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The attached Report (the "Report") has been prepared by AECOM Canada Ltd. ("Consultant") for the benefit of the client ("Client") in accordance with the agreement between Consultant and Client, including the scope of work detailed therein (the "Agreement").

The information, data, recommendations and conclusions contained in the Report (collectively, the “Information”):

- is subject to the scope, schedule, and other constraints and limitations in the Agreement and the qualifications contained in the Report (the "Limitations")
- represents Consultant's professional judgement in light of the Limitations and industry standards for the preparation of similar reports
- may be based on information provided to Consultant which has not been independently verified
- has not been updated since the date of issuance of the Report and its accuracy is limited to the time period and circumstances in which it was collected, processed, made or issued
- must be read as a whole and sections thereof should not be read out of such context
- was prepared for the specific purposes described in the Report and the Agreement
- in the case of subsurface, environmental or geotechnical conditions, may be based on limited testing and on the assumption that such conditions are uniform and not variable either geographically or over time

Consultant shall be entitled to rely upon the accuracy and completeness of information that was provided to it and has no obligation to update such information. Consultant accepts no responsibility for any events or circumstances that may have occurred since the date on which the Report was prepared and, in the case of subsurface, environmental or geotechnical conditions, is not responsible for any variability in such conditions, geographically or over time.

Consultant agrees that the Report represents its professional judgement as described above and that the Information has been prepared for the specific purpose and use described in the Report and the Agreement, but Consultant makes no other representations, or any guarantees or warranties whatsoever, whether express or implied, with respect to the Report, the Information or any part thereof.

The Report is to be treated as confidential and may not be used or relied upon by third parties, except:

- as agreed in writing by Consultant and Client
- as required by law
- for use by governmental reviewing agencies

Consultant accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to parties other than Client who may obtain access to the Report or the Information for any injury, loss or damage suffered by such parties arising from their use of, reliance upon, or decisions or actions based on the Report or any of the Information ("improper use of the Report"), except to the extent those parties have obtained the prior written consent of Consultant to use and rely upon the Report and the Information. Any damages arising from improper use of the Report or parts thereof shall be borne by the party making such use.

This Statement of Qualifications and Limitations is attached to and forms part of the Report and any use of the Report is subject to the terms hereof.
Table of Contents

1. Introduction ........................................................................................................................................ 1

2. Public and Agency Notification ........................................................................................................ 1
   2.1 PIC #1 ........................................................................................................................................... 2

3. Presentation Material .......................................................................................................................... 3

4. Summary of Comments Received .................................................................................................... 3
   4.1 Natural Environment ....................................................................................................................... 4
   4.2 Health and Safety ............................................................................................................................ 4
   4.3 Socio-Economic ............................................................................................................................... 4
   4.4 Transportation/Planning ................................................................................................................... 4
   4.5 Pedestrians and Cyclists ................................................................................................................... 4

5. Conclusion .......................................................................................................................................... 4

6. Next Steps .......................................................................................................................................... 5

List of Tables

Table 1. Agency Contact List .................................................................................................................... 1

Appendices

Appendix A – Notice of Public Information Centre #1
Appendix B – Public Information Centre #1 – Display Panels
Appendix C – Public Information Centre #1 – Formal Presentation Material
Appendix D – Table 2 – Summary of Public Comments Responses
Appendix E – Table 3 – Summary of Question and Answer Session
1. **Introduction**

The purpose of this report is to present an overview of Public Information Centre (PIC) #1, held as part of the Parkway Corridor Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA Study). Responses received from the public have been reviewed and documented in accordance with the Municipal Class EA document which is an approved process under the *Ontario Environmental Assessment Act*.

2. **Public and Agency Notification**

One of the key objectives of the Class EA process is to offer the public, interested parties and agencies with opportunities to provide meaningful input. A comprehensive public and agency notification program is undertaken that consists of providing notices of public consultation events. For the purposes of this EA Study, a study contact list (standard mail and email) was established based on members of the public that had previously demonstrated an interest in the New Peterborough Regional Health Centre Road Network Improvements EA Addendum, given the proximity to the current EA Study, and those who had requested to be added to the study contact list following the issuance of the Notice of Study Commencement.

The notice for PIC #1 was posted on the City’s website on September 19, 2012, and within the Peterborough this Week and Peterborough Examiner on September 19, 20 and 26, 2012. In addition, the notice was mailed via standard delivery to agencies and members of the public on the project contact list on Monday, September 17, 2012 and emailed to members of the public and/or agencies on the email contact list on September 18, 2012. A copy of the notice of PIC #1 is provided in Appendix A of this report.

The following agencies and Aboriginal communities and organizations were notified of PIC #1:

**Table 1. Agency Contact List**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Fisheries &amp; Oceans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provinical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Food &amp; Rural Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Municipal Affairs &amp; Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of the Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, Culture Programs Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport - Peterborough Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otonabee Region Conservation Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough and the Kawarthis Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Peterborough Area Economic Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough County/City EMS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2.1 PIC #1

PIC #1 was held from 5:30 pm to 8:30 pm on Tuesday, October 2, 2012, at the Evinrude Centre in Peterborough. The PIC was presented as a public drop-in and informal discussion, between 5:30 pm and 7:00 pm, at which time a formal presentation was offered by members of the Study Team. The PIC presented the background of the study, an overview of the Municipal Class EA process, feedback received from the public since the commencement of the study, an overview of the existing and anticipated traffic conditions, the Problem Statement, the alternative solutions that have been developed to address the Problem Statement and the preliminary network alternatives. PIC #1 provided an opportunity for members of the public to view the display material and discuss the EA Study with members of the Study Team. Attendees were encouraged to provide written comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County of Peterborough</th>
<th>Peterborough Fire Department</th>
<th>Peterborough Police Association</th>
<th>Peterborough Lakefield Community Police Service - Headquarters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td>Curve Lake First Nation</td>
<td>Hiawatha First Nation</td>
<td>Alderville First Nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation</td>
<td>Chippewas of Rama First Nation</td>
<td>Williams Treaty First Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation</td>
<td>Beausoleil First Nation</td>
<td>Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte</td>
<td>Union of Ontario Indians</td>
<td>Métis Nation of Ontario Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Peterborough and District Wapiti Métis Council</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bell Canada - O.P. Facilities</td>
<td>Canada Post - Operation</td>
<td>Canadian National Institute for the Blind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enbridge Gas Distribution Inc.</td>
<td>Hydro One</td>
<td>Peterborough Utilities Services Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cogeco Cable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board</td>
<td>Peterborough Victoria Northumberland and Clarington Catholic District School Board</td>
<td>Student Transportation Services</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peterborough and the Kawarthas Association of Realtors Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lakefield Heritage Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peterborough County-City Health Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following members of the Study Team were in attendance at PIC #1:

**City of Peterborough**
- Robert Dunford - Senior Project Manager, Utility Services Department
- Blair Nelson - Manager, Design and Construction
- Jim Kimble - Manager, Transportation
- Ken Hetherington - Manager, Planning Division
- Brad Appleby - Planner, Subdivision Control and Special Projects
- Susan Suave - Transportation Demand Management Planner

**AECOM**
- Kevin Jones, Project Manager
- Brenda Jamieson, Associate Vice President, Transportation
- Ian Dobrindt, Senior Environmental Planner
- Diana Addley, Environmental Planner, Transportation

**DM Wills**
- David Bonsall, Manager, Structural Department
- Paul Hurley, Manager, Surveys and Construction

**GLPi**
- Glenn Pothier, President and Facilitator

3. **Presentation Material**

The exhibits presented at PIC #1 are provided in Appendix B and generally include the following:

- Welcome
- Introduction and Purpose of PIC #1
- Background Information
- Class Environmental Assessment Process
- Comments Received to Date
- Existing Conditions Inventory
- Future Growth
- Future Long Term Growth Areas
- Future Road Network Capacity
- Road Network Capacity - South End Intersections
- Road Network Capacity - North End Intersections
- Collision History - North End Intersections
- Collision History - South End Intersections
- Problem Statement and Alternative Solutions
- Alternative 2 - Non Auto Based Solutions
- Alternative 3 - Intersection Improvements
- Alternative 4 - Widen Existing Roads/Add New Roads
- Assessment of Alternative Solutions
- Consideration of West By-Pass Concept
- Preliminary Network Alternatives - North End
- Preliminary Network Alternatives - South End
- Proposed Evaluation Criteria
- Next Steps

The formal presentation material is provided in Appendix C of this report.

4. **Summary of Comments Received**

Sixty-six (66) attendees signed the register at the time of PIC #1 and twenty-seven (27) comment forms were received by the requested submission date of October 19, 2012. Approximately thirty-seven (37) emails were
received from the public. Each comment was reviewed by members of the Study Team. The comments were categorized and generally summarized in table format (please refer to Table 2, Appendix D). Copies of the individual comment sheets and other correspondence will be included in the final Environmental Study Report.

In addition to the above, the comments and/or questions received during PIC question/answer period, as well as the associated responses, have been included in Appendix E of this report.

In general, the following concerns were reported by respondents:

4.1 Natural Environment
- Preservation of green and/or open space
- Preservation of the Jackson Creek valley
- Wildlife migration and habitat loss

4.2 Health and Safety
- Traffic safety at intersections
- Pedestrian safety concerns associated with existing traffic volumes
- Human health associated with active transportation and use of existing trails

4.3 Socio-Economic
- Costs associated with the EA Study and construction activities
- Effects associated with road widening alternatives (impacts to property)
- Referendum results (2003)

4.4 Transportation/Planning
- Infiltration of north-south traffic onto local roadways
- The need to implement operational/intersection improvements
- The need to reduce existing traffic congestion
- Accommodation of other modes of travel (i.e., mopeds, e-bikes, etc.)
- Consideration of a limited access roadway
- Overall opposition for the construction of a new roadway/creek crossing
- Suggestions to construct new roadway/creek crossing

4.5 Pedestrians and Cyclists
- Accommodation of pedestrians and cyclists
- Preservation of existing trails for pedestrian and cyclist use

5. Conclusion
PIC #1 was well attended by members of the community who are concerned about the health and safety of residents of the City. In general, the majority of respondents agreed that traffic improvements were required within the study area. However, many also felt that the existing transportation issues and population are not enough to warrant significant improvements in the study area. A number of residents fully supported the use of the corridor for the purpose for which it was historically intended, however others felt that the corridor has evolved to become a valuable green space and preferred the use of existing roadways (widening) as a solution. Many residents are concerned
about the potential development of a bridge across Jackson Park; however others felt that a new bridge was needed and could enhance the City. In addition, a number of residents felt that transit improvements are necessary in the City.

6. Next Steps

The next steps to be taken by members of the Study Team prior generally consist of the following:

- Review and consider the comments received;
- Confirm the Problem Statement and present to City Council;
- Identify the Preferred Solution;
- Confirm the network alternatives and evaluation criteria;
- Evaluate the network alternatives and identify the recommended network alternative;
- Develop alternative design concepts for the recommended network alternative; and
- Hold PIC #2.
APPENDIX A

Notice of Public Information Centre #1
THE STUDY
The City of Peterborough (City), through their consultant AECOM, is undertaking a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) study (Study) to examine the opportunity to improve traffic flow and increase roadway capacity to address long term growth in the City. Following City Council approval of the City-wide Transportation Plan Review, in November 2011, and the Hospital Access Road Class Environmental Assessment Addendum, in September 2011, an integrated Class EA study for the entire Parkway Corridor is being undertaken.

THE PROCESS
This Study is being carried out in accordance with the planning and design process for Schedule ‘C’ projects as outlined in the Municipal Class EA document (October 2000, as amended in 2007 & 2011), approved under the Environmental Assessment Act. The Municipal Class EA process includes identifying/assessing alternatives, assessment of the anticipated effects on the environment, the identification of reasonable measures to eliminate or reduce any adverse effects, and the preliminary design for the recommended alternative.

The first of three planned Public Information Centres (PICs) has been scheduled as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Tuesday, October 2, 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td>5:30 pm to 8:30 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A presentation will commence at 7:00 pm with discussion to follow

Location: Evinrude Centre  
911 Monaghan Road  
Peterborough

Representatives from the City and the Consultant Team will be at the PIC to present a series of displays for you to review the background of the Study, the draft problem/opportunity statement and the preliminary alternatives to address the problem/opportunity. This PIC will give the public an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments to the Study team.

COMMENTS
You are encouraged to provide your comments by October 19, 2012 so that they may be included in the Study. Information regarding this study will be posted on the City’s website as it becomes available (www.peterborough.ca). In addition, a project email address has been established for this study, ParkwayCorridorEA@peterborough.ca. Comments and requests to be added to the study mailing list can be sent to the study email address or you can contact:

Mr. Kevin Jones  
AECOM Canada Ltd.  
300 Water Street  
Whitby, Ontario L1N 9J2  
Toll Free: 1.800.668.1983, Ext 2515  
Tel: 905.668.9363, Ext. 2515  
Fax: 905.668.0221

Comments, input, and information regarding this study may be included in project documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the Public Record and may be used in the Environmental Study Report.

This Notice issued September 19, 20 and 26, 2012
www.peterborough.ca
APPENDIX B
Public Information #1 - Display Panels
Parkway Corridor
Class Environmental Assessment

Public Information Centre #1

October 2, 2012

WELCOME!
Please sign in so we can keep you updated on the study.
This is the first of three Public Information Centres (PICs) planned as part of this Class EA study. The purpose of this PIC is to present and obtain public input on the following:

- Background information and existing conditions in the study area
- The problem statement
- Alternative solutions and their assessment
- Preliminary network alternatives
- Proposed evaluation criteria
- Next steps in the Class EA process
Background Information

Hospital Access Road Class EA (MOE approved June 2008)

- Original Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) was intended to solve short term neighbourhood traffic issues
  - Many residents felt new road should connect to the Clonsilla Avenue / Parkway intersection
- Class EA Amended (November 2011) to stop construction at Sherbrooke Street
  - Comments received from the public generally supported the need to improve the connection from Medical Drive to the south end of the City
  - Recommendation to undertake separate Class EA study (broader mandate to consider long term growth needs)
    - to determine the need for improvements to the broader road network in the area, including alternative connections for the Hospital Access Road (Medical Drive) to the road network south of Sherbrooke Street.

Comprehensive Transportation Plan (City Council approved November 2011)

- City wide transportation master plan study
- Recommendations included:
  - Widening of Fairbairn Street to 4 lanes - Parkhill Road to The Parkway right of way
  - Construction of a new two-lane arterial road from Fairbairn Street to Cumberland Avenue, within The Parkway right of way.

Considering these as one integrated project to accommodate longer term growth of the City is consistent with the intent of the Class EA process.
Class Environmental Assessment Process

Phase 1
- Study Initiation & Data Collection
- Define Problems & Opportunities

Phase 2
- Develop Alternative Solutions
- Assess Alternative Solutions
- Present the Recommended Solution to Review Agencies / Public for review / comment

Phase 3
- Consider comments & identify Preferred Solution
- Develop Alternative Design Concepts for implementing Preferred Solution
- Undertake environmental field investigations
- Assess Alternative Design Concepts
- Present Recommend Alternative Design Concept to Review Agencies / Public for review / comment
- Consider comments & identify the Preferred Design Concept

Phase 4
- Complete & File Environmental Study Report
Comments Received to Date

Comments Following Notice of Commencement

• Opposed to improvements due to loss of greenspace / impacts on trail users, etc.
• No need - current traffic congestion is not a problem
• Consider economic costs / benefits to determine best use for the corridor
• Consideration for heritage features
• Consideration for existing users and uses for the corridor
• Alternatives should consider the original Parkway route connecting Parkhill Road to Fairbairn Street as opposed to widening of Fairbairn Street
• Concerned about impacts to (individual) property
• Support implementation of improvements in Parkway Corridor
• New corridor would support growth of community
• Consider closure of Highland Road to through traffic
Existing Conditions Inventory

Studies Completed / Underway
- Traffic Counts – Completed
- Collision Review – Completed
- Natural Environmental Inventory (i.e. Habitat Inventory, Species at Risk Review, etc)
- Built Heritage / Cultural Resource Assessment
- Archaeological Assessment

Proposed Studies to be Initiated
- Noise Assessment
- Air Quality Assessment
- Stormwater Management
- Structural Review

Information on features and species within the study area will be collected and used to assess alternatives and develop proposed measures to address potential adverse effects.
**Future Growth**

**Growth**
- City Population forecast to grow by 11.8% (from 78,698 in 2011 to 87,997 by 2031)
- Majority of population growth in north end of the City (approximately 6,100 new residents)
- Employment forecast to grow by 3% to 2021 – with no growth between 2021 and 2031
- Employment growth in southwest and downtown area
- Growth beyond 2031 will be accommodated in remaining lands within designated planning areas

**Population & Employment Growth to 2031**

*Source: (Transportation Master Plan, 2012)*

**Designated Planning Areas Full Build Out – Beyond 2031**

*Source: (Development Charge Background Study, 2012)*
Future Long Term Growth Areas

**Growth in Designated Planning Areas**
The City has identified three major development growth areas in the north end of the City:

1. Chemong Planning Area
2. Carnegie Planning Area
3. Lily Lake Planning Area

Forecasts prepared as part of the City’s Official Plan Amendment #142 (and to support the Transportation Plan Review) have forecast a growth of 6,100 new residents in these planning areas by 2031.

Additional growth would be expected to occur in Carnegie, Chemong and Lily Lake planning areas beyond 2031 as these areas build out to capacity.

An additional **9,200** residents can be accommodated (at planned density targets) – for growth beyond 2031.
Future Road Network Capacity

Capacity

- Without the Fairbairn Street widening and the new arterial roadway in the Parkway corridor, major road network links in the north end of the City will be operating at/over capacity by 2031.
- The City Official Plan and Transportation Master Plan establish Level of Service (LOS) D as a capacity target for future planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>What it Means?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Free Flowing Traffic Minimal Delays All traffic clears on green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Free Flowing Traffic Minimal Delays Most traffic clears on green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Uniform Traffic Flow Moderate Delays Some movements will not clear on green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Congestion noticeable Poor progression with frequent stops and increased delay Many movements at capacity and will not clear on green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Poor traffic flow with frequent stops and high delays Most movements over capacity and traffic rarely clears on first green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Forced Flow conditions with severe congestion Most movements over capacity with long queues that do not clear on green</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of Service for roadways is grouped into 6 categories as described above.

* Dashed lines represent conceptual road network in future planning areas
Today (2012)

2031

**Clonsilla Ave at Goodfellow Rd**
- Today, eastbound left turn is approaching capacity and can spill out of turn lane and block through traffic
- By 2031, eastbound left turn is well over capacity and requires significant green time resulting in northbound and southbound congestion on Goodfellow Road
- Eastbound Clonsilla Avenue over capacity

**Goodfellow Ave at Sherbrooke St**
- Today - northbound right turn approaching capacity
- By 2031 - northbound right turn over capacity with long queues

* 2031 results assume all improvements from 2012 TMP in place except 2 lane arterial road in Parkway corridor and Fairbairn Street widening to 4 lanes
Parkway Corridor
Class EA Study

Road Network Capacity
Simulation Modelling - PM Peak
South End Intersections

Clonsilla Ave at Sherbrooke St

- Northbound Clonsilla Avenue approaching capacity – minor queues
- Northbound left turn demand and lack of dedicated turn lane contributes to localized congestion on northbound Clonsilla Avenue

- Northbound Clonsilla Avenue over capacity – long queues
- Northbound left turn requires significant green time to clear – causes congestion on westbound Sherbrooke Street

* 2031 results assume all improvements from 2012 TMP in place except 2 lane arterial road in Parkway corridor and Fairbairn Street widening to 4 lanes
Parkhill Road at Monaghan Road
- Today westbound left turn backs up onto bridge - intersection approaching capacity
- By 2031 – intersection over capacity
- Long queues for westbound left turns and eastbound through traffic

Parkhill Road at Fairbairn Street
- Today eastbound left turn backs up across bridge during peak periods – intersection approaching capacity
- By 2031 intersection will be over capacity
- Long queues for eastbound left turns and westbound through traffic – southbound traffic queues to Glengarry Avenue
Today (2012)

2031

Chemong Rd at Towerhill Rd
- Northbound Chemong Road approaching capacity today
- By 2031 Northbound Chemong Road over capacity – long queues at intersection

Lily Lake Road at Towerhill Rd
- All Way Stop over capacity by 2031
- Requires enhanced capacity to avoid long queues on northbound approach

* 2031 results assume all improvements from 2012 TMP in place except 2 lane arterial road in Parkway corridor and Fairbairn Street widening to 4 lanes
Collision History
2007- June 2012
South End Intersections

Collisions
- Rear end and turning related collisions are indications of congestion and capacity related issues
- Some turning collisions can be reduced through turning lanes and other geometric improvements
Collisions

- Sideswipe collisions can also indicate congestion issues – or need for turning lanes
- Numerous angle collisions indicate the need for traffic controls (traffic signals)
Problem Statement

Why is this important?
The Problem/Opportunity Statement is extremely important to the Class EA. The statement developed in Phase 1 of the Class EA process establishes the key problems that the project is trying to solve and will assist in the development and evaluation of alternatives.

The performance of the alternatives will be evaluated against the Problem/Opportunity Statement, as one of a number of criteria that will be used to develop the study recommendations.

To accommodate planned population and employment growth the Comprehensive Transportation Plan (2012) identified the need to provide additional road capacity to accommodate north-south travel demands on the west side of the Otonabee River.

Without the Fairbairn Street widening and the new arterial roadway in the Parkway corridor, major road network links in the north end of the City will be operating at/over capacity by 2031, increasing congestion and safety concerns at major intersections.

The termination of Medical Drive at Sherbrooke Street and the interim intersection improvements on Sherbrooke Street are not able to accommodate future long term growth, resulting in congestion and safety concerns at key intersections in the Clonsilla Avenue, Goodfellow Road, and Sherbrooke Street area. Improvements to better connect the road network in this area to the south end of the City should be considered.

Alternative Solutions

1. Do Nothing
- No Improvements or changes to the transportation system beyond those already committed to by the City
- Provides a benchmark for comparing the alternative solutions in accordance with Class EA process

2. Non Auto Based Improvements
- Improvements to encourage transit use
- Implement measures to manage transportation demand
- Encourage increased use of cycling / pedestrian travel modes

3. Intersection Improvements
- Improvements to intersections to better manage the flow of traffic, enhance safety, or add capacity to critical movements

4. Widen Existing Roads / Add New Roads
- Widen existing arterial roads and/or provide new arterial roads within the Study Area

Are there any other alternative solutions that should be considered?
Non Auto Based Solutions have been adopted in the Transportation Master Plan and Mode Share targets have been incorporated into future forecasts for this Class EA. Even if these targets are achieved, additional road improvements will be required to accommodate the forecast demand.

**Improve Transit**
- City Transportation Master Plan recommends increase share of transit trips from 4% to 6%.
- This represents an increase of 890,000 riders per year or 28% from 2011.

**Manage Transportation Demand**
- City Transportation Master Plan recommends a series of policies and programs to manage the growth in auto demand. These have been factored into the base forecasts and mode share targets used.

**Increased Cycling / Pedestrian Use**
- City Transportation Master Plan recommends 83 km of new on road cycling lanes and 48 km of new off road trails.
- It is expected that this investment will increase share of cycling/walking trips from 6% to 8% - these assumptions have been incorporated into base forecasts.
Improvements may provide some operational benefits but will not provide sufficient new capacity to address midblock capacity deficiencies:

- Midblock sections of Chemong Road, Towerhill Road, Parkhill Road, Water Street, Clonsilla Avenue would still operate over capacity

Clonsilla Avenue at Goodfellow Road
- Left turn lanes already exist on Clonsilla Avenue and advance green phases are in use today
- With future growth in volume there is a lack of sufficient green time to serve EB left turn
  - Reassigning green to serve the left turn to Goodfellow would result in congestion on Goodfellow Road
  - Providing a second left turn lane would require widening of Clonsilla Avenue and Goodfellow
  - Significant property impacts

Clonsilla Avenue at Sherbrooke Street
- No left turn lanes exist – advance greens not efficient
  - If lanes restriped to provide separate left turn lanes there will be insufficient capacity to accommodate through volumes
  - If left turn lanes added – there would be significant property impacts on all four corners

Charlotte Street at Monaghan Road
- Eastbound / Westbound left turn lanes already exist on Charlotte Street and advance green phases are in use today
- With future growth in volume there is a lack of sufficient green time to serve EB left turn
  - Reassigning green to serve the left turn to Monaghan Road would result in Westbound congestion on Charlotte Street and Northbound congestion on Monaghan Road
  - Providing a second left turn lane would require widening of Charlotte Street and Monaghan Road
  - Significant property impacts

Parkhill Road – Monaghan Road to Fairbairn Street
- Middle lane in both directions already acts as separate left turn lane
- Advance green phases are in use and long queues exist during peak periods today
- With future growth in volume there is a lack of sufficient green time to serve Eastbound and Westbound left turn demands
  - Providing a second left turn lane would require widening of Parkhill Road, Fairbairn Street and/or Monaghan Road
  - The Transportation Master Plan recommended a roundabout at Parkhill Road / Fairbairn Street – along with widening Fairbairn Street
  - On its own, a roundabout does not address through capacity deficiency on Parkhill Road

Intersection improvements cannot provide sufficient new capacity to accommodate longer term growth without significant improvements (i.e. widening)
Various combinations of road widening and/or new road connections can address the capacity deficiencies and improve connectivity from Medical Drive to the south end of the city.

- The 2012 Transportation Master Plan identified a number of road improvements to address future capacity deficiencies.
- In the north end of the study area - Widening other existing roads (Fairbairn Street, Parkhill Road, County Road 19, etc) may also address some or all of the problems.
- Typically road network improvements located closer to the identified capacity deficiencies work better at solving these problems and require less out of way travel for motorists.
- In the south end of the study area - Widening existing roads (i.e. Clonsilla Avenue or Goodfellow Road) and/or providing a new road connection may address capacity deficiencies and provide an improved connection from Medical Drive to the road network in the south end of the city.
**Assessment of Alternative Solutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Does not address problems</td>
<td>Can partially address capacity problems</td>
<td>Can partially address capacity problems</td>
<td>Can address capacity and connectivity problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Environment</td>
<td>No adverse effects anticipated</td>
<td>Minimal potential for adverse effects – can be mitigated through implementation</td>
<td>Minor potential for localized adverse effects - can be avoided or mitigated in design</td>
<td>Moderate to High potential for effects - can be avoided or mitigated in design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Environment</td>
<td>No adverse effects anticipated May restrict future planned development</td>
<td>Minimal potential for adverse effects - can support development and increased densities</td>
<td>Minor potential for localized effects - can be avoided or mitigated in design</td>
<td>Moderate to High potential for effects - can be avoided or mitigated in design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Environment</td>
<td>Increased traffic infiltration in neighbourhoods (noise, air quality, safety, etc) effects</td>
<td>Increased traffic infiltration in neighbourhoods (noise, air quality, safety, etc) effects</td>
<td>Some potential to reduce traffic infiltration in neighbourhoods (localized areas) benefits</td>
<td>High potential to reduce traffic infiltration in neighbourhoods (noise, air quality, safety, etc) benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Environment</td>
<td>No adverse effects anticipated</td>
<td>No adverse effects anticipated Improved access for those without cars</td>
<td>Minor potential for localized adverse effects - can be avoided or mitigated in design</td>
<td>Moderate to High potential for adverse effects - can be avoided or mitigated in design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Environment</td>
<td>Higher delays reduce competitiveness of city No direct effects on business</td>
<td>High delays reduce competitiveness of city No direct effects on business Improved access to employers</td>
<td>Minor potential to reduce delays in localized areas Minor potential for localized effects to business - can be avoided or mitigated in design</td>
<td>Potential to reduce delays Moderate to High potential for displacement of businesses - can be avoided or mitigated in design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>No new capital / maintenance cost</td>
<td>Moderate capital and high operational costs</td>
<td>Moderate capital and minimal maintenance costs</td>
<td>Moderate – high capital and maintenance costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Not Recommended</td>
<td>Recommended in combination with Alternative 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>Recommended in combination with Alternative 2 &amp; 4</td>
<td>Recommended in combination with Alternative 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Combination Solution including Non-Auto Based Improvements (as per TMP), Intersection Improvements and Widening Roads and/ or Adding New Roads is recommended to address Problem Statement.
Past studies have assessed the West By-Pass Concept and concluded that it does not address the north-south capacity problems in the City (2002 TMP, West Side Corridor Study).

The “West By-Pass” already exists today.

To attract additional traffic use, 3rd Line, Fairbairn Street, Lily Lake Road, Ackison Road, and Brealey Drive would need to be upgraded to a 4 lane highway standard to provide for higher operating speeds.

Modelling results indicate that the West By-Pass:

- Could attract between 200 and 250 vehicles/hour from other roads
- Provides some localized relief to Chemong Road / Highland Road – but this traffic is shifted to Fairbairn Street
- Provides some relief to Towerhill Road
- Adds traffic to Fairbairn Street – south of Lily Lake Road – which would be at capacity
- Does not address the capacity deficiency on Parkhill Road – between Monaghan Road & Fairbairn Street
- Does not address the capacity deficiency on Clonsilla Avenue at Goodfellow Road and Charlotte Street at Monaghan Road

The West By-Pass does not provide enhanced connections from Medical Drive to the road network in the south end of the city.

The West By-Pass would not attract enough traffic to solve identified capacity issues and does not address the key problems identified.

Concept is not a “reasonable” solution to the problems identified and is not recommended to be carried forward.
1. Parkhill Road Widening + Water Street / George Street Upgrades

2. Parkhill Road - Fairbairn Street Widening to Parkway Corridor (per Transportation Master Plan, TMP) + 2 Lane Arterial in Parkway Corridor (per TMP) + Operational Improvements to Cumberland Avenue

3. Parkhill Road - Fairbairn Street Widening to 3rd line + Upgrades to 3rd Line and County Road 19 + New Connection to Cumberland Avenue + Operational Improvements to Cumberland Avenue

4. New bridge across Jackson Creek Valley + 2 Lane Arterial in Parkway Corridor (per TMP) + Operational Improvements to Cumberland Avenue

5. New bridge across Jackson Creek Valley + Fairbairn Street Widening to 3rd line + Upgrades to 3rd Line and County Road 19 + New Connection to Cumberland Avenue + Operational Improvements to Cumberland Avenue

Are there any other network alternatives that should be considered?
1. Medical Drive extension south to Clonsilla Avenue – via Parkway Corridor

2. Medical Drive Extension to Clonsilla Avenue (at Third Avenue) + Widening / Improvements to Clonsilla Avenue

3. Medical Drive extension to Goodfellow Road via Parkway Corridor + widening Goodfellow Road to 4 lanes + Widening / Improvements to Clonsilla Avenue

Are there any other network alternatives that should be considered?
### Proposed Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Proposed Evaluation Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Technical            | • Effect on network performance  
• Effect on intersection delay / congestion  
• Effect on safety  
• Effect on overall network delay  
• Effect on future roadway capacity beyond 2031 |
| Natural Environment  | • Effect on groundwater  
• Effect on surface water  
• Effect on aquatic habitat or functions  
• Effect on aquatic species including species at risk  
• Effect on terrestrial habitat or functions  
• Effect on terrestrial species including species at risk  
• Effect on drainage patterns |
| Built Environment    | • Effect on existing residences, businesses, and/or community, institutional, and recreational facilities  
• Effect on property  
• Effect on existing utility infrastructure |
| Social Environment   | • Effect on open space areas  
• Effect on pedestrians and cyclist facilities  
• Effect of noise at sensitive locations (receivers)  
• Effect on air quality from vehicle emissions |
| Cultural Environment | • Effect on known or potential significant Archaeological resources  
• Effect on built heritage resources and cultural landscape features |
| Economic Environment | • Effect on approved / planned land uses  
• Effect on overall travel time |
| Financial            | • Capital Costs  
• Operational / Maintenance Costs  
• Costs / Benefits |

Are there any other evaluation criteria that should be considered?
Next Steps

- Review comments provided
- Confirm Problem Statement and present to City Council
- Identify the Preferred Solution
- Confirm Network Alternatives and Evaluation Criteria
- Evaluate Network Alternatives and identify the recommended network alternative
- Develop Alternative Design Concepts for the Recommended Network Alternative
- Hold PIC 2 (tentatively scheduled for late January 2013)

Please provide your comments by October 19th, 2012

How can I provide comments?
- Fill in comment sheets provided tonight – drop them in box or send to project team via mail / fax
- Visit project website – review display material and submit comments online
  http://www.peterborough.ca/Business/Studies/Parkway_Corridor_EA/Comments.htm
- Send comments by email to ParkwayCorridorEA@peterborough.ca

Questions?
If you have any additional questions, please do not hesitate to contact:

Mr. Kevin Jones,
Consultant Project Manager
AECOM Canada
Toll Free: 1 800 668 1983 x 2515
Tel: 905 668 9363 x 2515
Email: kevin.jones@aecom.com
Parkway Corridor
Class Environmental Assessment

Public Information Centre #1

October 2, 2012

WELCOME!
Please sign in so we can keep you updated on the study.
This is the first of three Public Information Centres (PICs) planned as part of this Class EA study. The purpose of this PIC is to present and obtain public input on the following:

- Background information and existing conditions in the study area
- The problem statement
- Alternative solutions and their assessment
- Preliminary network alternatives
- Proposed evaluation criteria
- Next steps in the Class EA process
Background Information

**Hospital Access Road Class EA** *(MOE approved June 2008)*

- Original Class EA was intended to solve short term neighbourhood traffic issues
  - Many residents felt new road should connect to the Clonsilla Avenue / Parkway intersection

- Class EA Amended (November 2011) to stop construction at Sherbrooke Street
  - Public generally supported the need to improve the connection from Medical Drive to the south end of the City
  - Separate Class EA study to assess *alternative connections for the Hospital Access Road (Medical Drive) to the road network south of Sherbrooke Street*
    - (broader mandate to consider long term growth needs)
Comprehensive Transportation Plan
(City Council approved November 2011)

- City wide transportation master plan study
- Recommendations included:
  - Widening of Fairbairn Street to 4 lanes - Parkhill Road to The Parkway right of way
  - Construction of a new two-lane arterial road from Fairbairn Street to Cumberland Avenue, within The Parkway right of way.

Considering these as one integrated project to accommodate longer term growth of the City is consistent with the intent of the Class EA process.
Parkway Corridor
Class EA Study

Class Environmental Assessment Process

Phase 1
- Study Initiation & Data Collection
- Define Problems & Opportunities

Phase 2
- Develop Alternative Solutions
- Assess Alternative Solutions
- Present the Recommended Solution to Review Agencies / Public for review / comment
  - Consider comments & identify Preferred Solution

Phase 3
- Develop Alternative Design Concepts for implementing Preferred Solution
- Undertake environmental field investigations
- Assess Alternative Design Concepts
- Present Recommend Alternative Design Concept to Review Agencies / Public for review / comment
  - Consider comments & identify the Preferred Design Concept

Phase 4
- Complete & File Environmental Study Report

We are Here

Work completed to date
Future Growth

Growth

- City Population forecast to grow by 11.8%
  - About **9300 new residents by 2031**
  - (from 78,698 in 2011 to 87,997 by 2031)

- Majority of population growth in north end of the City
- and employment growth in southwest and downtown areas

- The five key growth areas in the north end of the City will add **approximately 6,100 new residents by 2031**

- An additional **9,200 residents can be accommodated for growth beyond 2031**

- Long term growth potential has not be used in forecasting future demands for 2031, but it is important to consider as we assess benefits of various alternatives

Source: (Development Charge Background Study, 2012)
2031 PM Peak - Road Network Capacity

- All improvements from TMP except Fairbairn Street widening and new 2 lane road in Parkway Corridor
- Major road network links in the north end of the City will be operating at/over capacity by 2031
Today (2012)

2031

**Clonsilla Ave at Goodfellow Rd**
- Today, eastbound left turn is approaching capacity and can spill out of turn lane and block through traffic
- By 2031, eastbound left turn is well over capacity and requires significant green time resulting in northbound and southbound congestion on Goodfellow Road
- Eastbound Clonsilla Avenue over capacity

**Goodfellow Ave at Sherbrooke St**
- Today - northbound right turn approaching capacity
- By 2031 - northbound right turn over capacity with long queues

*2031 results assume all improvements from 2012 TMP in place except 2 lane arterial road in Parkway corridor and Fairbairn Street widening to 4 lanes*
Clonsilla Ave at Sherbrooke St

- Northbound Clonsilla Avenue approaching capacity – minor queues
- Northbound left turn demand and lack of dedicated turn lane contributes to localized congestion on northbound Clonsilla Avenue

- Northbound Clonsilla Avenue over capacity – long queues
- Northbound left turn requires significant green time to clear – causes congestion on westbound Sherbrooke Street

* 2031 results assume all improvements from 2012 TMP in place except 2 lane arterial road in Parkway corridor and Fairbairn Street widening to 4 lanes
Parkhill Road at Monaghan Road
- Today westbound left turn backs up onto bridge - intersection approaching capacity
- By 2031 – intersection over capacity
- Long queues for westbound left turns and eastbound through traffic

Parkhill Road at Fairbairn Street
- Today eastbound left turn backs up across bridge during peak periods – intersection approaching capacity
- By 2031 intersection will be over capacity
- Long queues for eastbound left turns and westbound through traffic – southbound traffic queues to Glengarry Avenue
Today (2012)

Chemong Rd at Towerhill Rd
- Northbound Chemong Road approaching capacity today
- By 2031 Northbound Chemong Road over capacity – long queues at intersection

Lily Lake Road at Towerhill Rd
- All Way Stop over capacity by 2031
- Requires enhanced capacity to avoid long queues on northbound approach

* 2031 results assume all improvements from 2012 TMP in place except 2 lane arterial road in Parkway corridor and Fairbairn Street widening to 4 lanes

2031

Road Network Capacity
Simulation Modelling – PM Peak
North End Intersections
**Collisions**

- Rear end and turning related collisions are indications of congestion and capacity related issues
- Some turning collisions can be reduced through turning lanes and other geometric improvements
Collisions

- Sideswipe collisions can also indicate congestion issues – or need for turning lanes.
- Numerous angle collisions indicate the need for traffic controls (traffic signals).
Problem Statement

To accommodate planned population and employment growth the Comprehensive Transportation Plan (2012) identified the need to provide additional road capacity to accommodate north-south travel demands on the west side of the Otonabee River.

Without the Fairbairn Street widening and the new arterial roadway in the Parkway corridor, major road network links in the north end of the City will be operating at/over capacity by 2031, increasing congestion and safety concerns at major intersections.

The termination of Medical Drive at Sherbrooke Street and the interim intersection improvements on Sherbrooke Street are not able to accommodate future long term growth, resulting in congestion and safety concerns at key intersections in the Clonsilla Avenue, Goodfellow Road, and Sherbrooke Street area. Improvements to better connect the road network in this area to the south end of the City should be considered.

Alternative Solutions

1. Do Nothing
2. Non Auto Based Improvements
3. Intersection Improvements
4. Widen Existing Roads / Add New Roads
Alternative 2 - Non Auto Based Solutions

**Improve Transit**
- City Transportation Master Plan recommends increase share of transit trips from 4% to 6% - a 28% increase in ridership from 2006

**Manage Transportation Demand**
- City Transportation Master Plan recommends a series of policies and programs to manage the growth in auto demand. These have been factored into the base forecasts and mode share targets used.

**Increased Cycling / Pedestrian Use**
- City Transportation Master Plan recommends 83 km of new on road cycling lanes and 48 km of new off road trails.
- It is expected that this investment will increase share of cycling /walking trips from 6% to 8% - these assumptions have been incorporated into base forecasts.

*Mode Share targets have been incorporated into future forecasts for this Class EA.*

*Even if these targets are achieved, additional road improvements will be required to accommodate the forecast demand.*
Improvements may provide some operational benefits but will not provide sufficient new capacity to address midblock capacity deficiencies.

Midblock sections of Chemong Road, Towerhill Road, Parkhill Road, Water Street, Clonsilla Avenue would still operate over capacity.

**Clonsilla Avenue at Goodfellow Road**
- Reassigning green to serve the left turn to Goodfellow would result in congestion on Goodfellow Road
- Providing a second left turn lane would require widening of Clonsilla Avenue and Goodfellow
- Significant property impacts

**Charlotte Street at Monaghan Road**
- Reassigning green to serve the left turn to Monaghan Road would result in Westbound congestion on Charlotte Street and Northbound congestion on Monaghan Road
- Providing a second left turn lane would require widening of Charlotte Street and Monaghan Road
- Significant property impacts
Clonsilla Avenue at Sherbrooke Street
• If lanes restriped to provide separate left turn lanes there will be insufficient capacity to accommodate through volumes
• If left turn lanes added – there would be significant property impacts on all four corners

Parkhill Road – Monaghan Road to Fairbairn Street
• Providing a second left turn lane would require widening of Parkhill Road, Fairbairn Street and/or Monaghan Road
• The Transportation Master Plan recommended a roundabout at Parkhill Road / Fairbairn Street – along with widening Fairbairn Street
• On its own, a roundabout does not address through capacity deficiency on Parkhill Road

Intersection improvements cannot provide sufficient new capacity to accommodate longer term growth without significant improvements (i.e. widening)
Alternative 4 - Widen Existing Roads / Add New Roads

- The 2012 Transportation Master Plan identified a number of road improvements to address future capacity deficiencies.
- Widening other existing roads (Fairbairn Street, Parkhill Road, County Road 19, etc) may also address some or all of the problems.

- Widening existing roads (i.e. Clonsilla Avenue or Goodfellow Road) and/or providing a new road connection may address capacity deficiencies.
- May also provide an improved connection from Medical Drive to the road network in the south end of the city.

Various combinations of road widening and/or new road connections can address the capacity deficiencies and improve connectivity from Medical Drive to the south end of the city.
Assessment of Alternative Solutions

1. **Do Nothing**
   - Does not address problem statement
   - Potential for adverse effects (delays / neighbourhood traffic, etc)

2. **Non Auto Based Improvements**
   - Only partially addresses problem statement
   - Potential for adverse effects (delays / neighbourhood traffic, etc)

3. **Intersection Improvements**
   - Only partially addresses problem statement
   - Minor potential for adverse environmental effects – can be avoided / mitigated

4. **Widen Roads / Add New Roads**
   - Can addresses problem statement
   - Moderate to High potential for adverse environmental effects
   - Many effects can be avoided / mitigated

A Combination Solution is recommended. This includes:
- Planned Non-Auto Based Improvements (as per TMP),
- Intersection Improvements,
- Widening Roads and/or Adding New Roads
Past studies have assessed the West By-Pass Concept and concluded that it does not address the north-south capacity problems in the City (2002 TMP, West Side Corridor Study)

The “West By-Pass” already exists today

To attract additional traffic use, 3rd Line, Fairbairn Street, Lily Lake Road, Ackison Road, and Brealey Drive would need to be upgraded to a 4 lane highway standard to provide for higher operating speeds

**How much traffic would divert to use a west side by-pass?**

- Modelling results indicate that the West By-Pass:
  - Could attract between 200 and 250 vehicles / hour from other roads
  - Provides some localized relief to Chemong Road / Highland Road – but this traffic is shifted to Fairbairn Street
  - Provides some relief to Towerhill Road
Consideration of West By-Pass Concept

- Modelling results indicate that the West By-Pass:
  - Adds traffic to Fairbairn Street – south of Lily Lake Road – which would be at capacity
  - Does not address the capacity deficiency on Parkhill Road – between Monaghan Road & Fairbairn Street
  - Does not address the capacity deficiency on Clonsilla Avenue at Goodfellow Road and Charlotte Street at Monaghan Road

- The West By-Pass does not provide enhanced connections from Medical Drive to the road network in the south end of the city.

The West By-Pass would not attract enough traffic to solve identified capacity issues and does not address the key problems identified.

Concept is not a “reasonable” solution to the problems identified and is not recommended to be carried forward.
Are there any other network alternatives that should be considered?
Are there any other network alternatives that should be considered?
### Proposed Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Proposed Evaluation Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical</strong></td>
<td>• Effect on network performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Effect on intersection delay / congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Effect on safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Effect on overall network delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Effect on future roadway capacity beyond 2031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Environment</strong></td>
<td>• Effect on groundwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Effect on surface water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Effect on aquatic habitat or functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Effect on aquatic species including species at risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Effect on terrestrial habitat or functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Effect on terrestrial species including species at risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Effect on drainage patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Built Environment</strong></td>
<td>• Effect on existing residences, businesses, and/or community, institutional, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recreational facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Effect on property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Effect on existing utility infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Proposed Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Proposed Evaluation Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Environment</strong></td>
<td>• Effect on open space areas&lt;br&gt;• Effect on pedestrians and cyclist facilities&lt;br&gt;• Effect of noise at sensitive locations (receptors)&lt;br&gt;• Effect on air quality from vehicle emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Environment</strong></td>
<td>• Effect on known or potential significant Archaeological resources&lt;br&gt;• Effect on built heritage resources and cultural landscape features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Environment</strong></td>
<td>• Effect on approved / planned land uses&lt;br&gt;• Effect on overall travel time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial</strong></td>
<td>• Capital Costs&lt;br&gt;• Operational / Maintenance Costs&lt;br&gt;• Costs / Benefits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there any other evaluation criteria that should be considered?
Comments Received to Date

Comments Following Notice of Commencement

• Opposed to improvements due to loss of greenspace / impacts on trail users, etc.
• No need - current traffic congestion is not a problem
• Consider economic costs / benefits to determine best use for the corridor
• Consideration for heritage features
• Consideration for existing users and uses for the corridor
• Alternatives should consider the original Parkway route connecting Parkhill Road to Fairbairn Street as opposed to widening of Fairbairn Street
• Concerned about impacts to (individual) property
• Support implementation of improvements in Parkway Corridor
• New corridor would support growth of community
• Consider closure of Highland Road to through traffic
Comments

Tonight we want to hear what you have to say:

- What comments, if any, do you have about the problem statement?
- What other network alternatives (in either the North End or South End) should be considered?
- Do you have any suggestions for additional evaluation criteria beyond those already identified?

How can you provide comments?

- Fill in comment sheets provided tonight – drop them in box or send to project team via mail / fax
- Visit project website – review display material and submit comments online http://www.peterborough.ca/Business/Studies/Parkway_Corridor_EA/Comments.htm
- Send comments by email to ParkwayCorridorEA@peterborough.ca

Please provide your comments by October 19th, 2012
Next Steps

- Review comments provided
- Confirm Problem Statement and present to City Council
- Identify the Preferred Solution
- Confirm Network Alternatives and Evaluation Criteria
- Evaluate Network Alternatives and identify the recommended network alternative
- Develop Alternative Design Concepts for the Recommended Network Alternative
- Hold PIC 2 (tentatively scheduled for late January 2013)

Thank You!
APPENDIX D

Table 2 - Summary of Public Comments and Responses
### Table 2
**Summary of Public Comments and Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jackson Creek/Green Space</strong></td>
<td>Comments regarding the significance and importance of Jackson Park have been noted and will be considered in the evaluation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This section of Jackson Park is the most used, and the park itself is a very important part of Peterborough's green spaces, and should not be violated by a bridge. The Fairburn Street option appears to be the best. Whatever work is done on the roads in Peterborough, let it be done without a bridge built through Jackson Park. Jackson Park is a valuable and highly-used corridor for outdoor physical activity and safe cycling paths. To compromise it in order to save 5 minutes on car-travel is unnecessary and does not prioritize healthy urban planning. When environment is at the top of the list for most communities and governments to consider do we need to create faster routes so we can accommodate more cars? We are living in this city because it is natural and we can have natural and green space to breathe and not always be listening to the noise of traffic. Use the roads that we have. Save the green space for those who are nourished and rejuvenated by nature. We don’t all choose to live in the fast lane. I definitely do not want to see a bridge constructed over Jackson Park/Creek or the destruction of the remaining Parkway corridor between Fairbairn Street and Cumberland Avenue. Even if there was a pathway alongside the new road, the path would lose all of its aesthetic appeal. We thrive on walking and cycling, and these activities are greatly enhanced by trees, wildlife, and the absence of noisy, polluting traffic. Protect these vital areas, not just for human use, but for the wildlife that depend on connected natural areas. This is what makes cities more liveable. Please leave Jackson Park alone, and please do not extend the Parkway any further. Jackson Park is frequently busy with walkers and cyclists of all ages. It is a special place of wild beauty and habitat to a variety wildlife - a very special place in the center of a city and one of the important attractions that draws people to Peterborough to live and to visit.</td>
<td>Within the Environmental Assessment process, it is important to identify a comprehensive list of “reasonable” alternatives to address identified problems and opportunities. Some alternatives may functionally work better than others. On the other hand, some alternatives may result in various degrees of effects to the natural environment, the livability of neighbourhoods, or private businesses and residential properties, etc. The EA process is designed to highlight these advantages and disadvantages for each alternative, and how these factors have been considered in arriving at the recommended alternative that represents the best overall solution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2
Summary of Public Comments and Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction of any type of road through this park will destroy the natural peace and beauty that this location currently offers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please do not damage our park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am opposed to damaging any more of Jackson Park. This park has many uses, and wildlife considerations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't touch Jackson Park. Leave it the way it is! It is a treasure and a jewel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am against building any sort of roadway through Jackson Park. Protecting parkland in the city is much more important than making it easier for more cars to be on the roads. There is a fabulous green space there and once it is gone, there is no getting it back.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel strongly that paving any of Jackson's Park would not benefit Peterborough, which is known for having trees and parks, and cottage country nearby. If anything we should be expanding our park system, as it complements the recreational spirit which makes Peterborough so popular.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was a major donation of $150,000 by two concerned citizens to improve the walking/cycling trail along the Parkway corridor. This has improved the quality of life for all citizens of Peterborough, and enhanced our reputation as a 'green' city.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please do not build a bridge over Jackson Park - that park is heavily used by families, dog walkers, cyclists and walkers of all motilities as a place for peace and tranquility. Our parkland is precious and why many people move here.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Park is a treasure we are meant to steward for the future. We need to protect it from destruction of any kind. If the plan proceeds, Option 3 would be the least harmful option.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any bridge through Jackson Park (it looks like you're pushing that) must not interfere with the Trans Canada Trail or the open valley.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wildlife</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to see a year round wildlife survey of the existing corridor between Chemong Road and Cumberland Avenue, during all seasons. From my observations as a wildlife biologist and local resident, there is a significant use in this</td>
<td>Comments regarding the use of the existing corridor by wildlife have been noted and will be considered in the evaluation process. Our review and inventory of existing natural areas utilizes data sources from the MNR, Otonabee Region Conservation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2
Summary of Public Comments and Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>corridor during migration in the spring, fall and summer nesting.</td>
<td>Authority, and other agencies combined with field reviews to confirm potential habitat areas and any observed species. The reviews and determination of the significance of potential habitat areas are undertaken in accordance with established MNR guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Jackson Park is impacted, it will affect wildlife areas. This could result in more wildlife on private properties.  The corridor would lose its value as wildlife habitat and as a safe route by which birds and other wildlife can move across the city.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living where we do, I feel the traffic issues are understated. What I didn’t see was the effect on pedestrian traffic experienced by the sheer volume in particular. Living on Parkhill Road, we don’t feel it is safe for our kids to walk anywhere or access Jackson’s Park safely. Pedestrian traffic seems to be ignored. The existing bridge over the creek isn’t safe to walk on.  We have to take the traffic off residential streets for safety and reduce pollution from stop and go traffic.  It is time that action is taken to construct a roadway on this land as traffic in nearby residential areas is overwhelming at times and there are many accidents occurring.  Assess vehicle accidents present and forecast for routes where existing streets are proposed (i.e., Fairbairn, Parkhill, Clonsilla, Goodfellow, etc.).  Quality green space such as the Parkway corridor is also of huge benefit to community health, since it is such a pleasant place to walk and get exercise.</td>
<td>Comments regarding pedestrian safety, neighbourhood traffic and vehicular safety are noted and will be considered as part of the evaluation process. In response to comments an additional evaluation criterion has been added under the Social category to assess how well various alternatives reduce traffic using local / collector roads. As part of the preferred solution, opportunities to incorporate new pedestrian and cycling facilities into the alternatives will be assessed and a specific evaluation criterion has been included to address affects on recreational trails and open space areas. In the event that the recommended corridor impacts an existing trail, opportunities to provide a new trail, or similar facility, will be incorporated into the design of the new corridor in later stages of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The residents of Fairbairn Street, from Parkhill Road to Highland Road should not have to endure the amount of traffic that a 4-laned section of that street would attract. Also, a traffic light at Wolsely and Fairbairn Street would not be needed as there would be much less traffic on both Wolsely and Fairbairn Street if the new roadway crossed Fairbairn Street at the north end of Jackson Park.</td>
<td>Comments have been noted and will be considered during the evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkhill Road/Fairburn Option: The writer of the Peterborough Examiner editorial (October 7) describing this option as “even more attractive” overlooked a number of effects that should be of great concern to the community. The creation of a major</td>
<td>Comments have been noted and will be considered during the evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Health and Safety

- **Property Impacts**
  - The residents of Fairbairn Street, from Parkhill Road to Highland Road should not have to endure the amount of traffic that a 4-laned section of that street would attract. Also, a traffic light at Wolsely and Fairbairn Street would not be needed as there would be much less traffic on both Wolsely and Fairbairn Street if the new roadway crossed Fairbairn Street at the north end of Jackson Park.
  - Comments have been noted and will be considered during the evaluation.
  - Parkhill Road/Fairburn Option: The writer of the Peterborough Examiner editorial (October 7) describing this option as “even more attractive” overlooked a number of effects that should be of great concern to the community. The creation of a major

### Socio-Economic
## Table 2
Summary of Public Comments and Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>four-lane traffic corridor will act as a major barrier, rendering access to the park from the abutting neighbourhoods both difficult and unsafe. It is difficult to imagine a four-lane widening with bike lanes and sidewalks avoiding the parkland on the west side of Fairbairn Street (and the steep slopes of the valley) or the need to remove houses on the east side of Fairbairn Street.</td>
<td>The 2003 Referendum question was: <em>“Do you approve of the construction of the Parkway extension at an estimated cost of $22.0 million?”</em>. While “No” was the response received by the majority of voters, there were only 47.89% of votes received from registered voters. The turnout needs to be at least 50% of the registered voters for the results to be binding under the Provincial Legislation governing municipal referendums.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Referendum

A referendum was held on finishing the Parkway and it was defeated. Now they claim it didn't have enough voters. Then hold another referendum. Let the citizens have their say on this issue.

It was my understanding that this issue had been resolved in a referendum a few years ago.

I am deeply dismayed and concerned that the City is giving any further consideration to the idea of extending the road network system through Jackson Park - an option that I understand was clearly rejected in the 2003 referendum, though I did not live in Peterborough at that time.

A previous study 2 years ago that was presented to the City of Peterborough Council found that there was no current problem with traffic flow in the City that could not be fixed with minor intersection improvements. The previous Parkway referendum result showed that the majority of Peterborough residents rejected the plan for a parkway in Peterborough.

The voters have already turned it down in 2003.

There are a number of reasons why residents may have voted no:
- Some have noted that this referendum was for the “partial parkway” concept recommended in the 2002 Transportation Plan, and because this proposal did not include a bridge across Jackson Park they voted no;
- Others assumed that the expenditure was to be funded 100% from property taxes and that construction would proceed immediately - and as a result they felt the City could not afford the expenditure at that time;
- Others were opposed to the Parkway itself and voted no to the project.

Given the many reasons for residents voting no at the time, the City completed a review and update of their Transportation Master Plan. The 2012 Transportation Master Plan (TMP) looked at city-wide transportation improvements to address long term growth needs and examined a series of alternatives to the Parkway. The 2012 TMP identified the widening of Fairbairn Street along with a new two lane arterial road in the Parkway Corridor as two of a number of projects that would be required by 2031. The updated TMP was approved by City Council in November 2011.

This current Class EA study is undertaking the planning for the Parkway Corridor improvements recommended as part of the recent 2012 Transportation Master Plan, and the Hospital Access Road EA Addendum.
**Table 2**

**Summary of Public Comments and Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support for Parkway</strong></td>
<td>commenting have been noted and will be considered during the evaluation. In the event that a new arterial road in the Parkway Corridor is confirmed as the preferred road network alternative, design alternatives will be developed and evaluated to determine the preferred design treatment to maintain the current multi-use trail through these lands. As part of this Class EA study, we are planning to hold a design workshop where the public can provide their comments and input into the development of these design concepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The completion of the Parkway will be an awesome addition to the citizens of Peterborough. Being able to cross the city in a timely manner and spreading traffic out to alternate routes being the end result. Currently two of the major routes to and from the north section of the city require travel through the Downtown. Completion of the Parkway will reduce traffic congestion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow the original route so that bottle necks are eliminated at intersections. Build a bridge over Jackson Park (trees grow back). Take the bold step of finishing both remaining sections as one project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please consider the original route over Jackson Creek. The fact that the original route does not bisect the park but skirts the west and north border should be more clearly illustrated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Medical Drive at Sherbrooke Street should extend to hook up with the Parkway where it now stops at Clonsilla Avenue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t widen Fairbairn Street and Parkhill Road. Build the bridge over Jackson Park to extend the Parkway in both directions as originally planned. It’s the only way to avoid the congestion at all the other intersections.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Parkway as a 2-lane roadway so that green space and other important uses of the space can be maximized.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway should be built as soon as possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build the Parkway as it was planned!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it wise to look at a bridge over Jackson Park. Just look at Europe with their beautiful bridges. Make our city exceptional!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build the Parkway, using the designated corridor, and a bridge over Jackson Park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not object the building of a new 2 lane road from Fairbairn to Cumberland Avenue because this vacant land was set aside for this very purpose.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2
Summary of Public Comments and Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It would be nice to have future “off the road trails” along the corridor with a surface other than concrete or asphalt. How about an old fashion foot path with untrimmed grass?</td>
<td>Recommend building the Parkway along the right-of-way corridor set aside from existing streets. That is, build the Parkway as a new road, not expansion to existing roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend building the Parkway along the right-of-way corridor set aside from existing streets. That is, build the Parkway as a new road, not expansion to existing roads.</td>
<td>A two lane bridge could also include a walking trail and bicycle path which would provide an important link to Medical Drive. This could also be done at ground level. A photo of the present landscape where the bridge would be located and a conceptual drawing of a new bridge might be helpful at meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A two lane bridge could also include a walking trail and bicycle path which would provide an important link to Medical Drive. This could also be done at ground level. A photo of the present landscape where the bridge would be located and a conceptual drawing of a new bridge might be helpful at meetings.</td>
<td>It is so obvious that the city will grow and traffic will increase. The Parkway lands were set aside in 1951. The lands are owned by the City, all we have to do is pave it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is so obvious that the city will grow and traffic will increase. The Parkway lands were set aside in 1951. The lands are owned by the City, all we have to do is pave it.</td>
<td>The south end of Medical Drive should be joined to the Parkway at Clonsilla Avenue as soon as possible to help alleviate congestion on Goodfellow Road, Charlotte Street and Monaghan Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The south end of Medical Drive should be joined to the Parkway at Clonsilla Avenue as soon as possible to help alleviate congestion on Goodfellow Road, Charlotte Street and Monaghan Road.</td>
<td>Minimize or prohibit private and commercial entrances along the Parkway. This increases safety by reducing uncontrolled entrances and improving traffic flow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize or prohibit private and commercial entrances along the Parkway. This increases safety by reducing uncontrolled entrances and improving traffic flow.</td>
<td>The roadway needs to cross the Jackson Creek valley on a bridge. Widening both Fairbairn Street and Parkhill Road will do greater damage to Jackson Park and its valley than building the roadway and bridge directly from the end of Medical Drive to Fairbairn Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The roadway needs to cross the Jackson Creek valley on a bridge. Widening both Fairbairn Street and Parkhill Road will do greater damage to Jackson Park and its valley than building the roadway and bridge directly from the end of Medical Drive to Fairbairn Street.</td>
<td>Population Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Growth</td>
<td>Many road segments and intersections in the study area are currently showing signs of congestion, although it is recognized that peak period congestion is not currently as extensive as in some communities in the GTA. This is one factor that makes Peterborough a great place to live and raise a family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It seems ludicrrous to destroy a green zone (Parkway Corridor) for the sake of a possible 6,000 population increase over the next 20 years! In the north end!</td>
<td>The City has identified three major development growth areas within their Official Plan in the north end of the City (i.e., the Chemong, Carnegie and Lily Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True, we are growing, but only at a snail’s pace since the 1960’s. I feel that this whole issue was a mistake from its inception eons ago.</td>
<td>My observation is that Peterborough has only managed to grow its retirement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Public Comments and Responses
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Table 2
Summary of Public Comments and Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>industry. I don’t believe that such an industry requires new roads to</td>
<td>Planning Areas). These development areas will feature a variety of housing types that will cater to all age categories, similar to the Mason Homes and Heritage Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoid congestion. Let us first see the growth and then consider whether</td>
<td>subdivisions that are currently under construction. While it is true that the average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we need to relieve the congestion that may or may not come with it.</td>
<td>age of Peterborough residents is increasing it does not mean that all growth will be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It presupposes significant population growth for Peterborough and</td>
<td>due to growth in seniors or retirees. Based on a comparison of the 2011 and 2006 census results for Peterborough, the City grew by about 4.4%. While there was a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>predicts that parts of the existing road network will be operating at</td>
<td>slight reduction in the number of residents under the age of 19 (-1.4%), there was a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or over capacity in 2031. 2031 is a long way off - there is no accurate</td>
<td>7% increase in residents in the 20-39 age category, a 6% increase in the 40-65 age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>way to predict what the state of affairs will be at that time and there</td>
<td>category and an 8% increase in the over 65 age category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>may very well be revolutionary innovations in transportation long before</td>
<td>Planned population growth in the north end of the City, combined with employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>then. There is no need to make irreversible decisions 20 years in</td>
<td>growth in the downtown and southwest areas of the City will increase the pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advance because of what we think could possibly happen.</td>
<td>on the existing road network to accommodate future travel demands. Forecasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough has the highest population of seniors. Seniors will not be</td>
<td>prepared as part of the 2012 TMP update indicate that afternoon peak hour travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>driving to work daily - they will be hiking, cycling, driving to</td>
<td>demands will increase by 34% between 2006 and 2031 taking into account the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recreational activities in off-peak hours. The condo/townhomes at</td>
<td>demographic patterns of growth in the City. Even with planned road improvements,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Street and Water Street (Fergahra development) are occupied</td>
<td>by 2031, nearly 13% of the travel on the major road network is expected to be at or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by young, retired seniors who cottage in the area and go south during</td>
<td>over capacity, up from about 3% today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the winter months.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really don’t see the need for an extension at all. Will the suggested</td>
<td>Forecasts prepared as part of this Class EA have demonstrated that with this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increase in population in the north end be seniors in Retirement Homes</td>
<td>planned growth, many of road segments in the study area will be at or over capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? They won’t be driving. Who will be buying these homes?</td>
<td>In addition, many of the intersections will also be over capacity, resulting in long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your study you claimed 6,100 new residents by 2031, which is</td>
<td>queues of traffic, particularly for many left turn movements. Not only does this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approximately 300/year of which will not drive. So why do we need new</td>
<td>create additional delays for motorists, but it increases the number of vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roads to accommodate so few? Surely it will be enough to tweak the ones</td>
<td>conflicts and the risk of collisions as frustrated drivers take risks to avoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we already have?</td>
<td>extensive delays. It is no coincidence that 5 of the top ten collision prone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The implication of transportation needs to be considered before the</td>
<td>locations in the City in 2012 are found within the Study Area. (Parkhill Road at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City approves large residential developments in the northern part of</td>
<td>Fairbairn Street, Parkhill Road at George Street, Clonsilla Avenue at the Parkway,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the city.</td>
<td>Clonsilla Avenue at Sharbrooke Street, and Clonsilla Avenue at Goodfellow Road).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it is impossible to look 20 years into the future and know the</td>
<td>The planning and design process for new infrastructure projects takes a significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs will be. Since the hospital road was constructed in a matter of</td>
<td>amount of time. For example, the Hospital Access EA study was initiated in January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>months, why not wait until 2030, or the point at which traffic becomes</td>
<td>2006 and the EA was approved in June 2008. The City immediately initiated detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a problem, and exhaust all other alternatives before the last resort of</td>
<td>design and issued a tender for construction in June 2010. Construction was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building the Parkway.</td>
<td>completed in 2012. This project took six years from start to finish and there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The report indicates that future population growth in the north end</td>
<td>were no delays between stages in the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will be approximately 6,100 up to 9,000. On what are these figures</td>
<td>Undertaking the Class EA now does not mean that the recommend improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>based? Current approved development? Proposed development? The City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2  
Summary of Public Comments and Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>need to be built right away. Once the preferred network alternative and the preferred design has been approved, the City can implement the entire project at once or can implement portions of it when needed or when they can afford to construct it. City Council will have the final say on when to implement the project or portions of the project, as part of the annual budget process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think improved public transportation would alleviate the congestion issue.</td>
<td>As part of the City’s Comprehensive Transportation Plan (2012), the City recognizes the need to provide an efficient and reliable transit system through the Transit Service Development Strategy (Section 5.4.1). The ability to support public transportation will be considered as part of the evaluation of the alternative designs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With gas becoming more expensive, there may not be more demand for road space in the future; scooters, mini buses, and enhanced bikes may increase.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit could be improved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that expanding public transit is a much better use of money than building/widening roads. The more convenient public transit is the more people will use it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve public transit and the education around taking public transit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City needs to focus more on promoting alternative, healthier forms of transportation, such as better cycling trails and a vastly overhauled/improved bus system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should invest money into public transit, making it more convenient and less expensive to take a bus than to drive a car.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Bypass</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The Parkway is a means for residents (specifically north end residents) to avoid downtown Peterborough. A road through their neighbours backyards is not the best solution. The west side bypass would work better, especially with the newly improved Highway 7 west of town. | The “West By-Pass” route currently exists and includes portions of Airport Road, Brealey Drive, Ackison Road, Lily Lake Road, 3rd Line, and County Road 19. By 2031, even with this infrastructure in place updated transportation modelling work completed as part of this Class EA indicates that there would be insufficient north-south capacity on the west side of the Otonabee River. The roads making up the “West By-Pass” route would need to widened / upgraded to highway standards to improve travel speeds in order to attract additional traffic use beyond what would occur through natural growth. Modelling results indicate that an upgraded “West By-Pass”:  
• Could attract between 200 and 250 vehicles / hour from other roads  
• Provides some localized relief to Chemong Road / Highland Road – but this |
| For the west end bypass, widen County Road 3 and Atkinson/Brealey and increase speed limits to divert drivers from Chemong Road and also from mid-turn. |                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| The Third line and County Road 19 connections, in North end alternatives (3) and (5), would be better utilized as part of a future West-end By-pass. The Third line could be curved down to Lilly Lake Road and then curve around the bottom of the steep hill to connect with Atkinson Road. I assume you are aware the County of |
# Parkway Corridor
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### Table 2
**Summary of Public Comments and Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough is considering extending Hilliard Street to Bridgenorth as one alternative to a Bridgenorth By-pass. This would have a major impact on Peterborough traffic patterns. I feel that much traffic can be accommodated by widening the existing 'West Bypass'. The roads already exist and they can be widened without too much trouble.</td>
<td>traffic is simply shifted to Fairbairn Street • Provides some relief to Towerhill Road • Adds traffic to Fairbairn Street – south of Lily Lake Road – which would be at capacity as a result • Does not address the capacity deficiency on Parkhill Road – between Monaghan Road &amp; Fairbairn Street • Does not address the capacity deficiency on Clonsilla Avenue at Goodfellow Road and Charlotte Street at Monaghan Road As a result, an upgraded “West By-Pass” route would not attract enough traffic to solve identified capacity issues and does not address the key problems identified. This concept is not a “reasonable” solution to the problems identified and is not recommended to be carried forward in this Class EA. Longer distance traffic passing through Peterborough is already using by-pass routes to the west and east of the City. Highway 7, between Highway 115 and Fowlers Corners, Highway 7 East to Highway 28, and Television Road / University Road already serve much of the through traffic destined to cottage country or other communities north of the City.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Alternatives
The idea of a ring road is very appealing, considering the future development which also involves the east end so Television Road could become part of that concept. The widening of Television Road and the provision of an improved connection to the north end of the city (via University Road) has already been recommended in the 2012 Transportation Master Plan. Even with this improvement in place, forecasts undertaken as part of the Class EA indicate that there would also be insufficient north-south capacity on the west side of the Otonabee River. Comments on the suitability of the Parkway Corridor as an alternative have been noted. If the ‘Parkway’ is the absolute final decision at least makes it the right one - connection with the present at Clonsilla Avenue - Medical Drive across Jackson Park ‘perimeter’. Note: the park actually does not extend where the bridge would cross. Along the Parkway land to Cumberland Avenue/Water Street, with only traffic lights at major intersection ‘proper sequence’. Some four-way stops. Access and exits at only very major intersections possible - no more than four. This would solve problem areas at Clonsilla Avenue/Sherbrooke Street/Clonsilla Avenue/Parkway, and it would consider the quality of life of the people living on Fairbairn Street the beauty of the area - and the property values. The City of Peterborough has established policies within their Transportation Master Plan and Official Plan that define a “level of service” target for major arterial roads in

What is your definition of significant green time? What is an accepted amount of time to travel through the city south to north? Who decides this? A change of road...
### Table 2
Summary of Public Comments and Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>designation with restricted access and minimal lights could work if roundabouts were built on a few locations of current intersections of the current options proposed for the north route. I support option 3 as it is least disruptive to the park which is a heritage site within our city and as the municipality grows will become an even greater attraction and refuge to the citizens of Peterborough. What about building an express route above the current routes with controlled access? What about a light rail transit system now?</td>
<td>the City. When a road reaches 90-100% of its planned capacity it is considered unacceptable and is used as a trigger for undertaking improvements. These policies are approved by City Council as part of their approval of these respective policy documents. The comments regarding intersection improvements and potential for roundabouts are noted and will be considered in the development of design alternatives. The City of Peterborough is not yet large enough in terms of population to support a Light Rail Transit System or any other form of rapid transit without significant public subsidies through increased taxes. As the city grows, opportunities to implement improved transit services have already been assessed as part of the 2012 Transportation Master Plan. Opportunities to support these initiatives as part of the project will be considered as part of the evaluation of alternatives. The widening of Chemong Road and the Parkway Corridor were both recommended for implementation by 2031 as part of the 2012 Transportation Master Plan. The widening of Chemong Road was identified as a short term need to address existing capacity and collision patterns. The TMP recommended the widening of Fairbairn Street between 2016 and 2021, followed by the new two lane road in the Parkway Corridor, between 2021 and 2026. The implementation plan for this project may be refined as part of this Class EA study based on a series of factors (i.e. road network capacity, intersection capacity, improvements required to support planned development, improvement required to address existing flooding issues, integration with other planned infrastructure projects, etc). Once the preferred network alternative and the preferred design has been approved, the City can implement the entire project at once or can implement portions of it when needed or when they can afford to construct it. City Council will have the final say on when to implement the project or portions of the project, as part of the annual budget process. Comments regarding treatment of Highland Road are noted and will be considered in subsequent stages of the project if applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will widening of Chemong Road significantly affect the need for an arterial road?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the dead ending of Highland Road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City. When a road reaches 90-100% of its planned capacity it is considered unacceptable and is used as a trigger for undertaking improvements. These policies are approved by City Council as part of their approval of these respective policy documents. The comments regarding intersection improvements and potential for roundabouts are noted and will be considered in the development of design alternatives. The City of Peterborough is not yet large enough in terms of population to support a Light Rail Transit System or any other form of rapid transit without significant public subsidies through increased taxes. As the city grows, opportunities to implement improved transit services have already been assessed as part of the 2012 Transportation Master Plan. Opportunities to support these initiatives as part of the project will be considered as part of the evaluation of alternatives. The widening of Chemong Road and the Parkway Corridor were both recommended for implementation by 2031 as part of the 2012 Transportation Master Plan. The widening of Chemong Road was identified as a short term need to address existing capacity and collision patterns. The TMP recommended the widening of Fairbairn Street between 2016 and 2021, followed by the new two lane road in the Parkway Corridor, between 2021 and 2026. The implementation plan for this project may be refined as part of this Class EA study based on a series of factors (i.e. road network capacity, intersection capacity, improvements required to support planned development, improvement required to address existing flooding issues, integration with other planned infrastructure projects, etc). Once the preferred network alternative and the preferred design has been approved, the City can implement the entire project at once or can implement portions of it when needed or when they can afford to construct it. City Council will have the final say on when to implement the project or portions of the project, as part of the annual budget process. Comments regarding treatment of Highland Road are noted and will be considered in subsequent stages of the project if applicable.
## Table 2
Summary of Public Comments and Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanations offered at the open house concerning the future need for a facility focused on population and employment, and the pull of the south end as an employment area. But it was not clear that the city has an understanding of current trip origins, destinations, and purpose along the Parkway desire line (much of which today uses the Parkhill Road/Monaghan combination). For example, what percentage of overall travel is comprised of work and employment trips? Non-work related trips driven by retail, school, and recreational uses such as the Evinrude Centre likely form a substantial proportion of overall traffic; the EA should show how these trips factor into the current travel demand situation. It was not clear how future changes in development patterns above and beyond the residential growth areas shown at the open house are expected to affect traffic growth and traffic patterns. It may be that retail growth in the north end will eventually catch up with population growth and reduce the pull of the Lansdowne Street retail corridor, which I suspect generates a substantial amount of north-south traffic. The growth of downtown as a residential area as driven by the Places to Grow Plan could also alter future patterns of travel. If future growth trends such as these have been factored in, then the report should explicitly report on them. The traffic circle will also probably result in the loss of the east side parking area. Finally, from a travel perspective, the jog along Parkhill Road and Fairbairn Street is inconvenient to use, adds more traffic to Parkhill Road, and does not really solve the left-turn congestion at Fairbairn Street. I believe upgrading of existing streets can eliminate any traffic issues for years to come, especially when the refined model (report US TTRII-002, pgs 3 &amp; 4, Paril 18, 2011) admits that anticipated deficiencies are less than half of originally stated. Upgrade right hand turning lanes for existing intersections (e.g., Lansdowne Street, Brealy Drive, Towerhill Road/Chemong Road, Parkhill Road/George Street, Reid Street/Parkhill Road). Direct traffic to our one-way streets (Reid Street, Rubidge Street, etc.) and get the parking off of the streets. Regarding right-turn lanes on Lansdowne Street, there are right turn lanes at both Goodfellow Road and Webber Avenue. There also are right turn lanes on the Parkway at Lansdowne but not on Lansdowne at the Parkway. Why not?</td>
<td>Section 2.4 of the City Transportation Master Plan provides an overview of city-wide travel patterns, trip purposes and origin-destination patterns. This data is based on the Transportation Tomorrow Survey, a household travel survey undertaken every 5 years. The most recent survey data is for 2006. The City uses a computerized travel demand forecasting model that takes this survey data and use it to predict the future demand for trip making in the city (by all purposes), the share of trips traveling by transit, auto, and other non auto modes, and the future auto travel demands using various roadway corridors in the City. A description of the modelling development and how it works can be found in section 3.2.2 of the Transportation Master Plan report. Population and employment forecasts are an input to the model, and are used to predict future origin destination travel demands. As part of the City Transportation Master Plan land use forecasts reflecting Official Plan Amendment 142 (implementing the Places to Grow Growth Plan requirements) were as the basis for the travel demand forecasting work. Section 3.2.1 of the Transportation Master Plan report describes the growth forecasts used. Comments noted and will be considered as part of evaluation of design alternatives. The need for separate turning lanes at intersections are undertaken on a case by case basis by considering the operational benefits in terms of intersection performance and potential safety benefits versus the increased costs and the potential impacts associated with the additional roadway width.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2
**Summary of Public Comments and Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five minutes of anyone's time is not worth giving up the Parkway Trail and having a bridge run through Jackson Park.</td>
<td>In the event that a new arterial road in the Parkway Corridor is confirmed as the preferred road network alternative, design alternatives will be developed and evaluated to determine the preferred design treatment to maintain the current multi-use trail through these lands. This may include reconstructing a multi-use path beside the new road (as was done on Medical Drive) or relocating or rebuilding the current path within the lands adjacent to the road corridor. As part of this Class EA study, we are planning to hold a design workshop where the public can provide their comments and input into the development of these design concepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More needs to be done to encourage alternatives to auto trips about town. Peterborough could become a bicycle friendly city if a quarter of the money slated for these new roads was put into infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you make it safe and easy to bicycle many more will do so.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving people the option of walking or biking comfortably and safely should be a major goal.</td>
<td>The City Transportation Master Plan contains a number of recommendations for new and upgraded pedestrian and cycling infrastructure to increase the share of cycling / walking trips from 6% in 2006 to 8% by 2031.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not like to see any development that encroaches in any way on Jackson Park, or on the present bike/walking path which connects Fairburn Street and Hilliard Street. These are routes are heavily used now by walkers/bikers/rollerbladers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our goal should not be to build more roads or wider roads, but to create alternatives to automobile traffic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a cyclist, I appreciate having the safe and efficient option to take the Parkway Recreational Trail. I was attracted to live and work in Peterborough in large part because the City appeared to value, promote and protect active transportation and green space. Jackson Park and the Parkway Trail are jewels to our city - they make Peterborough the kind of place people want to live in.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am extremely disappointed and upset to think that this incredible asset that contributes to all community members’ quality of living is threatened with more construction for a road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage cycling and walking with improved pedestrian and biking options and continue to protect the precious green space we have in Peterborough.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting the use of bicycles and legs will not only improve air quality but will lead to a healthier population that does not need to rely so much on medical care.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should protect the green space we have. Peterborough is lucky to have set aside the Parkway land and now we should preserve it! Widening existing roads would have less environmental impact and preserve green space.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need more dedicated safe bike lanes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counts for use of the Parkway Trail - has this been done? Have you counted adults, dogs, bikers, runners and children?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3 - Summary of Q & A Session
### Table 3
Summary of Question and Answer Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel that the “Do Nothing” Alternative Solution needs to be modified.</td>
<td>Decisions on when to implement the recommended improvements will be made through the annual budget process of City Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It should be “Do Minimal”. It is not reasonable to do more planning, but</td>
<td>noting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rather ‘fine tuning’ until traffic congestion is serious enough to justify the expense.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why are we, as taxpayers who reside in this City, paying for motorists</td>
<td>noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who travel out of the City? Many motorist visit and/or work in the City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and reside elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your opinion on the collision experience and Lansdowne Street</td>
<td>We haven’t reviewed the collision data for that intersection, however this will be carried out as part of this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the Parkway? This is a sign of existing conditions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The traffic collision information appears to focus on intersections. It</td>
<td>We haven’t reviewed that information specifically as that is a very time consuming process. However, traffic volumes create issues at entrances and therefore we review traffic patterns, including congestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should also look at private entrances along the routes as collisions occur at these locations as well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will there be sufficient capacity for other uses in the corridor. If it is</td>
<td>That is one of the things we will evaluate as part of the next phase of this study. We already know that some portions of the corridor are narrow; however in some locations there is sufficient space to provide features (i.e., stormwater management pond, trail, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only two lanes, will there be enough room along the corridor to accommodate a trail system?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is affected if Medial Drive is connected to the Parkway?</td>
<td>We will evaluate affects as part of the next phase of the study. Kinsmen Park is there as well as other features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you implement the Parkway, you would take away traffic at four major intersections.</td>
<td>We will evaluate affects as part of the next phase of the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree with the first comment and would like to add right hand turning</td>
<td>noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lanes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I moved here in 2004 and the newspaper outlined the results of the</td>
<td>There were a number of reasons why City residents voted ‘No’: Many thought the expense was too great and would be constructed all at once - it was $22,000,000 in the referendum question. The construction can be a staged process, implementing portions of it as needed or as it can be afforded. The referendum was based on the 2002 Transportation plan, which included the alignment around Jackson Park. Many voted against it for that reason. The City it put it back on the table as part of their current Transportation Master Plan (2012). In addition, the referendum didn’t receive the 50% +1 majority of the eligible voter participation to make the results binding, as required under Provincial Legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>referendum, indicating that the Parkway was off the table? Why is it on the table again?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The problem statement says we’ll be at capacity in 2031, however the</td>
<td>The study is considering long term growth, not short term. Sherbrooke Street can accommodate short term growth but has limited capacity to accommodate long term growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>challenge with Sherbrooke Street is not identified? Can we address that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piece in the south end?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long is this EA process valid? Is it 2031?</td>
<td>Under the Class EA process, this study will be valid for 10 years. If the preferred design has not been implemented within that timeframe, the study has to be revisited. However, if portions/ a portion of the plan has been implemented within that timeframe, then this study will remain valid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I live in the north end. I can’t understand why, based on a population</td>
<td>noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increase of 300 people per year, we’re constructing a two lane corridor,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>destroying a natural area that migrating birds use annually. There’s just not enough traffic to warrant it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be traffic circles. They work well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why are we directing north-south traffic to Parkhill? We are feeding</td>
<td>We will be looking into options to address those traffic issues (‘spill off effects’) as part of the next phase of the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funneling into a problem area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is known that is a challenge getting onto Monaghan at the south end.</td>
<td>Population and growth was considered as part of the transportation review. Retail in the north end, as well as downtown and on Lansdowne has been factored in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I assume growth in the north end is related to retail growth?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a city the size of Peterborough, how much does this actually reduce</td>
<td>We have not reviewed travel times through the city, however this will be carried out as part of this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travel time through the City?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build or stay away from it. We would like to have a clear decision. Let’s get to it.</td>
<td>noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What about sidewalks? Bikelanes?</td>
<td>It is the City’s policy to put sidewalks on each side of the roadway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will affect public transit?</td>
<td>It could have benefits depending on the outcome of the study. The corridor could serve as an ideal transit route as it travels between major activity centres and through many high density residential areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you going to try to avoid Jackson’s Creek?</td>
<td>We have developed a number of reasonable alternatives for road improvements to address the identified current and future deficiencies. Some alternatives avoid a crossing of Jackson Creek while others include a crossing, as illustrated in the Official Plan. The evaluation of these alternatives will be undertaken in subsequent stages of the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to see something done on improving transportation, like Medical Drive - it’s easy to get north-south and there are no private driveways. I’m also glad to see the West Bypass go.</td>
<td>noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m glad to see the Parkway corridor used but believe it could be preserved. I don’t see the point of widening Fairbairn or Parkhill. You would lose more from Jackson Creek if you did a bridge over the valley.</td>
<td>noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many of these do we have to go through? We have nice existing roadways, trails, etc. Why not the original footprint as proposed over 50 years ago? Move on and get on with it - it seems to be taking forever.</td>
<td>noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>