinforce their premature recommendations. This leads us to believe that either:* *- the Project Team did a poor job in the evaluation of possible options or* *- the Project Team already had their mind made up to pick option 4 (a new northern route) and wrote their study around that recommendation.* **Project Team Response:** We have addressed this question and a very detailed response to your proposal for the widening of Dundas Street has been previously sent (ID# 119). Notwithstanding, your 4 lane widening option does not solve the capacity problem, it would result in large bottleneck impacts through the core of Waterdown. In the fall of 2005 we advised you of this and explained the following: "The proposal for the modified 4 lane widening along Dundas Street corridor suggested would have resulted in major property/business/social effects to the downtown core of Waterdown. The suggested option of using the existing road bed and consideration of providing four lanes along Dundas Street in downtown Waterdown would not work. Widening the road through the removal of parking lanes and prohibiting left turning movements during the peak periods would not accommodate the increased demand by 2021. Previous responses and the letter from Gerry Davis (November 18th 2009) address the discrepancy between your opinion and that of City of Hamilton staff and consultants". *Over the past 3 years of this study, we have uncovered*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	whole study. While the Project Team has advised us many times that the study has been Peer Reviewed by Hamilton, Burlington and Halton, we must reply that review was simply performed by the Project Team members from those municipalities. (These same municipalities hired the Consultant to do all the detailed work, not their staff). The only true Peer Review of this study would be if it was performed through another outside Consultant or agency. We have requested the City of Hamilton and Burlington Councillors to have a true peer review of their study before it goes to the MOE for approval. However, due to politics, we already know that any other outside Consultant agency that reviews this study and makes any possible negative comments to it, may not be look upon favourable by any of the Municipalities for future Consulting. We need an unbiased review which can only be performed by the MOE. We ask once again to the Project Team: Will you elevate this Schedule C Project to an individual environmental assessment as part of a Part II order? If once again the Project Team refuses to consider bumping up this project, we ask that they attempt to answer the following questions: 1) Because a 4 lane Option for the Downtown core did not appear to solve the problem, why did the Project Team simply not consider a wider corridor? 2) Because a 4 lane Option for the Downtown core did not appear to solve the problem, why did the Project Team still use it as a solution in their Option 3?:			*and advised the Project team of a multitude of other issues including mistakes and mis-leading information in their study. For example:* *- Mis-leading the public and councillors about the Ministry of Transportation closing Parkside Drive at highway 6* **Project Team Response:** Responses are included in ID# 204 (sent February 6, 2009), and the memo sent out by the Neutral Community Facilitator's Office (NCFO) on May 26, 2008 entitled "Review of MTO Highway 6 / Parkside Drive Issue". *- The Project Team not taking the Dufferin Quarry expansion and truck traffic requirements into consideration in their report* **Project Team Response:** Responses are included in ID#s 9 and 13 (addressed to Mr. Oliver), and ID# 133 (addressed to Mr. Seferiades). The most recent response is included in ID# 123 (addressed to Mr. Oliver on February 25, 2009). *- The ignoring of the MOE requirements against Barnes Environmental (now called Opta Mineral)* **Project Team Response:** Responses are included in ID#s 9, 13 and 107 (addressed to Mr. Oliver), and ID#s 81 and 133 (addressed to Mr. Seferiades). The most recent response is included in ID# 123 (addressed to Mr. Oliver on February 25, 2009). *- Refusing to advise the public if any of the options*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Thank you [redacted]			*were going to be a truck route* **Project Team Response:** An update regarding the City of Hamilton's Truck Route Master Transportation Plan was provided at the East-West NAC Meeting on October 28, 2008. *- Ignoring the inclusion of Hamilton Conservation Authority in the Phase 2 study (only after there recommendations were published, were HCA consulted)* **Project Team Response:** Responses to this concern were sent to [redacted] on the following dates: November 1st, 2005; February 13th, 2006; June 29th, 2006; October 5, 2006; October 13, 2006; and November 9, 2006. *- Costing errors in their report* **Project Team Response:** Response is included in ID# 82 (sent on February 6, 2009). *- Unbalanced and unrepresentative SAC committee* **Project Team Response:** Response is included in ID# 9, sent to [redacted] on February 8, 2008. *It is obvious that there are major problems with the whole study. While the Project Team has advised us many times that the study has been Peer Reviewed by Hamilton, Burlington and Halton, we must reply that review was simply performed by the Project Team*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				members from those municipalities. (These same municipalities hired the Consultant to do all the detailed work, not their staff). The only true Peer Review of this study would be if it was performed through another outside Consultant or agency. We have requested the City of Hamilton and Burlington Councillors to have a true peer review of their study before it goes to the MOE for approval. However, due to politics, we already know that any other outside Consultant agency that reviews this study and makes any possible negative comments to it, may not be look upon favourable by any of the Municipalities for future Consulting. We need an unbiased review which can only be performed by the MOE. *We ask once again to the Project Team: Will you elevate this Schedule C Project to an individual environmental assessment as part of a Part II order?* **Project Team Response:** Please see response to ID#204. "We refer you to correspondence to yourself from Sarah Paul at the Ontario Ministry of the Environment dated March 31, 2008. Ms. Paul states 'the Master Plan is prepared in accordance with Approach #2 of the Master Plan provisions of the Class EA...There are no Part II Order provisions for Master Plans. You, however, have the opportunity to make a written submission to the Minister asking that an individual Environmental Assessment be prepared for any proposed project which is planned under the Master Plan.' The Project Team is pursuing the Schedule C EA	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				process. When the Project Partners file a Notice of Completion there will be a 30 day comment period at which point you may make a written submission to the Minister of Environment asking that an individual Environmental Assessment be prepared for the proposed projects. The Project Partners are following the Schedule C Class EA process, and do not intend to elevate the work to an individual EA." *If once again the Project Team refuses to consider bumping up this project, we ask that they attempt to answer the following questions:* *1) Because a 4 lane Option for the Downtown core did not appear to solve the problem, why did the Project Team simply not consider a wider corridor?* *2) Because a 4 lane Option for the Downtown core did not appear to solve the problem, why did the Project Team still use it as a solution in their Option 3?:* **Neutral Community Facilitator's Response:** Please see response above. *Thank you.* Kind regards, Patricia Halajski on behalf of Sally Leppard, Neutral Community Facilitator's Office 36 Hunter Street East, 6th Floor Hamilton, ON L8N 3W8 Tel. (905) 818-8464 Fax (905) 528-4179 Email: info@waterdown-aldershot.ca	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
ID# 212 [redacted] Sep 25, 2008 Email	**Subject:** Re: East-West NAC Meeting #5 - Rescheduled To the Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Study Project Team **Comments to the June 24 PIC meeting minutes:** The minutes of the June 24th meeting regarding NS2 /NS3 do not reflect the discussions we raised at that meeting, nor the information that was communicated back to the Project Team after the meeting. Attached is the email that was sent to the Project Team communicating the following point to the Project Team about their presentation: *In the June 24th PIC meeting, which is suppose to be used to gather the public input, the detailed large scaled maps of the area clearly showed the Project Teams preferred D-F South road alignment, by drawing an actual scaled and coloured roadway of D-F South along the map. The two other possible alternatives (D-F Middle and D-F North) were drawn as single thin black lines with a small printed statement beside them stating:* ***"Alignment options to be assessed based on additional environmental and geotechnical information'.*** *It did not say to the public: '"We want your opinions on these alternative". It clearly stated that the final alignment would be based on information* ***not*** *from the public.* *At the meeting this point was advised to Lura consulting. Lura advised that the one comment board (on the floor under the detailed map) about the Centre Road crossing did refer to 4 options. We pointed out that the detailed map did not show or*	Waterdown-Aldershot Information & Large list	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 6, 2009 Email	Email was acknowledged Sep 25, 2008. **ID# 212 Response** **Facilitator's Office Response:** We have amended the draft summary report for the East-West Road Class EA Phase 3 and 4 Public Information Centre dated June 24, 2008. However, please be advised that we cannot amend the summary report to reflect discussions that were not held at the time of the meeting. Further to our email (ID# 156 dated June 25, 2008) the Project Team presented the results of their evaluation of the four options to the NAC participants and members of the public at the October and November NAC/PIC meetings. The map illustrating the four alignment options can be found on the project website under the November 5, 2008 East-West Public Information Centre (PIC) display panels.	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	refer to a 4th option. (Anyone could assume this was a printing error on the comment board.) The map presented at the PIC meeting can be found at: http://www.myhamilton.ca/NR/rdonlyres/5D3CC036-F1D6-4A29-9232-18919C002DC0/0/WaterdownEWRoadN3r1.pdf The same attached email has a reply back from the Project team stating: *Relating to section N-3 of the proposed roadway alignment - the project team is in the process of evaluating four potential alignments, the fourth alignment was identified at the NAC EW meeting on June 12, 2008. In light of the fact that the option was identified less than two weeks ago, the project team has advised that it is not yet in a position to provide information on the alternatives including the fourth option, since further data must be collected (including geo-technical and environmental conditions - as discussed at the NAC meeting). Once this data is collected the project team and the NAC participants/members of the public will be in a position to contribute to the evaluation of all four options. The opportunity for this discussion will be in September at the next NAC meetings and public information centres. These process steps were discussed with you last night.* *In light of your concerns that the fourth option was not identified on the map and the public wasn't explicitly consulted on it, we have been advised that Dillon*				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Consulting will prepare the drawing for this section of the roadway that identifies all four options. This map, along with the evaluation and data collection process will be posted on the web site, and we will advise you of the timing of this when it occurs. As mentioned previously, consultation will occur on the evaluation and this section of the roadway in September. The only comment about this discussion that Lura has stated in the June 24th PIC minutes presented was: "*Concern expressed that the public did not have adequate incentive to comment on the northernmost N3 alternative, since it was not drawn on the map, and there was only one comment about the four options being evaluated.*" This important information, that was discussed with the Project Team at the PIC and followed up on with emails to the Project Team **WAS NOT INCLUDED nor reflected in the minutes of your PIC meeting**. We would ask that the Minutes be updated to properly reflect this information and the Project Team follow through on what they advised they will do. Thank you. [redacted]				
ID# 218 [redacted] October 14, 2008 Email	To: The Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Project Team **Please explain who the Project Team is lying to: The general public - or - the Neighbourhood Advisory Committee?**	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Oct 17, 2008 Email	Dear [redacted] Thank you for your e-mail. We are contacting the project team today regarding your concerns. Regards,	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	In the June 12th East-West NAC (Neighbourhood Advisory Committee) meeting, the Project Team was asked by the NAC E-W members to review an Option 4 in the N2-N3 section of the Proposed East West road, where it crosses Centre Road (above Northlawn Ave.) The Project Team agreed to do this. In the June 24th PIC (Public Information Centre) Presentations, the Project Team presented the public their option 1, 2 and 3 in the N2-N3 Section of the road, with a "mention" of an option 4 (as indicated on a sign on the floor under their map.) The fact that the Project Team did not clearly present the Option 4 to the public as they said they would to the NAC, was made very clear to the Project Team in our email to them of June 25th. The Project Team then replied back to our email on the same day, June 25th, clearly stating that they are reviewing an Option 4 and will be presenting all 4 options in their next meeting to both the NAC and the Public. The following is the exact reply from the Project Team's June 25th reply to us about considering Option 4: *Relating to section N-3 of the proposed roadway alignment - the project team is in the process of evaluating four potential alignments, the fourth alignment was identified at the NAC EW meeting on June 12, 2008. In light of the fact that the option was identified less than two weeks ago, the project team has advised that it is not yet in a position to provide information on the alternatives including the fourth option, since further data must be collected (including geo-technical and environmental*			Sally M. Leppard --- Dear [redacted] Further to your e-mail dated October 13, 2008 (ID #218), we have clarified the situation with the Project Team relating to the determination of the alignment on the N2-N3 section of the roadway. The Project Team has advised as follows: Based on input from the EW-NAC on June 12, 2008, we agreed to explore a more northerly alignment of the roadway. The potential for a more northerly alignment was noted at the PIC on June 24, 2008. We agreed with you after that meeting that we would prepare a new map showing the potential for a more northerly alignment. During June, we also received the Hunter Park Survey community's evaluation of each potential alignment. We also noted that there was further work to be conducted to clarify the feasibility of a more northerly alignment. The Project Team is completing the routing of a 4th (more northern) alignment and its evaluation of the four possible alternative routes within this block at the current time. We will be in a position to discuss these results with the NAC and the public at the October/November meetings. Please be advised that as the specific routing of the alternatives (for evaluation) were dependent upon the results of biological and geo-	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	conditions - as discussed at the NAC meeting). Once this data is collected the project team and the NAC participants/members of the public will be in a position to contribute to the evaluation of all four options. The opportunity for this discussion will be in September at the next NAC meetings and public information centres. These process steps were discussed with you last night. *In light of your concerns that the fourth option was not identified on the map and the public wasn't explicitly consulted on it, we have been advised that Dillon Consulting will prepare the drawing for this section of the roadway that identifies all four options. This map, along with the evaluation and data collection process will be posted on the web site, and we will advise you of the timing of this when it occurs. As mentioned previously, consultation will occur on the evaluation and this section of the roadway in September.* Below is an email from a neighbour on Northlawn Ave (Mrs. Marchiori), who asked the Project Team on June 13th: *"What is the approximate distance from Northlawn Avenue to new east-west route?* Although it took the Project Team almost 4 MONTHS (June 13th to Oct 9th) to reply back to Mrs. Marchiori, their answer clearly only refers to 3 options, which were the first 3 options presented to the NAC in the June 12th meeting. It is clear that the Project Team is only giving "Lip Service" to either the NAC or the General public.			technical investigations, we have adjusted the alternative routes from what was originally presented. Please be assured that we are considering the input from the NAC and the Hunter Park Survey community, as per our commitment in June. Mr. Breznik, the NCFO will correct the Project Team's response to Ms. Marchiori. Regards, Sally M. Leppard	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Therefore we ask again: **Please explain who the Project Team is lying to: The general public or the Neighbourhood Advisory Committee?** Thank You [redacted] Waterdown. ----- Original Message ----- **From:** Waterdown-Aldershot Information **Sent:** Thursday, October 09, 2008 11:37 AM **Subject:** ID# 139 - East-West Road Inquiry Dear [redacted] Thank you for your phone call dated June 13, 2008. We have obtained responses from the Project Team to your inquiry, and have provided it below. The Project Team has responded to your inquiry in blue. What is the approximate distance from Northlawn Avenue to new east-west route? **Response**: Three options for the mid block alignments are being considered: an option to the north (290m away from Northlawn Ave.); an option in the middle (190m away from Northlawn Ave.); and an option to the south (100m away from Northlawn Ave.). The recommended option is to be presented at the upcoming Public Information Centre in early November. Regards,				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Patricia Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard,				
ID# 221 [redacted] Oct 16, 2008 Email	1) **To:** The Project Team of the Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Plan Project. Lura Consulting was hired by the Project Team to ensure all questions from the public were properly documented and replied to by the Project Team with 10 working days. The following is a partial list of outstanding questions still not answered by the Lura / the Project Team: (The numbers were assigned by Lura) # 75 (Cost savings) dated Mar 30th, acknowledged by Lura on April 1st - No reply # 82 MTO Correspondence questioned Mar 13th, Review Report prepared by Lura on May 26th. The report has been questioned on Sept 5th and renumbered to #204 # 85 dated April 3, acknowledged by Lura on May 9th - Still Outstanding - not all Agency Correspondence has been posted on the Web site as the Project Team said the would. # 118 dated May 18th, acknowledged by Lura and answered on Aug 18th, requestioned on Sept 1 - No Reply # 119 dated May 12th, acknowledged by Lura and answered on Aug 18th, requestioned on Sept 2 - Renumbered to #205 - No Reply # 146 dated June 16th, acknowledged by Lura on June 18th - No Reply # 156 dated June 25th, acknowledged by Lura on June 25th - No Reply but advised to wait till next NAC	Waterdown Aldershot Information	Waterdown Aldershot Information Sally Leppard Oct 27, 2008 Email with letter attached	*Letter from NAC Oct 08 (see ID# 241, Response in RB-Section)*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	meetings. # 199 dated Aug 15th, acknowledged by Lura on Aug 15th - No Reply # 204 dated Sept 5th, acknowledged by Lura on Sept 5th - No Reply # 205 dated Sept 2nd, acknowledged by Lura on Sept 10th - No Reply # 212 dated Sept 25th, acknowledged by Lura on Sept 25th - No Reply # 218 dated Oct 13th, acknowledged by Lura on Oct 14th - No Reply Either Lura Consulting is not doing its job ensuring the Publics questions are being fully answered **or** The Consultants Dillon have been instructed not to answer the questions **or** The Hamilton City Project Team Project has decided not to provide answers back to Lura. **or** The Project Team is simply playing a game and intends to answer all the outstanding questions over the past 6 months, maybe 1 week before the next meeting with the Hamilton or Burlington City Councillors to approve the project. In Feb. 20th, 2006 at the Hamilton Public Works Sub-Committee meeting, the Hamilton Councillors and Mayor were advised by the Public that the Project Team was taking up to 5 months to answer the Public's questions and those scarce answers only came back 1 week prior to the Publics Works Sub-committee				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	meeting. This left minimal time for the Public to understand the replies or verify or challenge them. The Hamilton Mayor and Councillors specifically told the Project Team to improve their timeliness and answer all of the Publics questions within 6 weeks at the maximum. It is obvious that the Project Team is following their instructions. While the Project Team may simply try to deflect the above statement by saying that some of the questions presented to them were very detailed and required a lot of special work, that answer only goes to prove that the Project Team did not properly do their homework / research of their data before they presented their results and recommendations to the Public. A properly researched EA study should have had almost immediate answers to all of the questions asked. So once again we ask the Project Team - When will they being replying to all of our outstanding questions and concerns? 2) To The Hamilton City Councillors: This Process of having to deal through a mediator clearly indicates the reluctance of the City Staff to have to deal with the public. It appears the City Staff are simply shielding themselves. This makes the whole communication process a farce. The City Staff gets to choose and pick when they feel like to answer any questions from the residents of Waterdown. Hamilton Councillors should review this process because it is simply allowing their staff to run wild and				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	do what ever they want with total disregard for the publics input. All the current method does is allow Lura to "document" the process to meet the "intent" of the EA process. This is not a community process.				
ID# 232 [redacted] Oct 21, 2008 Email	Sally: In the June 17th meeting in Flamborough on the City of Hamilton's Truck Route Master Transportation Plan, the residents asked the Project Team of the Truck Route Master Plan to advise the public as soon as possible if they plan to make the Proposed new East-West Road of the Waterdown-Aldershot Master Transportation Plan Proposal, a Truck Route. The Project Team said they will look into it and advise the Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Plan Project Team by September if they are proposing that the East West Road become a truck route. Since Lura Consulting is a mediator of both Projects, we ask that you update the NAC and Public of the Truck Route designation, either prior to or at the up coming NAC and PIC meetings. Please advise that you have followed up with the Hamilton's Truck Route Master Transportation Plan Project Team to ensure they have updated the Waterdown-Aldershot Master Transportation Plan Project Team, and that this information will be made public at the up coming meetings. Thank you.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Oct 28, 2008 In person	*NCFO provided an update at East-West NAC meeting on October 28, 2008.*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	[redacted] Waterdown				
ID# 241 [redacted] Oct 23, 2008 Email	Sally: Although Lura Consulting may have the best of intentions to ask us to attend a pre-meeting (as you have asked in the attached email), the meaning of the meeting is obvious - To allow the Project Team to present us their final recommendations and their justifications for those recommendations, **without regard or consideration for our detailed input or review.** Lets review the facts: - The Project Team said they would meet with Steve Oliver and Al Seferiades right after the June 11th NAC meeting, to review the Option 5 route and listen to their input.. - The Project Team is now setting that meeting up 1 hour before the next NAC meeting. - The Project Team based their Option 4 recommendation over the resident's Option 5 recommendation, on an Option 5 route that passes through Opta Minerals. - The resident's Option 5 recommendation (since 2005) never went through Opta Minerals. - After the June 11th NAC meeting, the NAC requested the Project Team to review 4 options for the E-W Road, as it crosses Centre Road, and present those 4 options at the June 23rd PIC meeting for the public input.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Oct 27, 2008 Email	Dear [redacted] **Re: Waterdown-Aldershot Transportation Master Plan – Class Environmental Assessments** Over the past few months, and in particular, in the last week, there has been a number of concerns expressed by some concerned residents about the integrity of the consultation process for this project. Some of those concerns include: • Input from the public is not being considered in this process; • Option 5 (E-W) alternatives have been assessed without the benefit of discussions with and knowledge from local residents; • The Project Team's Option 5 alternative (through Opta Minerals property) was never recommended by residents; • The outcome of the assessment of alternative alignments (considered in Phase 3) is pre-determined; • There is not enough time for public input and the process should slow down; • Long delays from the project team in providing some responses; and, • Requesting the Project Partners to conduct a peer review and/or an individual **Environmental Assessment.** As the Neutral Community Facilitator for this project, I am writing to address some of these concerns and to outline the process for public input in the future.	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	- They didn't. - The NAC requested at the same June 11th meeting to have the Project Team review the 4 options that cross Centre Road and present them with the evaluation information to both the NAC and the Public to get their input, **prior to making a recommendation**. - The Project Team is now allowing 3 people to see the results of the 4 Options crossing Centre Road, 1 hour before the NAC meeting. **Obviously the Project Team is not interested in the NAC's or Publics comments other than to "record them for the record" so they can simply push their recommendations through.** I am sorry, but I have no intention of attending a pre-meeting called at the last minute to satisfy the "record" of meeting with the "concerned" residents. I would suggest the Project Team and City of Hamilton Staff stop making a joke of the local public input to this EA process and listen to what we asked them at our first NAC meeting: Slow the process down and take the time to listen and understand our local input. **We deserve to be treated with respect.** [redacted] Waterdown 905-689-3938			In Phase 3, input has been obtained through a number of forums: the Neighbourhood Advisory Committees, the Public Information Centres, consultation with government review agencies, and correspondence with members of the community. During Phases 2 and 3 of this project, members of the public have suggested a number of alternatives that have been considered by the Project Team. These include: • A number of alternative alignments and connections for sections of the North-South and East-West routes (including four alternatives at the E-W route's Centre Road Crossing and an "option 5" alternative for the Parkside Drive connection. These alternatives have generally been identified to assist in minimizing the impact on the community, the environment and the economy of the proposed roadways; • Traffic calming/control measures; • Traffic flow measures; • Crossings for the Bruce Trail and pedestrians; and, • Bicycle and transit opportunities. In June of this year, the Project Team received further variations to consider. This input has generated additional fieldwork and assessments that has informed the evaluation process. Government review agencies have also been requested for their comments on the variations. Dillon Consulting has recently completed their evaluation of these alternatives, and made recommendations to the Project Partners last week. The results of the evaluations will be	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				presented at the NAC meetings to be held this week, and at the PICs next week for further discussion with the community. In addition, the Project Team wishes to consult with NAC members and members of the public on roadway design features and impact mitigation measures at these upcoming meetings. The Class Environmental Assessment process undertaken by the Project Partners will be completed with the preparation and filing of two Environmental Study Reports (ESRs) (one for each project) on Public Record in spring 2009 subject to approvals from various Councils. The Project Partners are committed to completing these ESRs on time. As you know, once the ESRs are completed, they will be placed on public record for 30 calendar days in accordance with the Municipal Class EA. If concerns arise, which cannot be resolved in discussion with the City, a person or party may request that the Minister of the Environment make an order for the project to comply with Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act (referred to as a Part II order), which addresses individual environmental assessments. Requests must be received by the Minister of the Environment within the 30-day public review period. The Minister may make one of the following decisions: • Deny the request • Refer the matter to mediation • Require the City to comply with Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act by undertaking one of the following: □ Submitting the Project File Report for government review and approval; or,	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
			---------- Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 6, 2009 Email	□ Completing an individual Environmental Assessment for government review and approval; or, □ Preparing Terms of Reference governing the preparation of an individual Environmental Assessment. Subject to comments received, the Project Partners will proceed with the implementation of the recommendations included in the Environmental Study Reports. Input from the public has been fully documented and considered by the Project Team. Changes to the original routing proposals have been made as a result of this input. Delays in responding to some enquiries and questions have been experienced due to the fact that the process for refining the alignments and assessing design alternatives was underway. Responses can only be generated once the results are known. Please be assured that responses to all of your enquiries will be provided. The Project Team has asked that I reiterate their assurance to you that they have, and will continue to consider all of your input. I hope this serves to clarify the consultation process. Sincerely, Sally M. Leppard Neutral Community Facilitator --- **ID# 241** --- Sally:	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				Although Lura Consulting may have the best of intentions to ask us to attend a pre-meeting (as you have asked in the attached email), the meaning of the meeting is obvious - To allow the Project Team to present us their final recommendations and their justifications for those recommendations, **without regard or consideration for our detailed input or review.** Lets review the facts: - The Project Team said they would meet with Steve Oliver and Al Seferiades right after the June 11th NAC meeting, to review the Option 5 route and listen to their input.. - The Project Team is now setting that meeting up 1 hour before the next NAC meeting. - The Project Team based their Option 4 recommendation over the resident's Option 5 recommendation, on an Option 5 route that passes through Opta Minerals. - The resident's Option 5 recommendation (since 2005) never went through Opta Minerals. - After the June 11th NAC meeting, the NAC requested the Project Team to review 4 options for the E-W Road, as it crosses Centre Road, and present those 4 options at the June 23rd PIC meeting for the public input. - They didn't. - The NAC requested at the same June 11th meeting to have the Project Team review the 4 options that cross	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				Centre Road and present them with the evaluation information to both the NAC and the Public to get their input, **prior to making a recommendation.** - The Project Team is now allowing 3 people to see the results of the 4 Options crossing Centre Road, 1 hour before the NAC meeting. **Obviously the Project Team is not interested in the NAC's or Publics comments other than to "record them for the record" so they can simply push their recommendations through.** I am sorry, but I have no intention of attending a pre-meeting called at the last minute to satisfy the "record" of meeting with the "concerned" residents. I would suggest the Project Team and City of Hamilton Staff stop making a joke of the local public input to this EA process and listen to what we asked them at our first NAC meeting: Slow the process down and take the time to listen and understand our local input. **We deserve to be treated with respect.** **Facilitator's Office Response:** 1) We appreciate your concern regarding the short notice for a meeting before the NAC meeting of October 28, 2008. As we pointed out to you and Mr. Oliver the Project Partners had only recently considered the results of the evaluation, and as noted in my memo to the NAC members dated October 27, 2008.	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				2) Regarding the Project Team's Option 5 and the resident's recommended Option 5, Lura has been requested to provide a concise summary of the issue and will document the chronology of the proponent's Option 5 and the resident's Option 5. 3) Regarding public input on the four options please refer to the response to ID#212. Due to the extent of public, stakeholder and Agency input on the East-West and North-South route which requires the Project Team to consider carefully the advice and meet with participants the completion of the ESR is now expected to go to Council in Spring 2009	
ID# 252 [redacted] Oct 27, 2008 Email	To the Project Team of the Hamilton Waterdown Master Transportation Plan: I have read the reply you have sent to Steve Oliver and I must address the inaccuracies in your reply: 1) The Parkside resident asked the Project Team in late 2005 to start reviewing Option 5. Only since we found discrediting information on the Project Team's option 4 vs the residents Option 5 in Late 2007, did the Project Team even start reviewing Option 5. It is obvious they are simply now in the process to "cover their tracks" like they have been doing with all the other errors and misleading information we have advised them about for the past 3 years. (In Jan 2008 the Christine Lee Morison of the Project Team stated that they do not look at any old information presented to them by the public, they are only looking at any new information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 6, 2009 Email	Email was acknowledged Oct 30, 2008. **ID# 252** Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email dated October 27, 2008. We have obtained responses from the Project Team to your inquiries, and have inserted them in your email below. The Project Team has responded to your email in blue. --- **Subject:** ID# 252 - RE: Response from Mr. Oliver.Re: Requests for information that was not included in Appendix D of final report. *To the Project Team of the Hamilton Waterdown*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	presented to them. Maybe if the Project Team ever paid attention to what the public was telling them from day one, the report could have been finished 2 years ago and on budget!) 2) **Thank you for finally admitting, 10 months after we advised you of them, that you had mathematical calculation errors in your "Pier reviewed" Justification Tables.** The Project Team is correct is saying that the "rounding" they did, really did not make a difference to the numbers. However, there is no excuse for the errors in any of the formulas. We clearly advise the Project Team (10 months ago) that after their errors are fixed, the final results of the Justification table still indicated the Project Team's Option 4 had a lower number, indicating it would be the preferred route. However, the difference between the Project Teams Option 4 and the Residents Option 5 were within 6.5% of each other. Therefore we made the following points to the Project Team: - The Option 5 results, which was an alternative suggested by "untrained" residents, initially indicated it was a close second to the recommended Option 4. We suggested that if the Project Team would have started working with the residents back in 2005, they may have been able to improve the residents Option 5 and make it even better. - By comparing the 3 options with the lowest totals, which were all the Northern Routes, it clearly indicated that the Option 5 was better than the recommended Option 4 route. Even Option 1 (the all northern route)			*Master Transportation Plan:* *I have read the reply you have sent to Steve Oliver and I must address the inaccuracies in your reply:* *1) The Parkside resident asked the Project Team in late 2005 to start reviewing Option 5. Only since we found discrediting information on the Project Team's option 4 vs the residents Option 5 in Late 2007, did the Project Team even start reviewing Option 5. It is obvious they are simply now in the process to "cover their tracks" like they have been doing with all the other errors and misleading information we have advised them about for the past 3 years. (In Jan 2008 the Christine Lee Morison of the Project Team stated that they do not look at any old information presented to them by the public, they are only looking at any new information presented to them. Maybe if the Project Team ever paid attention to what the public was telling them from day one, the report could have been finished 2 years ago and on budget!)* **Project Team Response**: Option 5 (representing an alternate route between the previously identified Option 1 and Option 4) was reviewed as part of the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) and has been documented in the TMP Report. The Project Team also agreed to review this evaluation as part of the Phase 3 Class EA process which we have done. This has been done at a higher level of detail than undertaken in the TMP study, in effect, replacing the Option 4 vs. 5 work that was undertaken in Phase 2. During Phase 3, we have considered two alternative Options (within the	

<table>
<tr><th>Correspondent</th><th>Issue/Concern</th><th>To</th><th>Responder</th><th>Response</th><th>Follow-up</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>
was better than the recommended Option 4. (See table below.)

- By comparing the two Options 4 and 5 against each other, Option 5 produced lower numbers indicating it is a better alternative than Option 4. (See table below.)

- These are only some errors we noticed on the East West Route of the Justification Tables. Precedence would indicate that similar errors and poor judgment of evaluations would also exist in the evaluation of the North-South Justification tables.

Below are the numbers from the corrected Justification Tables indicating Option 5 as the best when compared to the other Northern Options 1 and 4.
<table>
<tr><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>Corrected Option 1 All Northern Route</th><th>Corrected Option 4 Northern Hybrid Route</th></tr>
<tr><td>Natural Environment Total</td><td></td><td></td><td>12.23</td><td>6.02</td></tr>
<tr><td>Social Environment</td><td></td><td></td><td>8.11</td><td>15.54</td></tr>
<tr><td>Economic Environment Total</td><td></td><td></td><td>4.06</td><td>3.83</td></tr>
<tr><td>Costs</td><td></td><td></td><td>2.98</td><td>3.49</td></tr>
<tr><td>Transportation Service</td><td></td><td></td><td>2.65</td><td>5.68</td></tr>
</table>
</td><td></td><td></td><td>
Option 5 opportunity – one the Opta Minerals option – provided by the Project Partners, and the second, the "Saw Tooth" option, provided by the residents). We also considered variations on four options for the portion of the roadway that crosses Centre Road. All information that has been considered by the project team has been available for comment by the pubic and agencies.

2) ***Thank you for finally admitting, 10 months after we advised you of them, that you had mathematical calculation errors in your "Pier reviewed" Justification Tables.*** *The Project Team is correct is saying that the "rounding" they did, really did not make a difference to the numbers. However, there is no excuse for the errors in any of the formulas. We clearly advise the Project Team (10 months ago) that after their errors are fixed, the final results of the Justification table still indicated the Project Team's Option 4 had a lower number, indicating it would be the preferred route. However, the difference between the Project Teams Option 4 and the Residents Option 5 were within 6.5% of each other.*

Project Team Response: We have previously provided comments on this issue, and most recently in our e-mail response to Mr. Oliver (ID# 246) and issues that you raised in your April 3, 2008 email. We have also discussed this with you at meetings held with the Parkside Residents Association. We have no further comments to make. Reference to the input from residents in the Hunter Park Survey's comments, and your individual comments, regarding data errors and
</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>Correspondent</th><th>Issue/Concern</th><th>To</th><th>Responder</th><th>Response</th><th>Follow-up</th></tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>
TOTAL 30.03 34.56

Below are the numbers from the corrected Justification Tables indicating Option 5 as the best when compared to the Project Team's Options 4.

<table>
<tr><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>Corrected Option 4 Northern Hybrid Route</th><th>Corrected Option 5 New Northern Route</th></tr>
<tr><td>Natural Environment Total</td><td></td><td></td><td>11.13</td><td>15.86</td></tr>
<tr><td>Social Environment</td><td></td><td></td><td>20.14</td><td>10.85</td></tr>
<tr><td>Economic Environment Total</td><td></td><td></td><td>5.69</td><td>7.3</td></tr>
<tr><td>Costs</td><td></td><td></td><td>4.98</td><td>5.01</td></tr>
<tr><td>Transportation Service</td><td></td><td></td><td>7.01</td><td>3.98</td></tr>
<tr><td>TOTAL</td><td></td><td></td><td>48.95</td><td>43</td></tr>
</table>

3) The Project Teams statement of: We further note that when differences among options are minimal, reducing the number of options being evaluated at any one time, can also produce a different preference ranking order for the remaining options. So the Project
</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>
validity tests will be included in the Environmental Study Report (ESR) which is expected to be released in Spring 2009.

Therefore we made the following points to the Project Team:

- The Option 5 results, which was an alternative suggested by "untrained" residents, initially indicated it was a close second to the recommended Option 4. We suggested that if the Project Team would have started working with the residents back in 2005, they may have been able to improve the residents Option 5 and make it even better.

Project Team Response: As stated before, the project team made efforts to develop a feasible Option 5 alignment that included discussions with the affected landowners/ business operators in the study area. The Project Team is of the opinion that the "Saw Tooth" alignment (previous Stantec Option) that was suggested by the Parkside Drive community in late Spring 2008 is not a viable alignment nor would it be preferred over Option 4. In terms of the Centre Road crossing, we carefully considered the local knowledge of residents on the NAC and have made adjustments to the alignment based on our further investigations. Please note however, that the Hamilton Conservation Authority is still reviewing the Project Team's recommended alignment. Rationale for this has been provided to the public and will be included in the ESR. The rationale for this recommendation is documented in Dillon Consulting's memo to the East-West NAC,
</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</table>

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Team admits that reducing the number of options (ie - looking at only the northern options 1, 4 and 5 or just 4 and 5) can produce different preference ranking. **YES IT DOES!** Using the Project Team's own data shows that the Residents Option 5 (and even the Option 1 all Northern Route) is better than the Project Team's Option 4! 4) The Project Team goes on to say: *This is why in making the decision regarding the route preference, we did not rely entirely on the results of the SAW method but also implemented a "reasoned argument" approach that involved a review of the major advantages/disadvantages of each option.* The Project Team has **"changed the Rules"** in order to cover up the fact that their own justification Tables (as stated in point 3 above) indicates that the Residents Option 5 (and even the Option 1 the all Northern Route) is better than the Project Team's Option 4 - From the Phase 2 Draft Report the Project team states *To confirm the selection of Option 4 as the preferred **on the basis of the SAW procedure**, the differences among the options (considering the collected data), was reviewed as presented below.* If anyone really reads the Project Teams review on Page 69 and 70 of the Draft report, all the report states is opinionated reasons to support their Option 4 over option 1, 2 and 3. - From the Final Phase 2 Report the Project Team changed their wording in this section to the following: *To confirm the selection of Option 4 as the preferred on the basis of the SAW procedure, the differences among the options (considering the collected data),*			dated October 27, 2008. *- By comparing the 3 options with the lowest totals, which were all the Northern Routes, it clearly indicated that the Option 5 was better than the recommended Option 4 route. Even Option 1 (the all northern route) was better than the recommended Option 4. (See table below.)* **Project Team Response**: As explained in our previous response to you, the original Option 5 evaluation in the TMP did not include the business impact costs associated with the Opta Minerals version of Option 5. A more detailed evaluation exercise was undertaken as part of the Phase 3 work which included a more refined road design (than considered in Phase 2) and additional data. Again, the Phase 2 evaluation was undertaken at a corridor level of detail without the benefit of a refined road design. The results of this work have concluded that Option 4 is still the preferred option. *- By comparing the two Options 4 and 5 against each other, Option 5 produced lower numbers indicating it is a better alternative than Option 4. (See table below.)* **Project Team Response**: See response above. Your comments on the Phase 2 work have been duly noted however, the Project Partners moved on to a Phase 3 evaluation which reexamined the same issue that was examined in Phase 2 but at a greater level of detail. As such, replacing the work that was done in Phase 2.	

<table>
<tr><th>Correspondent</th><th>Issue/Concern</th><th>To</th><th>Responder</th><th>Response</th><th>Follow-up</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>were reviewed through a reasoned argument approach as presented below. <u>It was on the basis of the rationalization below that Option 4 was selected as the preferred alternative.</u>
The Project Team now realizing the technical flaws in their SAW (justification table) changed the wording in their report and added the extra (underlined) sentence to remove the emphasis off the Justifications Tables picking the recommended route, to now an rationalized review of the options. But the Project Team did not change any of their reasons as stated in the Draft report, in their Final report. They did not even review or comment on Option 5. They simply left all their previous opinionated reasons why their Option 4 was better than the options 1, 2 and 3.
The Project Team apparently gets to change the rules as they wish to suit their requirements to justify their answers.

5) The Extra costs issue on Option 5 that the Project Team now brings forward are based on the Project Team's version an Option 5 solution of running through Opta Minerals. Of course this would cost more!. But that was never the residents Option 5 recommendation to run through Opta. The Project Team obviously went through Opta Minerals to force the issue of the higher costs. However, if you even include their higher costs into the Justification tables, comparing option 4 to their option 5, Option 5 still gives the lowest number, meaning it is better!
6) The Project Team states: The Project Team anticipates that should the connection of the East/West roadway at Highway 6 be north of</td><td></td><td></td><td>- These are only some errors we noticed on the East West Route of the Justification Tables. Precedence would indicate that similar errors and poor judgment of evaluations would also exist in the evaluation of the North-South Justification tables.

Below are the numbers from the corrected Justification Tables indicating Option 5 as the best when compared to the other Northern Options 1 and 4.

<table>
<tr><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>Corrected Option 1 All Northern Route</th><th>Corrected Option 4 Northern Hybrid Route</th><th>Corrected Option 5 New Northern Route</th></tr>
<tr><td>Natural Environment Total</td><td></td><td></td><td>12.23</td><td>6.02</td><td>8.73</td></tr>
<tr><td>Social Environment</td><td></td><td></td><td>8.11</td><td>15.54</td><td>7.33</td></tr>
<tr><td>Economic Environment Total</td><td></td><td></td><td>4.06</td><td>3.83</td><td>5.1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Costs</td><td></td><td></td><td>2.98</td><td>3.49</td><td>3.51</td></tr>
<tr><td>Transportation Service</td><td></td><td></td><td>2.65</td><td>5.68</td><td>2.65</td></tr>
<tr><td>TOTAL</td><td></td><td></td><td>30.03</td><td>34.56</td><td>27.32</td></tr>
</table>

Below are the numbers from the corrected Justification Tables indicating Option 5 as the best when compared</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
ID# 311 [redacted] Nov 5, 2008 In-person at PIC	Request to post Option 5 versus Option 4 memo prepared by Dillon on the project website.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Nov 28, 2008	Posted Nov 28, 2008	
ID# 329 [redacted] Nov 18, 2008 Email	**Subject:** Fw:Partial reply to ID# 266, 281 and 283 - Soil Data To the Project Team: We did not ask to see a **summary report** of the soil sample report. We asked to see the actual report. - Your summary report does not map out the specific locations where samples were taken. The summary information only refers to "Road Alignments" of which you indicate multiple locations for the same information. There should be a specific map of the locations. - Your summary report does not indicate the number of samples taken at each Road alignment An Ecological Land Classification (ELC) for this project, should contain more information than just Soil information, such as the geologic, landform, vegetative, climatic, wildlife, water, ... As such if you have prepared a real ELC for this project in this area, we would like a copy of it. If you are not preparing one, please advise what you have actually studied and send us a full copy of it. If you are only doing soil samples please confirm and send us a copy of the full report. We are simply asking for the technical information that	Waterdown-Aldershot Information & large list	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 5, 2009 Email --- Mar 3, 2009 Email	Email was acknowledged Nov 19, 2008. Dear [redacted] Further to your requests for soil data information, please be advised that we will be in touch with you as soon as the report is available, along with the other reports you have requested. Please see our response dated December 18, 2008 (referencing ID#332 and 283). Kind regards,Patricia Halajski née Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard ----------The Natural Environment Inventory Report is available on the following ftp site. ftp://NCFO+lura%2Eca:NCFO2009@ftp.lura.ca	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	the Project Team has used to make their recommendations for their road alignment. If your full ELC has not yet been completed, we ask how the Project Team can once again make a recommendations prior to all of the information being gathered and interpreted. Thank you. [redacted] for the Residents of the Hunter Park Survey				
ID# 332 [redacted] Nov 19, 2008 Email	**Subject: RE: Waterdown/Aldershot Transportation - New East-West Road Corridor and Waterdown Road Corridor EA** Christine: Good Morning! I have taken a quick read of your attached letter have to take an immediate exception to your statement that a meeting has been set up for Nov 19th (tonight) to discuss the results of the Project Teams latest evaluations with concerned residents on the E-W road alignment. Your meeting tonight is with the residents of Parkside Drive, not the residents of Hunter Park Survey. Steve Oliver of the Parkside Residents association has made this clear to Sally of Lura in an email to her on Nov 17th. Steve advised that I was only part of their meeting because I provided them with some technical information. Although I and my neighbors have sent emails to the Project Team over the past 2 weeks, indicating that we want a follow up meeting with the Project Team, we have had no invitation addressed to myself, or the individual residents who asked for a meeting, to discuss our concerns.	Christine Lee-Morrison, Waterdown-Aldershot Information & Large list	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Dec 5, 2008 Email	Email was acknowledged Nov 19, 2008 Dear [redacted] Further to your request for a meeting with the Project Team on December 8, 2008, we have explored with the Project Team the availability and timing of the materials you requested (in advance of the meeting), in order to identify an appropriate time. We have been advised that a number of the materials (see below) will not be available until December 18, 2008. 1. Full soil sample report 2. Ecological Land Classification (ELC) for this project (the biological evaluations of the Woodlot / Wetland will be included in this report) 3. Noise report 4. Air pollution studies or evaluations 5. Plan of proposed Joe Sam's Park expansion 6. Responses to PIC meeting questions (ID# 283) 7. Review of Justification tables (ID# 284) The Project Team also advises that light pollution will be addressed as part of the final ESR report, and truck	air quality report outstanding and meeting with residents.

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	At this late time it would be impossible for the majority of the Hunter Park Survey residents to be contacted and commit to meeting tonight. I thank you for agreeing that based on the input from the Residents of Hunter Park survey, that the Project Team does want to meet with us to discuss our issues and concerns in more detail. As such, I ask that the Project Team suggest a new date to meet with us. [redacted] of the Hunter Park Survey		---------- Mar 2009 Email	traffic assumptions were addressed in Phase 2. The Project Team also advises that with respect to your question regarding the effect on real estate values, the evaluation matrix presented by Dillon indicated that the "potential for impact on residential property value" varied with distance to the road and noted that there was some potential for effects for the southern alternatives. The Project Team included real estate values in their matrix in response to the request from the public, although this factor is not normally included as part of an EA evaluation process. In light of the upcoming holiday season, please let us know of a convenient time, early in the New Year, when you might be available to meet with the Project Team. Kind regards, Sally Leppard, Neutral Community Facilitator ---------- Geotechnical Report was sent Mar 2, 2009. The Natural Environment Inventory Report is available on the following ftp site. **ftp://NCFO+lura%2Eca:NCFO2009@ftp.lura.ca** The noise report was sent Mar 12, 2009.	
ID# 334 [redacted] Nov 23, 2008 Email	**Subject:** Re: Waterdown/Aldershot Transportation - New East-West Road Corridor and Waterdown Road Corridor EA Mr. Davis: I have finally had a chance to read the detailed letter you sent me. I have attached a copy of it (WATMP	Gerry Davis, Waterdown-Aldershot Information & Large list	N/A	*No response required.*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Letter.1). I have the following concerns with your comments to me: 1) Below is the email I replied back to you with, on the same day I received your email. I and my fellow residents of Hunter Park Survey were never invited to a meeting to discuss our issues with the Project Team on Nov 19th as you stated in your email. That meeting was with the concerned residents of Parkside Drive. However, since sending my email back to Christine, Lura Consulting has contacted me and has advised that they will be contacting me with future dates to meet with us. 2) In your second paragraph you state: "***I strongly disagree with your claim, stated in your email dated Oct 16th, 2008 that you were not provided with complete or truthful answers***". The only email I sent to the Project Team on Oct 16th, 2008 is the attached email (Copy of Oct 16th, 2008 Email to WATMP). No where in my email did I make such a statement. The intent of my email was question why it is taking so long for the Project Team to reply to our outstanding questions as documented by Lura Consulting and the frustration of having to deal with a facilitator instead of the Project Team members. 3) The Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Process Guideline clearly states that: "Members of the public having concerns about the potential environmental effects of a project or the planning process being followed, **have a responsibility** to bring				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	their concerns to the attention of the Proponent early in the planning process..." I and other have been bringing concerns on this project forward since late 2004. Please note that in Sept 2006, Scott Stewart from the City of Hamilton sent me an email advising that the City of Hamilton will no longer address any of my concerns in the Phase 2 study and that I need to wait until the Phase 3 portion of the Project before they will accept anymore input from me. I was never sure if his request followed the public input guidelines of the EA process. 4) You have made the statement that: "*I do not agree with certain aspects of the project and are compelled to voice my concerns*". In accordance with point 3 above, I have a responsibility to voice my concerns. While some residents have simply given up trying to communicate their information (and frustration) to the Project Team, there are other residents still very active in providing input. The Project Team in their meeting on Nov 19th, with the residents on Parkside Drive, clearly stated to the residents (and in their overhead presentation) of the errors they made in their Phase 2 report. If it wasn't for residents, continuing to push their concerns, these errors (and others we have pointed out) would have been simply been ignored by the Project Team. The major concern now is if these errors that the Project Team has admitted to, affects the recommendations of the Phase 2 report. I would speculate that only after all of the residents outstanding questions are finally fully replied to, can that be determined. As such, I				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	(and probably others) are still waiting for replies from the Project Team for all of the outstanding questions, dating back to March, as indicated in my Oct 16th, 2008 email. In closing, I understand your initial requirement to support your staff. However it also brings to light that if you have never read any of the information that the residents are bringing forward and questioning, who does the public then reply upon to ensure all their concerns, issues and questions, have been addressed by the Project Team? Thank you. [redacted], Waterdown				
ID# 348 [redacted] Dec 1, 2008 Email	**Subject:** Alignment of the East-West Road at Highway 6 - Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Plan Christine, Don, Paul: From your meeting tonight with the Parkside Residents, you advised that MTO does not want you to "add" anymore intersections on Highway 6. Therefore your proposed recommendation that was presented to the Public and NAC for having your proposed E-W road join highway 6, north of the 4th Concession West, will not be allowed by MTO. You then stated that your current option is to re-align your proposed E-W road with the 4th Concession West intersection. The NAC was totally against this. We recommended and agreed with your recommended alignment that was going to be north of the 4th Concession West. This	Waterdown-Aldershot Information & Large list	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 25, 2009 Email	Email was acknowledged Dec 2, 2008. Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email dated December 1, 2008. We have obtained a response from the Project Team to your inquiry, and have inserted it directly into your e-mail below. The Project Team has responded to your email in blue. --- *Christine, Don, Paul:* *From your meeting tonight with the Parkside Residents, you advised that MTO does not want you to "add" anymore intersections on Highway 6. Therefore your proposed recommendation that was presented to the*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	was the same recommendation that you made to the public at the last PIC meeting for their comments. To now make a change from what was presented, should require new public input prior to the Project Team finalizing such a change. After hearing this new information, a suggestion was made in the meeting, to simple bring the East-West Road alignment on the West side, back to Parkside Drive to use the existing intersection at Highway 6. (Similar to how you are re-aligning the eastern portion of the E-W road back to Parkside Drive). Instead of working with this suggest, all we heard from the Project Team was negative and unsubstantiated reasons why it cannot be done: Example: - It was stated: *"The use of Parkside Drive was studied in Phase 2 and rejected so we cannot re-consider it at this point in the project"* That statement is totally false. In the Phase 2 study, the use of Parkside Drive was for the complete E-W route. In this case, the re-alignment of the northern E-W road to re-align with Parkside prior to Highway 6 is only a refinement. It is no different than the Project Team re-evaluating the Option 5 alignment that went north of Parkside Drive on the east side of Waterdown. - It was stated: *"MTO may restrict access at Highway 6 and Parkside in the future so their is no point in considering this re-alignment option"* The whole transportation study is based on the future traffic and known changes that will occurring up to the year 2021. Since MTO has no set plans to close			*Public and NAC for having your proposed E-W road join highway 6, north of the 4th Concession West, will not be allowed by MTO. You then stated that your current option is to re-align your proposed E-W road with the 4th Concession West intersection.* *The NAC was totally against this. We recommended and agreed with your recommended alignment that was going to be north of the 4th Concession West. This was the same recommendation that you made to the public at the last PIC meeting for their comments.* *To now make a change from what was presented, should require new public input prior to the Project Team finalizing such a change.* *After hearing this new information, a suggestion was made in the meeting, to simple bring the East-West Road alignment on the West side, back to Parkside Drive to use the existing intersection at Highway 6. (Similar to how you are re-aligning the eastern portion of the E-W road back to Parkside Drive).* *Instead of working with this suggest, all we heard from the Project Team was negative and unsubstantiated reasons why it cannot be done:* *Example:* *- It was stated: "The use of Parkside Drive was studied in Phase 2 and rejected so we cannot re-consider it at this point in the project"* *That statement is totally false. In the Phase 2 study, the use of Parkside Drive was for the complete E-W route. In this case, the re-alignment of the northern E-W road to re-align with Parkside prior to Highway 6 is only a*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Parkside or restrict its access prior to 2021, this statement is not relevant. The City of Hamilton GRIDS plan clearly states that we should be using existing roads in the most efficient manner we can. Here we have an existing road / intersection (Parkside at Highway 6), that can be efficiently and cost effectively used, instead of the Project Team recommending a new Northern intersection at the 4th concession. In comparison of building a new intersection to align with the 4th Concession West, to using the existing Parkside Drive intersection: - The new intersection will cost more money than expanding the Parkside Drive intersection. - The new intersection will require the complete displacement of one resident on the East Side of Highway 6 across from the 4th Concession west. The expansion of the existing Parkside Drive will not require any residential displacement. - The intersection at 4th concession West is already bad due to the angle the road intersects with Highway 6 and that it is at the base of a hill. In light of the new information that the Project Team has learned from the MTO, we request: 1) that you consider the re-alignment of the E-W road back to Parkside Drive to use the existing Parkside Highway 6 intersection. 2) You call another PIC (and NAC) meeting to present your revised alignment suggestion at highway 6 for			*refinement. It is no different than the Project Team re-evaluating the Option 5 alignment that went north of Parkside Drive on the east side of Waterdown.* *- It was stated: "MTO may restrict access at Highway 6 and Parkside in the future so their is no point in considering this re-alignment option"* *The whole transportation study is based on the future traffic and known changes that will occurring up to the year 2021. Since MTO has no set plans to close Parkside or restrict its access prior to 2021, this statement is not relevant.* *The City of Hamilton GRIDS plan clearly states that we should be using existing roads in the most efficient manner we can.* *Here we have an existing road / intersection (Parkside at Highway 6), that can be efficiently and cost effectively used, instead of the Project* *Team recommending a new Northern intersection at the 4th concession.* *In comparison of building a new intersection to align with the 4th Concession West, to using the existing Parkside Drive intersection:* *- The new intersection will cost more money than expanding the Parkside Drive intersection.* *- The new intersection will require the complete displacement of one resident on the East Side of Highway 6 across from the 4th Concession west. The expansion of the existing Parkside Drive will not require any residential displacement.* *- The intersection at 4th concession West is already bad due to the angle the road intersects with Highway 6*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	public input. If you plan to do neither of these requests, we ask that you advise us why. Thank you [redacted] Waterdown			*and that it is at the base of a hill.* *In light of the new information that the Project Team has learned from the MTO, we request:* *1) that you consider the re-alignment of the E-W road back to Parkside Drive to use the existing Parkside Highway 6 intersection.* *2) You call another PIC (and NAC) meeting to present your revised alignment suggestion at highway 6 for public input* *If you plan to do neither of these requests, we ask that you advise us why.* **Project Team Response**: We will meet with MTO to further examine the issues that they have raised. The development of a new intersection at Concession 4 would not mean that the current Parkside Dr/Hwy 6 intersection would need to be closed. The realignment of the east-west road to the existing Parkside Dr. intersection could be problematic. First, if the controlled access improvements to Hwy 6 were ever extended northerly this would mean that Highway 6 access at Parkside Drive would have to be eliminated, as an interchange is not possible at the current location. It would be too close to the Dundas St. interchange that is being built. This alternative was identified during Phase 2 work and was screened out for that reason. There are a number of refinements that the Project Team is making to both the E-W corridor, and the N-S	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				corridor. Once these refinements have been made, the Protect Team intends to issues a newsletter update to members of the public, and complete the Environmental Study Report. When the ESR is complete, it will be available for public review. No further public meetings are planned at this time. The Project Team is still committed to meet with the Hunter Park Survey residents, once the reports that you have requested become available. We will be happy to discuss your concerns and suggestions relating to the connection of the new East-West Route at Highway 6 Parkside at that time. --- Kind regards, Patricia Halajski on behalf of Sally Leppard	
ID# 356 [redacted] Nov 5, 2008 In person at EW PIC	[redacted] has questions about noise levels at various receptors and MOE's criteria for noise. • What are the future noise levels at the various receptors if road doesn't go in? Need to compare it with future noise levels with the road. • What are the noise level at receptors today • What are the MOE criteria for noise? • Were the levels based on a 2-lane or future 4-lane roadway? Why not 4-lane for noise, if the bed of the road is 4-lane?	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Mar 12, 2009 Email	The draft Noise report was sent Mar 12, 2009	
ID# 357 [redacted] Dec 21, 2008	Michael: Good Morning! Can you please pass this email (and my next one), to	Michael Kirkopoulos, Waterdown-	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Email was acknowledged Jan 12, 2009 Dear[redacted]	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
Email	Chris Murray. It is very frustrating when neither the Outside Communications company (Lura Consulting) nor any of the City if Hamilton Project Team members do not acknowledge emails, let alone answer them. In my past experience of working with Chris, he did take the time to review our issues and meet with us. I would think he would be interested in how the City staff is now handling this project. Please confirm if you will or will not be forwarding this information to Chris. Thank you.[redacted] ----- Original Message ----- **From:**[redacted] **Sent:** Sunday, December 21, 2008 8:57 PM **Subject:** Re: Waterdown-Aldershot Master Transportation Plan - Outstanding questions and Issues **Can someone from the Project Team please advise everyone on this email why it is taking up to 9 months to get any answers to our questions???** It has now been two months since I sent my last email requesting to know when we will be provided with answers to all of our outstanding questions on the Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Plan. Since that time I have also sent other questions to the Project Team. The status of all questions and replies so	Aldershot Information & Large list	Jan 14, 2009 Email --- Waterdown-Aldershot Information Jan 23, 2009 Email --- Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 6, 2009 Email	Re: Your Outstanding Enquiries Further to our e-mail dated January 12, 2009, please be advised that we are still receiving responses from the Project Team to a number of your enquiries. The City also advises that they have not yet completed their review of the Consultant reports you have requested. We will provide you with an update of the progress on your outstanding enquiries by the end of next week. We apologize for the delay. Sincerely, Sally Leppard --- Dear[redacted] Re: Your Outstanding Enquiries This is to advise you that preparation of a package in response to your enquiries is still in progress. Sincerely, Sally Leppard --- Dear[redacted] Please find attached to this email the responses to the ID#'s highlighted below. Kind regards,	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	far are listed below: # 75 (Cost savings) dated Mar 30th, acknowledged by Lura on April 1st - No reply # 82 MTO Correspondence questioned Mar 13th, Review Report prepared by Lura on May 26th. The report has been questioned on Sept 5th and renumbered to #204 # 85 dated April 3, acknowledged by Lura on May 9th - Still Outstanding - not all Agency Correspondence has been posted on the Web site as the Project Team said the would. # 118 dated May 18th, acknowledged by Lura and answered on Aug 18th, requestioned on Sept 1 - No Reply # 119 dated May 12th, acknowledged by Lura and answered on Aug 18th, requestioned on Sept 2 - Renumbered to #205 - No Reply # 146 dated June 16th, acknowledged by Lura on June 18th - No Reply # 156 dated June 25th, acknowledged by Lura on June 25th - No Reply but advised to wait till next NAC meetings. # 199 dated Aug 15th, acknowledged by Lura on Aug 15th - No Reply # 204 dated Sept 5th, acknowledged by Lura on Sept 5th - No Reply # 205 dated Sept 2nd, acknowledged by Lura on Sept 10th - No Reply # 212 dated Sept 25th, acknowledged by Lura on Sept 25th - No Reply # 218 dated Oct 13th, acknowledged by Lura on Oct 14th. Received reply that routing will be based on			Patricia Halajski née Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard **From:** [redacted] **Sent:** December 21, 2008 8:58 PM **Subject:** Re: Waterdown-Aldershot Master Transportation Plan - Outstanding questions and Issues **Can someone from the Project Team please advise everyone on this email why it is taking up to 9 months to get any answers to our questions???** It has now been two months since I sent my last email requesting to know when we will be provided with answers to all of our outstanding questions on the Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Plan. Since that time I have also sent other questions to the Project Team. The status of all questions and replies so far are listed below: # 75 (Cost savings) dated Mar 30th, acknowledged by Lura on April 1st - No reply - It appears that the ID#s for the first two inquiries on the list have been reversed, the correct ID# for this inquiry is **ID# 82**. Please find the response attached. # 82 (the correct ID# for this inquiry is **ID# 75**) MTO Correspondence questioned Mar 13th, Review Report prepared by Lura on May 26th. The report has been questioned on Sept 5th and renumbered to **#204** - The response to ID# 204 is attached. **# 85** dated April 3, acknowledged by Lura on May 9th - Still Outstanding - not all Agency Correspondence has been posted on the Web site as the Project Team said the would. - The response to ID# 85 is attached. # 118 dated May 18th, acknowledged by Lura and	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Biological and Geotechnical results. On Nov 6th asked for the Biological Data. Nov 17th, received only a partial report on soil conditions. Sent new email on Nov 18 requesting full report - Acknowledged by Lura on Nov 19.- No Reply but re-numbered to # 329. # 241 dated Oct 23rd, acknowledged by Lura on Oct 24th - No Reply. # 252 dated Oct 27th, acknowledged by Lura on Oct 30th - No Reply. # 280 dated Nov 6th, acknowledged by Lura on Nov 14th - No Reply. # 281 dated Nov 6th, acknowledged by Lura on Nov 17th. Reply by Lura that reports will be ready by Dec 19th to send to us so we can schedule a meeting together to discuss. Lura advises Dec 19th that reports will not be ready until Jan. # 283 dated Nov 8th, acknowledged by Lura on Nov 17th. Received a memo from Lura from Dillon containing a partial report on the soil conditions. Sent new email asking for full report that recommendations were based on. Reply by Lura that reports will be ready by Dec 19th to send to us so we can schedule a meeting together to discuss. Lura advises Dec 19th that reports will not be ready until Jan. # 284 dated Nov 18th, acknowledged by Lura on Nov 19th - No Reply # 287 dated Oct 29th, acknowledged by Lura on Nov 19th - No Reply. # 332 Dated Dec 2nd, acknowledged by Lura on Dec 5th with only partial replies. Sent new email on Dec 7th requesting clarification and additional information. Lura advises Dec 19th that reports will not be ready until Jan so we can meet after.			answered on Aug 18th, requestioned on Sept 1 - No Reply - response outstanding. # 119 dated May 12th, acknowledged by Lura and answered on Aug 18th, requestioned on Sept 2 - Renumbered to #205 - No Reply - response outstanding. **# 146** dated June 16th, acknowledged by Lura on June 18th - No Reply - The response to ID# 146 is attached. # 156 dated June 25th, acknowledged by Lura on June 25th - No Reply but advised to wait till next NAC meetings. - Please find the response to this inquiry in the response to **ID# 212** (attached). # 199 dated Aug 15th, acknowledged by Lura on Aug 15th - No Reply - please find outstanding responses to the highlighted ID#s attached to is email. Further responses will be sent shortly. **# 204** dated Sept 5th, acknowledged by Lura on Sept 5th - No Reply - The response to ID# 204 is attached. # 205 dated Sept 2nd, acknowledged by Lura on Sept 10th - No Reply - response outstanding. **# 212** dated Sept 25th, acknowledged by Lura on Sept 25th - No Reply - The response to ID# 212 is attached. # 218 dated Oct 13th, acknowledged by Lura on Oct 14th. Received reply that routing will be based on Biological and Geotechnical results. On Nov 6th asked for the Biological Data. Nov 17th, received only a partial report on soil conditions. Sent new email on Nov 18 requesting full report - Acknowledged by Lura on Nov 19.- No Reply but re-numbered to # 329. - response outstanding. # 241 dated Oct 23rd, acknowledged by Lura on Oct 24th - No Reply. - The response to ID# 241 is attached.	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	. I do not understand if Lura Consulting is not fulfilling their job to ensure questions on this project are being answered - or - if the Project Team simply refuses to answer the questions. **Once again - Can anyone comment why it is taking up to 9 months to receive answers to our questions?**		---------- Waterdown-Aldershot Information Mar 12, 2009 Email	# 252 dated Oct 27th, acknowledged by Lura on Oct 30th - No Reply. - The response to ID# 252 is attached. # 280 dated Nov 6th, acknowledged by Lura on Nov 14th - No Reply. - response outstanding. # 281 dated Nov 6th, acknowledged by Lura on Nov 17th. Reply by Lura that reports will be ready by Dec 19th to send to us so we can schedule a meeting together to discuss. Lura advises Dec 19th that reports will not be ready until Jan. - response outstanding. # 283 dated Nov 8th, acknowledged by Lura on Nov 17th. Received a memo from Lura from Dillon containing a partial report on the soil conditions. Sent new email asking for full report that recommendations were based on. Reply by Lura that reports will be ready by Dec 19th to send to us so we can schedule a meeting together to discuss. Lura advises Dec 19th that reports will not be ready until Jan. - The response to ID# 283 is attached. # 284 dated Nov 18th, acknowledged by Lura on Nov 19th - No Reply - The response to ID# 284 is attached. # 287 dated Oct 29th, acknowledged by Lura on Nov 19th - No Reply. - The response to ID# 287 is attached. # 332 Dated Dec 2nd, acknowledged by Lura on Dec 5th with only partial replies. Sent new email on Dec 7th requesting clarification and additional information. Lura advises Dec 19th that reports will not be ready until Jan so we can meet after. - response outstanding. ---------- Dear [redacted] Please find an update on your outstanding inquiries below.	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
[redacted] Oct 24, 2008 Email	[redacted] have put forth in support of [redacted] and the hard work he has put forth. I have also noticed that our elected officials and want to be elected ones are sitting quietly while Rick and his committee are spending countless hours of work in trying to get answers on issues that affect the community of Waterdown and area. May I add that is all being done without pay!! I must suggest that you answer the concerns put forth by [redacted] and his team who is acting on the behalf of our community. If you can not please forward these issues to someone who can or at least put forth for a discussion to the community well in advance of any approval. Enough is enough!!! As a construction worker and resident of Waterdown who is not affected directly by the proposed 4 lane route, can not see as to why this proposed route would improve the congestion through Waterdown. Why was this route proposed when said route should have been up King Road, which then would connect at Evens Road and Highway 5. Why would I want to exit off 403 westbound onto Waterdown Road North only to travel East again at the "mad circle" (dangerous) and travel North again to Highway 5 (Dundas) to which I have to stop at and "intersection" only to travel East again to another "intersection" to make connection to the proposed future bypass? Than I must travel North again to bypass Waterdown/?? Why?? Sorry for the long sentence but that is the proposed direction put	Information	Information Oct 27, 2008		

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	forth. This is one direction I would not take especially with the cost of fuel. What a costly mess!! I urge all that are reading this to please put your forth thoughts in support of [redacted]				
ID# 249 [redacted] Oct 24, 2008 Email	Syeda and Paul, People come from all over Ontario to bicycle the Waterdown-Campbelleville corridor. I was very surprised to find that clubs from all over, at least 5 local clubs, many from Toronto, St. Catharines, Waterloo etc. all have various scheduled rides in this area every year – the local clubs have up to 4 rides per week from Burlington/Waterdown through to Campbelleville. We have become accustomed to enjoying the sight of the cyclists as they travel through town. On a personal note, two years ago I injured my knee and discovered that all I could really do was cycle and it became a passion. Over the past few years I have a much better idea of the size of the cycling community that enjoys this area – just take a ride on a Saturday or Sunday morning and to get a feel for it! Many passing cyclists: passing, smiling, waving, and commenting on the beauty of the area. Is the implementation of the New East/West corridor going to improve the accessibility to the Campbelleville routes? Centre Street? Or the more common Robson St.? Will there be an unimpeded and/or dedicated crossing for cyclists?	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 9, 2009 Email	Email was acknowledged Oct 30, 2008. Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email dated October 24, 2008. We have obtained responses to your inquiries from the Project Team, and have inserted them directly into your e-mail below. The Project Team has responded to your email in blue. *People come from all over Ontario to bicycle the Waterdown-Campbelleville corridor. I was very surprised to find that clubs from all over, at least 5 local clubs, many from Toronto, St. Catherines, Waterloo etc. all have various scheduled rides in this area every year – the local clubs have up to 4 rides per week from Burlington/Waterdown through to Campbelleville. We have become accustomed to enjoying the sight of the cyclists as they travel through town.* *On a personal note, two years ago I injured my knee and discovered that all I could really do was cycle and it became a passion. Over the past few years I have a much better idea of the size of the cycling community that enjoys this area – just take a ride on a Saturday or Sunday morning and to get a feel for it! Many passing cyclists: passing, smiling, waving, and*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Today, Parkside is the most treacherous portion of the trip east to Robson. Will there be a better, safer, unimpeded route to Robson? ... many thanks .. the copy is to my personal email address ... steve			*commenting on the beauty of the area.* *Is the implementation of the New East/West corridor going to improve the accessibility to the Campbelleville routes? Centre Street? Or the more common Robson St.? Will there be an unimpeded and/or dedicated crossing for cyclists?* *Today, Parkside is the most treacherous portion of the trip east to Robson. Will there be a better, safer, unimpeded route to Robson?* **Response**: Thank you for your comments regarding the proposed new east-west road. No changes are being made as part of this project to the existing north-south routes that the new east-west roadway will cross. An "on road" cycling lane will be provided along the entire length of the new east-west road. Kind regards, Patricia Halajski née Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard	
ID# 250 [redacted] Oct 27, 2008 Phone	Lives at Waterdown Question about E-W road: is it going to be an overpass or a stoplight at Centre Rd and Highway 6? Concern: If it is a stoplight, traffic will be very heavy.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 10, 2009 Mail	Re: ID# 250 Thank you for your phone call dated October 27, 2008. We have obtained a response to your inquiries from the Project Team, and have provided it below. The Project Team has responded to your questions in blue. Question: Is the East-West road going to be an overpass or a stoplight at Centre Road and Highway 6?	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				Concern: If it is a stoplight, traffic will be very heavy. **Project Team Response**: The current plans for the East-West roadway as it crosses Centre Road does provide for a stoplight. The current plans for the location of the connection of the new east-west road with Highway 6 are under discussion with the Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO). The Project Team's proposal would include an at-grade signalized intersection at Highway 6. When the plans become finalized, we will provide you with an update through a newsletter. We have added your contact information to our database. Thank you for your interest in the Waterdown-Aldershot Transportation Master Plan. Kind regards, Patricia Halajski née Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard	
ID# 251 [redacted] Oct 27, 2008 Email	Sally – could I please confirm that you have received the petition I sent in earlier this month regarding the widening of hwy 5 portion to 6 lanes specifically relating to the area between Kerns Road & Evans Road? Thank you, [redacted]	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information, Oct 27, 2008 Email	Hi [redacted] Yes, we have received it. It is an agenda item for the NAC meeting. Thank you. Liz Nield (on behalf of Sally Leppard)	
ID# 254 [redacted] Oct 28, 2008 Two emails	Please let me know where and when for tonight's meeting. – I am planning on attending but don't know where it is. Thank you, [redacted] Patricia – thank you..	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information, Oct 28, 2008 Email	Dear [redacted] Please note tonight's meeting of the East-West Neighbourhood Advisory Committee (NAC) will be held from 6:30 pm - 9:00 pm at St. Thomas Church (715 Centre Road, Waterdown).	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Also, as I work in downtown Toronto, the earliest I can be at the meeting is 7:30pm, could you please ask that the petition I have submitted be on the agenda for after 8pm. I've been advised that it has been included in the agenda for tonight. Thank you. [redacted]			Kind regards, Patricia Halajski née Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard Petition was discussed at East-West NAC meeting after 8:00 p.m.	
ID# 255 & 255b [redacted] Oct 28, 2008 Two Emails	I am not sure if I can make the meeting tonight. Is there going to be a public meeting (PIC) in the upcoming weeks, where I can discuss my issues with the project team? Also, can you send an agenda for tonight's meeting? Thanks. --- 255b Can you also provide a copy of the handouts for tonight's meeting including the alignment alternatives and locations and anything else that may be referenced.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Oct 28, 2008 Email --- Part B Waterdown-Aldershot Information Nov 5, 2008	Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email. Please note there will be two Public Information Centres (PICs) in early November: East-West focused Public Information Centre (PIC) Wednesday, November 5, 2008 6:00 pm - 8:30 pm St. Thomas the Apostle Church, 715 Centre Road, Waterdown North-South focused Public Information Centre (PIC) Thursday, November 6, 2008 6:00 pm - 8:30 pm Crossroads Center, 1295 North Service Road, Burlington Also, please find attached the agenda for tonight's East-West Neighbourhood Advisory Committee (NAC) Meeting. Kind regards, Patricia Halajski née Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard --- Dear [redacted]	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
			Email	Please find attached the "Update to NAC for the Proposed New East-West Corridor - Alternatives Review" as promised. Kind regards, Patricia Halajski née Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard Attachment: Waterdown EW Road Alignment Alternatives – NAC Memo Final October 27 2008 (2)	
ID# 256 [redacted] Oct 28, 2008 Email	Would you kindly provide me with further information regarding what details go into the environmental study reports and what public input was sought? I'm also interested in where the subwatershed study fits into this process and who can discuss it in more layman's detail, particularly with regard to possible environmental mitigation measures. At what point do we discuss ways to protect the stream, ESAs and wildlife from encroachment? I've been hearing that's "next step" for years now. My fear is that one day I'll wake up and it was "last step". Regards, [redacted]	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Nov 5, 2008 Email	Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email dated October 28, 2008. We have obtained a response to your inquiry from the Project Team, and have provided it in blue below. --- *Would you kindly provide me with further information regarding what details go into the environmental study reports and what public input was sought? I'm also interested in where the subwatershed study fits into this process and who can discuss it in more layman's detail, particularly with regard to possible environmental mitigation measures.* *At what point do we discuss ways to protect the stream, ESAs and wildlife from encroachment? I've been hearing that's "next step" for years now. My fear is that one day I'll wake up and it was "last step".* **Project Team Response**: The Environmental Study Report (ESR) will document the natural environment	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
			---------- - Mar 3, 2009 Email	data/information that has been collected through reviews of background information, discussions with agencies and field survey results. The draft South Waterdown Subwatershed Study was reviewed as a background report as part of this process. Potential effects will be described and mitigation measures recommended. The ESR will be available for the public review and comment. As well, we expect that various agencies such as the Niagara Escarpment Commission, the Ministry of Natural Resources and Conservation Authorities will be particularly interested in the proposed mitigation measures. Additional permitting requirements from these agencies will result in further review of these issues as a post Environmental Assessment activity, at the detailed design stage. Mitigation measures will be proposed to address the issues you raise including ways to protect the stream, ESAs and wildlife from road encroachment. If you would like to discuss these issues in detail and/or provide your comments we could have the project biologist contact you. Please let us know if you would like to have this discussion. ---------- -- Geotechnical Report was sent via email and a link to the The Natural Environment Inventory Report is available on the following ftp site. **ftp://NCFO+lura%2Eca:NCFO2009@ftp.lura.ca**	
ID# 257 [redacted] Oct 28, 2008 2 Emails	Original email: request for NS NAC materials ---------- -- Follow-up email Oct 28:	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information, Oct 28, 2008	Dear [redacted] Our apologies. Our office has sent the letter to you this morning. We have checked our files, and you were	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Yes I got the notice of the meeting and will be there, but there do not appear to be any materials yet? I also got this a.m.'s pdf file [redacted]		Email	sent the October 14, 2008 agenda with the details of this Thursday's NAC meeting. Please let me know if you received this. Regards, Sally Leppard	
ID# 258 [redacted] Oct 28, 2008 In person at NAC	Request for info on truck routes and quarries Follow-up email: Patricia Thank you for the prompt follow-up to my request. I very much appreciate it. Thank you [redacted]	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information, Oct 29, 2008 Email	Dear [redacted] As per your discussion with Danny Stone from the City of Hamilton, please find the requested files attached. The truck route study contact is Gary Kirchknop. He can be reached at 905-546-2424 extension 7217, or by email: Gary.Kirchknop@hamilton.ca Kind regards, Patricia Halajski née Prokop	
ID# 259 [redacted] Oct 30, 2008 2 Emails	Hi. Is there a document package for the meeting this evening (other than the agenda)? Thanks, [redacted]. --- Thanks, I would appreciate seeing them electronically in advance of the meeting.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information, Oct 30, 2008 2 Emails	Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email. All of the documents will be available at the meeting this evening. If you would like receive electronic copies of the materials please let us know. Regards, Liz Nield on behalf of Sally Leppard --- -- Dear [redacted] We do not currently have all of the documents electronically available – also the maps are too large to send. We will work on getting the materials to you after the meeting this evening. Thank you. Liz Nield	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
ID# 261 [redacted] Oct 31, 2008 Email	Hi Liz. Can u email me the photos or "plates" that were displayed last night. I would like to forward them to the cycling committee for additional feedback. In particular, I am interested in plates 4, 5 & 7. Thanks [redacted]	Liz Nield Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information, Nov 14, 2008 Mail	Materials were sent via CD by NCFO	
ID# 265 [redacted] Nov 1, 2008 Email	Hello Sally Why does the attached PIC notice still show the map with the East West route connecting to the 4th Concession at Hwy #6, and Parkside as still closed off at Hwy #6. The routes, as I understand from last weeks NAC meeting, presented a route with the East West bypass connecting further north on Hwy #6, and clearly did not align with the 4th Concession. And I also understood that city staff and consultants admitted that the MOE had no intention of closing off Parkside why does it repeatedly show up on maps as closed off. I thought we had moved past all this in the last meeting. Part of the frustration residents have felt during this NAC process, is we are told one thing at meetings, then maps continue to appear with what we understand to be old information. So which is it - is the map on the PIC notice accurate and the information at the meetings presented to us incorrect. If the map is not correct, it is giving	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information, Nov 4, 2008 Email	Dear [redacted], Thank you for your email dated November 1, 2008. We have obtained a response to your inquiry from the Project Team, and have provided it in blue below. *Why does the attached PIC notice still show the map with the East West route connecting to the 4th Concession at Hwy #6, and Parkside as still closed off at Hwy #6.* *The routes, as I understand from last weeks NAC meeting, presented a route with the East West bypass connecting further north on Hwy #6, and clearly did not align with the 4th Concession. And I also understood that city staff and consultants admitted that the MOE had no intention of closing off Parkside why does it repeatedly show up on maps as closed off. I thought we had moved past all this in the last meeting.* *Part of the frustration residents have felt during this NAC process, is we are told one thing at*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	continuous false information. When residents are working very hard on this project to ensure accuracy in what we say, continuously feed back of conflicting information to us is not going to build credibility and trust in the process. Respectfully, we are all trying to work together and have invested an enormous amount of time and effort to try and mitigate the issues - the accuracy of the information we share and agree to is critical. regards, [redacted]			*meetings, then maps continue to appear with what we understand to be old information. So which is it - is the map on the PIC notice accurate and the information at the meetings presented to us incorrect. If the map is not correct, it is giving continuous false information. When residents are working very hard on this project to ensure accuracy in what we say, continuously feed back of conflicting information to us is not going to build credibility and trust in the process.* *Respectfully, we are all trying to work together and have invested an enormous amount of time and effort to try and mitigate the issues - the accuracy of the information we share and agree to is critical.* **Project Team Response**: The map has been used for consistency to describe the general project area. It wouldn't be prudent to continually change maps to indicate which route /design option is being considered each time the map is provided. We provide the detailed map boards at the NAC's and PIC's, where the project options are discussed through stakeholders' comments, and are recorded and bear significance. The "Notice Map" is to provide the general information about the location of the project and not the specifics. The "Notice Map" can be considered as a project logo, until the new project is finalized and Preferred Option/Design Alternative is confirmed. Kind regards,	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				Patricia Halajski née Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard	
ID# 267 [redacted] Nov 3, 2008 Phone + Nov 4, 2008 Email (follow-up request)	He would like to be sent the latest maps and detail regarding the E-W road (highway 5 bypass). He visited the website but the map and information does not seem to be up to date. He would like to be sent the information as soon as possible as he would like to inform his father before attending a PIC --- Hi Patricia, Could you send me specifically a detailed blown up section map showing where the Hwy 5 Bypass is proposing to intersect Hwy 6. Thanks would be very helpful. Thanks Patricia, [redacted]	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information, Nov 4, 2008 2 emails --- - Waterdown-	Dear [redacted] Please find the following East-West Neighbourhood Advisory Committee meeting materials attached: - PowerPoint presentation slides; and - Update on the City-wide Truck Route Master Plan Study (including two maps). Please note due to the large size of these files I will send the materials in two parts, this is email 1 of 2. For more details on the alignment alternatives and designs please attend the upcoming Public Information Centres (PICs). East-West focused Public Information Centre (PIC) Wednesday, November 5, 2008 6:00 pm - 8:30 pm St. Thomas the Apostle Church, 715 Centre Road, Waterdown North-South focused Public Information Centre (PIC) Thursday, November 6, 2008 6:00 pm - 8:30 pm Crossroads Center, 1295 North Service Road, Burlington Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any additional questions or comments. Kind regards, Patricia Halajski née Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response
			Aldershot Information, Nov 19, 2008	---------- Hello [redacted] Please find attached an enlarged map the proposed new East-West route inte 6. Please do not hesitate to contact us if additional questions or comments. Kind regards, Patricia Halajski
ID# 268 [redacted] In person at NAC meeting Oct 28, 2008	Request for information about truck routes	City of Hamilton, Danny Stone	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Nov 11, 2008 Email	Dear [redacted] Please find attached the Transportatio accompanying map, as per your discu Danny Stone from the City of Hamilton. Kind regards, Patricia Halajski née Prokop on behalf
ID# 269 Ontario Realty Corporation (AGENCY) Nov 4, 2008 Email	Please see attached letter. Thank you. Hoeun Heng Ontario Realty Corporation Attached letter, with map, reads: November 3, 2008 To Whom It May Concern, **RE: ORC Initial Comments on Notice of PIC Class EA, New east-west corridor and Waterdown Road corridor** Thank you for circulating Ontario Realty Corporation (ORC) on your Public Information Centre. The ORC is the strategic manager of the government's real property with a mandate of maintaining and optimizing value of the portfolio, while ensuring real estate decisions reflect public policy objectives of the	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Dec 4, 2008 Email	Dear Ms. Myslicki, Thank you for your letter dated Novem have obtained a response to your inqu Project Team, and have provided it in l **Project Team Response**: Thank you for interest in the Waterdown Road Class E Assessment. In reviewing the informati provided, it would appear that Waterc crosses two power transmission line cor under the mandate of the Ontario Rec (ORC). We have not identified any oth

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
ID# 313 [redacted] Nov 5, 2008 In person at PIC	Request for the Waterdown Road Class EA and New East-West Road Class EA Preferred alignment map to be sent	Waterdown-Aldershot Information & Large list	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Nov 13, 2008 Email	Dear [redacted] Please find attached the Waterdown Road Class EA and New East-West Road Class EA Preferred alignment map as per your request. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any additional questions or comments.	
ID# 314 [redacted] Nov 5, 2008 In person at PIC	Request for display panels to be sent, specifically the Saw tooth and Option 4. Yes, please send the CD. The address you have is correct.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information & Large list	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Nov 21, 2008 Email and Mail	Dear [redacted] As per your request at the Public Information Center, I have the obtained the electronic copies of the display boards and related maps from the East-West November 5, 2008 Public Information Centre, however the files are too large to send via email, I can easily copy the files to a CD and send the CD to you by mail. Would this be suitable for you? If so, please verify your mailing address below: [redacted] Connon Nurseries --- Materials were sent by NCFO Nov 24, 2008	
ID# 315 [redacted] Nov 5, 2008 In person at PIC	Request for the Waterdown Road Class EA and New East-West Road Class EA Preferred alignment map to be sent	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Nov 21, 2008 Mail	Map sent via mail by NCFO Nov 21, 2008	
ID# 316 [redacted] Nov 5, 2008 In person at PIC	Request for the Waterdown Road Class EA and New East-West Road Class EA Preferred alignment map to be sent	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Nov 21, 2008 Mail	Map sent via mail by NCFO Nov 21, 2008	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
ID# 317 [redacted] Nov 5, 2008 In person at PIC	Request for a copy of the map from PIC and all EW NAC materials be sent to him by mail.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Nov 24, 2008 Mail	Dear [redacted], Please find the following East-West NAC meeting materials on the enclosed CD: - East-West Neighbourhood Advisory Committee (NAC) Meeting #5 agenda - Comment form - PowerPoint presentation slides - Update on the City-wide Truck Route Master Plan Study (including two maps) - Petition from Jane Drewe - Letter from Conservation Halton - Update to NAC for the Proposed New East-West Corridor – Alternatives Review - Waterdown Road Class EA and New East-West Road Class EA Preferred alignment map	
ID# 318 [redacted] Nov 13, 2008 Phone	I am a member of the Hunter Park Survey residents group. I am not happy with the preferred option Dillon has come up with for the road north of Northlawn Avenue that crosses Centre Road. I support [redacted] and his analysis of the options for that area. There need to be mitigation measures put in place to deal with noise if the southern option proposed by Dillon is constructed. We will need a noise barrier or other mitigation measures. We want to see Dillon's data with respect to noise, [redacted] has requested it and we have not seen it yet. At the last East-West NAC meeting Dillon told us that we don't need a noise wall, and that they would re-evaluate the area for noise after the road has been constructed, but that is too late. We need to know if mitigation measures will be implemented. Will the ESR look at all the alternative routes presented	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 11, 2009 Email	Dear [redacted], Thank you for your phone call dated November 13, 2008. We have obtained a response from the Project Team to your inquiry, and have provided it below. The Project Team has responded in blue. --- *I am a member of the Hunter Park Survey residents group. I am not happy with the preferred option Dillon Consulting has come up with for the east-west road north of Northlawn Avenue that crosses Centre Road. I support [redacted] and his analysis of the options for that area.* *There need to be mitigation measures put in place to*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	throughout the process or only the final preferred/proposed route? A while back a staff member from the City of Hamilton came to meet with the residents of Northlawn at our homes, and he took detailed notes and promised to get our issues addressed and resolved, but I have now been told by [redacted] that this man is no longer with the City of Hamilton. Whatever happened to his notes from our meeting. Can the City advise on this? I'm not sure of the man's name (*Michael Marini?*).			*deal with noise if the southern option proposed by Dillon Consulting is constructed. We will need a noise barrier or other mitigation measures. We want to see Dillon's data with respect to noise, [redacted] has requested it and we have not seen it yet. At the last East-West NAC meeting Dillon told us that we don't need a noise wall, and that they would re-evaluate the area for noise after the road has been constructed, but that is too late. We need to know if mitigation measures will be implemented.* *Will the ESR look at all the alternative routes presented throughout the process or only the final preferred/proposed route?* *A while back a staff member from the City of Hamilton came to meet with the residents of Northlawn Avenue at our homes, and he took detailed notes and promised to get our issues addressed and resolved, but I have now been told by [redacted] that this man is no longer with the City of Hamilton. Whatever happened to his notes from our meeting? Can the City advise on this? I'm not sure of the man's name.* **Project Team Response:** The Draft Noise Report is being reviewed internally by the Project Team. A copy of the report will be provided when the reviews are complete. The Environmental Study Report (ESR) will contain a summary of the alternatives considered in Phase 2, a full description of the alternatives considered in Phase 3, and the full Phase 2 Final Report contained in the	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				appendix. We understand that it was Mr. Murray who visited with you. Mr. Murray was the project manager for a period of a few months, and he is now the City Manager. He verbally passed on the results of his meeting with you to the incoming Project Manager - Ms. Christine Lee-Morrison. --- Kind regards, Patricia Halajski née Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard --- East West Road Noise Assessment Draft Report was sent via email Mar 12, 2009.	
ID# 320 [redacted] Nov 7, 2008 Phone	Request to be added to the project contact database.	Forwarded to Waterdown-Aldershot Information from City of Hamilton	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Nov 21, 2008	[redacted] was added to the mailing database on Nov 21, 2008.	
ID# 321 [redacted] Nov 14, 2008 Email & Fax	**Subject:** North Waterdown Hi [redacted] As per Lee's e-mail below to Heather, please find attached a copy of the North Waterdown Letter from [redacted], for your review and information.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Nov 21, 2008	Email was acknowledged Nov 14, 2008. Dillon Consulting to meet with [redacted].	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Regards, Vanessa Attachment is found in hard copy.				
ID# 322 [redacted] Nov 14, 2008 Phone	**Subject:** Conversation with Joanne Stajov The following is a summary of my phone conversation with [redacted] resident on Northlawn Avenue. She is new to the study and attended the last E-W NAC meeting. When the members broke up in small groups, they requested information on the soil testing and noise study at the Centre Road woodlot. The group has not received that information as of yet. She also brought up a comment that was made at the NAC about a noise wall. We apparently suggested, earlier in the study that a noise wall be constructed between Northlawn and the new East West Road. At the NAC, one of the project partners (she couldn't remember who) said that a noise wall will not be considered. [redacted] is concerned about the issue because it is currently quite noisy in her back yard from Centre Road traffic. She feels that trees would not offer an appropriate noise barrier. She brought up some concerns about truck traffic.	Forwarded to Waterdown-Aldershot Information from Dillon Consulting	Dillon Consulting Nov 14, 2008 Phone	I explained that the City is currently assessing truck traffic in their Truck Route Study. She has received some false statements from [redacted] so I corrected her on those. I offered to send her a copy of the truck route study memo. I believe she is working with [redacted], though she didn't make that statement. She explained that based on weighting of the evaluation criteria, the northern route was favoured. She is concerned that the criteria has been dropped and not being followed. She hasn't seen the chart, but this is what she has heard. She is concerned that Dillon is being influenced by political figures. I told her that our recommendations are based on facts and technical experience. I also explained that through soil testing, we determined that the soil to the north consists of mostly organics which is wet and unfavoured. I also pointed out that the northern route creates a barrier between the ESA and the Wetland, a potential mammal crossing area. She has also heard that downtown businesses would like to put trucks on the E-W road. She believes that trucks won't use Dundas through downtown, they will use new road to avoid the bottleneck. Overall, I think I corrected a lot of false statements. I feel that I put her mind at ease on some issues. She provided me with her contact information so that we could send her the requested documents.	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				Amanda Shipley	
ID# 325 [redacted] Nov 17, 2008 Email	Dear Mr. MacLeod, **Re:** Waterdown Aldershot Transportation Master Plan (WATMP) Phase 3 & 4 Municipal Class Environmental Assessment On behalf of our client, Waterdown Bay Inc., we are writing to follow-up from our discussion at the PIC held on November 6th, 2008, concerning the above matter. As stated, our particular interest is with respect to the North-South corridor. We are requesting an immediate meeting with the members of the WATMP project team to discuss our significant concerns with the material that was presented at the PIC. Our concerns relate to the process that was followed by the project team in arriving at the preferred option presented at the PIC, as well as, specific concerns with the preferred option itself. It is our view that the process and outcome are seriously flawed as the project team did not have regard for fundamental materials that should have been considered. This would include the Sub-watershed Study prepared by Ecoplans, the Draft Secondary Plan for Waterdown South and the approved Draft Plan of Subdivision for Phase 1A of the Waterdown Bay lands. In addition, there has been insufficient consultation with the affected property owner. It is essential that these deficiencies be rectified immediately.	Dillon Consulting & Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Dec 18, 2008	Email was acknowledged Nov 18, 2008. Dillon met with [redacted] and Waterdown Bay on December 18, 2008.	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	It would be appreciated if you could provide an immediate response to this submission and confirm the availability of the project team to meet with Waterdown Bay and their consulting team. Following this meeting and our opportunity to review updated materials, we will be in a position to provide formal written comments. We look forward to your response. [redacted]				
ID# 327 [redacted] Nov 5, 2008 In person at PIC	Questioned regarding the construction timing of the new EW Road. When will it be finished, when will construction begin?	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 11, 2009 Email	Dear [redacted] Thank you for your inquiry dated November 5, 2008, which you submitted at the Public Information Centre (PIC). We have obtained a response from the Project Team to your inquiry, and have provided it below. The Project Team has responded in blue. --- *What is the construction timing of the new East-West Road? When will it be finished, when will construction begin?* **Project Team Response**: The construction schedule is dependent upon obtaining approvals from the Ministry of the Environment for the Environmental Study Report (ESR), obtaining permits from other agencies, and then tendering the project. Construction would not likely start until 2013 at the earliest. ---	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				Kind regards, Patricia Halajski née Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard	
ID# 330 [redacted] Nov 18 2008 Email --- -[redacted] Nov 27, 2008 Email	Hello Ms. Leppard, My questions are as follows: 1. What is the approximate timing of implementation/ construction for both the N-S and E-W corridors. 2. Has the City of Hamilton prepared a draft development phasing plan for the new roads. 3. How much/if any new development will be allowed to proceed ahead of or concurrent to construction of the N-S and E-W corridors. --- -- Hi Patricia, Do you have any answers yet? If not, when do you anticipate receiving responses? Thanks, [redacted]	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Dec 2, 2008 Email	Email was acknowledged Nov 19, 2008. Resident advised Nov 27, 2008 that the Project Team is working on a number of outstanding responses, and that it is hoped that a response will be sent shortly. Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email dated November 19, 2008. We have obtained a response from the Project Team to your inquiry, and have inserted it directly into your e-mail below. The Project Team has responded to your email in blue. --- 1. What is the approximate timing of implementation/construction for both the N-S and E-W corridors? **Project Team Response**: The Project Team plans to complete Phases 3 and 4 of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment for New East-West Corridor and Waterdown Road Corridor in the summer of 2009. Once the three partner councils i.e. Hamilton, Burlington and Halton Region have approved the draft Environmental Study Reports (ESRs) for the two road corridor projects, these will be filed on public record for a minimum of 30 days review period. If there are no Part II order requests by any individual or party filed	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				with the Ministry of Environment (MOE), we anticipate that construction of new roadways would not occur for at least five years. (This timeline is contingent upon approvals from the Project Partners – City of Hamilton, City of Burlington and Halton Region and Agencies.) 2. Has the City of Hamilton prepared a draft development phasing plan for the new roads? **Project Team Response**: No. The City of Hamilton has not yet prepared the draft Development Phasing Plan for the new roads. Guidelines for the Implementation and Phasing Plan will be part of the Environmental Study Reports to be prepared for the project. 3. How much/if any new development will be allowed to proceed ahead of or concurrent to construction of the N-S and E-W corridors? **Project Team Response**: There is no answer for this at the moment. The Implementation and Phasing Plan will determine this. Also, the City of Hamilton is preparing a Traffic Allocation Study which will further address this issue. --- Kind regards, Patricia Halajski on behalf of Sally Leppard	
ID# 333 [redacted] Nov 19, 2008	**Subject:** Re: Spectator Article - Waterdown Growth Gives Burlington Pain Thanks Margaret. I'm sure you have also reminded Burlington council	Forwarded to Waterdown-Aldershot	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 25, 2009	Dear [redacted], Thank you for your email dated November 19, 2008. We have obtained a response from the Project	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
Email	that as neighbouring residents, we spend a large portion of our earnings between Waterdown and Burlington to keep the businesses strong. I'm sure forward-thinking Planners and City staff are well aware of the importance of wide curb lanes to allow vehicles and bicycles to share the road. In urban areas, most of the cycling-vehicular crashes occur at intersections, but the region of Halton knows only too well the hazards of lanes being too narrow as there have been several cyclists killed as a result of narrow lanes and cars hitting cyclists. For example see share the road and the annual ride in Halton (http://sharetheroad.ca/events/ and http://www.halton.ca/ppw/roads/alternativetravel/cycling.htm#Share_the_Road). Proper and adequate lane width is critical for cycling commuters and recreational riders. Wide lanes help cars become accustomed to sharing the road safely. Many cycling commuters do not like to use paths and trails as the trails also have persons walking dogs, children ambling, roller bladers etc all who equally like to enjoy the trails. The multi-use trails usually have a maximum speed limit of 20 km per hr. (too slow for a cycling commuter) hence the need and **"right" under the Highway Traffic Act** for cyclist to use the roads. Most cyclists are also motorists who respect both modes of transportation. In reality, both cyclists and motorists need continued education on obeying the Highway traffic act. Many have never read the Act so it's up to all of us including municipal staff to help provide the education tools so that everyone understands what "sharing the road" means. Thanks for your continued work on this.	Information from City of Hamilton	Email	Team to your inquiry, and have inserted the response directly into the text of your email below. The Project Team has responded in blue. --- *I'm sure you have also reminded Burlington council that as neighbouring residents, we spend a large portion of our earnings between Waterdown and Burlington to keep the businesses strong. I'm sure forward-thinking Planners and City staff are well aware of the importance of wide curb lanes to allow vehicles and bicycles to share the road. In urban areas, most of the cycling-vehicular crashes occur at intersections, but the region of Halton knows only too well the hazards of lanes being too narrow as there have been several cyclists killed as a result of narrow lanes and cars hitting cyclists. For example see share the road and the annual ride in Halton (http://sharetheroad.ca/events/ and http://www.halton.ca/ppw/roads/alternativetravel/cycling.htm#Share_the_Road). Proper and adequate lane width is critical for cycling commuters and recreational riders. Wide lanes help cars become accustomed to sharing the road safely. Many cycling commuters do not like to use paths and trails as the trails also have persons walking dogs, children ambling, roller bladers etc all who equally like to enjoy the trails. The multi-use trails usually have a maximum speed limit of 20 km per hr. (too slow for a cycling commuter) hence the need and **"right" under the Highway Traffic Act** for cyclist to use the roads. Most cyclists are also motorists who respect both modes of*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	[redacted] Waterdown.		---------- - Waterdown-Aldershot Information Mar 6, 2009 Email	*transportation. In reality, both cyclists and motorists need continued education on obeying the Highway traffic act. Many have never read the Act so it's up to all of us including municipal staff to help provide the education tools so that everyone understands what "sharing the road" means.* **Project Team Response**: Your comments are noted. The decision regarding providing wider on-road allowance for bicycles considers many factors including the resulting additional property, the number of potential users, the existence of other available facilities (e.g. multi-use pathway) and consulting with the City's overall Cycling Master Plan. Kind regards, Patricia Halajski on behalf of Sally Leppard --- --Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email dated November 19, 2008. We have obtained an additional response from the Project Team to your inquiry, and have inserted the response below. The Project Team has responded in blue. --- **Project Team Response**: Accommodating future capacity of vehicular and alternate forms of transportation along these proposed corridors is a key variable that requires careful study. The Project Team has been consulting with several City of Hamilton, City	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				as they become available. We have been advised that this should be within the next few days. --- The draft East West Road Noise Assessment Report was sent via email Mar 12, 2009	
ID# 376 [redacted] Feb 28, 2009 Email	**Subject:** Re: Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Plan Re: ID# 358 Response Dear Project Team It is unacceptable that this process has been allowed to go off the rails with information and reports not being forwarded as we were promised in several meetings. Unlike the paid staff and consultants, the good people of Flamborough who have committed to participating in this project, have spent countless hours of volunteer time doing what they believed to be important, inclusive work on behalf of their community. Some have dedicated considerably more volunteer time reviewing, dissecting and analyzing reports for the rest of us. We have followed the rules and process and have been assured the process would be honoured. To go back on ones word as promised is very disingenuous and disrespectful of the process and everyone involved. If this process is allowed to fail, it will confirm what many suspected,- that the city of Hamilton really doesn't care about it's Flamborough urban/rural taxpayers and to try to work together is a sham. The only way to correct the communities perceptions is to change the behavior and attitude behind the	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Mar 3 & 12, 2009 Email	**Subject:** ID# 376 - Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Plan Re: ID# 358 Response Dear [redacted] The Natural Environment Inventory Report is available on the following ftp site. FTP Login Instructions: Step 1 - In Windows, open any folder, e.g. My Documents Step 2 - Paste this URL in the Address bar at the top: **ftp://NCFO+lura%2Eca:NCFO2009@ftp.lura.ca** Step 3 - Access and download file just as if it was on your PC. Please do not delete or rename file. We have also attached the Geotechnical Report. The Project Team has asked that we advise you this is a draft report and is to be used for background information only. The Project Team is nearing completion of their review of the noise, and air quality studies. These studies will be forwarded to you as soon as they become available. We have been advised that this should be within the next few days. --- The draft East West Road Noise Assessment Report was	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	city's approach to this issue. When all is said and done the most important thing any of us have is our integrity of keeping our word. It is the only thing that will save this from a disastrous outcome. Just do what you promised to do. Respectfully [redacted] Carlisle			sent via email Mar 12, 2009	
ID# 377 [redacted] Feb 28, 2009 Email	**Subject:** Re: Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Plan Re: ID# 358 Response Hello Project Team, Mayor Esinberger, Councillor Margaret McCarthy Why is the Project Team not responding to the request of [redacted], and other concerned volunteers who have put in tireless hours in working on this project? Mayor Eisenberger, and Councillor Margaret McCarthy, how come your voices have not been heard? Are these issues not important enough for either of you to address. Have you got something to hide, if not than help in requesting to the Project Team to answers questions that [redacted] and his committee have been putting forth. As concerned resident of Waterdown I feel we should start **"with holding our taxes"** (which have sky rocketed) until all questions put forth by [redacted] and his committee to be answered. This type of action may cause enough disturbance in the Mayor's office in getting answers. Enough is enough, this kind	Waterdown-Aldershot Information & large list	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Mar 3 & 12, 2009 Email	**Subject:** ID# 377 - Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Plan Re: ID# 358 Response Dear [redacted] The Natural Environment Inventory Report is available on the following ftp site. FTP Login Instructions: Step 1 - In Windows, open any folder, e.g. My Documents Step 2 - Paste this URL in the Address bar at the top: **ftp://NCFO+lura%2Eca:NCFO2009@ftp.lura.ca** Step 3 - Access and download file just as if it was on your PC. Please do not delete or rename file. We have also attached the Geotechnical Report. The Project Team has asked that we advise you this is a draft report and is to be used for background information only. The Project Team is nearing	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	of politics has got to stop. [redacted]			completion of their review of the noise, and air quality studies. These studies will be forwarded to you as soon as they become available. We have been advised that this should be within the next few days. --- The draft East West Road Noise Assessment Report was sent via email Mar 12, 2009	
ID# 378 [redacted] Mar 2, 2009 Email	**Subject:** RE: Waterdwon Waldershot Master Transportation Plan Re: ID# 358 Response What bureaucratic arrogance on the part of the planning team. To gather information from taxpayors , and then declare that those same taxpayors are incapable of interpretting the technical aspects of the documents. Is the committee that out of touch with the community they're supposed to be dealing with on this issue?Some of the residents of Hunter Park have been on this file longer than the project team has. Ms. McCarthy, when are you and the mayor going to hold YOUR employees responsible for their contemptable and dishonest treatment of the taxpayors of Waterdown?Are you surprised people still want to secede, Mayor Eisenberger?The current team should be sacked, to a person, and replaced with people who can do their jobs efficiently, while dealing with taxpayors and the truth. The current staff fails on both those counts. [redacted]	Waterdown-Aldershot Information & large list	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Mar 10, 2009 Email	Dear [redacted] Thank you for your e-mail. We have forwarded it to the Project Team for their information. Kind regards, Sally Leppard Neutral Community Facilitator	
ID# 382 [redacted] Mar 5, 2009 Email	**Subject:** Re: Hwy #5 bypasss Waterdown Hi Kirsten, Hope you having a good day so far. Please email me any information you may have regarding Hwy 5 bypass in Waterdown & if you have any approximate	Forwarded to Waterdown-Aldershot Information from City of	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Apr 17, 2009 Email	Email was acknowledged by the City of Hamilton Mar 5, 2009. Dear [redacted] Thank you for your inquiry dated March 5, 2009. We	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
---------- - Apr 17, 2009 Email	timing for the construction of this bypass. Secondly, would you have any information on Hwy #5 & Hwy #6 interchanges, kindly forward that too. Thank you for your assistance, [redacted] ---------- --Thank you for the information.	Hamilton		have obtained a response from the Project Team to your inquiry, and have inserted the response directly into the text of your email below. The Project Team has responded in blue. *Please email me any information you may have regarding Hwy 5 bypass in Waterdown & if you have any approximate timing for the construction of this bypass.* **Project Team Response**: The "Waterdown/Aldershot Transportation Master Plan" was completed in February 2008 by the City of Hamilton, the City of Burlington and Halton Region (the Project Partners) to assess and address the transportation needs of the existing and proposed development in Waterdown until 2021. Road improvement solutions include widening Waterdown Road (to increase north-south capacity), a further evaluation of King Road to address safety and operations concerns, and a new/improved east-west route across the community of Waterdown. The Master Plan followed the Municipal Engineers Association Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) process. The Project Team plans to complete Phases 3 and 4 of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment for the **New East-West Corridor** and the **Waterdown Road Corridor** in the summer of 2009. Once the three partner councils i.e. Hamilton, Burlington and Halton Region have approved the draft Environmental Study Reports (ESRs) for the two road corridor projects, these	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				will be filed on public record for a minimum of 30 days review period. If there are no Part II order requests by any individual or party filed with the Ministry of Environment (MOE), the projects will proceed to detailed design and construction stage. We anticipate that construction of new roadways would start within next five years. (This timeline is contingent upon approvals from the Project Partners – City of Hamilton, City of Burlington and Halton Region and Agencies). For more detailed information please visit the project website at www.hamilton.ca/WaterdownTMP *Secondly, would you have any information on Hwy #5 & Hwy #6 interchanges, kindly forward that too.* **Project Team Response**: According to Ayvun Jeganathan, Senior Project Engineer, Ministry of Transportation, the preliminary design was done for the Highway 6 and Highway 5 interchange, and a preferred option has been identified. For detailed information about the Highway 5 and Highway 6 interchange please contact: Ayvun Jeganathan Senior Project Engineer for Hamilton Niagara Ministry of Transportation (MTO) Tel. (416) 235-3485 Kind regards,Patricia Halajski on behalf of Sally Leppard	
ID# 385	**Subject:** Re: Waterdown Aldershot Master	Waterdown-	Waterdown-	Dear [redacted]	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
[redacted] Mar 10, 2009 Email	Transportation Plan Re: ID# 358 Response THANK YOU Mr. Mayor, for finally acknowledging we even exist. This form letter that states you have "CONFIDENCE", even makes it sweeter! To send an email of this MAGNITUTE (not), is an insult, to the integrity of the efforts by [redacted] to extract answers that will ultimately greatly impact our quality of life. I truly hope you will find some time to at least show that you have some knowledge of what is going wrong here! This just isn't right, and is nothing short of Shameful!!! Sincerely, two more frustrated residents of Waterdown [redacted]	Aldershot Information & large list	Aldershot Information Mar 12, 2009 Email	We acknowledge receipt of a copy of your e-mail to Mayor Fred Eisenberger and will document it for the record. Kind regards, Patricia Halajski on behalf of Sally Leppard	
ID# 386 [redacted] Mar 10, 2009 Email	Hi Patricia, My clients are looking at X Parkside Drive in Waterdown as a possible purchase and are concerned about the possibility of future property expropriation. I have reviewed the Master Plan but don't seem to be able to see anything about this issue. Any information that could be provided would be appreciated. Thank you, [redacted]	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information		
ID# 388 [redacted] Mar 12, 2009 Phone	[redacted] has request detailed plans with respect to effects on her property at X Parkside Drive. Was promised these plans as part of ID# 296. She was told she would be sent the plans by end of February 2009. Would like to know if an additional meeting will be	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Apr 17, 2009 Email	Dear [redacted], Thank you for your phone calls dated March 12 and 24, 2009. We have obtained a response from the Project Team to your inquiry, and have provided it	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	held with Parkside Drive residents once plans are released.			below. The Project Team has responded to your email in blue. *Questions: I would like to see detailed plans with respect to effects on my property at X Parkside Drive. I was told I would be sent the plans by the end of February 2009.* *I would also like to know if an additional meeting will be held with the Parkside Drive residents once plans are released.* *Is the Project Team considering the 2005 quarry expansion report as part of the ESR? Truck traffic is a major concern for Parkside Drive residents.* **Project Team Response**: The plans in this area are currently being updated and in the process of finalization. Detailed plans for Parkside Drive will be made available as part of the Environmental Study Report (ESR) in summer 2009. The plans that were issued in November 2008 can be found on the project website at www.hamilton.ca/WaterdownTMP. Please look under the link entitled "Public Information Centres (PICs)" on the right hand side and look at the materials for the East-West Focus Public Information Centre No. 6 held on November 5, 2008. Truck haul routes are being considered by the Project Team.	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				There will be no further meetings with the Parkside Drive residents at this time. However, a newsletter update will be sent out to local residents before the release of the ESR. This newsletter will illustrate all the changes which resulted from the public input regarding the East-West Road, and the preferred design. Kind regards, Patricia Halajski on behalf of Sally Leppard	
ID# 394 [redacted] Mar 30, 2009 Email	Syeda....could you let me know what is the latest information re Waterdown? The owner of Ridgeway Florists is calling for an update regarding his property and I'd like to know when you think we'd be in a position to start buying property, please. Please advise.....thank you. Darlene Cole Senior Business Development Consultant Economic Development & Real Estate Planning & Economic Development City of Hamilton	Forwarded to Waterdown-Aldershot Information by City of Hamilton	City of Hamilton Mar 30, 2009 Email	Hi [redacted] The update for New East-West Corridor is that we hope to take our report to Council in June and if approved will file the Environmental Study Report on public record in summer for at-least 30 days. If there is no Part II order request, the project will go to design and construction. At which stage, you can start your property buying process. The florist should take a look at our project website: www.hamilton.ca/waterdowntmp He should look at the November 2008 PIC # 6 material to see the road alignment with respect to his property. There are not any significant changes to this particular section of the road since the last PIC. He can refer to E-W Plates 3 and 4 for his information. Let me know if there are any further questions.	
ID# 396 [redacted] Mar 31, 2009 Email	**Subject:** RE: NOISE REPORT on the Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Plan These constant attempts to misguide concerned residents seems almost criminal to me. Where are our politicians in this travesty of justice?	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	N/A	No response is required.	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
ID# 398 [redacted] Apr 20, 2009 Email	**Subject: Waterdown Road Widening** To whom it may concern, Can you please tell me when the next public information meeting is on the proposed widening of Waterdown Road, and what stage of the process we are at? Thanks. [redacted]	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information April 29, 2009	Dear Ms. [redacted] Thank you for your inquiry dated April 20, 2009. We have received a response from the Project Team which is presented below. ========== == **Project Team Response**: The Environmental Study Report (ESR) for the Waterdown Road Class Environmental Assessment is nearing completion and is expected to be prepared in draft form in late Spring. When this draft report is completed, it will be reviewed by the Project Partners (Hamilton, Halton Region and Burlington), and taken to their respective Councils for consideration of endorsement. Once that has occurred, a Notice of Completion will be issued, and the ESR will be filed on the public record for a minimum 30-day public and agency review will commence. Any issues and concerns raised during that review can be discussed with the Project Partners' Project Manager. If there is no resolution, then a formal "bump-up" request (for an individual EA) can be filed with the Ministry of the Environment. The Minister has a number of options, including denying the request, asking for some conditions, or request the proponent to conduct an individual EA. Up-to-date information and progress on the Waterdown-Aldershot Transportation Master Plan	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				including announcements of any upcoming activity is available at www.hamilton.ca/WaterdownTMP. A newsletter will be issued that provides updated information to the public about the status of the project. We will forward this newsletter to you when it is available. ========== == Yours sincerely, Sally M. Leppard Neutral Community Facilitator's Office 36 Hunter Street East, 6th Floor Hamilton, ON L8N 3W8 Tel. (905) 818-8464 Fax (905) 528-4179 Email: info@waterdown-aldershot.ca	
ID# 399 [redacted] Apr 21, 2009 Email	**Subject:** ID# 399-RE: NOISE REPORT on the Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Plan Respectfully, the nature of this ongoing email discussion is frustrating to say the least. The Transportation Master Plan Team initiated the use of email as a means to communicate the issues and their resolutions. While I reserve judgment on my support of his position, I believe that Rick Breznik has communicated his issues in a professional and responsible manner. If these emails are being received by the team at Lura, Dillon and Hamilton, please have the courtesy to respond in a timely manner either with an answer or when everyone can expect an answer.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information & large list	Waterdown-Aldershot Information April 29, 2009	Dear [redacted] Thank you for your e-mail dated April 21, 2009. Our office did provide an acknowledgement to Mr. Breznik on April 6th. The Project Team has advised us that they are in the process of reviewing Mr. Breznik's input, and our office will provide that input to Mr. Breznik as soon as it is available, along with one additional outstanding report that he has requested. At that time, a meeting with Mr. Breznik will be scheduled. We appreciate your suggestions relating to the communications. In some cases, the material that has	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	If, as part of the Class Environmental Assessment Act requirements, the team is taking a different approach to communicating than was initially indicated, please let Rick and the rest of us know. The long delay between responses by the City team is creating a lack of trust and respect for our City employees - at least for me. I know that this is not what is desired. Maybe these issues should be taken off email and some face time with those affected residents would be best. A summary email to everyone else would suffice.			been requested has not been completed in written format, and as such there is time required to prepare this material. Kind regards, Patricia Halajski on behalf of Sally Leppard Neutral Community Facilitator's Office 36 Hunter Street East, 6th Floor Hamilton, ON L8N 3W8 Tel. (905) 818-8464 Fax (905) 528-4179 Email: info@waterdown-aldershot.ca	
ID# 402 [redacted] May 14, 2009 Email	To the Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Plan Project Team, On behalf of the residents of the Hunter park survey, we would like to know if and when we can expect our outstanding questions answered. We would like to meet with you once we receive these answers. Please advise us as to your next course of action. Respectfully, [redacted]Northlawn Ave. Waterdown	Waterdown-Aldershot Information & large list	Waterdown-Aldershot Information May 15, 2009	Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email. We are currently tracking the Project Team's response to Mr. Breznik's questions (ID# 401, dated May 7, 2009). In the meantime, we would appreciate it if you could advise us if the date of June 1, 2009 is convenient for you and your neighbours (understanding that this is subject to receiving a response to Mr. Breznik's questions). Kind regards, Patricia Halajski on behalf of Sally Leppard	
ID# 406 [redacted] May 19, 2009	Can you please provide me with an update on where the Phase 3&4 Assessments are (when they are expected to be completed), when the next public consultations are and projected timelines for	Waterdown-Aldershot Information		*In-progress*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
Email	completions of the studies and commencement of work for the East/West Road? Regards, [redacted]				
ID# 410 [redacted] May 31, 2009 Email	Sally , I have not received the minutes of the meetings held on Nov 19th/ 08 and December 1st/08. Do you still consider this a short delay? [redacted]	Sally Leppard (NCFO)	City of Hamilton June 26, 2009 Email	Back in November and December 2008 the project team met with Parkside Drive Residents Association. For your information and review, attached please find DRAFT meeting notes from November 19, 2008 and December 1, 2008. These minutes are also being sent to [redacted] for their information and review. Please send any comments on the content of the minutes to: info@waterdown-aldershot.ca Thank you, **The Project Partners** Waterdown Aldershot Transportation Master Plan City of Hamilton | City of Burlington | Halton Region Web: www.hamilton.ca/WaterdownTMP E/M: info@waterdown-aldershot.ca	
ID# 416 [redacted] June 16, 2009	Dear Ms. Morreale, After reviewing the information presented at the resident's meeting, and the package that you sent to us, I have a few concerns. We strongly object to options 1 and 2 of your design alternatives, because we will be greatly and negatively affected if either of those is implemented.	Diana Morreale (City of Hamilton) and Waterdown Aldershot	N/A	Dear [redacted] Thank you for your comments. We are currently revising the options and evaluation of the New East-West Road corridor's connection to Highway 6. Your comments along with the others received from the resident's meeting and MTO will be used in finalizing the assessment.	

	Follow-up
t some orthern ue to nern arried 1 and s will (east of st of ptions nost ince ue June ll be . sions ay 6 ing not	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				However, it is noted that the high costs of business displacement (an industrial waste processing facility and a nursery) were not included in the evaluation as the original evaluation criteria were not designed to take this level of business impacts into account. This is a significant consideration missing from this evaluation. Clearly these business impacts were recognized in the original evaluation of Option 5 as is documented in the TMP. --- Kind regards, Patricia Halajski née Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard	
ID# 260 [redacted] Oct 31, 2008 Email	Please send me a PDF file and your text email on the announcement of the upcoming PIC meeting on Nov 5th, in Waterdown, so that I may distribute it to my neighbours by email. Thanks,[redacted]	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information, Liz Nield Oct 31, 2008 Email + attachment	Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email. Please find attached the PIC notice for the two upcoming meetings. Regards, Liz Nield on behalf of Sally Leppard Attachment: PIC Notice (Nov5_6_08)	
ID# 271 [redacted] Nov 5/08 Email	Dear Project Team, I am requesting a reply within 10 days for a summary and analysis of the noise-modeling studies that were done to measure the effect on the homes on Fellowes Cres, that back onto Parkside Drive between Boulding Ave. and Robson Rd. There are 10 homes involved. I also request a specific analysis on how it will affect my home at X Fellowes Cres which is closer than all other homes by an additional 15-20 feet (approx).	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 25, 2009 Email	Email was acknowledged Nov 20, 2008. Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email dated November 5, 2008. We have obtained a response to your inquiry from the Project Team, and have provided it in blue below. --- *I am requesting a reply within 10 days for a summary*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	We ask that you review the increased noise affects in two parts: -all homes as a group along Fellowes Cres facing Parkside Drive, and if no mitigation is possible; -review of the two homes which are closer to Parkside Drive than the 8 others - as these properties are backset in their lots by an additional 15-20 feet closer to the roadway (X Fellowes is currently 60 feet from the two-lane Parkside Drive and could end up closer by approx. 12 feet to the new 4 lane roadway. **See diagram of the lot of X Fellowes which shows how much closer it is to the current roadway. Power Point Slides.** **1. Background:** As you know, the residents of Fellowes Crescent will be affected the most by increased noise and pollution by the new East West Bypass due to the very close proximity of their homes, relative to all others, along the East West Bypass road plan. We ask that the City would give consideration to providing noise-attenuation fencing for two purposes. To reduce noise and to ensure that the neighbourhood is attractively maintained by having a consistent fence style that maintains the attractiveness of the area as is the case with the Hollybush subdivision in west Waterdown. Currently, most of the homes on Fellowes Cres. do			*and analysis of the noise-modeling studies that were done to measure the effect on the homes on Fellowes Cres, that back onto Parkside Drive between Boulding Ave. and Robson Rd. There are 10 homes involved. I also request a specific analysis on how it will affect my home at x Fellowes Cres which is closer than all other homes by an additional 15-20 feet (approx).* *We ask that you review the increased noise affects in two parts:* *-all homes as a group along Fellowes Cres facing Parkside Drive, and if no mitigation is possible;* *-review of the two homes which are closer to Parkside Drive than the 8 others - as these properties are backset in their lots by an additional 15-20 feet closer to the roadway (215 Fellowes is currently 60 feet from the two-lane Parkside Drive and could end up closer by approx. 12 feet to the new 4 lane roadway.* ***See diagram of the lot of x Fellowes which shows how much closer it is to the current roadway. Power Point Slides.*** ***1. Background:*** *As you know, the residents of Fellowes Crescent will be affected the most by increased noise and pollution by the new East West Bypass due to the very close proximity of their homes, relative to all others, along the East West Bypass road plan.* *We ask that the City would give consideration to providing noise-attenuation fencing for two purposes.*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	have a fence and the fences are partially or mostly blocked from view due to trees, shrubs and grasses. Once the plants and trees, next to our fences on Parkside Drive, are removed to allow for the new sidewalks and road widening, the fences will be in full view of the roadway. I am concerned that the current fences will also be an 'eye-sore' if not properly maintained. If the City does not put in noise-attenuation fencing, then each homeowner might choose to put in different varieties of fences which may not look attractive or may not be properly maintained. It is my understanding from the last NAC5 meeting, that the Project Team has said that their noise-modelling studies do not show that there will be an increase of noise that warrants any mitigation. I disagree with this finding as it would apply to my home since it is much closer to Parkside than any other house along the entire East West route. **I request one of two things; that the Project Team provide me a report and summary of the noise study and to provide me a copy of the original study and its methodology or, agree to mitigate my legitimate concern about increased noise volume by installing noise-attenuation fencing and windows (rear and sides of our house).** **2. Community Precedent with standardize fencing built behind Hollybush residential community on Parkside Drive.** Please also note that the City has ensured that a consistent noise-attenuation fence design was built on			*To reduce noise and to ensure that the neighbourhood is attractively maintained by having a consistent fence style that maintains the attractiveness of the area as is the case with the Hollybush subdivision in west Waterdown.* *Currently, most of the homes on Fellowes Cres. do have a fence and the fences are partially or mostly blocked from view due to trees, shrubs and grasses. Once the plants and trees, next to our fences on Parkside Drive, are removed to allow for the new sidewalks and road widening, the fences will be in full view of the roadway. I am concerned that the current fences will also be an 'eye-sore' if not properly maintained. If the City does not put in noise-attenuation fencing, then each homeowner might choose to put in different varieties of fences which may not look attractive or may not be properly maintained.* *It is my understanding from the last NAC5 meeting that the Project Team has said that their noise-modelling studies do not show that there will be an increase of noise that warrants any mitigation. I disagree with this finding as it would apply to my home since it is much closer to Parkside than any other house along the entire East West route.* ***I request one of two things; that the Project Team provide me a report and summary of the noise study and to provide me a copy of the original study and its methodology or, agree to mitigate my legitimate concern about increased noise volume by installing noise-attenuation fencing and windows (rear and sides of our house).***	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Parkside Drive in West Waterdown where traffic volumes are less than here and where homes are further back from the road than they are in our neighbourhood. I ask that the City provide leadership in this neighbourhood by ensuring that a proper noise attenuation fence be built for the 10 homes here that back onto Parkside Drive. The cost for 10 homes would not be that much considering the budget for the roadway is in the millions of dollars. **3. Two homes on Fellowes Cres are significantly closer to Parkside Drive than 8 others - the impact of increased noise is more severe to these homes. (X and X Fellowes Cres.)** Further, my home, is closer to Parkside, than the other 9 homes on Fellowes Crescent. I am only 60 feet from the current traffic lane. Bringing a new lane, 12 feet closer, will bring a huge level of noise to back of my home and much of it will enter my home even through closed windows. I ask that the City provide some mitigation by installing enhanced noise attenuation windows to the back and sides of my home where the increased noise volume will penetrate. Even though the road will be reduce from 60 km/hr to 50 km/hr, that reduction will not offset the increased volume that will occur due to the closer approximation of the new inside road lane and the fact that my home is already very close to the current roadway (60 feet). The new roadway will be only 48 feet or less from my bedroom window. **4. Impact on Hawthorne Tree at back of X Fellowes**			**Project Partners Response:** A noise report is being finalized by the Project Team, after which it can be released to the public. A copy will be sent to you once it is finalized. ***2. Community Precedent with standardize fencing built behind Hollybush residential community on Parkside Drive.*** *Please also note that the City has ensured that a consistent noise-attenuation fence design was built on Parkside Drive in West Waterdown where traffic volumes are less than here and where homes are further back from the road than they are in our neighbourhood. I ask that the City provide leadership in this neighbourhood by ensuring that a proper noise attenuation fence be built for the 10 homes here that back onto Parkside Drive. The cost for 10 homes would not be that much considering the budget for the roadway is in the millions of dollars.* **Project Partners Response:** The need for the provision of new fencing is being considered by the Project Team. The Environmental Study Report (ESR) will reference the need for such fencing. ***3. Two homes on Fellowes Cres are significantly closer to Parkside Drive than 8 others - the impact of increased noise is more severe to these homes. (Xand XFellowes Cres.)*** *Further, my home, is closer to Parkside, than the other 9*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Cres. Last, I am concerned that a mature Hawthorne tree, that is behind my home, will be removed. This tree provides an outstanding block of the view of the road. It provides beautiful blossoms in the spring, and red fruit in the fall. The bluejays, finches, and cardinal frolic in this tree throughout the spring, summer, and fall season. Without this tree, we will lose the birds, and the enjoyment they bring to us. (See photo attached). We ask if it would be possible to skew the road to the north in order to avoid the destruction of this tree. Thanks for your attention to this matter. I look forward to your timely reply. Regards, [redacted]			*homes on Fellowes Crescent. I am only 60 feet from the current traffic lane. Bringing a new lane, 12 feet closer, will bring a huge level of noise to back of my home and much of it will enter my home even through closed windows. I ask that the City provide some mitigation by installing enhanced noise attenuation windows to the back and sides of my home where the increased noise volume will penetrate. Even though the road will be reduce from 60 km/hr to 50 km/hr, that reduction will not offset the increased volume that will occur due to the closer approximation of the new inside road lane and the fact that my home is already very close to the current roadway (60 feet). The new roadway will be only 48 feet or less from my bedroom window.* **Project Partners Response:** We have reviewed the noise increase calculations for this area and have concluded that noise mitigation is not required. With respect to the fence, we are currently investigating whether it will be impacted and in need of replacement. ***4. Impact on Hawthorne Tree at back of X Fellowes Cres.*** *Last, I am concerned that a mature Hawthorne tree, that is behind my home, will be removed. This tree provides an outstanding block of the view of the road. It provides beautiful blossoms in the spring, and red fruit in the fall. The bluejays, finches, and cardinal frolic in this tree throughout the spring, summer, and fall season. Without this tree, we will lose the birds, and the enjoyment they bring to us. (See photo attached). We*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				ask if it would be possible to skew the road to the north in order to avoid the destruction of this tree. **Project Partners Response:** Vegetation along the south side of Parkside Drive could be unaffected if the south side sidewalk was eliminated. We will review the need for the sidewalk on the south side of the roadway. Thanks for your attention to this matter. I look forward to your timely reply. --- Kind regards, Patricia Halajski on behalf of Sally Leppard	
ID# 282 [redacted] Nov 6, 2008 Email	**Subject:** Hwy 6 access of Waterdown East West Bypass should be located approx 400 meters north of Concession 4 West and not connected to Concession 4 West. Dear Don and the Project Team. I am very concerned to have been told last night at the Waterdown East West Bypass PIC Meeting for the Phase 3 & 4 plan, that MTO may not be in favour of the East West bypass accessing Hwy 6 some 400 meters north of Concession 4. As you know, we have objected to the closure of Parkside Drive at Hwy 6 intersection and we have also opposed the connection of the East West Bypass to Concession 4/Hwy 6. We finally felt we had made some progress with the Project Team when it announced, in May 2008, at a	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Mar 4, 2009 Email	Email was acknowledged Nov 19, 2008 Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email dated November 6, 2008. We have obtained responses from the Project Team to your inquiries, and have inserted them in your email below. The Project Team has responded to your email in blue. --- *Dear Don and the Project Team.* *I am very concerned to have been told last night at the Waterdown East West Bypass PIC Meeting for the Phase 3 & 4 plan, that MTO may not be in favour of the East West bypass accessing Hwy 6 some 400 meters north of Concession 4.*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Neighbourhood Advisory Meeting, that it was proposing an East West alignment that was further north of Concession 4. This proposal was going to allow Parkside Drive intersection to remain open and also provide a 2nd access to Waterdown North with a new northern intersection. To turn the clock back and go back to the original Concession 4/Hwy6/East West Bypass intersection is not acceptable to us. We do not want to see the bypass connected to Concession 4 West at all due to the close proximity of 3 large gravel quarries that exist a few kilometers west on Concession 4 near Brock Rd. If our bypass is connected to it, this link will provide a potentially shorter route for quarry trucks to travel through our residential community in order to get to Hwy 407. We have never agreed to have a road built that will support access to the quarries. The Dufferin/Lafarge quarries have been approved to produce over 3 Million tons of gravel per year and traffic studies have determined that truck traffic, during peak season, will exceed 80 trucks per hour during the day going in and out of the quarries. The majority of trucks need access to destinations east of here which would make our residential bypass very attractive to use for gravel trucks. There is no doubt in our minds that the quarries would seek approval to use the bypass as an alternate route. It is for this reason, that we do not want to see the bypass connected to Concession 4 West and we also want Parkside Drive to remain open at Hwy 6 as it is the preferred access route to residents who live near Parkside Drive as I do.			*As you know, we have objected to the closure of Parkside Drive at Hwy 6 intersection and we have also opposed the connection of the East West Bypass to Concession 4/Hwy 6.* *We finally felt we had made some progress with the Project Team when it announced, in May 2008, at a Neighbourhood Advisory Meeting, that it was proposing an East West alignment that was further north of Concession 4. This proposal was going to allow Parkside Drive intersection to remain open and also provide a 2nd access to Waterdown North with a new northern intersection.* *To turn the clock back and go back to the original Concession 4/Hwy6/East West Bypass intersection is not acceptable to us.* *We do not want to see the bypass connected to Concession 4 West at all due to the close proximity of 3 large gravel quarries that exist a few kilometers west on Concession 4 near Brock Rd. If our bypass is connected to it, this link will provide a potentially shorter route for quarry trucks to travel through our residential community in order to get to Hwy 407. We have never agreed to have a road built that will support access to the quarries. The Dufferin/Lafarge quarries have been approved to produce over 3 Million tons of gravel per year and traffic studies have determined that truck traffic, during peak season, will exceed 80 trucks per hour during the day going in and out of the quarries. The majority of trucks need access to destinations east of here which would make our residential bypass very*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	This leaves us two alternatives, we either move the bypass, that accesses Hwy 6, north of Concession 4, or the bypass is merged to Parkside Drive on approach to Hwy 6. We ask for the cooperation of the Project Team and MTO to make this work for our community by not insisting that the bypass be connected to Concession 4 West. Our ideas and concerns have been supported strongly by the Neighbourhood Advisory Committee to which we have actively participated in and expressed our views on this. Regards, [redacted] Parkside Drive Citizens Group East West Neighbourhood Advisory Group Waterdown, Ontario			*attractive to use for gravel trucks. There is no doubt in our minds that the quarries would seek approval to use the bypass as an alternate route. It is for this reason, that we do not want to see the bypass connected to Concession 4 West and we also want Parkside Drive to remain open at Hwy 6 as it is the preferred access route to residents who live near Parkside Drive as I do.* *This leaves us two alternatives, we either move the bypass, that accesses Hwy 6, north of Concession 4, or the bypass is merged to Parkside Drive on approach to Hwy 6.* *We ask for the cooperation of the Project Team and MTO to make this work for our community by not insisting that the bypass be connected to Concession 4 West. Our ideas and concerns have been supported strongly by the Neighbourhood Advisory Committee to which we have actively participated in and expressed our views on this.* **Project Team Response:** This study is not proposing to close the existing intersection of Parkside Drive/Highway 6. The development of a new intersection at the Concession 4 Road (or near the Concession 4 Road) would not mean that the current Parkside Drive/Highway 6 intersection would need to be closed. When the MTO determines their requirement of the future interchange at Highway 5 & 6, the MTO standards will then dictate to the municipality whether or not the intersection needs to be closed. The realignment of the east-west road to the existing	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				Parkside Dr. intersection could be problematic. First, if the controlled access improvements to Hwy 6 were ever extended northerly this would mean that Highway 6 access at Parkside Drive would have to be eliminated, as an interchange is not possible at the current location. It would be too close to the Dundas St. interchange that is being built. This alternative was identified during Phase 2 work and was screened out for that reason. The Project Partners are well aware of the community's concern regarding the potential use of the new East-West road by gravel trucks. Your comments and concerns have been passed onto the MTO. We do note that the City's only recourse when gravel trucks change their Haul Route or use municipal roads without consent from the City of Hamilton may be to contact MNR and complain that they are not in compliance with the terms of the their license The Lafarge quarry is proposing an extension of their existing North quarry operations located between Concession 4 and 5 and east of Brock Road. The transportation system currently in place for the Lafarge Dundas Quarry will remain unchanged when operations move to the Lafarge North Quarry Extension according to their current proposal. There will be no change to current Haul Routes as part of this extension, as all material mined from the North quarry are transferred via conveyor to the processing plant south of Hwy 5. This process will continue. It is not anticipated that there will be any increase in production levels, therefore both internal and external truck traffic levels will remain constant. It is anticipated that all truck traffic will continue to enter and exit the	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				site via Hwy 5. In regards to the Dufferin quarry, the City is not aware of any planned expansions at this site and has not received any information from Dufferin regarding truck rerouting. The City will review the Haul Route Study prepared by the proponent and consider any proposed haul route as part of any quarry's planning applications. In the case of the St. Marys' quarry application in Flamborough, the proponents of the quarry are undertaking a Haul Route Study which has been requested by the City of Hamilton and structured as a "shadow" Environmental Assessment (EA). The Haul Route Study is being structured as a "shadow" EA to ensure the study is consistent with the EA process should a Class EA be required in the future for road improvements. The Haul Route terms are established by the City as part of the review of planning applications but are not a requirement of the Ontario Aggregate Resources Act (ARA) process. There are opportunities for formal public input during the ARA process. Kind regards, Patricia Halajski on behalf of Sally Leppard,	
ID# 285 [redacted] Nov 9, 2008 Email	**Subject:** Request for Meeting with Project Team to review Option 5 - Stantec Route Dear Sally and the Project Team, We wish to have the Project Team and its consultants,	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information (Sally Leppard)	**From:** Sally Leppard **Sent:** Sunday, November 09, 2008 6:09 PM Dea[redacted]	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	to present their review of the Option 5 Stantec alignment to us on Wednesday Nov 12th, at 7 PM at a location in Waterdown arranged by yourself. We ask that you arrange this at a location in Waterdown such as St. Thomas Church, the Municipal Building, or another similar type of venue. As you know the Project Team, and its consultants, were to continue a conversation with us, that initially occurred at the NAC # 4 Meeting on Thursday June 12th. In that conversation, we had suggested that there was an alternate route to the Option 5 -Opta Minerals route that the Project Team decided, on itself, to evaluate. We were disappointed to see that the Project Team never did contact us for a meeting to discuss an approach to choosing the Option 5 northern route, but simply went ahead on its own and contacted us Oct 24th, over 4 months later, to hear their review one hour before they delivered the results at NAC # 5 meeting on Oct 28th, 2008. This I must remind you, does not build a great deal of trust when the development of the Option 5 Stantec is not done carefully with all concerns of ours considered much early in the process. The Parkside Drive Citizens Group has always been in favour of a route that ran north of Opta Minerals because it was calculated, based on the Project Team's Phase 2 Draft report, to be as optimal as the study's Preferred Route. Also, in Dec 2008, we submitted an analysis, prepared by [redacted] of Waterdown, who proved that the Option 5 route was mathematically more preferred than the study's		Nov 19, 2008	I have requested that date from the project team and hope to get back to you on Tuesday. Regards, Sally --- **Sent:** Monday, November 17, 2008 1:17 PM **Subject:** Waterdown Aldershot - Meeting on November 19th [redacted] I attach an agenda that has been reviewed by the Project Team for the meeting on Wednesday. The agenda has been developed based on your e-mail, and no changes have been made. The Team understands that all times are approximate. Dillon Consulting and the City will bring the materials/equipment that you requested. Sally Leppard Neutral Community Facilitator's Office --- **Sent:** Monday, November 17, 2008 8:12 PM Hi[redacted] I have requested this from Dillon. I am hopeful we can get it to you first thing in the morning. Sally --- Meetings were held Nov 19th and Dec 1st, 2008	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up

choice of Option 4.

As you are well aware, the Project Team subsequently abandoned the mathematical model in its Draft study, after we provided these calculations, and change the approach to selected the preferred route in its Final Phase 2 report.

			Corrected Option 1 All Northern Route	**Corrected Option 4 Northern Hybrid Route**	**Corrected Option 5 New Northern Route**
Natural Environment Total			12.23	6.02	8.73
Social Environment			8.11	15.54	7.33
Econòmic Environment Total			4.06	3.83	5.1
Costs			2.98	3.49	3.51
Transportation Service			2.65	5.68	2.65
TOTAL			**30.03**	**34.56**	**27.32**

Below are the numbers from the corrected Justification Tables indicating Option 5 as the best when compared to the Project Team's Options 4.

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up

			Corrected Option 4 Northern Hybrid Route	Corrected Option 5 New Northern Route	
Natural Environment Total			11.13	15.86	
Social Environment			20.14	10.85	
Economic Environment Total			5.69	7.3	
Costs			4.98	5.01	
Transportation Service			7.01	3.98	
TOTAL			**48.95**	**43**	

Please advise as quickly as possible of we can have this meeting with the Project Team's and its consultants on Wednesday Nov 12th.

I ask that the appropriate posters and visual materials be available to appropriately refer to in discussions.

Thanks,

[redacted]
Parkside Drive Citizens Group
Subject: Re: Waterdown Aldershot - Meeting on

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	November 19th Sally, In your agenda for Wednesday's meeting you state: *Residents have requested a meeting with the Project Team to discuss a variety of issues (noted on the agenda) relating to the* ***Centre Road/Parkside Drive*** *alignments of the E-W Route. The agenda items were identified by* [redacted] *in an e-mail dated November 12, 2008.* This meeting has nothing to do with Center Road alignment issues. This is simply a meeting of the Parkside Drive Citizens Group issues. [redacted] is with us as he helped us on the evaluation of our Options. We all share in common the interest about the bypass entrance on Hwy 6. Would you please correct the agenda and strike out the Center Road issue? That will be addressed at a subsequent meeting request, I believe, from [redacted] Thanks, [redacted] ----- Original Message ----- **Sent:** Monday, November 17, 2008 8:07 PM **Subject:** Re: Waterdown Aldershot - Meeting on November 19th ; Request for copy of Oct 27th Memo on Option 5 vs Option 4. [redacted] would like to do a page by page review of the				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Option 4 vs Option 5 Alignment review, dated Oct 27, 2008, that you gave to us on Oct 28th. Also, can you please send an email to me with this report asap? I need to circulate it to [redacted] and would like a backup on a pdf. Please send it along with the colour maps if possible. Please copy [redacted] with it as it would get to him sooner with only one day to prepare. Thanks, [redacted]				
ID# 286 [redacted] Nov 19, 2008 Email	**Subject:** Fw:Residents of Fellowes Crescent: Additional Issue regarding installation of light standards along Parkside Drive behind our homes. Dear WAI and Syeda Basira Banuri, Senior Project Manager, Don McKinnon - Dillon Consulting. As you both know, the residents of Fellowes Cres, that back onto Parkside Drive, will be the most affected by the new 4-lane road expansion in terms of traffic noise, dust/pollution, and night time light flooding of the light standards into our yards and homes. In addition to the concerns and recommendations that I have sent in the attached email dated Nov 5, 2008, I would like to bring forward some additional comments and concerns. As discussed separately with Don McKinnon and Syeda Banuri during the PIC meeting on Nov 5th, 2008, the residents of Fellowes Cres, who's home back onto Parkside Drive, ask that the issues around light	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Jan 5, 2009 Email --- Waterdown-Aldershot Information Mar 12, 2009 Email	Email was acknowledged Nov 19, 2008. Dear [redacted] Further to your e-mail dated November 9, 2008 (ID#286), the City of Hamilton is in the process of considering your request relating to noise attenuation. Your concerns relating to lighting mitigation measures are being considered by the Project Team. Kind regards, Patricia Halajski née Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard, --- Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email inquiries numbered ID# 286, 323, 349, 350, 351, 359 and 365. Since some of your questions and comments are very similar in nature, the responses are also similar. We will be sending you individual responses to each of your inquiries to ensure that you receive complete responses to each	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	standards also be reviewed in order to mitigate and prevent bright street lighting from flooding our backyards and rear bedroom windows of our homes. I also spoke separately to both Mr. McKinnon and Ms. Banuri, about the need for noise attenuation fencing and windows for the homes of X and X Fellowes and I also recommended that noise attenuation fencing be provided to all 10 homes that are on Fellowes Cres that back onto Parkside Drive. I also presented photos to them (attached) of the precedent of noise-attenuation fencing that occurs on Parkside Drive west near Hollybush Drive. Lighting mitigation measures in order of maximum benefit to residents of Fellowes Cres: - no installation of Parkside Drive light standards behind the 10 homes on Fellowes Cres (there are currently no light standards on the current segment of roadway so why are they needed now?) -if light standards must be installed, please install them on the northside of the roadway where the sidewalk is being installed. It is our understanding that no sidewalk is being installed on the south side of the roadway which is adjacent to our backyards and homes. Therefore the maximum benefit to people using the sidewalk at night would be to install light standards over the north sidewalk. -if light standards are to be installed, that the lowest light level be installed, and the fewest light standards installed, to avoid disturbing the homes on Fellowes Crescent in which rear facing bedroom windows are present.		---------- Waterdown-Aldershot Information Mar 12, 2009 Email	communication that has been sent to the Neutral Community Facilitator's Office (NCFO). Kind regards, Patricia Halajski on behalf of Sally Leppard, ---------- Dear Mr.[redacted] Thank you for your email dated November 9, 2008. We have obtained a response to your inquiry from the Project Team, and have provided it in blue below. --- *Dear WAI and Syeda Basira Banuri, Senior Project Manager, Don McKinnon - Dillon Consulting.* *As you both know, the residents of Fellowes Cres, that back onto Parkside Drive, will be the most affected by the new 4-lane road expansion in terms of traffic noise, dust/pollution, and night time light flooding of the light standards into our yards and homes.* *In addition to the concerns and recommendations that I have sent in the email dated Nov 5, 2008, I would like to bring forward some additional comments and concerns.* *As discussed separately with Don McKinnon and Syeda Banuri during the PIC meeting on Nov 5th, 2008, the residents of Fellowes Cres, who's home back onto Parkside Drive, ask that the issues around light standards also be reviewed in order to mitigate and*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	<u>At your earliest convenience, please advise us of how you can mitigate our concerns with the light standard plan, and what mitigation measures you propose for noise attenuation fencing and windows, several weeks prior to submitting your Notice of Completion to the MOE. May I also suggest you meet with us to discuss the finer details in order to prevent misunderstanding on these issues.</u> Regards, [redacted] Parkside Drive Citizens Group.			*prevent bright street lighting from flooding our backyards and rear bedroom windows of our homes. I also spoke separately to both Mr. McKinnon and Ms. Banuri, about the need for noise attenuation fencing and windows for the homes of 215 and 213 Fellowes and I also recommended that noise attenuation fencing be provided to all 10 homes that are on Fellowes Cres that back onto Parkside Drive. I also presented photos to them (attached) of the precedent of noise-attenuation fencing that occurs on Parkside Drive west near Hollybush Drive.* *Lighting mitigation measures in order of maximum benefit to residents of Fellowes Cres:* *- no installation of Parkside Drive light standards behind the 10 homes on Fellowes Cres (there are currently no light standards on the current segment of roadway so why are they needed now?)* *-if light standards must be installed, please install them on the northside of the roadway where the sidewalk is being installed. It is our understanding that no sidewalk is being installed on the south side of the roadway which is adjacent to our backyards and homes. Therefore the maximum benefit to people using the sidewalk at night would be to install light standards over the north sidewalk.* *-if light standards are to be installed, that the lowest light level be installed, and the fewest light standards installed, to avoid disturbing the homes on Fellowes Crescent in which rear facing bedroom windows are present.*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				At your earliest convenience, please advise us of how you can mitigate our concerns with the light standard plan, and what mitigation measures you propose for noise attenuation fencing and windows, several weeks prior to submitting your Notice of Completion to the MOE. May I also suggest you meet with us to discuss the finer details in order to prevent misunderstanding on these issues. **Project Team Response:** The light standard designs and light scatter issues can be mitigated in the design phase of the project. Various methods of mitigation can be facilitated by selecting the correct light standard and correcting for height adjustments. Other methods to mitigate are decreasing spacing or random staggering of fixtures compounded with shielded or cut-off components added inside the fixture to restrict and direct the intensity of the light. The Project Team has considered the Halton Policy on Noise Abatement and has applied it to the understanding of your concerns. The City of Hamilton does not currently have a policy on noise abatement. The project endeavors to address provincial protocols when assessing the requirement for noise mitigation measures. In order to assess the potential noise and pollution impacts of this project, issues have been addressed by undertaking an Air Quality Study and Noise Study to ensure that sensitivity and traffic issues have been addressed. The Noise Study will be sent out later today, and the final studies will be made available when the East West Corridor Class Environmental Assessment Environmental Study Report	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				is filed on Public Record in the summer of 2009. After an thorough examination of The City of Hamilton's Fence Inventory, Plan of Subdivision engineer's drawings, Township of Flamborough and Region of Hamilton Wentworth Subdivision Agreements, and Maintenance records for subdivisions along Parkside Drive, the City of Hamilton has found no evidence that the fencing between Hollybush and Duncan Avenue or between Boulding Avenue and Robson Road along Parkside Drive was installed for the purpose of noise attenuation mitigation. The project partners would not recommend any noise attenuation mitigation for areas that do not warrant it. The owner of 21 Strathroy Crescent went to the Flamborough Building Department to obtain a permit to put a swimming pool in their backyard. Due to the minimal distances between houses etc. the only way to move equipment into the backyard to install the pool was to construct a temporary access (driveway) from Parkside Drive and remove the fence, install the culvert, etc. The only way into the backyard was for the resident to remove a portion of the fence on Parkside Drive and reinstall it when the construction was complete. This was done by acquiring a Temporary Access Permit (Driveway Permit) issued April 9, 1999, to 21 Strathroy Crescent, to install a culvert in the ditch (in City of Hamilton road allowance so drainage would not be blocked) on Parkside Drive so the homeowner could bring the heavy machinery into the backyard through	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				the temporary access from Parkside Drive. The owner paid an Inspection Fee to the Region since he was doing the culvert work himself. The Township of Flamborough inspected to make sure the temporary access was installed correctly and also to make sure it was removed when the construction of the pool was complete. The requirement for the Temporary Access Permit does not imply that the fence was owned and maintained by the City. --- Kind regards, Patricia Halajski on behalf of Sally Leppard,	
ID# 289 [redacted] Nov 19, 2008 Email	**Subject:** Concerns about Traffic Circles on Waterdown East West Bypass; need for traffic light at Boulding and Parkside Drive. Dear WAI and Don McKinnon, Dillon Consulting and Syedà Basira Banuri, Senior Project Manager At the PIC Meeting on Nov 5, 2008, I had a discussion with Don McKinnon of Dillon Consulting and he suggested I send in my questions of concern around the traffic circles. **Traffic Circle Concern:** I am suspicious that the traffic circles will not be able to safely absorb the peak traffic volumes that are projected. Currently, traffic volumes in the evening are in the 500-600 cars per hour. The Project Team predicted that the current two-lane road cannot accommodate the increased traffic volumes	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 26, 2009 Email	Email was acknowledged Nov 19, 2008. **ID# 289** Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email dated November 9, 2008. We have obtained a response to your inquiry from the Project Team, and have provided it in blue below. *Dear WAI and Don McKinnon, Dillon Consulting and Syeda Basira Banuri, Senior Project Manager* *At the PIC Meeting on Nov 5, 2008, I had a discussion with Don McKinnon of Dillon Consulting and he suggested I send in my questions of concern around the traffic circles.*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	predicted from the new North Waterdown development. Since traffic volumes are projected to almost double, I cannot see how the traffic circle, west of the railway track and just east of the nursing home, can possibly be safe to navigate. The majority of traffic is destined to Parkside Drive and, consequently, will need to make a 270 degree turn, through the proposed traffic circle, to enter Parkside Drive. How is it possible for that to occur safely when some 600 - 800 cars per hours will try to make that turn? Will we not expect the traffic to become backed-up, from the circle, as soon as a few cars have to stop in order to allow easterly traffic to pass through ? I think we have to see your worst -case model and determine if this is safe and acceptable to have a traffic circle here. The same review should be done for the other two traffic circles before submitting your Notice of Completion. **Installation of Traffic Light at Boulding Ave. and Parkside Drive is preferred by residents.** In addition, I would also like to raise that every resident I have talked to has said that we need **a traffic light at Boulding and Parkside** since it is already very dangerous to turn west on Parkside Drive, from Boulding during rush hour and other times during the day. It certainly will become less safe to access Parkside Drive from Boulding Ave., without a traffic light , and future traffic volume and a 4-lane road to merge into. Please advise us if you can install a traffic light at this intersection which is a popular preference amongst the residence of our subdivision. Regards,			***Traffic Circle Concern:*** *I am suspicious that the traffic circles will not be able to safely absorb the peak traffic volumes that are projected. Currently, traffic volumes in the evening are in the 500-600 cars per hour. The Project Team predicted that the current two-lane road cannot accommodate the increased traffic volumes predicted from the new North Waterdown development. Since traffic volumes are projected to almost double, I cannot see how the traffic circle, west of the railway track and just east of the nursing home, can possibly be safe to navigate. The majority of traffic is destined to Parkside Drive and, consequently, will need to make a 270 degree turn, through the proposed traffic circle, to enter Parkside Drive. How is it possible for that to occur safely when some 600 - 800 cars per hours will try to make that turn? Will we not expect the traffic to become backed-up, from the circle, as soon as a few cars have to stop in order to allow easterly traffic to pass through ? I think we have to see your worst -case model and determine if this is safe and acceptable to have a traffic circle here. The same review should be done for the other two traffic circles before submitting your Notice of Completion.* **Project Team Response:** Vehicles in the roundabout have the right-of-way and do not have to stop to turn onto Parkside Drive going west bound. We do not anticipate any back-ups. ***Installation of Traffic Light at Boulding Ave. and***	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	[redacted] Parkside Drive Citizens Group.			***Parkside Drive is preferred by residents.*** *In addition, I would also like to raise that every resident I have talked to has said that we need* ***a traffic light at Boulding and Parkside*** *since it is already very dangerous to turn west on Parkside Drive, from Boulding during rush hour and other times during the day. It certainly will become less safe to access Parkside Drive from Boulding Ave., without a traffic light, and future traffic volume and a 4-lane road to merge into. Please advise us if you can install a traffic light at this intersection which is a popular preference amongst the residence of our subdivision.* **Project Team Response:** Our assessment of this intersection indicates that in the future traffic signals will not be required. However future operations may be a concern and we will recommend that this intersection be monitored. Kind regards, Patricia Halajski on behalf of Sally Leppard,	
ID# 323 [redacted] Nov 17, 2008	**Subject:** City owns and maintains fence on Parkside Drive West near Hollybush;we request a similar fence to be installed on bypass road. Dear Syeda, Don, Paul and Christine, As you are aware, I have raised on many occasions, including with Syeda and Don at the recent Nov 5th PIC meeting, that the residents of Fellowes Crescent seek mitigation for noise, pollution and other traffic disturbances for the rear of our homes and backyards.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information & large list	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 3, 2009 Email	Email was acknowledged Nov 17, 2008. Dear[redacted] Further to your request relating to noise attenuation fencing, please be advised that the City is still considering this matter. We will be in touch with you as soon as we have a response. Thank you,	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	I did advise Syeda and Don about the fence, that the City appears to own and maintain, on a westerly portion of Parkside Drive. Please look at the attached photos of that fence and also of our stretch of Parkside Drive. My home is situated the closest of 10 homes to Parkside Drive due to the cul-de-sac alignment that my house is situation on Fellowes Cres. My home is 18.5 feet closer to the roadway by approx 18.5 feet. This closer proximity already imparts significantly more noise and disruption from the current 2 lane road, and with an additional lane, and potential removal of the large Hawthorne tree, the increased noise will be much worse for X and X than for many of the other homes. I am approximately 68 feet form the current edge of the two lane road. Please find an email attached from a homeowner who backs onto the City of Hamilton's fence on a western portion of Parkside Drive near Hollybush. That fence has sections as high as 8 feet tall and has sound attenuation design. It appears to be maintained by the City and that the homeowners incurred a minimal cost, through developers, to have it installed and owned by the City. I have attached photos of their fence, as well as some of my neighourhood again, as a reminder to you have the current situation. If you could discuss this with us on Wednesday, we would appreciate it.		---------- Mar 12, 2009 Email ---------- Mar 12, 2009 Email	Patricia Halajski née Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard ---------- Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email inquiries numbered ID# 286, 323, 349, 350, 351, 359 and 365. Since some of your questions and comments are very similar in nature, the responses are also similar. We will be sending you individual responses to each of your inquiries to ensure that you receive complete responses to each communication that has been sent to the Neutral Community Facilitator's Office (NCFO). Kind regards, Patricia Halajski on behalf of Sally Leppard, ---------- Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email dated November 17, 2008. We have obtained a response to your inquiry from the Project Team, and have provided it in blue below. --- *Dear Syeda, Don, Paul and Christine,* *As you are aware, I have raised on many occasions, including with Syeda and Don at the recent Nov 5th PIC meeting, that the residents of Fellowes Crescent seek mitigation for noise, pollution and other traffic disturbances for the rear of our homes and backyards.* *I did advise Syeda and Don about the fence, that the*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Regards,[redacted] ----- Original Message ----- **From:** [redacted] **To:** [redacted] **Sent:** Sunday, November 16, 2008 12:30 PM **Subject:** Fencing Dear [redacted] Here is the information that I can give you in regards to the existing painted cedar fence at the rear of our property. • $1000 lot premium was added to premiums on all lots backing Parkside Drive. • There is a 1 foot easement on the back of our property where the fence line resides. • Ownership of fence was with the former Town of Flamborough. We know this as when the approval to remove the fence was given to install a pool, a deposit was taken by the town and returned once the fence was re-erected and inspected. • Recently, the City did do fence repairs which likely indicates that they indeed assumed ownership of them once we became the New City of Hamilton. I hope this helps. [redacted]			*City appears to own and maintain, on a westerly portion of Parkside Drive. Please look at the attached photos of that fence and also of our stretch of Parkside Drive. My home is situated the closest of 10 homes to Parkside Drive due to the cul-de-sac alignment that my house is situation on Fellowes Cres. My home is 18.5 feet closer to the roadway by approx 18.5 feet. This closer proximity already imparts significantly more noise and disruption from the current 2 lane road, and with an additional lane, and potential removal of the large Hawthorne tree, the increased noise will be much worse for 215 and 213 than for many of the other homes. I am approximately 68 feet form the current edge of the two lane road.* *Please find an email attached from a homeowner who backs onto the City of Hamilton's fence on a western portion of Parkside Drive near Hollybush. That fence has sections as high as 8 feet tall and has sound attenuation design. It appears to be maintained by the City and that the homeowners incurred a minimal cost, through developers, to have it installed and owned by the City.* *I have attached photos of their fence, as well as some of my neighourhood again, as a reminder to you have the current situation.* **Project Team Response:** The City of Hamilton does not currently have a policy on noise abatement. The project endeavors to address provincial protocols when assessing the requirement for noise mitigation measures. In order to assess the potential noise and	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				pollution impacts of this project, issues have been addressed by undertaking an Air Quality Study and Noise Study to ensure that sensitivity and traffic issues have been addressed. The Noise Study will be sent out later today, and the final studies will be made available when the East West Corridor Class Environmental Assessment Environmental Study Report is filed on Public Record in the summer of 2009. After an thorough examination of The City of Hamilton's Fence Inventory, Plan of Subdivision engineer's drawings, Township of Flamborough and Region of Hamilton Wentworth Subdivision Agreements, and Maintenance records for subdivisions along Parkside Drive, the City of Hamilton has found no evidence that the fencing between Hollybush and Duncan Avenue or between Boulding Avenue and Robson Road along Parkside Drive was installed for the purpose of noise attenuation mitigation. The project partners would not recommend any noise attenuation mitigation for areas that do not warrant it. The owner of X Strathroy Crescent went to the Flamborough Building Department to obtain a permit to put a swimming pool in their backyard. Due to the minimal distances between houses etc. the only way to move equipment into the backyard to install the pool was to construct a temporary access (driveway) from Parkside Drive and remove the fence, install the culvert, etc. The only way into the backyard was for the resident to remove a portion of the fence on Parkside Drive and reinstall it when the construction was complete.	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				This was done by acquiring a Temporary Access Permit (Driveway Permit) issued April 9, 1999, to 21 Strathroy Crescent, to install a culvert in the ditch (in City of Hamilton road allowance so drainage would not be blocked) on Parkside Drive so the homeowner could bring the heavy machinery into the backyard through the temporary access from Parkside Drive. The owner paid an Inspection Fee to the Region since he was doing the culvert work himself. The Township of Flamborough inspected to make sure the temporary access was installed correctly and also to make sure it was removed when the construction of the pool was complete. The requirement for the Temporary Access Permit does not imply that the fence was owned and maintained by the City. Kind regards, Patricia Halajski on behalf of Sally Leppard,	
ID# 349 [redacted] Dec 7, 2008	**Subject:** Fellowes Crescent neighbours (backing unto Parkside Drive) express concern that City of Hamilton Public Works Dept continues to not commit to providing noise-attentuation fencing to mitigate noise from future 4 lane roadway expansion Thank you for meeting on Monday Dec 8th with myself, [redacted] and a few others that represent and support the Parkside Drive Citizens Group. We met with you to discuss a number of concerns we have that have been outstanding since we first contacted the first project manager, Andrew Head, and your predecessor, Mary Lou Tanner, in November of 2005.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information & large list	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Mar 12, 2009 Email	Email was acknowledged Dec 5, 2008. Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email inquiries numbered ID# 286, 323, 349, 350, 351, 359 and 365. Since some of your questions and comments are very similar in nature, the responses are also similar. We will be sending you individual responses to each of your inquiries to ensure that you receive complete responses to each communication that has been sent to the Neutral Community Facilitator's Office (NCFO).	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	I will address these issues separately over a number of emails. Our first concerns is the following: **Your Department has continued to not make any commitment to us to install noise-attenuation fencing, or windows which we believe would significantly help to mitigate the increased level of traffic noise that will occur for the 10 households that exist on Fellowes Cres. and that back onto Parkside Drive. As you know, you are planning to build a 4-lane roadway, from a 2-lane roadway to accommodate new residential expansion in Waterdown. We request the noise attenuation fencing, and windows if appropriate, to mitigate the noise from the increased future residential traffic that will occur due to the residential expansion in Waterdown. The four-lane East West roadway is being planned to accommodate residential expansion of Waterdown (5000 new homes planned) and you are charging the developers for the majority of the road. We suggest that you also have the developers build a proper fence to mitigate the noise from the increased traffic.** • Some of the homes, such as mine at X Fellowes, are currently only 69 feet from the current single lane Parkside Drive. You are aware that by expanding Parkside Drive to four lanes, which is planned to have much greater traffic to address the 1500 new homes that will be built to the west of our neighbourhood, that the noise level is unacceptable to us. We currently do not have a noise-attenuation fence behind our homes and we		---------- Mar 12, 2009 Email	Kind regards, Patricia Halajski on behalf of Sally Leppard, ---------- Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email dated December 7, 2008. We have obtained a response to your inquiries from the Project Team, and have provided it in blue below. --- *Thank you for meeting on Monday Dec 8th with myself, [redacted] and a few others that represent and support the Parkside Drive Citizens Group. We met with you to discuss a number of concerns we have that have been outstanding since we first contacted the first project manager, Andrew Head, and your predecessor, Mary Lou Tanner, in November of 2005.* *I will address these issues separately over a number of emails.* *Our first concerns is the following:* ***Your Department has continued to not make any commitment to us to install noise-attenuation fencing, or windows which we believe would significantly help to mitigate the increased level of traffic noise that will occur for the 10 households that exist on Fellowes Cres. and that back onto Parkside Drive. As you know, you are planning to build a 4-lane roadway, from a 2-lane roadway to accommodate new residential expansion in Waterdown. We request the noise***	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	desire the City to provide one for us as soon as possible and preferably prior to the expansion of the road. • We have brought to your department's attention, on several occasions over the past 3 years and also to you recently, that the City of Hamilton owns the noise-attenuation fence that exists on another section of Parkside Drive nearly Hollybush Ave. (See attached photos). We believe that the fence in that neighbourhood was built to mitigate noise for the current and future traffic expected on Parkside Drive. We are also concerned that your consultant, Paul McLeod, would suggest to all of us on Monday Nov 8th, that this fence is a not noise-attenuation or noise-mitigation fencing. The fence is sealed to the ground, is of heavier materials than a basic fence, and allows no spacing between boards and is 8-9 feet tall in many sections. Mr. McLeod is wrong in his comment and his comment is further aggravating and delaying a decision by your department to provide the mitigation that we are deserving of. We would suggest you obtain a neutral 3rd party consultant who is willing to acknowledge the facts about your fence. We have already done our homework and have consulted a professional landscape architect who has educated us on the details of a noise-attenuation fence. What is very disturbing to us is that your department should know full-well what this type of fence is and we should not be wasting time and going back and forth with such a debate			***attenuation fencing, and windows if appropriate, to mitigate the noise from the increased future residential traffic that will occur due to the residential expansion in Waterdown. The four-lane East West roadway is being planned to accommodate residential expansion of Waterdown (5000 new homes planned) and you are charging the developers for the majority of the road. We suggest that you also have the developers build a proper fence to mitigate the noise from the increased traffic.*** · *Some of the homes, such as mine at 215 Fellowes, are currently only 69 feet from the current single lane Parkside Drive. You are aware that by expanding Parkside Drive to four lanes, which is planned to have much greater traffic to address the 1500 new homes that will be built to the west of our neighbourhood, that the noise level is unacceptable to us. We currently do not have a noise-attenuation fence behind our homes and we desire the City to provide one for us as soon as possible and preferably prior to the expansion of the road.* · *We have brought to your department's attention, on several occasions over the past 3 years and also to you recently, that the City of Hamilton owns the noise-attenuation fence that exists on another section of Parkside Drive nearly Hollybush Ave. (See attached photos). We believe that the fence in that neighbourhood was built to mitigate noise for the current and future traffic expected on Parkside Drive. We are also concerned that*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	as it is wasting valuable time for all of us. • We would like to show you, in the photos attached, how the Town of Milton provided a noise-attenuation fence this year, during a two-lane to four-lane Thompson Road expansion between both a new and older residential subdivision. This fence was built at the back of the yards of the old subdivision and is clearly a noise-attenuation fence similar to the one you, the City of Hamilton, own in Waterdown. What we like about the fence in Milton is that they used a better quality standard by using **high density cedar tongue-and-grove boards that do not allow any air or noise to pass between the boards on the fence.** The Town of Milton also maintains ownership of the fence and will repair and treat it with sealer from time to time. We would also like to point out that we measured the distances of this fence to the road and it is 46 feet. If you compare this to Parkside Drive and my backyard fence, my fence is only 20 feet from the current roadway. Once you expand Parkside Drive, we are looking at a comparably very short distance from the new road to our fence. On top of that, my home is situated very closely to my fence. My house is only 46 feet from the fence. My circumstances are far worse than the residents backing onto Thompson Road in Milton. o We also visited neighbours, along Thompson Road in Milton who have the new noise-attenuation fence, and they told			*your consultant, Paul McLeod, would suggest to all of us on Monday Nov 8th, that this fence is a not noise-attenuation or noise-mitigation fencing. The fence is sealed to the ground, is of heavier materials than a basic fence, and allows no spacing between boards and is 8-9 feet tall in many sections. Mr. McLeod is wrong in his comment and his comment is further aggravating and delaying a decision by your department to provide the mitigation that we are deserving of. We would suggest you obtain a neutral 3rd party consultant who is willing to acknowledge the facts about your fence. We have already done our homework and have consulted a professional landscape architect who has educated us on the details of a noise-attenuation fence. What is very disturbing to us is that your department should know full-well what this type of fence is and we should not be wasting time and going back and forth with such a debate as it is wasting valuable time for all of us.* • *We would like to show you, in the photos attached, how the Town of Milton provided a noise-attenuation fence this year, during a two-lane to four-lane Thompson Road expansion between both a new and older residential subdivision. This fence was built at the back of the yards of the old subdivision and is clearly a noise-attenuation fence similar to the one you, the City of Hamilton, own in Waterdown. What we like about the fence in Milton is that they used a better quality standard by using **high density cedar***	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	us that they did not have to petition for the fence, nor meet with the City of Milton to appeal for such a fence. They also told us that the Town of Milton also sealed the cedar with a sealant on the home owner's side of the fence as well. They also told us that the cost of the fence was probably paid for by the developers who build the subdivisions directly across the street. It is these subdivisions that would lead to the increased traffic that required an upgrade from a two-lane to a four-lane roadway. Its the increased traffic from the subdivisions that leads to the increased noise and the need for a noise-attenuation fence. See attached photos of Town of Milton, Thompson Road. Christine, Syeda, and the Project Team. We ask that you provide us a noise-attenuation fence and noise-attenuation windows (triple pane designed to reduce noise) for homes that would qualify for mitigation, as part of your East West Roadway Plan. If you are not willing to do so, we will have no other choice but to appeal the plan to the MoE to have a 3rd party project team develop the plan for Waterdown. Regards, [redacted] Parkside Drive Citizens Group			***tongue-and-grove boards that do not allow any air or noise to pass between the boards on the fence.*** *The Town of Milton also maintains ownership of the fence and will repair and treat it with sealer from time to time. We would also like to point out that we measured the distances of this fence to the road and it is 46 feet. If you compare this to Parkside Drive and my backyard fence, my fence is only 20 feet from the current roadway. Once you expand Parkside Drive, we are looking at a comparably very short distance from the new road to our fence. On top of that, my home is situated very closely to my fence. My house is only 46 feet from the fence. My circumstances are far worse than the residents backing onto Thompson Road in Milton.* *We also visited neighbours, along Thompson Road in Milton who have the new noise-attenuation fence, and they told us that they did not have to petition for the fence, nor meet with the City of Milton to appeal for such a fence. They also told us that the Town of Milton also sealed the cedar with a sealant on the home owner's side of the fence as well. They also told us that the cost of the fence was probably paid for by the developers who build the subdivisions directly across the street. It is these subdivisions that would lead to the increased traffic that required an upgrade from a two-lane to a four-lane roadway. Its the increased traffic from the subdivisions that leads to the increased noise and the need for a noise-attenuation fence.*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				See attached photos of Town of Milton, Thompson Road. *Christine, Syeda, and the Project Team. We ask that you provide us a noise-attenuation fence and noise-attenuation windows (triple pane designed to reduce noise) for homes that would qualify for mitigation, as part of your East West Roadway Plan. If you are not willing to do so, we will have no other choice but to appeal the plan to the MoE to have a 3rd party project team develop the plan for Waterdown.* **Project Team Response:** The Project Team has considered the Halton Policy on Noise Abatement and has applied it to the understanding of your concerns. The City of Hamilton does not currently have a policy on noise abatement. The project endeavors to address provincial protocols when assessing the requirement for noise mitigation measures. In order to assess the potential noise and pollution impacts of this project, issues have been addressed by undertaking an Air Quality Study and Noise Study to ensure that sensitivity and traffic issues have been addressed. The Noise Study will be sent out later today, and the final studies will be made available when the East West Corridor Class Environmental Assessment Environmental Study Report is filed on Public Record in the summer of 2009. After an thorough examination of The City of Hamilton's Fence Inventory, Plan of Subdivision engineer's drawings, Township of Flamborough and Region of Hamilton Wentworth Subdivision	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				Agreements, and Maintenance records for subdivisions along Parkside Drive, the City of Hamilton has found no evidence that the fencing between Hollybush and Duncan Avenue or between Boulding Avenue and Robson Road along Parkside Drive was installed for the purpose of noise attenuation mitigation. The project partners would not recommend any noise attenuation mitigation for areas that do not warrant it. The owner of X Strathroy Crescent went to the Flamborough Building Department to obtain a permit to put a swimming pool in their backyard. Due to the minimal distances between houses etc. the only way to move equipment into the backyard to install the pool was to construct a temporary access (driveway) from Parkside Drive and remove the fence, install the culvert, etc. The only way into the backyard was for the resident to remove a portion of the fence on Parkside Drive and reinstall it when the construction was complete. This was done by acquiring a Temporary Access Permit (Driveway Permit) issued April 9, 1999, to X Strathroy Crescent, to install a culvert in the ditch (in City of Hamilton road allowance so drainage would not be blocked) on Parkside Drive so the homeowner could bring the heavy machinery into the backyard through the temporary access from Parkside Drive. The owner paid an Inspection Fee to the Region since he was doing the culvert work himself. The Township of Flamborough inspected to make sure the temporary access was installed correctly and also to make sure it was removed when the construction of the pool was	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				complete. The requirement for the Temporary Access Permit does not imply that the fence was owned and maintained by the City. --- Kind regards, Patricia Halajski on behalf of Sally Leppard,	
ID# 350 [redacted] Dec 7, 2008	**Subject:** Fellowes Cres backyards on Parkside Drive requesting sound attenuation fencing prior to fourlane road construction;Request for meeting with neighbours of Fellowes Cres to discuss noise-attenuation fencing request Dear Ms. Benuri, and Ms. Lee-Morrison - Project Manager for the East West Waterdown Roadway. Copy: Ministry of Environment. Here is the information and background of the City of Hamilton's noise-attenuation fence which is on a less travelled part of Parkside Drive near Hollybush Ave. As you know, we brought this to your attention over 1 month ago and as of our meeting with you on Dec 8th, you have not completed a review on the history behind this fence and why Hollybush area of town is entitled to a noise-attenuation fence that you maintain, yet there are still no plans for you to provide one to the residents of Fellowes Cres, who back onto Parkside Drive. As you know, you plan to expand the road behind us to four lanes, to accommodate all the new traffic for the Waterdown North subdivision, and yet we still do not see a noise -attenuation fence, or noise-attenuation triple pane windows in your plans.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information & large list	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Mar 12, 2009 Email --- Mar 12, 2009 Email	Email was acknowledged Dec 5, 2008. Dear[redacted] Thank you for your email inquiries numbered ID# 286, 323, 349, 350, 351, 359 and 365. Since some of your questions and comments are very similar in nature, the responses are also similar. We will be sending you individual responses to each of your inquiries to ensure that you receive complete responses to each communication that has been sent to the Neutral Community Facilitator's Office (NCFO). Kind regards, Patricia Halajski on behalf of Sally Leppard, --- Dear[redacted] Thank you for your email dated December 7, 2008. We have obtained a response to your inquiries from the Project Team, and have provided it in blue below. --- *Here is the information and background of the City of Hamilon's noise-attenuation fence which is on a less*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	We wish to make it clear to you that the history behind the building of the Hollybush fence is not our issue. What we are seeking is fair and equal treatment to that which the residents of Hollybush received when their subdivision was built in 1998. We believe that the fence was built at Hollybush for the correct reasons. It was built to mitigate traffic noise from a 2 lane Parkside Drive, a possible expansion of Parkside Drive, and the future residential development which is planned at 1500 homes. Vehicles from these new homes would be increasing the traffic and the fence would help to mitigate the noise from these vehicles. I have also spoken with a number of residents this week and updated them on the status of your review of noise for residents of Fellowes Cres. A number of them wish to meet with you as a group. Please let us know when you can meet us in Waterdown to further discuss. Lastly, I do not find the council chambers, a proper place to have a meeting and discussion. The screen for slide projection is too far away from participants and was not adequate during my presentation on Monday Nov. 8. I would prefer that we meet at your preferred site where you held the PIC and NAC meetings - St. Thomas Church. If you could please book future meetings with us, in one of their small meeting rooms, I am sure the church would be happy to accommodate us. Regards, [redacted]			*travelled part of Parkside Drive near Hollybush Ave. As you know, we brought this to your attention over 1 month ago and as of our meeting with you on Dec 8th, you have not completed a review on the history behind this fence and why Hollybush area of town is entitled to a noise-attenuation fence that you maintain, yet there are still no plans for you to provide one to the residents of Fellowes Cres, who back onto Parkside Drive. As you know, you plan to expand the road behind us to four lanes, to accommodate all the new traffic for the Waterdown North subdivision, and yet we still do not see a noise -attenuation fence, or noise-attenuation triple pane windows in your plans.* *We wish to make it clear to you that the history behind the building of the Hollybush fence is not our issue. What we are seeking is fair and equal treatment to that which the residents of Hollybush received when their subdivision was built in 1998. We believe that the fence was built at Hollybush for the correct reasons. It was built to mitigate traffic noise from a 2 lane Parkside Drive, a possible expansion of Parkside Drive, and the future residential development which is planned at 1500 homes. Vehicles from these new homes would be increasing the traffic and the fence would help to mitigate the noise from these vehicles.* *I have also spoken with a number of residents this week and updated them on the status of your review of noise for residents of Fellowes Cres. A number of them wish to meet with you as a group. Please let us know when you can meet us in Waterdown to further discuss.*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				Project Team Response: Please contact the facilitator's office once you have reviewed the forthcoming noise report, should you and your neighbours have any questions. *Lastly, I do not find the council chambers, a proper place to have a meeting and discussion. The screen for slide projection is too far away from participants and was not adequate during my presentation on Monday Nov. 8. I would prefer that we meet at your preferred site where you held the PIC and NAC meetings - St. Thomas Church. If you could please book future meetings with us, in one of their small meeting rooms, I am sure the church would be happy to accommodate us.* **Project Team Response:** Regarding your suggestion relating to meeting locations, the City uses their own facilities to reduce the cost to taxpayers. After an thorough examination of The City of Hamilton's Fence Inventory, Plan of Subdivision engineer's drawings, Township of Flamborough and Region of Hamilton Wentworth Subdivision Agreements, and Maintenance records for subdivisions along Parkside Drive, the City of Hamilton has found no evidence that the fencing between Hollybush and Duncan Avenue or between Boulding Avenue and Robson Road along Parkside Drive was installed for the purpose of noise attenuation mitigation. The project partners would not recommend any noise attenuation mitigation for areas that do not warrant it.	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				The City of Hamilton does not currently have a policy on noise abatement. The project endeavors to address provincial protocols when assessing the requirement for noise mitigation measures. In order to assess the potential noise and pollution impacts of this project, issues have been addressed by undertaking an Air Quality Study and Noise Study to ensure that sensitivity and traffic issues have been addressed. The Noise Study will be sent out later today, and the final studies will be made available when the East West Corridor Class Environmental Assessment Environmental Study Report is filed on Public Record in the summer of 2009. The owner of x Strathroy Crescent went to the Flamborough Building Department to obtain a permit to put a swimming pool in their backyard. Due to the minimal distances between houses etc. the only way to move equipment into the backyard to install the pool was to construct a temporary access (driveway) from Parkside Drive and remove the fence, install the culvert, etc. The only way into the backyard was for the resident to remove a portion of the fence on Parkside Drive and reinstall it when the construction was complete. This was done by acquiring a Temporary Access Permit (Driveway Permit) issued April 9, 1999, to x Strathroy Crescent, to install a culvert in the ditch (in City of Hamilton road allowance so drainage would not be blocked) on Parkside Drive so the homeowner could bring the heavy machinery into the backyard through the temporary access from Parkside Drive. The owner paid an Inspection Fee to the Region since he was	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				doing the culvert work himself. The Township of Flamborough inspected to make sure the temporary access was installed correctly and also to make sure it was removed when the construction of the pool was complete. The requirement for the Temporary Access Permit does not imply that the fence was owned and maintained by the City. Kind regards, Patricia Halajski on behalf of Sally Leppard	
ID# 351 [redacted] Dec 9, 2008	**Subject:** Fw: See attached Halton Policy on Noise Abatement; results of policy = noise attenuation fence on Thompson Road Dear WAI, Christine, and Syeda I had sent this out on Sunday evening, but the file pictures sizes were too big. I am resending this to you today. I would also like to repeat my statement from the previous emails that the residents of Fellowes Cres., wish to have a meeting with the City to discuss the issues around their noise modeling study that it feels would not justify a city owned noise attenuation fence to be built like the one in the Town of Milton on Thompson Road. Thanks,[redacted]	Waterdown-Aldershot Information & large list	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Dec 18, 2008 Email	Email was acknowledged Dec 9, 2008. Dear[redacted] Thank you for your emails dated December 7 and 9, 2008. We have obtained a response to your inquiries from the Project Team, and have provided it in blue below. **Project Team Response**: Thank you for your emails dated December 7th and 9th, and the attached pictures and Region of Halton policy relating to the issue/noise abatement. The City of Hamilton abides by provincial protocols when assessing the requirement for noise mitigation measures. In order to assess the noise impacts of this project, Dillon Consulting has drafted a noise report. The report will provide us with the necessary data to consider your concerns. We anticipate the review and completion of the of the report by our staff in January 2009, at which point we will be able	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
			---------- Waterdown-Aldershot Information Mar 12, 2009 Email	to respond to your comments . We appreciate your continued input into this project. --- Best regards, and all the best for a happy holiday. Patricia Halajski née Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard, --- Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email inquiries numbered ID# 286, 323, 349, 350, 351, 359 and 365. Since some of your questions and comments are very similar in nature, the responses are also similar. We will be sending you individual responses to each of your inquiries to ensure that you receive complete responses to each communication that has been sent to the Neutral Community Facilitator's Office (NCFO). Kind regards, Patricia Halajski on behalf of Sally Leppard, --- Dear[redacted] Thank you for your email dated December 9, 2008. We have obtained a response to your inquiries from the Project Team, and have provided it in blue below. --- *I had sent this out on Sunday evening, but the file pictues sizes were too big. I am resending this to you today.* *I would also like to repeat my statement from the*	
			---------- Mar 12, 2009 Email		

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				previous emails that the residents of Fellowes Cres., wish to have a meeting with the City to discuss the issues around their noise modeling study that it feels would not justify a city owned noise attenuation fence to be built like the one in the Town of Milton on Thompson Road. *...* *Dear Ms. Lee-Morrison and Ms. Benuri,* *I have not been able to find a City of Hamilton Policy on noise abatement so I am going to provide this one to you from Halton. If you do have a written policy for the City of Hamilton, can you send it to us?* *I believe this document from Halton explains very well why it built the new noise attenuation fencing on Thompson road adjacent to the yards of the older residential survey. I have sent you the pictures of the homes and this fence in a previous email this evening.* *I wish to believe that the City of Hamilton's policy intent would not be much different.* *Please advise if you have reviewed the City Policy on Noise Abattement and if you have applied it to the analysis of our concern.* **Project Team Response:** The Project Team has considered the Halton Policy on Noise Abatement and has applied it to the understanding of your concerns. The City of Hamilton does not currently have a policy on noise abatement. The project endeavors to	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				address provincial protocols when assessing the requirement for noise mitigation measures. In order to assess the potential noise and pollution impacts of this project, issues have been addressed by undertaking an Air Quality Study and Noise Study to ensure that sensitivity and traffic issues have been addressed. The Noise Study will be sent out later today, and the final studies will be made available when the East West Corridor Class Environmental Assessment Environmental Study Report is filed on Public Record in the summer of 2009. After an thorough examination of The City of Hamilton's Fence Inventory, Plan of Subdivision engineer's drawings, Township of Flamborough and Region of Hamilton Wentworth Subdivision Agreements, and Maintenance records for subdivisions along Parkside Drive, the City of Hamilton has found no evidence that the fencing between Hollybush and Duncan Avenue or between Boulding Avenue and Robson Road along Parkside Drive was installed for the purpose of noise attenuation mitigation. The project partners would not recommend any noise attenuation mitigation for areas that do not warrant it. Kind regards, Patricia Halajski on behalf of Sally Leppard Neutral Community Facilitator's Office	
ID# 352 [redacted] Dec 9, 2008	Hello Marina,Patricia, Liz, Sally I have two email addresses for Christine Morrison that she has used in the past. Can you let us know which is	Waterdown-Aldershot Information & large list	Christine-Lee Morrison, City of Hamilton Dec 9, 2008	[redacted] There was a corporate wide change in format some months ago. My up to date e-mail address is	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	working or preferred? Christine.Lee-Morrison@hamilton.ca cleemorr@hamilton.ca Thanks, [redacted]			Christine.Lee-Morrison@hamilton.ca . Sincerely, Christine Lee-Morrison,	
ID# 359 [redacted] Dec 27, 2008 Email	**From:** [redacted]] **Sent:** December 27, 2008 12:49 PM **To:** Waterdown-Aldershot Information; Christine Lee-Morrison; Sally Leppard **Cc:** [redacted] **Subject:** Follow-up on Parkside Drive-Fellowes Cres Residents request for Noise-Attenuation Fence Dear WAI On Dec 8th 2008, during our meeting with the Project Team, Christine Lee Morrison indicated that she would determine the background on the noise attenuation fence that is owned by the City which exists on Parkside Drive near Hollybush. To date we have not heard why the Town of Flamborough took ownership of this fence, which is now owned by the City of Hamilton. We suspect the fence was built due to results from noise-modeling studies which suggest that the current expected future noise warranted such a fence. We would like to know why the City of Hamilton and the Project Team has not applied similar justification for a fence to be built behind our homes as well with the upcoming roadway expansion. The Project Team continues to maintain that we are	Waterdown-Aldershot Information & large list	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 5, 2009 Email --- Waterdown-Aldershot Information Mar 12, 2009 Email ---	Email was acknowledged Jan 2, 2009. Dear [redacted] The City has not yet completed its inquiries into the matters that you raise in your e-mail dated December 27, 2008. We will provide you with their responses as soon as they become available. Kind regards, Patricia Halajski née Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard --- Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email inquiries numbered ID# 286, 323, 349, 350, 351, 359 and 365. Since some of your questions and comments are very similar in nature, the responses are also similar. We will be sending you individual responses to each of your inquiries to ensure that you receive complete responses to each communication that has been sent to the Neutral Community Facilitator's Office (NCFO). Kind regards, Patricia Halajski on behalf of Sally Leppard,	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	not entitled to a noise-attenuation fence based on noise modeling studies that it has not provided us a report on. In a memo provided to us on Oct 27, 2008, from the Project Team, it justified its position by stating that its noise modeling studies do not justify our claim for a noise attenuation fence. We asked the Project Team to at least provide us its data within 10 days and we have had no response as of it. In a subsequent meeting on Dec 8th with the Project Team, it indicated that it would take it another two weeks to provide us this data. More recently, you have advised us that we will now have to wait until January. May I ask how is it that the Project Team can make statements and claims in its reports without having the data available at that time? How can the Project Team expect us to trust its conclusions when no data is available at the time it makes its conclusions? **How is it that the City and Project Team can deny us our requests for a noise attenuation fence when it has provided this type of barrier in other parts of Waterdown?** In Waterdown, a noise barrier fence exists, that is owned by the City, which exists behind homes on Dundas St. west of Bayview Ave on both the north and southsides of Dundas St. This fence was built even though the homes are much further away from the nearest lane by at least 100 feet. Even though the roads there have speed limits of 60 KM/hour, they are well back from the homes and would not experience the intensity of noise that we do now and will experience in the future. In our situation, reducing		Mar 12, 2009 Email	----------Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email dated December 27, 2008. We have obtained a response to your inquiries from the Project Team, and have provided it in blue below. --- *Dear WAI* *On Dec 8th 2008, during our meeting with the Project Team, Christine Lee Morrison indicated that she would determine the background on the noise attenuation fence that is owned by the City which exists on Parkside Drive near Hollybush. To date we have not heard why the Town of Flamborough took ownership of this fence, which is now owned by the City of Hamilton. We suspect the fence was built due to results from noise-modeling studies which suggest that the current expected future noise warranted such a fence. We would like to know why the City of Hamilton and the Project Team has not applied similar justification for a fence to be built behind our homes as well with the upcoming roadway expansion.* *The Project Team continues to maintain that we are not entitled to a noise-attenuation fence based on noise modeling studies that it has not provided us a report on. In a memo provided to us on Oct 27, 2008, from the Project Team, it justified its position by stating that its noise modeling studies do not justify our claim for a noise attenuation fence. We asked the Project*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	speeds to 50 km/hr on Parkside Dr. would only mitigate the noise, to a level acceptable to us, if we much further back from the planned road. This will not be the case due to the narrow roadway allowance that exists on Parkside Drive. As you know, we are very close to the road, my home will be as close as 57 feet from the nearest lane of the new road. Therefore, noise will be much greater in my rear yard, than a home backing onto Dundas St. even though the speeds are greater. Another example in Waterdown exists on Parkside Drive West at Hollybush where the City owns the noise-attenuation fence that is up to 8 feet high in sections. Why is it that the Town of Flamborough ensured that this fence was built by the developers, and maintained by the town (now the City of Hamilton) and yet the noise levels there are not as severe as will exist, based on traffic studies, on our section of Parkside Drive? No doubt the costs of such fences were born by the developers at no cost to the City. We have also attached photos that have been previously sent to the Project Team. Also included is the Thompson Road fence in Milton in which the Town of Milton built for the homes there when Thompson Road was expanded from a 2 lane to a 4 lane road, even though the nearest lane is more than 46 feet away from the fence - clearly less noise than we will experience on Parkside Drive - even at a reduced speed of 50 km/hour. Please answer these questions as soon as possible.			*Team to at least provide us its data within 10 days and we have had no response as of it. In a subsequent meeting on Dec 8th with the Project Team, it indicated that it would take it another two weeks to provide us this data. More recently, you have advised us that we will now have to wait until January. May I ask how is it that the Project Team can make statements and claims in its reports without having the data available at that time? How can the Project Team expect us to trust its conclusions when no data is available at the time it makes its conclusions?* ***How is it that the City and Project Team can deny us our requests for a noise attenuation fence when it has provided this type of barrier in other parts of Waterdown?*** *In Waterdown, a noise barrier fence exists, that is owned by the City, which exists behind homes on Dundas St. west of Bayview Ave on both the north and southsides of Dundas St. This fence was built even though the homes are much further away from the nearest lane by at least 100 feet. Even though the roads there have speed limits of 60 KM/hour, they are well back from the homes and would not experience the intensity of noise that we do now and will experience in the future. In our situation, reducing speeds to 50 km/hr on Parkside Dr. would only mitigate the noise, to a level acceptable to us, if we much further back from the planned road. This will not be the case due to the narrow roadway allowance that exists on Parkside Drive. As you know, we are very close to the road, my home will be as close as 57 feet from the*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Regards [redacted]			*nearest lane of the new road. Therefore, noise will be much greater in my rear yard, than a home backing onto Dundas St. even though the speeds are greater.* *Another example in Waterdown exists on Parkside Drive West at Hollybush where the City owns the noise-attenuation fence that is up to 8 feet high in sections. Why is it that the Town of Flamborough ensured that this fence was built by the developers, and maintained by the town (now the City of Hamilton) and yet the noise levels there are not as severe as will exist, based on traffic studies, on our section of Parkside Drive?* *No doubt the costs of such fences were born by the developers at no cost to the City.* *We have also attached photos that have been previously sent to the Project Team. Also included is the Thompson Road fence in Milton in which the Town of Milton built for the homes there when Thompson Road was expanded from a 2 lane to a 4 lane road, even though the nearest lane is more than 46 feet away from the fence - clearly less noise than we will experience on Parkside Drive - even at a reduced speed of 50 km/hour.* *Please answer these questions as soon as possible.* **Project Team Response**: The Project Team has considered the Halton Policy on Noise Abatement and has applied it to the understanding of your concerns. The City of Hamilton does not currently have a policy on noise abatement. The project endeavours to	

	Follow-up
protocols when assessing the ise mitigation measures. In order to al noise and pollution impacts of this e been addressed by undertaking y and Noise Study to ensure that ic issues have been addressed. The sent out later today, and the final de available when the East West ronmental Assessment Environmental d on Public Record in the summer of	
examination of The City of nventory, Plan of Subdivision gs, Township of Flamborough and n Wentworth Subdivision Maintenance records for subdivisions /e, the City of Hamilton has found no fencing between Hollybush and r between Boulding Avenue and g Parkside Drive was installed for the ttenuation mitigation. The project recommend any noise attenuation s that do not warrant it.	
athroy Crescent went to the ding Department to obtain a permit pool in their backyard. Due to the between houses etc. the only way nt into the backyard to install the uct a temporary access (driveway) e and remove the fence, install the nly way into the backyard was for	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Dundas Street Option. All of the Project Teams replies have been to simply try and justify and reinforce their premature recommendations. This leads us to believe that either: - the Project Team did a poor job in the evaluation of possible options or - the Project Team already had their mind made up to pick option 4 (a new northern route) and wrote their study around that recommendation. Over the past 3 years of this study, we have uncovered and advised the Project team of a multitude of other issues including mistakes and mis-leading information in their study. For example: - Mis-leading the public and councillors about the Ministry of Transportation closing Parkside Drive at highway 6 - The Project Team not taking the Dufferin Quarry expansion and truck traffic requirements into consideration in their report - The ignoring of the MOE requirements against Barnes Environmental (now called Opta Mineral) - Refusing to advise the public if any of the options were going to be a truck route - Ignoring the inclusion of Hamilton Conservation Authority in the Phase 2 study (only after there recommendations were published, were HCA consulted) - Costing errors in their report - Unbalanced and unrepresentative SAC committee - ... It is obvious that there are major problems with the			*have been to simply try and justify and reinforce their premature recommendations. This leads us to believe that either:* *- the Project Team did a poor job in the evaluation of possible options or* *- the Project Team already had their mind made up to pick option 4 (a new northern route) and wrote their study around that recommendation.* **Project Team Response:** We have addressed this question and a very detailed response to your proposal for the widening of Dundas Street has been previously sent (ID# 119). Notwithstanding, your 4 lane widening option does not solve the capacity problem, it would result in large bottleneck impacts through the core of Waterdown. In the fall of 2005 we advised you of this and explained the following: "The proposal for the modified 4 lane widening along Dundas Street corridor suggested would have resulted in major property/business/social effects to the downtown core of Waterdown. The suggested option of using the existing road bed and consideration of providing four lanes along Dundas Street in downtown Waterdown would not work. Widening the road through the removal of parking lanes and prohibiting left turning movements during the peak periods would not accommodate the increased demand by 2021. Previous responses and the letter from Gerry Davis (November 18th 2009) address the discrepancy between your opinion and that of City of Hamilton staff and consultants". *Over the past 3 years of this study, we have uncovered*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	whole study. While the Project Team has advised us many times that the study has been Peer Reviewed by Hamilton, Burlington and Halton, we must reply that review was simply performed by the Project Team members from those municipalities. (These same municipalities hired the Consultant to do all the detailed work, not their staff). The only true Peer Review of this study would be if it was performed through another outside Consultant or agency. We have requested the City of Hamilton and Burlington Councillors to have a true peer review of their study before it goes to the MOE for approval. However, due to politics, we already know that any other outside Consultant agency that reviews this study and makes any possible negative comments to it, may not be look upon favourable by any of the Municipalities for future Consulting. We need an unbiased review which can only be performed by the MOE. We ask once again to the Project Team: Will you elevate this Schedule C Project to an individual environmental assessment as part of a Part II order? If once again the Project Team refuses to consider bumping up this project, we ask that they attempt to answer the following questions: 1) Because a 4 lane Option for the Downtown core did not appear to solve the problem, why did the Project Team simply not consider a wider corridor? 2) Because a 4 lane Option for the Downtown core did not appear to solve the problem, why did the Project Team still use it as a solution in their Option 3?:			*and advised the Project team of a multitude of other issues including mistakes and mis-leading information in their study. For example:* *- Mis-leading the public and councillors about the Ministry of Transportation closing Parkside Drive at highway 6* **Project Team Response:** Responses are included in ID# 204 (sent February 6, 2009), and the memo sent out by the Neutral Community Facilitator's Office (NCFO) on May 26, 2008 entitled "Review of MTO Highway 6 / Parkside Drive Issue". *- The Project Team not taking the Dufferin Quarry expansion and truck traffic requirements into consideration in their report* **Project Team Response:** Responses are included in ID#s 9 and 13 (addressed to [redacted]), and ID# 133 (addressed to [redacted]). The most recent response is included in ID# 123 (addressed to [redacted] on February 25, 2009). *- The ignoring of the MOE requirements against Barnes Environmental (now called Opta Mineral)* **Project Team Response:** Responses are included in ID#s 9, 13 and 107 (addressed to [redacted], and ID#s 81 and 133 (addressed to [redacted]. The most recent response is included in ID# 123 (addressed to [redacted] on February 25, 2009). *- Refusing to advise the public if any of the options*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Thank you. [redacted]			*were going to be a truck route* **Project Team Response:** An update regarding the City of Hamilton's Truck Route Master Transportation Plan was provided at the East-West NAC Meeting on October 28, 2008. *- Ignoring the inclusion of Hamilton Conservation Authority in the Phase 2 study (only after there recommendations were published, were HCA consulted)* **Project Team Response:** Responses to this concern were sent to [redacted] on the following dates: November 1st, 2005; February 13th, 2006; June 29th, 2006; October 5, 2006; October 13, 2006; and November 9, 2006. *- Costing errors in their report* **Project Team Response:** Response is included in ID# 82 (sent on February 6, 2009). *- Unbalanced and unrepresentative SAC committee* **Project Team Response:** Response is included in ID# 9, sent to [redacted] on February 8, 2008. *It is obvious that there are major problems with the whole study. While the Project Team has advised us many times that the study has been Peer Reviewed by Hamilton, Burlington and Halton, we must reply that review was simply performed by the Project Team*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				members from those municipalities. (These same municipalities hired the Consultant to do all the detailed work, not their staff). The only true Peer Review of this study would be if it was performed through another outside Consultant or agency. We have requested the City of Hamilton and Burlington Councillors to have a true peer review of their study before it goes to the MOE for approval. However, due to politics, we already know that any other outside Consultant agency that reviews this study and makes any possible negative comments to it, may not be look upon favourable by any of the Municipalities for future Consulting. We need an unbiased review which can only be performed by the MOE. *We ask once again to the Project Team: Will you elevate this Schedule C Project to an individual environmental assessment as part of a Part II order?* **Project Team Response:** Please see response to ID#204. "We refer you to correspondence to yourself from Sarah Paul at the Ontario Ministry of the Environment dated March 31, 2008. Ms. Paul states 'the Master Plan is prepared in accordance with Approach #2 of the Master Plan provisions of the Class EA…There are no Part II Order provisions for Master Plans. You, however, have the opportunity to make a written submission to the Minister asking that an individual Environmental Assessment be prepared for any proposed project which is planned under the Master Plan.' The Project Team is pursuing the Schedule C EA	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				process. When the Project Partners file a Notice of Completion there will be a 30 day comment period at which point you may make a written submission to the Minister of Environment asking that an individual Environmental Assessment be prepared for the proposed projects. The Project Partners are following the Schedule C Class EA process, and do not intend to elevate the work to an individual EA." *If once again the Project Team refuses to consider bumping up this project, we ask that they attempt to answer the following questions:* *1) Because a 4 lane Option for the Downtown core did not appear to solve the problem, why did the Project Team simply not consider a wider corridor?* *2) Because a 4 lane Option for the Downtown core did not appear to solve the problem, why did the Project Team still use it as a solution in their Option 3?:* **Neutral Community Facilitator's Response:** Please see response above. *Thank you.* Kind regards, Patricia Halajski on behalf of Sally Leppard, Neutral Community Facilitator's Office 36 Hunter Street East, 6th Floor Hamilton, ON L8N 3W8 Tel. (905) 818-8464 Fax (905) 528-4179 Email: info@waterdown-aldershot.ca	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
ID# 212 [redacted] Sep 25, 2008 Email	**Subject:** Re: East-West NAC Meeting #5 - Rescheduled To the Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Study Project Team **Comments to the June 24 PIC meeting minutes:** The minutes of the June 24th meeting regarding NS2 /NS3 do not reflect the discussions we raised at that meeting, nor the information that was communicated back to the Project Team after the meeting. Attached is the email that was sent to the Project Team communicating the following point to the Project Team about their presentation: *In the June 24th PIC meeting, which is suppose to be used to gather the public input, the detailed large scaled maps of the area clearly showed the Project Teams preferred D-F South road alignment, by drawing an actual scaled and coloured roadway of D-F South along the map. The two other possible alternatives (D-F Middle and D-F North) were drawn as single thin black lines with a small printed statement beside them stating:* ***"Alignment options to be assessed based on additional environmental and geotechnical information'.*** *It did not say to the public: "'We want your opinions on these alternative". It clearly stated that the final alignment would be based on information* ***not*** *from the public.* *At the meeting this point was advised to Lura consulting. Lura advised that the one comment board (on the floor under the detailed map) about the Centre Road crossing did refer to 4 options. We pointed out that the detailed map did not show or*	Waterdown-Aldershot Information & Large list	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 6, 2009 Email	Email was acknowledged Sep 25, 2008. **ID# 212 Response** **Facilitator's Office Response:** We have amended the draft summary report for the East-West Road Class EA Phase 3 and 4 Public Information Centre dated June 24, 2008. However, please be advised that we cannot amend the summary report to reflect discussions that were not held at the time of the meeting. Further to our email (ID# 156 dated June 25, 2008) the Project Team presented the results of their evaluation of the four options to the NAC participants and members of the public at the October and November NAC/PIC meetings. The map illustrating the four alignment options can be found on the project website under the November 5, 2008 East-West Public Information Centre (PIC) display panels.	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	refer to a 4th option. (Anyone could assume this was a printing error on the comment board.) The map presented at the PIC meeting can be found at: http://www.myhamilton.ca/NR/rdonlyres/5D3CC036-F1D6-4A29-9232-18919C002DC0/0/WaterdownEWRoadN3r1.pdf The same attached email has a reply back from the Project team stating: *Relating to section N-3 of the proposed roadway alignment - the project team is in the process of evaluating four potential alignments, the fourth alignment was identified at the NAC EW meeting on June 12, 2008. In light of the fact that the option was identified less than two weeks ago, the project team has advised that it is not yet in a position to provide information on the alternatives including the fourth option, since further data must be collected (including geo-technical and environmental conditions - as discussed at the NAC meeting). Once this data is collected the project team and the NAC participants/members of the public will be in a position to contribute to the evaluation of all four options. The opportunity for this discussion will be in September at the next NAC meetings and public information centres. These process steps were discussed with you last night.* *In light of your concerns that the fourth option was not identified on the map and the public wasn't explicitly consulted on it, we have been advised that Dillon*				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Consulting will prepare the drawing for this section of the roadway that identifies all four options. This map, along with the evaluation and data collection process will be posted on the web site, and we will advise you of the timing of this when it occurs. As mentioned previously, consultation will occur on the evaluation and this section of the roadway in September. The only comment about this discussion that Lura has stated in the June 24th PIC minutes presented was: *"Concern expressed that the public did not have adequate incentive to comment on the northernmost N3 alternative, since it was not drawn on the map, and there was only one comment about the four options being evaluated."* This important information, that was discussed with the Project Team at the PIC and followed up on with emails to the Project Team **WAS NOT INCLUDED nor reflected in the minutes of your PIC meeting.** We would ask that the Minutes be updated to properly reflect this information and the Project Team follow through on what they advised they will do. Thank you. [redacted]				
ID# 218 [redacted] October 14, 2008 Email	To: The Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Project Team **Please explain who the Project Team is lying to: The general public - or - the Neighbourhood Advisory Committee?**	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Oct 17, 2008 Email	Dear [redacted] Thank you for your e-mail. We are contacting the project team today regarding your concerns. Regards,	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	In the June 12th East-West NAC (Neighbourhood Advisory Committee) meeting, the Project Team was asked by the NAC E-W members to review an Option 4 in the N2-N3 section of the Proposed East West road, where it crosses Centre Road (above Northlawn Ave.) The Project Team agreed to do this. In the June 24th PIC (Public Information Centre) Presentations, the Project Team presented the public their option 1, 2 and 3 in the N2-N3 Section of the road, with a "mention" of an option 4 (as indicated on a sign on the floor under their map.) The fact that the Project Team did not clearly present the Option 4 to the public as they said they would to the NAC, was made very clear to the Project Team in our email to them of June 25th. The Project Team then replied back to our email on the same day, June 25th, clearly stating that they are reviewing an Option 4 and will be presenting all 4 options in their next meeting to both the NAC and the Public. The following is the exact reply from the Project Team's June 25th reply to us about considering Option 4: *Relating to section N-3 of the proposed roadway alignment - the project team is in the process of evaluating four potential alignments, the fourth alignment was identified at the NAC EW meeting on June 12, 2008. In light of the fact that the option was identified less than two weeks ago, the project team has advised that it is not yet in a position to provide information on the alternatives including the fourth option, since further data must be collected (including geo-technical and environmental*			Sally M. Leppard --- Dear [redacted] Further to your e-mail dated October 13, 2008 (ID #218), we have clarified the situation with the Project Team relating to the determination of the alignment on the N2-N3 section of the roadway. The Project Team has advised as follows: Based on input from the EW-NAC on June 12, 2008, we agreed to explore a more northerly alignment of the roadway. The potential for a more northerly alignment was noted at the PIC on June 24, 2008. We agreed with you after that meeting that we would prepare a new map showing the potential for a more northerly alignment. During June, we also received the Hunter Park Survey community's evaluation of each potential alignment. We also noted that there was further work to be conducted to clarify the feasibility of a more northerly alignment. The Project Team is completing the routing of a 4th (more northern) alignment and its evaluation of the four possible alternative routes within this block at the current time. We will be in a position to discuss these results with the NAC and the public at the October/November meetings. Please be advised that as the specific routing of the alternatives (for evaluation) were dependent upon the results of biological and geo-	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	conditions - as discussed at the NAC meeting). Once this data is collected the project team and the NAC participants/members of the public will be in a position to contribute to the evaluation of all four options. The opportunity for this discussion will be in September at the next NAC meetings and public information centres. These process steps were discussed with you last night. *In light of your concerns that the fourth option was not identified on the map and the public wasn't explicitly consulted on it, we have been advised that Dillon Consulting will prepare the drawing for this section of the roadway that identifies all four options. This map, along with the evaluation and data collection process will be posted on the web site, and we will advise you of the timing of this when it occurs. As mentioned previously, consultation will occur on the evaluation and this section of the roadway in September.* Below is an email from a neighbour on Northlawn Ave (Mrs. Marchiori), who asked the Project Team on June 13th: *"What is the approximate distance from Northlawn Avenue to new east-west route?* Although it took the Project Team almost 4 MONTHS (June 13th to Oct 9th) to reply back to Mrs. Marchiori, their answer clearly only refers to 3 options, which were the first 3 options presented to the NAC in the June 12th meeting. It is clear that the Project Team is only giving "Lip Service" to either the NAC or the General public.			technical investigations, we have adjusted the alternative routes from what was originally presented. Please be assured that we are considering the input from the NAC and the Hunter Park Survey community, as per our commitment in June. [redacted], the NCFO will correct the Project Team's response to Ms. Marchiori. Regards, Sally M. Leppard	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Therefore we ask again: **Please explain who the Project Team is lying to: The general public or the Neighbourhood Advisory Committee?** Thank You [redacted] Waterdown. ----- Original Message ----- **From:** Waterdown-Aldershot Information **Sent:** Thursday, October 09, 2008 11:37 AM **Subject:** ID# 139 - East-West Road Inquiry Dear [redacted] Thank you for your phone call dated June 13, 2008. We have obtained responses from the Project Team to your inquiry, and have provided it below. The Project Team has responded to your inquiry in blue. What is the approximate distance from Northlawn Avenue to new east-west route? **Response**: Three options for the mid block alignments are being considered: an option to the north (290m away from Northlawn Ave.); an option in the middle (190m away from Northlawn Ave.); and an option to the south (100m away from Northlawn Ave.). The recommended option is to be presented at the upcoming Public Information Centre in early November. Regards,				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Patricia Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard,				
ID# 221 [redacted] Oct 16, 2008 Email	1) **To:** The Project Team of the Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Plan Project. Lura Consulting was hired by the Project Team to ensure all questions from the public were properly documented and replied to by the Project Team with 10 working days. The following is a partial list of outstanding questions still not answered by the Lura / the Project Team: (The numbers were assigned by Lura) # 75 (Cost savings) dated Mar 30th, acknowledged by Lura on April 1st - No reply # 82 MTO Correspondence questioned Mar 13th, Review Report prepared by Lura on May 26th. The report has been questioned on Sept 5th and renumbered to #204 # 85 dated April 3, acknowledged by Lura on May 9th - Still Outstanding - not all Agency Correspondence has been posted on the Web site as the Project Team said the would. # 118 dated May 18th, acknowledged by Lura and answered on Aug 18th, requestioned on Sept 1 - No Reply # 119 dated May 12th, acknowledged by Lura and answered on Aug 18th, requestioned on Sept 2 - Renumbered to #205 - No Reply # 146 dated June 16th, acknowledged by Lura on June 18th - No Reply # 156 dated June 25th, acknowledged by Lura on June 25th - No Reply but advised to wait till next NAC	Waterdown Aldershot Information	Waterdown Aldershot Information Sally Leppard Oct 27, 2008 Email with letter attached	*Letter from NAC Oct 08 (see ID# 241, Response in RB-Section)*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	meetings. # 199 dated Aug 15th, acknowledged by Lura on Aug 15th - No Reply # 204 dated Sept 5th, acknowledged by Lura on Sept 5th - No Reply # 205 dated Sept 2nd, acknowledged by Lura on Sept 10th - No Reply # 212 dated Sept 25th, acknowledged by Lura on Sept 25th - No Reply # 218 dated Oct 13th, acknowledged by Lura on Oct 14th - No Reply Either Lura Consulting is not doing its job ensuring the Publics questions are being fully answered **or** The Consultants Dillon have been instructed not to answer the questions **or** The Hamilton City Project Team Project has decided not to provide answers back to Lura. **or** The Project Team is simply playing a game and intends to answer all the outstanding questions over the past 6 months, maybe 1 week before the next meeting with the Hamilton or Burlington City Councillors to approve the project. In Feb. 20th, 2006 at the Hamilton Public Works Sub-Committee meeting, the Hamilton Councillors and Mayor were advised by the Public that the Project Team was taking up to 5 months to answer the Public's questions and those scarce answers only came back 1 week prior to the Publics Works Sub-committee				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	meeting. This left minimal time for the Public to understand the replies or verify or challenge them. The Hamilton Mayor and Councillors specifically told the Project Team to improve their timeliness and answer all of the Publics questions within 6 weeks at the maximum. It is obvious that the Project Team is following their instructions. While the Project Team may simply try to deflect the above statement by saying that some of the questions presented to them were very detailed and required a lot of special work, that answer only goes to prove that the Project Team did not properly do their homework / research of their data before they presented their results and recommendations to the Public. A properly researched EA study should have had almost immediate answers to all of the questions asked. So once again we ask the Project Team - When will they being replying to all of our outstanding questions and concerns? 2) To The Hamilton City Councillors: This Process of having to deal through a mediator clearly indicates the reluctance of the City Staff to have to deal with the public. It appears the City Staff are simply shielding themselves. This makes the whole communication process a farce. The City Staff gets to choose and pick when they feel like to answer any questions from the residents of Waterdown. Hamilton Councillors should review this process because it is simply allowing their staff to run wild and				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	do what ever they want with total disregard for the publics input. All the current method does is allow Lura to "document" the process to meet the "intent" of the EA process. This is not a community process.				
ID# 232 [redacted] Oct 21, 2008 Email	Sally: In the June 17th meeting in Flamborough on the City of Hamilton's Truck Route Master Transportation Plan, the residents asked the Project Team of the Truck Route Master Plan to advise the public as soon as possible if they plan to make the Proposed new East-West Road of the Waterdown-Aldershot Master Transportation Plan Proposal, a Truck Route. The Project Team said they will look into it and advise the Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Plan Project Team by September if they are proposing that the East West Road become a truck route. Since Lura Consulting is a mediator of both Projects, we ask that you update the NAC and Public of the Truck Route designation, either prior to or at the up coming NAC and PIC meetings. Please advise that you have followed up with the Hamilton's Truck Route Master Transportation Plan Project Team to ensure they have updated the Waterdown-Aldershot Master Transportation Plan Project Team, and that this information will be made public at the up coming meetings. Thank you.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Oct 28, 2008 In person	*NCFO provided an update at East-West NAC meeting on October 28, 2008.*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	[redacted] Waterdown				
ID# 241 [redacted] Oct 23, 2008 Email	Sally: Although Lura Consulting may have the best of intentions to ask us to attend a pre-meeting (as you have asked in the attached email), the meaning of the meeting is obvious - To allow the Project Team to present us their final recommendations and their justifications for those recommendations, **without regard or consideration for our detailed input or review.** Lets review the facts: - The Project Team said they would meet with Steve Oliver and Al Seferiades right after the June 11th NAC meeting, to review the Option 5 route and listen to their input.. - The Project Team is now setting that meeting up 1 hour before the next NAC meeting. - The Project Team based their Option 4 recommendation over the resident's Option 5 recommendation, on an Option 5 route that passes through Opta Minerals. - The resident's Option 5 recommendation (since 2005) never went through Opta Minerals. - After the June 11th NAC meeting, the NAC requested the Project Team to review 4 options for the E-W Road, as it crosses Centre Road, and present those 4 options at the June 23rd PIC meeting for the public input.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Oct 27, 2008 Email	Dear NAC Members: **Re: Waterdown-Aldershot Transportation Master Plan – Class Environmental Assessments** Over the past few months, and in particular, in the last week, there has been a number of concerns expressed by some concerned residents about the integrity of the consultation process for this project. Some of those concerns include: • Input from the public is not being considered in this process; • Option 5 (E-W) alternatives have been assessed without the benefit of discussions with and knowledge from local residents; • The Project Team's Option 5 alternative (through Opta Minerals property) was never recommended by residents; • The outcome of the assessment of alternative alignments (considered in Phase 3) is pre-determined; • There is not enough time for public input and the process should slow down; • Long delays from the project team in providing some responses; and, • Requesting the Project Partners to conduct a peer review and/or an individual **Environmental Assessment.** As the Neutral Community Facilitator for this project, I am writing to address some of these concerns and to outline the process for public input in the future.	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	- They didn't. - The NAC requested at the same June 11th meeting to have the Project Team review the 4 options that cross Centre Road and present them with the evaluation information to both the NAC and the Public to get their input, **prior to making a recommendation.** - The Project Team is now allowing 3 people to see the results of the 4 Options crossing Centre Road, 1 hour before the NAC meeting. **Obviously the Project Team is not interested in the NAC's or Publics comments other than to "record them for the record" so they can simply push their recommendations through.** I am sorry, but I have no intention of attending a pre-meeting called at the last minute to satisfy the "record" of meeting with the "concerned" residents. I would suggest the Project Team and City of Hamilton Staff stop making a joke of the local public input to this EA process and listen to what we asked them at our first NAC meeting: Slow the process down and take the time to listen and understand our local input. **We deserve to be treated with respect.** [redacted] Waterdown [redacted]			In Phase 3, input has been obtained through a number of forums: the Neighbourhood Advisory Committees, the Public Information Centres, consultation with government review agencies, and correspondence with members of the community. During Phases 2 and 3 of this project, members of the public have suggested a number of alternatives that have been considered by the Project Team. These include: • A number of alternative alignments and connections for sections of the North-South and East-West routes (including four alternatives at the E-W route's Centre Road Crossing and an "option 5" alternative for the Parkside Drive connection. These alternatives have generally been identified to assist in minimizing the impact on the community, the environment and the economy of the proposed roadways; • Traffic calming/control measures; • Traffic flow measures; • Crossings for the Bruce Trail and pedestrians; and, • Bicycle and transit opportunities. In June of this year, the Project Team received further variations to consider. This input has generated additional fieldwork and assessments that has informed the evaluation process. Government review agencies have also been requested for their comments on the variations. Dillon Consulting has recently completed their evaluation of these alternatives, and made recommendations to the Project Partners last week. The results of the evaluations will be	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				presented at the NAC meetings to be held this week, and at the PICs next week for further discussion with the community. In addition, the Project Team wishes to consult with NAC members and members of the public on roadway design features and impact mitigation measures at these upcoming meetings. The Class Environmental Assessment process undertaken by the Project Partners will be completed with the preparation and filing of two Environmental Study Reports (ESRs) (one for each project) on Public Record in spring 2009 subject to approvals from various Councils. The Project Partners are committed to completing these ESRs on time. As you know, once the ESRs are completed, they will be placed on public record for 30 calendar days in accordance with the Municipal Class EA. If concerns arise, which cannot be resolved in discussion with the City, a person or party may request that the Minister of the Environment make an order for the project to comply with Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act (referred to as a Part II order), which addresses individual environmental assessments. Requests must be received by the Minister of the Environment within the 30-day public review period. The Minister may make one of the following decisions: • Deny the request • Refer the matter to mediation • Require the City to comply with Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act by undertaking one of the following: □ Submitting the Project File Report for government review and approval; or,	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
			---------- Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 6, 2009 Email	□ Completing an individual Environmental Assessment for government review and approval; or, □ Preparing Terms of Reference governing the preparation of an individual Environmental Assessment. Subject to comments received, the Project Partners will proceed with the implementation of the recommendations included in the Environmental Study Reports. Input from the public has been fully documented and considered by the Project Team. Changes to the original routing proposals have been made as a result of this input. Delays in responding to some enquiries and questions have been experienced due to the fact that the process for refining the alignments and assessing design alternatives was underway. Responses can only be generated once the results are known. Please be assured that responses to all of your enquiries will be provided. The Project Team has asked that I reiterate their assurance to you that they have, and will continue to consider all of your input. I hope this serves to clarify the consultation process. Sincerely, Sally M. Leppard Neutral Community Facilitator --- **ID# 241** --- Sally:	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				Although Lura Consulting may have the best of intentions to ask us to attend a pre-meeting (as you have asked in the attached email), the meaning of the meeting is obvious - To allow the Project Team to present us their final recommendations and their justifications for those recommendations, **without regard or consideration for our detailed input or review.** Lets review the facts: - The Project Team said they would meet with Steve Oliver and Al Seferiades right after the June 11th NAC meeting, to review the Option 5 route and listen to their input.. - The Project Team is now setting that meeting up 1 hour before the next NAC meeting. - The Project Team based their Option 4 recommendation over the resident's Option 5 recommendation, on an Option 5 route that passes through Opta Minerals. - The resident's Option 5 recommendation (since 2005) never went through Opta Minerals. - After the June 11th NAC meeting, the NAC requested the Project Team to review 4 options for the E-W Road, as it crosses Centre Road, and present those 4 options at the June 23rd PIC meeting for the public input. - They didn't. - The NAC requested at the same June 11th meeting to have the Project Team review the 4 options that cross	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				Centre Road and present them with the evaluation information to both the NAC and the Public to get their input, **prior to making a recommendation.** - The Project Team is now allowing 3 people to see the results of the 4 Options crossing Centre Road, 1 hour before the NAC meeting. **Obviously the Project Team is not interested in the NAC's or Publics comments other than to "record them for the record" so they can simply push their recommendations through.** I am sorry, but I have no intention of attending a pre-meeting called at the last minute to satisfy the "record" of meeting with the "concerned" residents. I would suggest the Project Team and City of Hamilton Staff stop making a joke of the local public input to this EA process and listen to what we asked them at our first NAC meeting: Slow the process down and take the time to listen and understand our local input. **We deserve to be treated with respect.** **Facilitator's Office Response:** 1) We appreciate your concern regarding the short notice for a meeting before the NAC meeting of October 28, 2008. As we pointed out to you and Mr. Oliver the Project Partners had only recently considered the results of the evaluation, and as noted in my memo to the NAC members dated October 27, 2008.	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				2) Regarding the Project Team's Option 5 and the resident's recommended Option 5, Lura has been requested to provide a concise summary of the issue and will document the chronology of the proponent's Option 5 and the resident's Option 5. 3) Regarding public input on the four options please refer to the response to ID#212. Due to the extent of public, stakeholder and Agency input on the East-West and North-South route which requires the Project Team to consider carefully the advice and meet with participants the completion of the ESR is now expected to go to Council in Spring 2009	
ID# 252 [redacted] Oct 27, 2008 Email	To the Project Team of the Hamilton Waterdown Master Transportation Plan: I have read the reply you have sent to [redacted] and I must address the inaccuracies in your reply: 1) The Parkside resident asked the Project Team in late 2005 to start reviewing Option 5. Only since we found discrediting information on the Project Team's option 4 vs the residents Option 5 in Late 2007, did the Project Team even start reviewing Option 5. It is obvious they are simply now in the process to "cover their tracks" like they have been doing with all the other errors and misleading information we have advised them about for the past 3 years. (In Jan 2008 the Christine Lee Morison of the Project Team stated that they do not look at any old information presented to them by the public, they are only looking at any new information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 6, 2009 Email	Email was acknowledged Oct 30, 2008. **ID# 252** Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email dated October 27, 2008. We have obtained responses from the Project Team to your inquiries, and have inserted them in your email below. The Project Team has responded to your email in blue. --- **Subject:** ID# 252 - RE: Response from [redacted] Re: Requests for information that was not included in Appendix D of final report. *To the Project Team of the Hamilton Waterdown*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	presented to them. Maybe if the Project Team ever paid attention to what the public was telling them from day one, the report could have been finished 2 years ago and on budget!) 2) **Thank you for finally admitting, 10 months after we advised you of them, that you had mathematical calculation errors in your "Pier reviewed" Justification Tables.** The Project Team is correct is saying that the "rounding" they did, really did not make a difference to the numbers. However, there is no excuse for the errors in any of the formulas. We clearly advise the Project Team (10 months ago) that after their errors are fixed, the final results of the Justification table still indicated the Project Team's Option 4 had a lower number, indicating it would be the preferred route. However, the difference between the Project Teams Option 4 and the Residents Option 5 were within 6.5% of each other. Therefore we made the following points to the Project Team: - The Option 5 results, which was an alternative suggested by "untrained" residents, initially indicated it was a close second to the recommended Option 4. We suggested that if the Project Team would have started working with the residents back in 2005, they may have been able to improve the residents Option 5 and make it even better. - By comparing the 3 options with the lowest totals, which were all the Northern Routes, it clearly indicated that the Option 5 was better than the recommended Option 4 route. Even Option 1 (the all northern route)			*Master Transportation Plan:* *I have read the reply you have sent to Steve Oliver and I must address the inaccuracies in your reply:* *1) The Parkside resident asked the Project Team in late 2005 to start reviewing Option 5. Only since we found discrediting information on the Project Team's option 4 vs the residents Option 5 in Late 2007, did the Project Team even start reviewing Option 5. It is obvious they are simply now in the process to "cover their tracks" like they have been doing with all the other errors and misleading information we have advised them about for the past 3 years. (In Jan 2008 the Christine Lee Morison of the Project Team stated that they do not look at any old information presented to them by the public, they are only looking at any new information presented to them. Maybe if the Project Team ever paid attention to what the public was telling them from day one, the report could have been finished 2 years ago and on budget!)* **Project Team Response**: Option 5 (representing an alternate route between the previously identified Option 1 and Option 4) was reviewed as part of the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) and has been documented in the TMP Report. The Project Team also agreed to review this evaluation as part of the Phase 3 Class EA process which we have done. This has been done at a higher level of detail than undertaken in the TMP study, in effect, replacing the Option 4 vs. 5 work that was undertaken in Phase 2. During Phase 3, we have considered two alternative Options (within the	

<table>
<tr><th>Correspondent</th><th>Issue/Concern</th><th>To</th><th>Responder</th><th>Response</th><th>Follow-up</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>
was better than the recommended Option 4. (See table below.)

- By comparing the two Options 4 and 5 against each other, Option 5 produced lower numbers indicating it is a better alternative than Option 4. (See table below.)

- These are only some errors we noticed on the East West Route of the Justification Tables. Precedence would indicate that similar errors and poor judgment of evaluations would also exist in the evaluation of the North-South Justification tables.

Below are the numbers from the corrected Justification Tables indicating Option 5 as the best when compared to the other Northern Options 1 and 4.
<table>
<tr><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>Corrected Option 1 All Northern Route</th><th>Corrected Option 4 Northern Hybrid Route</th></tr>
<tr><td>Natural Environment Total</td><td></td><td></td><td>12.23</td><td>6.02</td></tr>
<tr><td>Social Environment</td><td></td><td></td><td>8.11</td><td>15.54</td></tr>
<tr><td>Economic Environment Total</td><td></td><td></td><td>4.06</td><td>3.83</td></tr>
<tr><td>Costs</td><td></td><td></td><td>2.98</td><td>3.49</td></tr>
<tr><td>Transportation Service</td><td></td><td></td><td>2.65</td><td>5.68</td></tr>
</table>
</td><td></td><td></td><td>
Option 5 opportunity – one the Opta Minerals option – provided by the Project Partners, and the second, the "Saw Tooth" option, provided by the residents). We also considered variations on four options for the portion of the roadway that crosses Centre Road. All information that has been considered by the project team has been available for comment by the pubic and agencies.

2) Thank you for finally admitting, 10 months after we advised you of them, that you had mathematical calculation errors in your "Pier reviewed" Justification Tables. The Project Team is correct is saying that the "rounding" they did, really did not make a difference to the numbers. However, there is no excuse for the errors in any of the formulas. We clearly advise the Project Team (10 months ago) that after their errors are fixed, the final results of the Justification table still indicated the Project Team's Option 4 had a lower number, indicating it would be the preferred route. However, the difference between the Project Teams Option 4 and the Residents Option 5 were within 6.5% of each other.

Project Team Response: We have previously provided comments on this issue, and most recently in our e-mail response to [redacted] (ID# 246) and issues that you raised in your April 3, 2008 email. We have also discussed this with you at meetings held with the Parkside Residents Association. We have no further comments to make. Reference to the input from residents in the Hunter Park Survey's comments, and your individual comments, regarding data errors and
</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>Correspondent</th><th>Issue/Concern</th><th>To</th><th>Responder</th><th>Response</th><th>Follow-up</th></tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>
<table>
<tr><td>TOTAL</td><td>30.03</td><td>34.56</td></tr>
</table>

Below are the numbers from the corrected Justification Tables indicating Option 5 as the best when compared to the Project Team's Options 4.
<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Corrected Option 4 Northern Hybrid Route</td><td>Corrected Option 5 New Northern Route</td></tr>
<tr><td>Natural Environment Total</td><td></td><td></td><td>11.13</td><td>15.86</td></tr>
<tr><td>Social Environment</td><td></td><td></td><td>20.14</td><td>10.85</td></tr>
<tr><td>Economic Environment Total</td><td></td><td></td><td>5.69</td><td>7.3</td></tr>
<tr><td>Costs</td><td></td><td></td><td>4.98</td><td>5.01</td></tr>
<tr><td>Transportation Service</td><td></td><td></td><td>7.01</td><td>3.98</td></tr>
<tr><td>TOTAL</td><td></td><td></td><td>48.95</td><td>43</td></tr>
</table>

3) The Project Teams statement of: We further note that when differences among options are minimal, reducing the number of options being evaluated at any one time, can also produce a different preference ranking order for the remaining options. So the Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>validity tests will be included in the Environmental Study Report (ESR) which is expected to be released in Spring 2009.

Therefore we made the following points to the Project Team:

- The Option 5 results, which was an alternative suggested by "untrained" residents, initially indicated it was a close second to the recommended Option 4. We suggested that if the Project Team would have started working with the residents back in 2005, they may have been able to improve the residents Option 5 and make it even better.

Project Team Response: As stated before, the project team made efforts to develop a feasible Option 5 alignment that included discussions with the affected landowners/ business operators in the study area. The Project Team is of the opinion that the "Saw Tooth" alignment (previous Stantec Option) that was suggested by the Parkside Drive community in late Spring 2008 is not a viable alignment nor would it be preferred over Option 4. In terms of the Centre Road crossing, we carefully considered the local knowledge of residents on the NAC and have made adjustments to the alignment based on our further investigations. Please note however, that the Hamilton Conservation Authority is still reviewing the Project Team's recommended alignment. Rationale for this has been provided to the public and will be included in the ESR. The rationale for this recommendation is documented in Dillon Consulting's memo to the East-West NAC,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</table>

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Team admits that reducing the number of options (ie - looking at only the northern options 1, 4 and 5 or just 4 and 5) can produce different preference ranking. **YES IT DOES!** Using the Project Team's own data shows that the Residents Option 5 (and even the Option 1 all Northern Route) is better than the Project Team's Option 4! 4) The Project Team goes on to say: *This is why in making the decision regarding the route preference, we did not rely entirely on the results of the SAW method but also implemented a "reasoned argument" approach that involved a review of the major advantages/disadvantages of each option.* The Project Team has **"changed the Rules"** in order to cover up the fact that their own justification Tables (as stated in point 3 above) indicates that the Residents Option 5 (and even the Option 1 the all Northern Route) is better than the Project Team's Option 4 - From the Phase 2 Draft Report the Project team states *To confirm the selection of Option 4 as the preferred **on the basis of the SAW procedure**, the differences among the options (considering the collected data), was reviewed as presented below.* If anyone really reads the Project Teams review on Page 69 and 70 of the Draft report, all the report states is opinionated reasons to support their Option 4 over option 1, 2 and 3. - From the Final Phase 2 Report the Project Team changed their wording in this section to the following: *To confirm the selection of Option 4 as the preferred on the basis of the SAW procedure, the differences among the options (considering the collected data),*			dated October 27, 2008. *- By comparing the 3 options with the lowest totals, which were all the Northern Routes, it clearly indicated that the Option 5 was better than the recommended Option 4 route. Even Option 1 (the all northern route) was better than the recommended Option 4. (See table below.)* **Project Team Response**: As explained in our previous response to you, the original Option 5 evaluation in the TMP did not include the business impact costs associated with the Opta Minerals version of Option 5. A more detailed evaluation exercise was undertaken as part of the Phase 3 work which included a more refined road design (than considered in Phase 2) and additional data. Again, the Phase 2 evaluation was undertaken at a corridor level of detail without the benefit of a refined road design. The results of this work have concluded that Option 4 is still the preferred option. *- By comparing the two Options 4 and 5 against each other, Option 5 produced lower numbers indicating it is a better alternative than Option 4. (See table below.)* **Project Team Response:** See response above. Your comments on the Phase 2 work have been duly noted however, the Project Partners moved on to a Phase 3 evaluation which reexamined the same issue that was examined in Phase 2 but at a greater level of detail. As such, replacing the work that was done in Phase 2.	

<table>
<tr><th>Correspondent</th><th>Issue/Concern</th><th>To</th><th>Responder</th><th>Response</th><th>Follow-up</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>were reviewed through a reasoned argument approach as presented below. <u>It was on the basis of the rationalization below that Option 4 was selected as the preferred alternative.</u>
The Project Team now realizing the technical flaws in their SAW (justification table) changed the wording in their report and added the extra (underlined) sentence to remove the emphasis off the Justifications Tables picking the recommended route, to now an rationalized review of the options. But the Project Team did not change any of their reasons as stated in the Draft report, in their Final report. They did not even review or comment on Option 5. They simply left all their previous opinionated reasons why their Option 4 was better than the options 1, 2 and 3.
The Project Team apparently gets to change the rules as they wish to suit their requirements to justify their answers.

5) The Extra costs issue on Option 5 that the Project Team now brings forward are based on the Project Team's version an Option 5 solution of running through Opta Minerals. Of course this would cost more!. But that was never the residents Option 5 recommendation to run through Opta. The Project Team obviously went through Opta Minerals to force the issue of the higher costs. However, if you even include their higher costs into the Justification tables, comparing option 4 to their option 5, Option 5 still gives the lowest number, meaning it is better!
6) The Project Team states: The Project Team anticipates that should the connection of the East/West roadway at Highway 6 be north of</td><td></td><td></td><td>- These are only some errors we noticed on the East West Route of the Justification Tables. Precedence would indicate that similar errors and poor judgment of evaluations would also exist in the evaluation of the North-South Justification tables.

Below are the numbers from the corrected Justification Tables indicating Option 5 as the best when compared to the other Northern Options 1 and 4.

<table>
<tr><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>Corrected Option 1 All Northern Route</th><th>Corrected Option 4 Northern Hybrid Route</th><th>Corrected Option 5 New Northern Route</th></tr>
<tr><td>Natural Environment Total</td><td></td><td></td><td>12.23</td><td>6.02</td><td>8.73</td></tr>
<tr><td>Social Environment</td><td></td><td></td><td>8.11</td><td>15.54</td><td>7.33</td></tr>
<tr><td>Economic Environment Total</td><td></td><td></td><td>4.06</td><td>3.83</td><td>5.1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Costs</td><td></td><td></td><td>2.98</td><td>3.49</td><td>3.51</td></tr>
<tr><td>Transportation Service</td><td></td><td></td><td>2.65</td><td>5.68</td><td>2.65</td></tr>
<tr><td>TOTAL</td><td></td><td></td><td>30.03</td><td>34.56</td><td>27.32</td></tr>
</table>

Below are the numbers from the corrected Justification Tables indicating Option 5 as the best when compared</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>Correspondent</th><th>Issue/Concern</th><th>To</th><th>Responder</th><th>Response</th><th>Follow-up</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Concession 4 as currently being evaluated the closing of Parkside Drive will not be required. Beginning in early 2005, the Project Team had told the public and Councillors that MTO plans to close Parkside Drive. Their statement was obvious to once again justify their new Option 4 Northern route. The Project team hid behind this mis-statement even though the residents clearly had supporting documentation from the MTO that the MTO had no intention of closing Parkside Drive. Only 2-1/2 years later did the Facilitator (Lura Consulting) review the communications on this issue only to once again cover the Project Team's misleading statements by allowing the Project Team to infer that MTO does not know what it is doing and keeps changing its mind. And now the Project Team advises the Public that the closing of Parkside Drive will not be required. It never was required! (Of course the Project Team will say yes it would have to be closed but that is only because if they put the new Northern route within a certain distance of Parkside Drive, MTO regulations would not allow two intersections so close to each other.)
And finally the Project Team has not even acted on the Facilitators report of May 26th Path Forward recommendations.
If the Project Teams wishes to deny any of the above additional information we have presented to them, we look forward to hearing them. Please reply to all who have been copied on this email.
Rick Breznik, Waterdown</td><td></td><td></td><td>to the Project Team's Options 4.
<table><tr><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>Corrected Option 4 Northern Hybrid Route</th><th>Corrected Option 5 New Northern Route</th></tr><tr><td>Natural Environment Total</td><td></td><td></td><td>11.13</td><td>15.86</td></tr><tr><td>Social Environment</td><td></td><td></td><td>20.14</td><td>10.85</td></tr><tr><td>Economic Environment Total</td><td></td><td></td><td>5.69</td><td>7.3</td></tr><tr><td>Costs</td><td></td><td></td><td>4.98</td><td>5.01</td></tr><tr><td>Transportation Service</td><td></td><td></td><td>7.01</td><td>3.98</td></tr><tr><td>TOTAL</td><td></td><td></td><td>48.95</td><td>43</td></tr></table>
3) The Project Teams statement of: We further note that when differences among options are minimal, reducing the number of options being evaluated at any one time, can also produce a different preference ranking order for the remaining options. So the Project Team admits that reducing the number of options (ie - looking at only the northern options 1, 4 and 5 or just 4 and 5) can produce different preference ranking. YES IT DOES! Using the Project Team's own data shows that</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				the Residents Option 5 (and even the Option 1 all Northern Route) is better than the Project Team's Option 4! **Project Team Response**: See above response regarding the more detailed work undertaken in Phase 3 that supports the selection of Option 4. Yes, as shown in our tables as well as the tables you have prepared (which omit important information such as the business impact costs), the difference among the alternatives was shown to be small. As such, the Project Team agreed to reevaluate Option 4 vs. 5. We discussed your further comments on this most recent and more detailed reevaluation at our meeting with the Parkside Drive Residents Association on November 19 and December 1, 2008. *4) The Project Team goes on to say: This is why in making the decision regarding the route preference, we did not rely entirely on the results of the SAW method but also implemented a "reasoned argument" approach that involved a review of the major advantages/disadvantages of each option. The Project Team has* ***"changed the Rules"*** *in order to cover up the fact that their own justification Tables (as stated in point 3 above) indicates that the Residents Option 5 (and even the Option 1 the all Northern Route) is better than the Project Team's Option 4.* **Project Team Response**: No rules have been changed. It was always intended that the selection of the preferred alternative in Phase 2 be based on a combination of the SAW method and reasoned	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				argument. As stated in the TMP, the results of the SAW method indicate that there was a small difference among the alternatives (and which did not include business impact costs that would result from one variation of Option 5). Therefore, the Project Team agreed to re-evaluate Option 5 (Opta), and later review Option 5 (saw tooth), at the residents' request, which we have done. *- From the Phase 2 Draft Report the Project team states To confirm the selection of Option 4 as the preferred* **on the basis of the SAW procedure**, *the differences among the options (considering the collected data), was reviewed as presented below. If anyone really reads the Project Teams review on Page 69 and 70 of the Draft report, all the report states is opinionated reasons to support their Option 4 over option 1, 2 and 3.* **Project Team Response**: Any process that involves making a decision regarding the selection of a preferred alternative involves some amount of opinion and subjectivity based on professional experience and knowledge. The opinions we provide are based on the data collected, the expected effects and our professional experience in road development. This is how decisions are made in an EA process. In making the decision to select Option 4 as the preferred alignment we have considered the facts available to us and have made tradeoffs that consider the relative importance of the various criteria as well as the magnitude and certainty of these effects and the extent to which they can be mitigated. Our	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				conclusion is that we are of the opinion that Option 4 is a reasonable alternative to develop and that the effects can be largely mitigated. Others may disagree with this opinion and we respect that. While we have carefully considered the residents input, local knowledge, and concerns, on balance, taking everything into account, we believe that the widening of Parkside Drive from 2 to 4 lanes (which is designated as an arterial road) is a reasonable solution to the problem. *- From the Final Phase 2 Report the Project Team changed their wording in this section to the following: To confirm the selection of Option 4 as the preferred on the basis of the SAW procedure, the differences among the options (considering the collected data), were reviewed through a reasoned argument approach as presented below. It was on the basis of the rationalization below that Option 4 was selected as the preferred alternative.* *The Project Team now realizing the technical flaws in their SAW (justification table) changed the wording in their report and added the extra (underlined) sentence to remove the emphasis off the Justifications Tables picking the recommended route, to now an rationalized review of the options. But the Project Team did not change any of their reasons as stated in the Draft report, in their Final report. They did not even review or comment on Option 5. They simply left all their previous opinionated reasons why their Option 4 was better than the options 1, 2 and 3.* ***The Project Team apparently gets to change the rules***	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				as they wish to suit their requirements to justify their answers. **Project Team Response –** As stated above we have not changed the rules. Edits made from the draft to final report were done based in response to pubic and agency comments. Many of the edits, such as the one you refer to, were done for clarification purposes. The TMP report documents the results of the Option 4 vs. 5 evaluation that was undertaken in Phase 2. The ESR will describe the results of the additional more detailed review that has been undertaken last year. The Phase 3 evaluation of Option 4 vs. 5 (variations) have carefully considered the pros and cons of each alternative and have provided a rationalization for the selection of Option 4 as the preferred alternative. These results have been presented to the NAC and the public at the PIC. The comments you provide have continued to focus on the Phase 2 work yet the project team and the evaluation process has moved beyond this and included the residents' option in Phase 3. More refined road designs have been developed and additional data have been collected. The confirmation of Option 4 has been based on this more recent information. *5) The Extra costs issue on Option 5 that the Project Team now brings forward are based on the Project Team's version an Option 5 solution of running through Opta Minerals. Of course this would cost more!. But that was never the residents Option 5 recommendation to run through Opta. The Project Team obviously went through Opta Minerals to force*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				deciduous forest. This type of habitat has greater ecological sensitivity to disturbance due to changes in hydrology. As well, the flora community is considered to be more sensitive due to vegetative dependence on organic soils. A greater priority is given to organic swamps as they are relatively uncommon in the Hamilton Region as compared to mineral swamps (which the southern alignment passes through). Due to the above, we support our ranking. DE-5 results in the greatest impact for this criterion. ***Criteria:*** *Potential for impact on terrestrial features* ***Criteria importance:*** *High-Medium* ***Indicator:*** *Potential for effects to adjacent habitat.* *While the Project Team state DE2 has the second lowest length of new edge created of about 330 meters, the new edge created by DE3 is only about 340 meters, less than 3% difference than DE2, which again is insignificant. This make DE2 and DE3 about the same.* *However DE5 still has the lowest amount of new edge created.* ***Therefore DE5 is the preferred alignment under this indicator.*** **Project Team Response:** We agree that DE-5 has the lowest distance of new edge habitat created (about 475 metres vs. 620 metres for DE-3, which is the next lowest). However, the edge effect in organic swamp habitat is considered to be more substantial as this habitat is more ecologically sensitive/ vulnerable to disruption/degradation as compared to mineral swamps (present in the middle and southern sections of the woodlot). Therefore, it is our opinion that DE-5 is	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				the least preferred alignment for this indicator. ***Criteria***:- *Potential for impact on terrestrial features* ***Criteria importance:*** *High-Medium* ***Indicator:*** *Fragmentation of natural areas.* *The Project Team state that DE5 and DE2 have the lowest level of fragmentation. However, by scaling the fragmented areas:* *DE2 will have 37950 sq.meters of Woodlot/Wetland to its south and 88850 sq meters of Woodlot/Wetland to its north.* *DE3 will have 51000 sq.meters of Woodlot/Wetland to its south and 75800 sq meters of Woodlot/Wetland to its north.* *DE4 will have 86260 sq.meters of Woodlot/Wetland to its south and 53590 sq meters of Woodlot/Wetland to its north.* *DE5 will have 102000 sq.meters of Woodlot/Wetland to its south and 15000 sq meters of Woodlot/Wetland to its north.* *It is clear that DE5 allows for the largest area of the woodlot / wetland to remain.* ***Therefore DE5 is the preferred alignment under this indicator.*** **Project Team Response:** Alignments DE-2 and DE-5 result in the least amount of fragmentation. DE-2 results in forests sizes of 26 and 104 hectares whereas DE-5 results in forest sizes of 23 and 109 hectares. As the size of the larger forest for DE-5 is slightly larger (about 4.5 %) we agree that DE-5 is slightly better than DE-2 in this regard. Both alignments are preferred over the interior alignments.	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				Criteria: *Potential for impact on terrestrial features* ***Criteria importance:*** *High-Medium* ***Indicator:*** *Effect on terrestrial corridor connectivity / linkages.* *The Project Team rates DE2, DE3 and DE4 all equal. On DE5 they state it creates the least amount of barrier effects. This comment would make DE5 the Preferred alignment.* *However, they continue on to say DE5 would create a significant barrier to the migration of wildlife between the Woodlot / PSW and the much larger Waterdown North Wetland ESA's. Therefore while DE5 is preferred in one case (least amount of barrier effects to the existing woodlot / wetland) it is not preferred in another case to the barrier to the much larger Eastern Wetland. If anything, that would make this indicator a "draw", no road alignment is better than the other. However, one may argue that DE5 will allow the largest area of the existing woodlot / wetland to remain as intact as possible. DE5 would also encourage the Project Team to ensure mitigation is performed to allow any concerned wildlife to be able to safely migrate between the remaining large woodlot / wetland and the Waterdown North Wetland ESA's.* ***Therefore because of the advantages and disadvantages of each option under this indicator, the result is EVEN for all options.*** **Project Team Response:** The wording of the evaluation table could have been clearer. To clarify our position, although DE5 will isolate a similar sized forest as alignment DE-2 (but to the north of the road), it will	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				create a significant barrier to the migration of wildlife between the Centre Road woodlot a Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW) and the Waterdown North Wetland Environmental Significant Area (ESA) lands to the northeast. The road will isolate most of the woodlot (that would be south of the new road). As such, alignment DE-5 is ranked least preferred for this indicator. ***Criteria**: Potential for impact on aquatic features* ***Criteria importance:** Medium* ***Indicator:** Amount and quality of aquatic habitat altered/disturbed/removed.* *Although the Project Team now states all options have the same effects, they previously stated in their June report that their most Southern option had the highest impact to this indictor (meaning it is not preferred).* ***In summary, under the Natural environment, DE5 still has the least effects, making it still the preferred road alignment.*** **Project Team Response:** We fail to understand the rationale for your conclusion that DE-5 is preferred for this indicator. DE-1would result in the relocation of a section of the creek west of Centre Rd. The DE-2 alignment, which is to the north of DE-1 and replaces it, does not require the relocation of the creek. The remaining four options all require one crossing of the creek and thus have all been ranked the same. You make no summary statements regarding the overall natural environment criteria group as was done for the social environment criteria group. We are of	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				the opinion that the natural environment criteria group is of critical importance in the selection of the alignment through the forest. Our rankings have been based on field work and the experience of our biologists. We are of the opinion that the southern alignment is the preferred as it will result in the least impact on the woodlot and the larger natural heritage system. We are obtaining an opinion from the Hamilton Conservation Authority regarding the crossing location and will advise you of this once received. ***Economic Environment:*** *Rated by the NAC TEAM Members and the Project Partners as a lower criteria than the Social Environment and Natural Environment.* ***Criteria****: Potential for impact on residential property value* ***Criteria importance:*** *Medium* ***Indicator:*** *Potential for change to property values.* *Any new road close to a house will affect the value of the house. In this case the further south the road is, the larger the property value effects will be to the 9 houses on Northlawn Ave that back parallel to the new E-W road. This can be confirmed by any professional property evaluator. For any distance of less than 300 meters, a new road will affect property values of existing houses, decreasing their value as the road gets closer. The Project Team's simple statement that a 100 meter wide treed area between the road and the residents will not affect the residents property value,* ***is simply not true.***	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				DE2 will greatly affect the property values of 9 houses on Northlawn Ave, especially without a noise barrier. DE3 will still have an affect on the property values of the 9 houses, but less than DE2. DE3 will start to have a property value effect on 1 house. *DE4 will start to minimize the effects on the 9 houses but will still have an effect on 1 house. (The same house as DE3.)* *DE5 will have negligible effect to the 9 houses but will again have an effect on 1 house.* ***Therefore DE5 and DE4 affect the least number of homes making it the preferred alignment for this indicator.*** **Project Team Response:** Predicting how a proposal will affect property values is always difficult as there are many factors to consider. The project team is of the opinion that property values of the residential properties along Northlawn Avenue will not substantially change for many reasons: they are well buffered from the new road, air quality and noise effects will be minimal and the road will not be highly visible from the backyard of the Northlawn Road properties. Residents to the north are much closer to the northern alignments. While these properties already front onto a busy roadway, the addition of another roadway in close proximity could potentially affect their values since there is less of a buffer for these residents. For these reasons, we stand behind our rankings for this indicator. ***Criteria**:- Potential for impact on agricultural land*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				Criteria importance: *Medium* ***Indicator:*** *Area of designated agricultural land removed.* *The Project Team rated DE 2 and DE3 as better than DE4 and DE5 because they say the northern alignments DE4 and DE5 pass through the least amount of agricultural land west of Centre Road. The fields west of Centre Road has not been in any agricultural production for the last 15 years. This farm land has since been sold to developers. This small land area that is being affected will never be farmed again.* ***Therefore this "potential effect" should not even be considered in this case meaning all the routes have the same effect on this indicator.*** **Project Team Response:** We agree that the impact on farmland for all of these alignments is a minor consideration in the overall evaluation and that the difference among these alignments for this indicator is minimal. ***In summary, under the Economic environment, DE5 (and DE4) has the least effects, making it still the preferred road alignment.*** **Project Team Response:** It is our opinion that the difference among the alternatives with regard to the Economic environment is minimal and should not be a major determinate in the selection of the preferred alignment. ***Costs:*** *Rated by the NAC TEAM Members and the Project Partners as low / medium criteria importance.* ***Criteria:*** *Capital Costs*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				Criteria importance: *Low - Medium* ***Indicator:*** *Estimated Capital costs (including land acquisition).* *The Project Team in June said all three of their routes would have the same costs. They are now stating that DE2 and DE3 are equivalent in costs and DE4 and DE5 are similar to each other, but more expensive that DE2 and DE3. Again, this is simply a statement with no dollar values to show what the actual difference may be. Also, the City owns the lands east of Centre Road through the woodlot / wetland anyways. Because the NAC and Project Partners rated this criteria as a low to medium importance, the costs increase, if any, would be minimal and should not play as major decision on which route to take.* ***In summary, under the Costs, while DE5 and DE4 may have a minimal (to nil) percentage increase over DE2 and DE3, the NAC and Project Partners rated this indicator as a low - medium importance.*** **Project Team Response:** We agree. While the more northern alignments are longer and would result in some increase in road construction costs, the cost difference among the alternatives is expected to be insignificant. ***Transportation:*** *Rated by the NAC TEAM Members and the Project Partners as a low, high and medium depending on the criteria.* ***Criteria****: Change in Traffic operations. delay and capacity* ***Criteria importance:*** *Low*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				Indicator: *Potential to increase level of traffic service. In June the Project Team stated the most Southern option is the least preferred from an operations perspective due to the closer proximity of its Centre Road intersection with the existing Northlawn Ave / Centre Road intersection. The Project Team is now stating that DE2 and DE3 will have the shorter distance and most direct route compared to DE4 and DE5. While this may be visually true when looking at the road alignments, please remember that DE4 and DE5 are also traffic calming routes because curving of the E-W road will mitigate speeding and make traffic flow safer. In addition, the alignment of DE5 with its large sweeping curves, is not much different than the western alignment that the Project Team is recommending for the East West road connect at highway 6.* *Also, the rating of this indicator was rated as low.* ***In summary under Transportation, while DE2 and DE3 may appear to be better because it is a straighter road alignment, the ability of the curved roads to calm traffic, and the low importance of this indicators, still makes DE5 a better alternative.*** **Project Team Response**: Our analysis has led to the conclusion that the alignments are generally equal for this criterion group. Alignment DE-2 has been moved further north so the separation distance from Northlawn Avenue is no longer an issue. All alignments can address the capacity requirements and can be designed to ensure safe movement of traffic. We see no significant difference among the alternatives.	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				Closing Summary. *Under each Criteria grouping (Social, Natural, Economic, Costs and Transportation) and their specific criteria, each of their indicators in 9 of the 15 cases clearly showed that DE5, the most Northern route, was the best alignment. (The remaining 6 cases were neutral.) And because 8 of those cases recommending DE5 were all rated as a High or Medium criteria importance, there is no doubt that DE5, the most Northern route, is the best alignment.* **Project Team Response:** The difference among the alignments in regards to Economic, Transportation and Cost consideration is in our opinion very slight and thus provide little value in distinguishing among the alternative alignments. In regards to the social environment, the interior alignments are preferred while we are of the opinion that the overall social impacts of DE-2 and DE-5 are of similar significance (considering magnitude, certainty and ability to mitigate effects). The criterion group that exhibits the greatest difference among the alternatives and the greatest significance of impact is the natural environment criteria group. Our position is that the southern alignment (DE-2) will result in the least overall impact. As previously stated, we are attempting to obtain input from the Hamilton Conservation Authority regarding our recommendations. Our final evaluation will reflect their comments. *We ask that should the Project Team disagree with any of the above statements, that they reply back to us with their comments, and factual proof of their*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				comments, as soon as possible, due to their own short timeline of pushing this project through. *Thank you.* --- Kind regards, Patricia Halajski née Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard,	
ID# 287 [redacted] Oct 29, 2008 Email	**Subject:** Re: ID# 139 - East-West Road Inquiry (Updated Response) **To the Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Project Team** Now you have really confused the residents of the Hunter Park Survey and especially the people who live on Northlawn Ave.. In early June you told the NAC (Neighbourhood Advisor Committee) that you will review 4 Options on the E-W road crossing Centre Road. In late June you did a very poor job of advising the public at the PIC meeting that there were 4 options to consider, that you wanted their opinion on. You acknowledged this and advise us that you will present the 4 options at the future NAC and PIC meeting for proper input. In early October you tell one of our neighbours that you will only have 3 options. When we correct you about your agreement to review 4 options, you update your reply to our neighbour (in	Waterdown-Aldershot Information & large list	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 6, 2009 Email	Email was acknowledged Nov 19, 2008. **ID# 287** --- ***To the Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Project Team*** *Now you have really confused the residents of the Hunter Park Survey and especially the people who live on Northlawn Ave..* *In early June you told the NAC (Neighbourhood Advisor Committee) that you will review 4 Options on the E-W road crossing Centre Road.* *In late June you did a very poor job of advising the public at the PIC meeting that there were 4 options to consider, that you wanted their opinion on. You acknowledged this and advise us that you will present the 4 options at the future NAC and PIC meeting for proper input.* *In early October you tell one of our neighbours that*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	your email below) **on Oct 24th** that there will be 4 options. You also advise *"The most southern alignment is about 140 m north of the residences on the north side of Northlawn Ave (measured from the homes). We note that a 100 m treed buffer would be maintained between the road and the back of the residential properties."* In the NAC meeting last night (Oct 27th) you presented 5 options, but immediately dismissed the most southern road, then stated your recommendation is the second most southern road of the 4 remaining options you considered. This road (that you named DE-2) is only 100 meters from Northlawn Ave (not the back of the houses). DE-3 was your next road option that was slightly more north, at approximately the 140 meter distance from Northlawn Ave, which is closer to what you advise us of in your Oct 24th email, as the most southern road option. We are astounded that your most southern road option can change in less than 3 working days, Oct 24th to Oct 27th. (We would hate to think that the Project Team simply made another mistake in their communications to the public) Please advise us what the special last minute information was that came in that made you change your most southern route option location. We also ask that you send us a copy of that information. Thank you. [redacted]			*you will only have 3 options.* *When we correct you about your agreement to review 4 options, you update your reply to our neighbour (in your email below)* ***on Oct 24th*** *that there will be 4 options. You also advise* "The most southern alignment is about 140 m north of the residences on the north side of Northlawn Ave (measured from the homes). We note that a 100 m treed buffer would be maintained between the road and the back of the residential properties." *In the NAC meeting last night (Oct 27th) you presented 5 options, but immediately dismissed the most southern road, then stated your recommendation is the second most southern road of the 4 remaining options you considered. This road (that you named DE-2) is only 100 meters from Northlawn Ave (not the back of the houses).* *DE-3 was your next road option that was slightly more north, at approximately the 140 meter distance from Northlawn Ave, which is closer to what you advise us of in your Oct 24th email, as the most southern road option.* *We are astounded that your most southern road option can change in less than 3 working days, Oct 24th to Oct 27th. (We would hate to think that the Project Team simply made another mistake in their communications to the public).* *Please advise us what the special last minute information was that came in that made you change your most southern route option location. We also ask that you send us a copy of that information.*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Waterdown.			**Project Team Response:** At both the NAC and PIC meetings held on October 28 and November 5, 2008, five Centre Road crossing alignments were identified: DE-1 through DE-5. The most southern option was the original alignment presented at the June PIC's (DE-1). It is located approximately 133 meters from Northlawn Avenue and approximately 100 meters from the backs of the existing homes on Northlawn Avenue. This option was eliminated from the evaluation process due to its impact on a tributary of Borer's Creek. DE-2 replaces DE-1 as the southern most option and this option avoids the creek to clarify, it is located approximately 167 meters from Northlawn Avenue. At the time of your neighbour's request on June 13, 2008 the Project Team had not presented its recommendations at the June PICs. After that time as you know the Project Team reviewed five possible alignments and presented the recommendation to the Project Partners just prior to the October 28th East-West Neighbourhood Advisory Committee meeting. The response that your neighbour received dated October 24th, 2008 referred to the four options under consideration to be presented for discussion with the public in October/November 2008.	
ID# 288 [redacted] Oct 29, 2008 Email	**Subject:** Ignoring Pubic input to the Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Plan Project To the Hamilton City Councillors: I and my fellow residents have sent a number of emails	Waterdown-Aldershot Information & large list	Waterdown-Aldershot Information N/A	In-progress / ongoing - see ID# 357, 332 and 283	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	with questions to the Project Team on the Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation plan, over the past 2-1/2 weeks. We have not received any written acknowledgement of our emails from Lura Consulting (the facilitator for this Project) nor the Project Team (consisting of the City of Hamilton Staff). This means either Lura Consulting is not doing its job or The Project Team has advised Lura Consulting not to acknowledge or receive any of our input. As the Project Team is closing off the final public input to the Phase 3 of the study, and the Project Team has clearly advised that they want to expediently push this study through, we would think this is the most critical time to ensure public input is reviewed and replied to, by the Project Team in a timely manner. **We ask that you please advise us as soon as possible, what we should do.** Thank you Residents of Hunter Park Survey: [redacted]				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
ID# 311 [redacted] Nov 5, 2008 In-person at PIC	Request to post Option 5 versus Option 4 memo prepared by Dillon on the project website.	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Nov 28, 2008	Posted Nov 28, 2008	
ID# 329 [redacted] Nov 18, 2008 Email	**Subject:** Fw:Partial reply to ID# 266, 281 and 283 - Soil Data To the Project Team: We did not ask to see a **summary report** of the soil sample report. We asked to see the actual report. - Your summary report does not map out the specific locations where samples were taken. The summary information only refers to "Road Alignments" of which you indicate multiple locations for the same information. There should be a specific map of the locations. - Your summary report does not indicate the number of samples taken at each Road alignment An Ecological Land Classification (ELC) for this project, should contain more information than just Soil information, such as the geologic, landform, vegetative, climatic, wildlife, water, ... As such if you have prepared a real ELC for this project in this area, we would like a copy of it. If you are not preparing one, please advise what you have actually studied and send us a full copy of it. If you are only doing soil samples please confirm and send us a copy of the full report. We are simply asking for the technical information that	Waterdown-Aldershot Information & large list	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 5, 2009 Email --- Mar 3, 2009 Email	Email was acknowledged Nov 19, 2008. Dear [redacted] Further to your requests for soil data information, please be advised that we will be in touch with you as soon as the report is available, along with the other reports you have requested. Please see our response dated December 18, 2008 (referencing ID#332 and 283). Kind regards,Patricia Halajski née Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard ----------The Natural Environment Inventory Report is available on the following ftp site. ftp://NCFO+lura%2Eca:NCFO2009@ftp.lura.ca	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	the Project Team has used to make their recommendations for their road alignment. If your full ELC has not yet been completed, we ask how the Project Team can once again make a recommendations prior to all of the information being gathered and interpreted. Thank you. for the Residents of the Hunter Park Survey				
ID# 332 Nov 19, 2008 Email	**Subject: RE: Waterdown/Aldershot Transportation - New East-West Road Corridor and Waterdown Road Corridor EA** Christine: Good Morning! I have taken a quick read of your attached letter have to take an immediate exception to your statement that a meeting has been set up for Nov 19th (tonight) to discuss the results of the Project Teams latest evaluations with concerned residents on the E-W road alignment. Your meeting tonight is with the residents of Parkside Drive, not the residents of Hunter Park Survey. Steve Oliver of the Parkside Residents association has made this clear to Sally of Lura in an email to her on Nov 17th. Steve advised that I was only part of their meeting because I provided them with some technical information. Although I and my neighbors have sent emails to the Project Team over the past 2 weeks, indicating that we want a follow up meeting with the Project Team, we have had no invitation addressed to myself, or the individual residents who asked for a meeting, to discuss our concerns.	Christine Lee-Morrison, Waterdown-Aldershot Information & Large list	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Dec 5, 2008 Email	Email was acknowledged Nov 19, 2008 Dear Further to your request for a meeting with the Project Team on December 8, 2008, we have explored with the Project Team the availability and timing of the materials you requested (in advance of the meeting), in order to identify an appropriate time. We have been advised that a number of the materials (see below) will not be available until December 18, 2008. 1. Full soil sample report 2. Ecological Land Classification (ELC) for this project (the biological evaluations of the Woodlot / Wetland will be included in this report) 3. Noise report 4. Air pollution studies or evaluations 5. Plan of proposed Joe Sam's Park expansion 6. Responses to PIC meeting questions (ID# 283) 7. Review of Justification tables (ID# 284) The Project Team also advises that light pollution will be addressed as part of the final ESR report, and truck	air quality report outstanding and meeting with residents.

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	At this late time it would be impossible for the majority of the Hunter Park Survey residents to be contacted and commit to meeting tonight. I thank you for agreeing that based on the input from the Residents of Hunter Park survey, that the Project Team does want to meet with us to discuss our issues and concerns in more detail. As such, I ask that the Project Team suggest a new date to meet with us. [redacted] of the Hunter Park Survey		---------- Mar 2009 Email	traffic assumptions were addressed in Phase 2. The Project Team also advises that with respect to your question regarding the effect on real estate values, the evaluation matrix presented by Dillon indicated that the "potential for impact on residential property value" varied with distance to the road and noted that there was some potential for effects for the southern alternatives. The Project Team included real estate values in their matrix in response to the request from the public, although this factor is not normally included as part of an EA evaluation process. In light of the upcoming holiday season, please let us know of a convenient time, early in the New Year, when you might be available to meet with the Project Team. Kind regards, Sally Leppard, Neutral Community Facilitator ---------- Geotechnical Report was sent Mar 2, 2009. The Natural Environment Inventory Report is available on the following ftp site. **ftp://NCFO+lura%2Eca:NCFO2009@ftp.lura.ca** The noise report was sent Mar 12, 2009.	
ID# 334 [redacted] Nov 23, 2008 Email	**Subject:** Re: Waterdown/Aldershot Transportation - New East-West Road Corridor and Waterdown Road Corridor EA Mr. Davis: I have finally had a chance to read the detailed letter you sent me. I have attached a copy of it (WATMP	Gerry Davis, Waterdown-Aldershot Information & Large list	N/A	*No response required.*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Letter.1). I have the following concerns with your comments to me: 1) Below is the email I replied back to you with, on the same day I received your email. I and my fellow residents of Hunter Park Survey were never invited to a meeting to discuss our issues with the Project Team on Nov 19th as you stated in your email. That meeting was with the concerned residents of Parkside Drive. However, since sending my email back to Christine, Lura Consulting has contacted me and has advised that they will be contacting me with future dates to meet with us. 2) In your second paragraph you state: "***I strongly disagree with your claim, stated in your email dated Oct 16th, 2008 that you were not provided with complete or truthful answers***". The only email I sent to the Project Team on Oct 16th, 2008 is the attached email (Copy of Oct 16th, 2008 Email to WATMP). No where in my email did I make such a statement. The intent of my email was question why it is taking so long for the Project Team to reply to our outstanding questions as documented by Lura Consulting and the frustration of having to deal with a facilitator instead of the Project Team members. 3) The Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Process Guideline clearly states that: "Members of the public having concerns about the potential environmental effects of a project or the planning process being followed, **have a responsibility** to bring				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	their concerns to the attention of the Proponent early in the planning process..." I and other have been bringing concerns on this project forward since late 2004. Please note that in Sept 2006, Scott Stewart from the City of Hamilton sent me an email advising that the City of Hamilton will no longer address any of my concerns in the Phase 2 study and that I need to wait until the Phase 3 portion of the Project before they will accept anymore input from me. I was never sure if his request followed the public input guidelines of the EA process. 4) You have made the statement that: *"I do not agree with certain aspects of the project and are compelled to voice my concerns"*. In accordance with point 3 above, I have a responsibility to voice my concerns. While some residents have simply given up trying to communicate their information (and frustration) to the Project Team, there are other residents still very active in providing input. The Project Team in their meeting on Nov 19th, with the residents on Parkside Drive, clearly stated to the residents (and in their overhead presentation) of the errors they made in their Phase 2 report. If it wasn't for residents, continuing to push their concerns, these errors (and others we have pointed out) would have been simply been ignored by the Project Team. The major concern now is if these errors that the Project Team has admitted to, affects the recommendations of the Phase 2 report. I would speculate that only after all of the residents outstanding questions are finally fully replied to, can that be determined. As such, I				

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	(and probably others) are still waiting for replies from the Project Team for all of the outstanding questions, dating back to March, as indicated in my Oct 16th, 2008 email. In closing, I understand your initial requirement to support your staff. However it also brings to light that if you have never read any of the information that the residents are bringing forward and questioning, who does the public then reply upon to ensure all their concerns, issues and questions, have been addressed by the Project Team? Thank you. [redacted] Waterdown				
ID# 348 [redacted] Dec 1, 2008 Email	**Subject:** Alignment of the East-West Road at Highway 6 - Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Plan Christine, Don, Paul: From your meeting tonight with the Parkside Residents, you advised that MTO does not want you to "add" anymore intersections on Highway 6. Therefore your proposed recommendation that was presented to the Public and NAC for having your proposed E-W road join highway 6, north of the 4th Concession West, will not be allowed by MTO. You then stated that your current option is to re-align your proposed E-W road with the 4th Concession West intersection. The NAC was totally against this. We recommended and agreed with your recommended alignment that was going to be north of the 4th Concession West. This	Waterdown-Aldershot Information & Large list	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 25, 2009 Email	Email was acknowledged Dec 2, 2008. Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email dated December 1, 2008. We have obtained a response from the Project Team to your inquiry, and have inserted it directly into your e-mail below. The Project Team has responded to your email in blue. --- *Christine, Don, Paul:* *From your meeting tonight with the Parkside Residents, you advised that MTO does not want you to "add" anymore intersections on Highway 6. Therefore your proposed recommendation that was presented to the*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	was the same recommendation that you made to the public at the last PIC meeting for their comments. To now make a change from what was presented, should require new public input prior to the Project Team finalizing such a change. After hearing this new information, a suggestion was made in the meeting, to simple bring the East-West Road alignment on the West side, back to Parkside Drive to use the existing intersection at Highway 6. (Similar to how you are re-aligning the eastern portion of the E-W road back to Parkside Drive). Instead of working with this suggest, all we heard from the Project Team was negative and unsubstantiated reasons why it cannot be done: Example: - It was stated: *"The use of Parkside Drive was studied in Phase 2 and rejected so we cannot re-consider it at this point in the project"* That statement is totally false. In the Phase 2 study, the use of Parkside Drive was for the complete E-W route. In this case, the re-alignment of the northern E-W road to re-align with Parkside prior to Highway 6 is only a refinement. It is no different than the Project Team re-evaluating the Option 5 alignment that went north of Parkside Drive on the east side of Waterdown. - It was stated: *"MTO may restrict access at Highway 6 and Parkside in the future so their is no point in considering this re-alignment option"* The whole transportation study is based on the future traffic and known changes that will occurring up to the year 2021. Since MTO has no set plans to close			*Public and NAC for having your proposed E-W road join highway 6, north of the 4th Concession West, will not be allowed by MTO. You then stated that your current option is to re-align your proposed E-W road with the 4th Concession West intersection.* *The NAC was totally against this. We recommended and agreed with your recommended alignment that was going to be north of the 4th Concession West. This was the same recommendation that you made to the public at the last PIC meeting for their comments.* *To now make a change from what was presented, should require new public input prior to the Project Team finalizing such a change.* *After hearing this new information, a suggestion was made in the meeting, to simple bring the East-West Road alignment on the West side, back to Parkside Drive to use the existing intersection at Highway 6. (Similar to how you are re-aligning the eastern portion of the E-W road back to Parkside Drive).* *Instead of working with this suggest, all we heard from the Project Team was negative and unsubstantiated reasons why it cannot be done:* *Example:* *- It was stated: 'The use of Parkside Drive was studied in Phase 2 and rejected so we cannot re-consider it at this point in the project"* *That statement is totally false. In the Phase 2 study, the use of Parkside Drive was for the complete E-W route. In this case, the re-alignment of the northern E-W road to re-align with Parkside prior to Highway 6 is only a*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Parkside or restrict its access prior to 2021, this statement is not relevant. The City of Hamilton GRIDS plan clearly states that we should be using existing roads in the most efficient manner we can. Here we have an existing road / intersection (Parkside at Highway 6), that can be efficiently and cost effectively used, instead of the Project Team recommending a new Northern intersection at the 4th concession. In comparison of building a new intersection to align with the 4th Concession West, to using the existing Parkside Drive intersection: - The new intersection will cost more money than expanding the Parkside Drive intersection. - The new intersection will require the complete displacement of one resident on the East Side of Highway 6 across from the 4th Concession west. The expansion of the existing Parkside Drive will not require any residential displacement. - The intersection at 4th concession West is already bad due to the angle the road intersects with Highway 6 and that it is at the base of a hill. In light of the new information that the Project Team has learned from the MTO, we request: 1) that you consider the re-alignment of the E-W road back to Parkside Drive to use the existing Parkside Highway 6 intersection. 2) You call another PIC (and NAC) meeting to present your revised alignment suggestion at highway 6 for			*refinement. It is no different than the Project Team re-evaluating the Option 5 alignment that went north of Parkside Drive on the east side of Waterdown.* *- It was stated: "MTO may restrict access at Highway 6 and Parkside in the future so their is no point in considering this re-alignment option"* *The whole transportation study is based on the future traffic and known changes that will occurring up to the year 2021. Since MTO has no set plans to close Parkside or restrict its access prior to 2021, this statement is not relevant.* *The City of Hamilton GRIDS plan clearly states that we should be using existing roads in the most efficient manner we can.* *Here we have an existing road / intersection (Parkside at Highway 6), that can be efficiently and cost effectively used, instead of the Project* *Team recommending a new Northern intersection at the 4th concession.* *In comparison of building a new intersection to align with the 4th Concession West, to using the existing Parkside Drive intersection:* *- The new intersection will cost more money than expanding the Parkside Drive intersection.* *- The new intersection will require the complete displacement of one resident on the East Side of Highway 6 across from the 4th Concession west. The expansion of the existing Parkside Drive will not require any residential displacement.* *- The intersection at 4th concession West is already bad due to the angle the road intersects with Highway 6*	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	public input. If you plan to do neither of these requests, we ask that you advise us why. Thank you [redacted] Waterdown			*and that it is at the base of a hill.* *In light of the new information that the Project Team has learned from the MTO, we request:* *1) that you consider the re-alignment of the E-W road back to Parkside Drive to use the existing Parkside Highway 6 intersection.* *2) You call another PIC (and NAC) meeting to present your revised alignment suggestion at highway 6 for public input* *If you plan to do neither of these requests, we ask that you advise us why.* **Project Team Response**: We will meet with MTO to further examine the issues that they have raised. The development of a new intersection at Concession 4 would not mean that the current Parkside Dr/Hwy 6 intersection would need to be closed. The realignment of the east-west road to the existing Parkside Dr. intersection could be problematic. First, if the controlled access improvements to Hwy 6 were ever extended northerly this would mean that Highway 6 access at Parkside Drive would have to be eliminated, as an interchange is not possible at the current location. It would be too close to the Dundas St. interchange that is being built. This alternative was identified during Phase 2 work and was screened out for that reason. There are a number of refinements that the Project Team is making to both the E-W corridor, and the N-S	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				corridor. Once these refinements have been made, the Protect Team intends to issues a newsletter update to members of the public, and complete the Environmental Study Report. When the ESR is complete, it will be available for public review. No further public meetings are planned at this time. The Project Team is still committed to meet with the Hunter Park Survey residents, once the reports that you have requested become available. We will be happy to discuss your concerns and suggestions relating to the connection of the new East-West Route at Highway 6 Parkside at that time. --- Kind regards, Patricia Halajski on behalf of Sally Leppard	
ID# 356 [redacted] Nov 5, 2008 In person at EW PIC	[redacted] has questions about noise levels at various receptors and MOE's criteria for noise. • What are the future noise levels at the various receptors if road doesn't go in? Need to compare it with future noise levels with the road. • What are the noise level at receptors today • What are the MOE criteria for noise? • Were the levels based on a 2-lane or future 4-lane roadway? Why not 4-lane for noise, if the bed of the road is 4-lane?	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Mar 12, 2009 Email	The draft Noise report was sent Mar 12, 2009	
ID# 357 [redacted] Dec 21, 2008	Michael: Good Morning! Can you please pass this email (and my next one), to	Michael Kirkopoulos, Waterdown-	Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Email was acknowledged Jan 12, 2009 Dear [redacted]	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
Email	Chris Murray. It is very frustrating when neither the Outside Communications company (Lura Consulting) nor any of the City if Hamilton Project Team members do not acknowledge emails, let alone answer them. In my past experience of working with Chris, he did take the time to review our issues and meet with us. I would think he would be interested in how the City staff is now handling this project. Please confirm if you will or will not be forwarding this information to Chris. Thank you. [redacted] ----- Original Message ----- **From:** [redacted] **Sent:** Sunday, December 21, 2008 8:57 PM **Subject:** Re: Waterdown-Aldershot Master Transportation Plan - Outstanding questions and Issues **Can someone from the Project Team please advise everyone on this email why it is taking up to 9 months to get any answers to our questions???** It has now been two months since I sent my last email requesting to know when we will be provided with answers to all of our outstanding questions on the Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Plan. Since that time I have also sent other questions to the Project Team. The status of all questions and replies so	Aldershot Information & Large list	Jan 14, 2009 Email --- Waterdown-Aldershot Information Jan 23, 2009 Email --- Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 6, 2009 Email	Re: Your Outstanding Enquiries Further to our e-mail dated January 12, 2009, please be advised that we are still receiving responses from the Project Team to a number of your enquiries. The City also advises that they have not yet completed their review of the Consultant reports you have requested. We will provide you with an update of the progress on your outstanding enquiries by the end of next week. We apologize for the delay. Sincerely, Sally Leppard --- Dear [redacted], Re: Your Outstanding Enquiries This is to advise you that preparation of a package in response to your enquiries is still in progress. Sincerely, Sally Leppard --- Dear [redacted], Please find attached to this email the responses to the ID#'s highlighted below. Kind regards,	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	far are listed below: # 75 (Cost savings) dated Mar 30th, acknowledged by Lura on April 1st - No reply # 82 MTO Correspondence questioned Mar 13th, Review Report prepared by Lura on May 26th. The report has been questioned on Sept 5th and renumbered to #204 # 85 dated April 3, acknowledged by Lura on May 9th - Still Outstanding - not all Agency Correspondence has been posted on the Web site as the Project Team said the would. # 118 dated May 18th, acknowledged by Lura and answered on Aug 18th, requestioned on Sept 1 - No Reply # 119 dated May 12th, acknowledged by Lura and answered on Aug 18th, requestioned on Sept 2 - Renumbered to #205 - No Reply # 146 dated June 16th, acknowledged by Lura on June 18th - No Reply # 156 dated June 25th, acknowledged by Lura on June 25th - No Reply but advised to wait till next NAC meetings. # 199 dated Aug 15th, acknowledged by Lura on Aug 15th - No Reply # 204 dated Sept 5th, acknowledged by Lura on Sept 5th - No Reply # 205 dated Sept 2nd, acknowledged by Lura on Sept 10th - No Reply # 212 dated Sept 25th, acknowledged by Lura on Sept 25th - No Reply # 218 dated Oct 13th, acknowledged by Lura on Oct 14th. Received reply that routing will be based on			Patricia Halajski née Prokop on behalf of Sally Leppard **From:** [redacted] **Sent:** December 21, 2008 8:58 PM **Subject:** Re: Waterdown-Aldershot Master Transportation Plan - Outstanding questions and Issues **Can someone from the Project Team please advise everyone on this email why it is taking up to 9 months to get any answers to our questions???** It has now been two months since I sent my last email requesting to know when we will be provided with answers to all of our outstanding questions on the Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Plan. Since that time I have also sent other questions to the Project Team. The status of all questions and replies so far are listed below: # 75 (Cost savings) dated Mar 30th, acknowledged by Lura on April 1st - No reply - It appears that the ID#s for the first two inquiries on the list have been reversed, the correct ID# for this inquiry is **ID# 82**. Please find the response attached. # 82 (the correct ID# for this inquiry is **ID# 75**) MTO Correspondence questioned Mar 13th, Review Report prepared by Lura on May 26th. The report has been questioned on Sept 5th and renumbered to **#204** - The response to ID# 204 is attached. **# 85** dated April 3, acknowledged by Lura on May 9th - Still Outstanding - not all Agency Correspondence has been posted on the Web site as the Project Team said the would. - The response to ID# 85 is attached. # 118 dated May 18th, acknowledged by Lura and	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	Biological and Geotechnical results. On Nov 6th asked for the Biological Data. Nov 17th, received only a partial report on soil conditions. Sent new email on Nov 18 requesting full report - Acknowledged by Lura on Nov 19.- No Reply but re-numbered to # 329. # 241 dated Oct 23rd, acknowledged by Lura on Oct 24th - No Reply. # 252 dated Oct 27th, acknowledged by Lura on Oct 30th - No Reply. # 280 dated Nov 6th, acknowledged by Lura on Nov 14th - No Reply. # 281 dated Nov 6th, acknowledged by Lura on Nov 17th. Reply by Lura that reports will be ready by Dec 19th to send to us so we can schedule a meeting together to discuss. Lura advises Dec 19th that reports will not be ready until Jan. # 283 dated Nov 8th, acknowledged by Lura on Nov 17th. Received a memo from Lura from Dillon containing a partial report on the soil conditions. Sent new email asking for full report that recommendations were based on. Reply by Lura that reports will be ready by Dec 19th to send to us so we can schedule a meeting together to discuss. Lura advises Dec 19th that reports will not be ready until Jan. # 284 dated Nov 18th, acknowledged by Lura on Nov 19th - No Reply # 287 dated Oct 29th, acknowledged by Lura on Nov 19th - No Reply. # 332 Dated Dec 2nd, acknowledged by Lura on Dec 5th with only partial replies. Sent new email on Dec 7th requesting clarification and additional information. Lura advises Dec 19th that reports will not be ready until Jan so we can meet after.			answered on Aug 18th, requestioned on Sept 1 - No Reply - response outstanding. # 119 dated May 12th, acknowledged by Lura and answered on Aug 18th, requestioned on Sept 2 - Renumbered to #205 - No Reply - response outstanding. **# 146** dated June 16th, acknowledged by Lura on June 18th - No Reply - The response to ID# 146 is attached. # 156 dated June 25th, acknowledged by Lura on June 25th - No Reply but advised to wait till next NAC meetings. - Please find the response to this inquiry in the response to **ID# 212** (attached). # 199 dated Aug 15th, acknowledged by Lura on Aug 15th - No Reply - please find outstanding responses to the highlighted ID#s attached to is email. Further responses will be sent shortly. **# 204** dated Sept 5th, acknowledged by Lura on Sept 5th - No Reply - The response to ID# 204 is attached. # 205 dated Sept 2nd, acknowledged by Lura on Sept 10th - No Reply - response outstanding. **# 212** dated Sept 25th, acknowledged by Lura on Sept 25th - No Reply - The response to ID# 212 is attached. # 218 dated Oct 13th, acknowledged by Lura on Oct 14th. Received reply that routing will be based on Biological and Geotechnical results. On Nov 6th asked for the Biological Data. Nov 17th, received only a partial report on soil conditions. Sent new email on Nov 18 requesting full report - Acknowledged by Lura on Nov 19.- No Reply but re-numbered to # 329. - response outstanding. # 241 dated Oct 23rd, acknowledged by Lura on Oct 24th - No Reply. - The response to ID# 241 is attached.	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	. I do not understand if Lura Consulting is not fulfilling their job to ensure questions on this project are being answered - or - if the Project Team simply refuses to answer the questions. **Once again - Can anyone comment why it is taking up to 9 months to receive answers to our questions?**		---------- Waterdown-Aldershot Information Mar 12, 2009 Email	# 252 dated Oct 27th, acknowledged by Lura on Oct 30th - No Reply. - The response to ID# 252 is attached. # 280 dated Nov 6th, acknowledged by Lura on Nov 14th - No Reply. - response outstanding. # 281 dated Nov 6th, acknowledged by Lura on Nov 17th. Reply by Lura that reports will be ready by Dec 19th to send to us so we can schedule a meeting together to discuss. Lura advises Dec 19th that reports will not be ready until Jan. - response outstanding. # 283 dated Nov 8th, acknowledged by Lura on Nov 17th. Received a memo from Lura from Dillon containing a partial report on the soil conditions. Sent new email asking for full report that recommendations were based on. Reply by Lura that reports will be ready by Dec 19th to send to us so we can schedule a meeting together to discuss. Lura advises Dec 19th that reports will not be ready until Jan. - The response to ID# 283 is attached. # 284 dated Nov 18th, acknowledged by Lura on Nov 19th - No Reply - The response to ID# 284 is attached. # 287 dated Oct 29th, acknowledged by Lura on Nov 19th - No Reply. - The response to ID# 287 is attached. # 332 Dated Dec 2nd, acknowledged by Lura on Dec 5th with only partial replies. Sent new email on Dec 7th requesting clarification and additional information. Lura advises Dec 19th that reports will not be ready until Jan so we can meet after. - response outstanding. ---------- Dear [redacted] Please find an update on your outstanding inquiries below.	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				Kind regards, Patricia Halajski on behalf of Sally Leppard It has now been two months since I sent my last email requesting to know when we will be provided with answers to all of our outstanding questions on the Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Plan. Since that time I have also sent other questions to the Project Team. The status of all questions and replies so far are listed below: # 75 (Cost savings) dated Mar 30th, acknowledged by Lura on April 1st - No reply - It appears that the ID#s for the first two inquiries on the list have been reversed, the correct ID# for this inquiry is **ID# 82**. Response sent on February 6, 2009. # 82 (the correct ID# for this inquiry is **ID# 75**) MTO Correspondence questioned Mar 13th, Review Report prepared by Lura on May 26th. The report has been questioned on Sept 5th and renumbered to **#204** - The response to ID# 204 was sent on February 6, 2009. **# 85** dated April 3, acknowledged by Lura on May 9th - Still Outstanding - not all Agency Correspondence has been posted on the Web site as the Project Team said the would. - Response sent on February 6, 2009. # **118** dated May 18th, acknowledged by Lura and answered on Aug 18th, requestioned on Sept 1 - No Reply - Response outstanding, Project Team still reviewing. # **119** dated May 12th, acknowledged by Lura and answered on Aug 18th, requestioned on Sept 2 - Renumbered to #**205** - No Reply - Response sent	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
[redacted]				February 26, 2009. **# 146** dated June 16th, acknowledged by Lura on June 18th - No Reply - Response sent on February 6, 2009. # **156** dated June 25th, acknowledged by Lura on June 25th - No Reply but advised to wait till next NAC meetings. - Please find the response to this inquiry in the response to **ID# 212** (sent February 6, 2009). # **199** dated Aug 15th, acknowledged by Lura on Aug 15th - No Reply – This email indicates the status of outstanding responses. **# 204** dated Sept 5th, acknowledged by Lura on Sept 5th - No Reply - Response sent on February 6, 2009. # **205** dated Sept 2nd, acknowledged by Lura on Sept 10th - No Reply - Response sent February 26, 2009. **# 212** dated Sept 25th, acknowledged by Lura on Sept 25th - No Reply - Response sent on February 6, 2009. # **218** dated Oct 13th, acknowledged by Lura on Oct 14th. Received reply that routing will be based on Biological and Geotechnical results. On Nov 6th asked for the Biological Data. Nov 17th, received only a partial report on soil conditions. Sent new email on Nov 18 requesting full report - Acknowledged by Lura on Nov 19.- No Reply but re-numbered to # **329**. - Geotechnical Report sent on March 2, 2009. The link to the Natural Environment Inventory Report was sent March 3, 2009. # **241** dated Oct 23rd, acknowledged by Lura on Oct 24th - No Reply. - Response sent on February 6, 2009. # **252** dated Oct 27th, acknowledged by Lura on Oct 30th - No Reply. - Response sent on February 6, 2009. # **280** dated Nov 6th, acknowledged by Lura on Nov 14th - No Reply. – Response sent March 11, 2009.	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				# **281** dated Nov 6th, acknowledged by Lura on Nov 17th. Reply by Lura that reports will be ready by Dec 19th to send to us so we can schedule a meeting together to discuss. Lura advises Dec 19th that reports will not be ready until Jan. - Response sent March 12, 2009. # **283** dated Nov 8th, acknowledged by Lura on Nov 17th. Received a memo from Lura from Dillon containing a partial report on the soil conditions. Sent new email asking for full report that recommendations were based on. Reply by Lura that reports will be ready by Dec 19th to send to us so we can schedule a meeting together to discuss. Lura advises Dec 19th that reports will not be ready until Jan. - Response sent on February 6, 2009. # **284** dated Nov 18th, acknowledged by Lura on Nov 19th - No Reply - Response sent on February 6, 2009. # **287** dated Oct 29th, acknowledged by Lura on Nov 19th - No Reply. - Response sent on February 6, 2009. # **332** Dated Dec 2nd, acknowledged by Lura on Dec 5th with only partial replies. Sent new email on Dec 7th requesting clarification and additional information. Lura advises Dec 19th that reports will not be ready until Jan so we can meet after. – Geotechnical Report sent on March 2, 2009. The link to the Natural Environment Inventory Report was sent March 3, 2009. Noise report will be sent later today (March 12, 2009), and air quality report outstanding.	
ID# 358 [redacted] Dec 21, 2008 Email	Michael: Below is my second un-acknowledge email. Again I would appreciate if you would forward it to Chris Murray. Thank you. [redacted]	Michael Kirkopoulos, Waterdown-Aldershot Information	Waterdown-Aldershot Information Feb 26, 2009 Email	Email was acknowledged Jan 12, 2009 Email sent Jan 14, 2009 Dear [redacted]	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
	----- Original Message ----- **From:** [redacted] **Sent:** Sunday, December 21, 2008 10:48 PM **Subject:** Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Plan **To: The Project Team of the Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation plan:** We do not understand, how once again, the Project Team gets away with misleading the public. In October and November, the Project Team presented their recommended East-West route alignments to the public. They presented the rationality for their alignment based on their various justification tables. These tables clearly referred to the results of their studies - ie - noise studies, soil analysis, air pollution...as a basis for their recommended route alignment. Example statements made to the public from the Project Team's justification tables:: - *"Based on Air Quality modelling work conducted for this alignment, air emissions increases for the residents along Northlawn Ave will be essentially zero"* - *" Based on the Noise Modelling work undertaken for this alignment, residence along the north side of Northlawn Ave will, depending on their proximity to Centre Road, experience a "noticeable" to "insignificant" increase in Noise levels".* - *"Effects from intersection lighting to Northlawn Ave Residents expected to be minimal..."*	& Large list		Re: Your Outstanding Enquiries Further to our e-mail dated January 12, 2009, please be advised that we are still receiving responses from the Project Team to a number of your enquiries. The City also advises that they have not yet completed their review of the Consultant reports you have requested. We will provide you with an update of the progress on your outstanding enquiries by the end of next week. We apologize for the delay. Sincerely, Sally Leppard --- **From:** Waterdown-Aldershot Information **Sent:** February 26, 2009 12:38 PM **To:** [redacted] **Subject:** ID# 358 Response **ID# 358** Dear [redacted] Thank you for your email dated December 21, 2008. We have obtained a response from the Project Team to your inquiry, and have inserted it directly into your e-mail below. The Project Team has responded to your email in blue. ***To: The Project Team of the Waterdown Aldershot***	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern
	- *However, the swamp c* *considered to be more e* *other three alignments."* We the public have bee noise, soil and air studies were initially advised tha completed. We have re will now not be complet **This does not make sens** advise the public of their studies, that they say the upon, are now 2 months completed? It once ag to be pre-decided, espe produced after the fact. In our previous email of Project Team's E-W route Centre Road, we questio statement to the public Sam's Park. The Project on the most Northern ali stated: *Greatest area o* *and would be the most* *proposed park plan.* In the email below, the proposed layout of Joe Park layout is only a prop alignment. The Joe Sam only finalized their layou confirmed, **prior to May** route. If the Project Tea

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
				potential increase in the estimated noise level, monitoring of the traffic generated noise levels after construction of the new roadway be undertaken. *We ask that you stop this charade and start working with the residents to improve their lives, not destroy it!* *If you, the Project Team have no plans for mitigation to lower the expected noise levels, please immediately advise us.* *To all Hamilton Councillors, we are shocked that you have allowed the Project Team to continue abusing the public in their study.* *I have only looked at the noise results for our survey. I am sure the same type of errors and misleading information has been presented in areas affecting other Residents of Waterdown and Burlington. We would not be surprised if the Project Team continues to ignore the facts and attempts to push this ESR through as is. Therefore we ask that you advise the Project Team to start working with us and the other affect residents of Waterdown and Burlington.* --- Kind regards, Sally Leppard Neutral Community Facilitator's Office	
ID# 415 [redacted] June 9, 2009	Sally: Good Morning! I received a copy of the following email from the City	Sally Leppard (NCFO) and	Sally Leppard (NCFO) June 9, 2009	Hello [redacted] Yes, your e-mail has been received by the City. By copy of this e-mail, we are following up with the City.	

Correspondent	Issue/Concern	To	Responder	Response	Follow-up
Email	of Hamilton advising they have taken over the communications on this project. Can you please advise what the status is of our last email to you (from the residents of Hunter Park Survey) for a meeting with the Project Team and if this has been forwarded to Phil Homerski? Thank you. [redacted]	Waterdown Aldershot Information	Email	Kind regards, Sally	

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC ENQUIRIES AFTER EA PUBLIC PROCESS -- From June 1, 2009 - March 27, 2012

ID#	Date Received	Stakeholder Type	Name	Type of Correspondence	Subject	Comment / Question	Action Required	Status	Response	Date response was sent
411	2-Jun-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Noise reduction and mitigation – connected to ID# 403	Noise reduction and mitigation – connected to ID# 403	COH to respond.	Complete		26-Jun-09
412	2-Jun-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Noise modeling estimates and request for canned response – connected to ID#	Noise modeling estimates and request for canned response – connected to ID#	COH to respond.	Complete		26-Jun-09
413	2-Jun-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Request for Parkside Drive cross-sectional map	Request for Parkside Drive cross-sectional map	COH to respond.	Complete		26-Jun-09
414	6/2/2009?	Public	[redacted]	Email? Rec'd by Dillon	Plans for west end of Mountain Brow Road.	Plans for west end of Mountain Brow Road.	Dillon to respond.	Complete	Dillon e-mailed pdf of Mt. Brow plate.	2-Jun-09
415	9-Jun-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail rec'd by Lura	Was last e/m to Lura re meeting passed on to P. Homerski?	Was last e/m to Lura re meeting passed on to P. Homerski?	Lura to respond	Complete	Yes	9-Jun-09
416	16-Jun-09	Public	[redacted]	Email	Responding to info presented at Residents' Meeting. Concerned with Options 1 & 2 and MTO's input.	Responding to info presented at Residents' Meeting. Concerned with Options 1 & 2 and MTO's input.	Dillon to draft a response.			
417	13-Jul-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Relates to ID# 413. Request for 4-lane x-section.	Relates to ID# 413. Request for 4-lane x-section.	COH to respond.	Pending completion of ESR	Will provide a copy as soon as it's available.	15-Jul-09
418	13-Jul-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Appears to be errors in Stamson results for EW11.	Appears to be errors in Stamson results for EW11.	Dillon to respond.	Complete	Delay due to vacations. (Message sent 07/15). Response provided.	23-Dec-09
419	16-Jul-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Availability for meeting - ref: ID# 332	Availability for meeting - ref: ID# 332	No response req'd [redacted] to respond)	Complete		N/A
420	11-Jun-09	Public	[redacted]	Phone call to Dillon	Plans for west end of Mountain Brow Road (F/U to ID# 414). [redacted] phoned to get a hard copy of the plan.	Plans for west end of Mountain Brow Road (F/U to ID# 414). [redacted] phoned to get a hard copy of the plan.	Dillon to respond.	Complete	Dillon mailed hard copy of plan on 12 Jun 09.	12-Jun-09

421	15-Jul-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Relates to ID# 417 & 413. Concerns about road grade wrt noise. Spoke to Clr. McCarthy about fence for noise mitigation.	Relates to ID# 417 & 413. Concerns about road grade wrt noise. Spoke to Clr. McCarthy about fence for noise mitigation.	COH to respond.	Complete	Already answered.	30-Jul-09
422	18-Jul-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Concerned that if mtg is scheduled after ESR released, the residents don't have an opportunity to request changes.	Concerned that if mtg is scheduled after ESR released, the residents don't have an opportunity to request changes.	COH to respond.	Complete	Meeting moved to Sept. Comment moot.	N/A
423	31-Jul-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Noise wall for Parkside residents.	Relates to ID# 403. Response to receiving draft PDRA meeting notes.	No response req'd.	Complete		N/A
424	11-Aug-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail to Councillor's offc	Bike lanes & GO Transit.	Moving to Waterdown. Wants to ride bike to Aldershot GO.	Clr's Offc responded 8-Aug-09. Outstanding: Date of construction.	Complete		
425	25-Aug-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Timing of E/W construction.	Parkside resident wants to know timing of planning & construction and impacts on his property.				
426	10-Sep-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Hunter Park Residents' mtg	Comments on meeting	No response req'd	Filed		N/A
427	15-Sep-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail to Councillor's offc	Traffic safety.	re ID# 227 & 346 - No response for 7 mos.	COH to respond.	Complete		17-Sep-09
428	22-Sep-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Release of report.	Wants update on release of Phase 3/4 report.				
429	28-Sep-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Hunter Park Residents' mtg	Provided comments on mtg notes & response on action items by mid Oct.		Complete		
430	6-Sep-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail to DM	Overview of project	Considering home purchase in Waterdown. Requests info on Parkside, Mt. Brow & Waterdown Rd plans.	DM to respond	Complete		8-Sep-09
431	?	Public	[redacted]	E-mail to DM	Waterdown Road/Waterdown South	Qs pertaining to Bruce Trail crossings & stormwater management.	DM to respond	Complete	Waterdown Rd/Mt. Brow plates sent.	9-Sep-09
432	17-Sep-09	Public	[redacted]	Call ? To Dillon	Hwy 6 intersection	Reguested current plan of Hwy 6 & E/W intersection	Dillon to respond	Complete	Hwy 6 & E/W intersection plates mailed	18-Sep-09
433	2-Oct-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Hunter Park Residents' mtg	Added comments to meeting notes.	No response req'd	Filed		2-Oct-09
434	7-Oct-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	X-sect of Parkside. Relates to ID#s 413 & 417.	3rd request for X-section.	Dillon	Complete		30-Oct-09

435	7-Oct-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Noise mitigation fence.	Requests cost of noise mitigation fence.	DM to respond Outstanding: Question of Hollybush fence ownership.	Complete		30-Oct-09
436	16-Oct-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Hunter Park Residents' mtg outstanding business.	Promised reply to questions by mid-Oct.	DM & Paul to respond.	Complete		5-Nov-09
437	18-Oct-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	re ID# 436	Was 10/18 e/m (ID# 436) rec'd?	PH to respond	Complete	PPs putting final pieces together. Response likely by end of wk.	19-Oct-09
438	23-Oct-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Hunter Park Residents' mtg outstanding business.	Thanks for the Acoustic Impact Assess't. When will other Qs be answ?	DM to respond	Complete		5-Nov-09
439	28-Oct-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Meeting handouts	Would like copy of handouts from mtg at St. Matthew's Church, Aldershot on 10/27.	Burlington to respond	Fwded	DM to fwd to Burlington.	9-Dec-09
440	28-Oct-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Hunter Park Residents' mtg outstanding business.	Thanks for notification of Master Truck Route meetings. When will other Qs be answ?	DM to respond	Complete		5-Nov-09
441	29-Oct-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Light standards & Hawthorne tree	Haven't rec'd reply from Oct 7 e-mails & others dating back to Nov 9/08.	DM to respond	Complete	As stated in Mar 12/09 response, light spill can be addressed in design phase.	30-Oct-09
442	29-Oct-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Noise mitigation fence.	2nd request (see ID# 435) & relates to ID#391.	DM to respond	Complete	Ref to March 12 corresp. Will check on ownership.	30-Oct-09
443	29-Oct-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	X-sect of Parkside. Relates to ID#s 413, 417 & 434.	4th request for X-section.	Dillon	Complete		30-Oct-09
444	29-Oct-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Noise mitigation fence.	3rd Request for cost of noise mitigation fence.	DM to respond	Complete	Sept 9 mtg notes indicated staff would include noise mitigation costing options with report to Council.	30-Oct-09
445	?	Public	[redacted]	E-mail? To Dillon	Plates related to property.	Request for plans related to his property frontage.	Dillon to respond	Complete	3 plates e-mailed.	5-Oct-09
446	1-Nov-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Specs on noise attenuation fence.	Provides specs on noise attenuation fence preferred with City ownership.	No response required.	Filed		N/A
447	1-Nov-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Fence line.	Confirm proposed fence line inside current by few feet.	DM to respond	Complete	No add'l land req'd.	23-Dec-09
448	2-Nov-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Hunter Park Residents' mtg outstanding business.	3rd request for reply.	DM to respond	Complete		5-Nov-09
449	5-Nov-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Hunter Park Residents' mtg outstanding business.	4th request for reply.	DM to respond	Complete		5-Nov-09

450	6-Nov-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Missing info from outstanding business.	Missing [redacted] memo, Real Estate staff response & cost/m of noise mitigation fence.	DM to respond	Complete	[redacted] memo e-mailed 11/11, statement from Real Estate e/m'd 11/13.	13-Nov-09
451	8-Nov-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Follow up to ID# 447	It's been a week, haven't heard back.	DM to respond			23-Dec-09
452	9-Nov-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Noise study	Alleges incorrect data in the recalculated noise study provided Oct. 22.		Complete		14-Jan-10
453	11-Nov-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Missing info from outstanding business.	2nd request (see ID# 450).	DM to respond	Complete	Apology for delay, request understanding. 11/11. [redacted] memo e-mailed 11/11, statement from Real Estate e/m'd 11/13.	13-Nov-09
454	11-Nov-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Inaccuracies and promises.	Alleges incorrect, misleading data, lack of interest in public input.		Complete		
455	11-Nov-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Distance btw road & houses, noise study.	Alleges incorrect, misleading data.		Complete		
456	11-Nov-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Noise mitigation fence.	Confirm City will include noise mitigation costing for Parkside residents too.	DM to respond	Complete		
457	11-Nov-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Fence line.	Follow up to ID# 447. Why are Hunter Park Survey Residents getting replies before Parkside residents?		Complete		23-Dec-09
458	12-Nov-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail to Dillon	Include neighbour in communications	Neighbour [redacted] would like to be included in further communications.	Dillon to include in Waterdown Rd database.	Complete		12-Nov-09
459	13-Nov-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail to M. Fazio	Truck Routes and noise levels.	If E/W road to become a Truck Route, wants Scenario 3 be implemented.	McCarthy's Offc requests staff to respond.	Complete	Noise study has factored in truck traffic. Refer to Oct. 22, 2009 response.	18-Nov-09
460	13-Nov-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Real estate values.	Wants written reply from Real Estate.		No action req'd by WATMP.		N/A
461	22-Nov-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Construction schedule	When does Waterdown Rd exapnsion start? When will (403/Waterdown Rd intersection) be completed?				
462	29-Nov-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Oak tree locations	Alleges errors in [redacted] report.	DM to respond	Complete	Answered in Dec. 11 reply	22-Dec-09
463	29-Nov-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Follow up to ID# 452	Haven't rec'd reply from Nov 9 e-mails. Advise when to expect reply.		Complete		14-Jan-10
464	29-Nov-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Follow up to ID#454 & 462	Awaiting response on distances btw houses and proposed road.		Complete	Answered in previous replies	N/A
465	29-Nov-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail to Clr. McCarthy	Mitigation	Requests meeting w/Clr to discuss mitigation.	Clr. McCarthy's Offc to respond.	Complete	See also Clr's response RE ID# 465	4-Dec-09
466	4-Dec-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail to Clr. McCarthy	Requests to meet w/Clr	Requests to meet w/Clr. McCarthy when she meets with [redacted]	Clr. McCarthy's Offc to respond.	No action req'd by WATMP.		N/A

477	4-Dec-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	re ID# 447 & 457	Clarify loc'n of fence line. Expropriation?	DM to respond	Complete		23-Dec-09
478	6-Dec-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail to Clr. McCarthy	re ID# 465	Why was invitation to all residents retracted?	Clr. McCarthy's Offc to respond.	No action req'd by WATMP.	No changes - Breznik only. Confirm Dec. 10 at 4pm, Hamilton City Hall.	9-Dec-09
479	9-Dec-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail to Clr. McCarthy	re ID# 478	Requested mtg btw Clr and all Hunter Park Survey residents, not just him.	Clr. McCarthy's Offc to respond.	No action req'd by WATMP.		
480	10-Dec-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	re ID# 462	Haven't rec'd reply to Nov. 29 e/m.	Mgt. to respond		Answered in Dec. 11 reply	22-Dec-09
481	10-Dec-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	re ID# 452 & 463	Haven't rec'd reply to Nov. 9 & 29 E/Ms.	Mgt. to respond	Complete		14-Jan-10
482	10-Dec-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	re ID# 462 & 455	Haven't rec'd reply to Nov. 11 & 29 E/Ms.	Mgt. to respond			
483	12-Dec-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Distance btw road & property.	Pls confirm distance from back of their property to proposed E/W road.	DM to respond	Complete	Provided detailed response	7-Jan-10
484	13-Dec-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	re Clrs response RE ID# 465	Maintains original request was for a meeting btw Clr and all Hunter Park Survey residents.	Clr. McCarthy's Offc to respond.	No action req'd by WATMP.		14-Dec-09
485	20-Dec-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail to M. Fazio	re ID#459 Truck Route Master Plan	Wants Truck Route Study Group to commit to a noise study at the time the E/W roadway would be considered as a truck route.		No action req'd by WATMP.		N/A
486	20-Dec-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	re ID#s 462 & 480	Haven't rec'd reply to Nov. 29 or Dec. 10 e/m	DM to respond	Complete	Answered in Dec. 11 reply	22-Dec-09
487	20-Dec-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	re ID#s 452, 463 & 481	Haven't rec'd reply to Nov. 9, 29 or Dec. 10 e/m	DM to respond	Complete		14-Jan-10
488	20-Dec-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	re ID#s 455, 462 & 482	Haven't rec'd reply to Nov. 11, 29 or Dec. 10 e/m	DM to respond	Complete	Answered in previous replies	N/A
489	21-Dec-09	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	re ID# 483	Haven't rec'd reply to Dec. 12 e/m	DM to respond			
490	4-Jan-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Bike lanes	Objects to elimination of bike lanes. Formal objection?	Check w/Syeda			
491	5-Jan-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	re ID# 483 & 489	Haven't rec'd reply to Dec. 12 e/m	DM to respond	Complete	Detailed diagram sent.	7-Jan-10
492	7-Jan-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	re ID#s 452, 463, 481 & 487	Haven't rec'd reply to Nov. 9, 29, Dec. 10 or 20 e/m	PH to respond		Stock reply.	14-Jan-10
493	7-Jan-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	re ID#s 462 & 480	Cost of noise mitigation fence?	PH to respond	Complete	J. Stephen e/m	19-Apr-10
494	7-Jan-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Access to reports	How to obtain copy of prelim ESR, report to Council? How to request presentation to Council?	PH to respond	Complete	J. Stephen e/m	19-Apr-10
495	7-Jan-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail to Clr. McCarthy	Meeting	Requests group mtg w/Clr. McCarthy	Clr. McCarthy's Offc to respond.	No action req'd by WATMP.		N/A
496	12-Jan-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Roundabout	Impact of roundabout on property at 497 Parkside Dr.				
497	12-Jan-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	re ID# 494	Haven't got answer to Jan. 7 E/M.		Complete	J. Stephen e/m	19-Apr-10
498	12-Jan-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	re ID# 462	Cost of noise mitigation fence?		Complete	J. Stephen e/m	19-Apr-10
499	12-Jan-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail to Clr. McCarthy	re ID# 495	Haven't rec't response to request for meeting w/Clr.		No action req'd by WATMP.		N/A

500	14-Jan-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Notification of PWC mtg	Haven't rec'd notification of when ESR was to be presented to PWC.		Complete	E/M sent to all NAC members Jan. 18	18-Jan-10
501	14-Jan-10	Public	[redacted]	Meeting	How to request delegate status?	Staff met with [redacted] Had additional question on how to request delegate status at a Council ctee meeting.	Syeda to respond	Complete		14-Jan-10
502	14-Jan-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Mountain Brow Rd.	Will signal be installed at Mt. Brow and Waterdown Rd?		Complete	Yes.	9-Feb-10
503	15-Jan-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail to Councillor's offc	Stop-up of Conc 4W	Chicken farm requires accommodation for tractor trailers into/out of property.	Syeda to respond	Complete	Recommendation in ESR and in design stage.	27-Jan-10
504	17-Jan-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail to Clr. McCarthy	re ID#s 499,495&484	Haven't got answer to Jan. 7, 12 & Dec 13 E/M.		No action req'd by WATMP.		N/A
505	17-Jan-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Public review of ESR	Wants ESR released 60 days prior to filing for public input.		Complete	Process will not change.	7-Apr-10
506	17-Jan-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	re ID# 492	Claims hasn't got reply to previous e-mails on inaccuracies.		No action req'd by WATMP.	Dec. 22 & Jan. 14 e-mails indicate "comments relevant to the ESRs and received prior to December 1st, 2009 will be addressed in the ESRs as appropriate. "	N/A
507	18-Jan-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	How to request delegate status?	How to request delegate status for E/W portion?		Complete	See instructions in notification sent to NAC.	20-Jan-10
508	21-Jan-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail to Mayor	Meeting re concerns.	Clr. McCarthy hasn't responded to request for meeting. Will you meet with us?		No action req'd by WATMP.		N/A
509	24-Jan-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Waterdown Rd widening	Affect on 1691 Waterdown Rd?	PH to respond	Complete	No property acquisition req'd.	22-Feb-10
510	27-Jan-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail to Mayor	re ID# 508	Haven't rec'd acknowledgement of e-mail.		No action req'd by WATMP.		N/A
511	4-Feb-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	re ID# 509	When can I expect response to Jan. 24 E/M?			See ID# 509	
512	29-Jan-10	Public	[redacted]	Meeting	Impacts on property	Impacts on property at 678 Hwy 6 N	Provide package of materials.	Julia to Mail 2/12	Mailed:Draft E_W Noise report Draft E-W Air quality report Cross-sections in front of his house Some pictures of the curb and gutter that we are proposing	12-Feb-10
513	11-Feb-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	441 Parkside Drive impacts	Would like info on portion east of Hwy 6, streetscape of Parkside dr.				

514	11-Feb-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail to Clr. McCarthy	Public comment on ESR	Says City of Burl staff released report for 45 day public review, public open house then recommendations to Council. Wants Hamilton to do same for E/W portion.	Referred to mgt for response.		GM's e-mail.	20-Apr-10
515	21-Feb-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Traffic west of Hwy 6	How will E/W bypass join Hwy 5?				
516	22-Feb-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail	Waterdown Rd widening	Doesn't understand response to ID# 509.				
517	12-Mar-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail to Clr. McCarthy	Communication w/Councillor	Supports [redacted] concerns re communication w/Clr. McCarthy		No action req'd by WATMP.		N/A
518	29-Mar-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail to Mayor	Communication w/Councillor	Processs & communications issues wrt release of ESR.		No action req'd by WATMP.		N/A
519	29-Mar-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail to Murray & Davis	Release of report.	Processs & communications issues wrt release of ESR.		Complete	J. Stephen responded: process will not change.	7-Apr-10
520	8-Apr-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail to Stephen	Release of report.	Processs & communications issues wrt release of ESR.		Complete	J. Stephen responded w/detailed answers.	19-Apr-10
521	15-Apr-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail to Stephen	re ID# 520	Will I be receiving a response?		Complete	J. Stephen responded w/detailed answers.	19-Apr-10
522	19-Apr-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail to Stephen	re response to ID# 520	Claims not all Qs answered.		Complete	G. Davis responded - Qs answered, no more correspondence until after ESR is released.	20-Apr-10
523	20-Apr-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail to [redacted]	Remove from cc	Requests [redacted] remove him from distribution list - doesn't believe [redacted] making claims on everyone's behalf.		No action req'd by WATMP.		N/A
524	20-Apr-10	Public	[redacted]	Email to G. Davis	re response ID # 520	Claims not all Qs answered.		No action req'd by WATMP.		N/A
525	5-May-10	Public	[redacted]	Email to Staff, MOE and Cr	Hawthorne Tree Blossoms on Parkside Drive - EW route	Attached some pictures of Hawthorn trees and requested for the fence for noise mitigation		No action req'd by WATMP.		N/A
526	21-May-10	Public	[redacted]	E-mail via info@hamilton.ca (CCC)	Potential home buyer	Potential impacts of E/W route on property at 236 Parkside Drive? Traffic volumes? Municipal water hook-up?	Referred water Q to J. Scarcelli (WWW).	Complete	Provided WWW contact. Traffic volumes on Parkside at this location should not be affected.	1-Jun-10

527	Communications between 19-Oct-10 - 6-Mar-10	Public	[redacted]	Emails to City staff	Noise Assessment	Concerns about noise assessment report and requests for noise attenuation fence behind his house on Parkside Drive	MJ to respond	Complete	CoH staff met with resident to discuss issues and also onsite meeting. Recommnedation made and passed by City Council to include the noise attenuation fence to be built behind resident's home in the ESR	Communications between 25-Oct-10 - 6-Mar 12
528	20-Oct-12	Public	[redacted]	Email to Lori Rez	North-South Alignment	Wants a copy of the approved final north-south alignment	MJ to resond	Complete	Final ESR not available until filing. Directed to website for Draft north-south Corridor design plates	25-Oct-10
529	Communications between 22-Oct-10 - 4-Aug-11	Public	[redacted]	Email to Adam Millington	Status as it relates to property	Status of [redacted] Mountain Brow.	MJ to resond	Complete	Emailed update of status of Watedown Road ESR	11-Aug-11
530	Communications between 27-Jan-11 - 27-Mar-12	Public	[redacted]	Emails to Project Partners	Property on Dundas Street	Vibration, Noise, Pedestrian Crossing, Road Design, New City Park, Timing	MJ to resond	Complete	Emailed detailed response to concerns. Project Team met onsite to discuss noise and vibration concerns. Halton Region to conduct additional noise monitoring assessment.	Communications between 27-Jan-11 - 27-Mar-12
531	6-Feb-11	Public	[redacted]	Phone Call & Email to M.Jajko	Waterdown Road & Mountain Brow Road	Requested to be on mailing list	MJ to resond	Complete	Placed on mailing list.	6-Feb-11
532	Communications between 23-Feb-11 - 26-Apr-11	Public	[redacted]	Phone Call to T.McKenna	Detailed Design	Wants to be involved in detail design process as it relates to his property	MJ to resond	Complete	MJ & JM met with property owner. MJ sent detailed follow-up email.	Communications between 24-Feb-11 - 29-Apr-11
533	Communications between 28-Feb-11 - 22-Feb-12	Public	[redacted]	Phone Call and Emails to M.Jajko	[redacted] Hwy 6	Following up on behalf of property owner. Concerns include: traffic noise, drainage & grading impacts, property, natural environmental and air quality impacts, access to property, travel portion of hwy 6 closer, vibration, impacts of Parkside Drive EA on E-W EA	MJ to resond	Complete	Emailed detailed response to each question and mailed the property owner the response letter.	Communications between 28-Feb-11 - 23-Feb-12
534	15-Jun-11	Public	[redacted]	Phone Call to M.Jajko	[redacted] Mountain Brow Road	Requested design plates related to property.	MJ to resond	Complete	Emailed Draft Design Plates.	15-Jun-11

535	Communications between 14-July-11 - 13-Sept-11	Public	[redacted]	Email to SYL	Waterodwn Road Corridor	Access to Burlington? Right turn only off Flanders to Mountain Brow? Safety precautions for crossing Mountain Brow? Concerned about widening Mountain Brow to 4 lanes. Public involvement in detail design stage? Questions Rosecliffe Place being used as an emergency lane during construction. Clarification on number of lanes for Burke St / Mid-block. If Hwy 6 closes questions whether Waterdown Road will be used as truck route.	MJ to resond	Complete	Emailed detailed responses. TS responded Qs answered, no more correspondence until after ESR is released.	Communications between 9-Aug-11 - 6 Oct-11
536	21-Jul-12	Public	[redacted]	Phone Call to MJ	Waterdown Road Improvements	Requested update on Waterdown Road EA.	MJ to resond	Complete	Emailed link to study web site.	21-Jul-11
537	27-Sep-11	Public	[redacted]	Phone Call to MJ	Roadway Elements & EA process	Requested more information of roadway elements for Parkside Drive.	MJ to resond	Complete	Emailed key plan, web site link, and Parkside Drive roadway elements.	27-Sep-11
538	Communications between 30-Oct-11 - 9-Nov-11	Public	[redacted]	Email to Cllr Partridge	Waterdown/Aldershot TMP update	Requested update on EA, Hamilton-Burlington cost sharing agreement, timing for construction.	MJ to resond	Complete	Emailed detailed update on EA, Cost sharing agreement and timing.	Communications between 3-Nov-11 - 14-Nov-11
539	11-Nov-11	Public	[redacted]	Email to DM	SW corner of Dundas and Kerns	Anticipated timing? Timing to impact development applications? Updated cost of the area specific development charge. Link to ESR.	MJ to resond	Complete	Emailed detailed response.	23-Nov-11
540	27-Jan-12	Public	[redacted]	?	Parkside Drive Improvemetns	Requested information on proposed changes to Parkside Drive.	MJ to resond	Complete	Emailed typical cross-section of Parkside Drive and preliminary design concept.	27-Jan-12
541	1-Feb-12	Public	[redacted]	Email to CT	Realignment of Waterdown Road	Is Waterdown Road going to be realigned?	MJ to resond	Complete	Emailed update.	3-Feb-12
542	29-Feb-12	Public	[redacted]	Email to MJ	Waterdown Road Corridor East-West Road Corridor Municipal Class EA Update Newsletter Response	Requested clarification on relationship between filing Waterdown Rd and E/W component of road, clarification on DC Background study.	MJ to resond	Complete	Emailed detailed response.	9-Mar-12
543	Communications between 2-Mar-12 - 7 Mar-12	Public	[redacted]	Email to MM	East-West Corridor Alignment	Requested confirmation of East-West Road Corridor Alingment.	MJ to resond	Complete	Emailed AutoCAD files for the requested road section.	Communications between 2-Mar-12 - 27-Mar-12