

United Counties of Leeds & Grenville

Class EA for the Four Lane Upgrade of County Road 43, Kemptville Corridor – Report on PIC No.5

Prepared by:

AECOM
654 Norris Court
Kingston, ON, Canada K7P 2R9
www.aecom.com

613 389 3703 tel
613 389 6729 fax

Project Number:

108480

Date:

February, 2010

Statement of Qualifications and Limitations

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:

- are subject to the scope, schedule, and other constraints and limitations in the Agreement and the qualifications contained in the Report (the “Limitations”)
- represent 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
- have not been updated since the date of issuance of the Report and their accuracy is limited to the time period and circumstances in which they were collected, processed, made or issued
- must be read as a whole and sections thereof should not be read out of such context
- were 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

Unless expressly stated to the contrary in the Report or the Agreement, Consultant:

- shall not be responsible for any events or circumstances that may have occurred since the date on which the Report was prepared or for any inaccuracies contained in information that was provided to Consultant
- agrees that the Report represents its professional judgement as described above for the specific purpose described in the Report and the Agreement, but Consultant makes no other representations with respect to the Report or any part thereof
- in the case of subsurface, environmental or geotechnical conditions, is not responsible for variability in such conditions geographically or over time

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

Any use of this Report is subject to this Statement of Qualifications and Limitations. 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.

March 11, 2010

Les Shepherd
Director of Works, Planning Services and Asset Management
United Counties of Leeds and Grenville
25 Central Avenue West, Suite 100
Brockville, Ontario K6V 4N6

Dear Mr. Shepherd:

Project No: 108480

**Regarding: Class EA for the Four Lane Upgrade of County Road 43, Kemptville Corridor –
Report on PIC No.5**

We have now conducted the fifth public information centre (PIC) for the County Road 43, Kemptville Corridor EA Study. This PIC was the second under the current assignment and it has been named PIC No.5 as this assignment is a continuation of the first study. The PIC was organised to present the Technical Steering Committee's Technically Preferred Alternative design for the corridor to the public and relevant agencies and provide an opportunity for comments and questions.

Following this letter is a report on PIC No.5 which outlines the way in which the meeting was conducted including the public notification process, the meeting and all comments received pre, during and post meeting.

This report will be made available to the steering committee for review.

Should you have any enquiries please contact Shane Gray or undersigned.

Sincerely,
AECOM Canada Ltd.


Guy Laporte, P.Eng.
Project Manager
Guy.Laporte@aecom.com

XX:xx
Encl.

Distribution List


# of Hard Copies	PDF Required	Association / Company Name

Revision Log

Revision #	Revised By	Date	Issue / Revision Description


AECOM Signatures

Report Prepared By:



 Shane Gray, EIT
 Project Co-ordinator

Report Reviewed By:



 Guy Laporte, P.Eng
 Project Manager

Table of Contents

Statement of Qualifications and Limitations

Letter of Transmittal

Distribution List

		page
1.	Background.....	1
2.	Comments received Since PIC No.4 and before the Announcement of PIC No.5.	3
2.1	Public	3
2.2	Agency	3
3.	Notification of Public Information Centre No.5	4
4.	Public Information Centre No.5.....	5
5.	Public comments received during the Course of Public Information Centre No.5.....	7
5.1	Public Comments received before Public Information Centre No.5	7
5.2	Public Comments received during Public Information Centre No.5	7
5.3	Public Comments received after Public Information Centre No.5	7
5.4	Summary of Comments Received during the Course of Public Information Centre No.5.....	8
6.	Agency comments received since the announcement of PIC No.5.....	9
7.	Responses.....	10

List of Tables

	Table 5-1 Public Comments Received.....	8
--	---	---

Appendices

- Appendix A. - Comments received Since PIC No.4 and before the Announcement of PIC No.5
 - Public comments
 - Agency comments
- Appendix B. - Notification of PIC No.5
 - Brochure
 - Newspaper Notices
- Appendix C. - PIC No.5 Presentation Material
 - PIC No.5 Presentation
 - PIC No.5 Display Boards
- Appendix D. - PIC No.5 Comments
 - PIC No.5 Comments
 - PIC Bo.5 Newspaper Articles
- Appendix E. - Agency Comments

1. Background

This Study is a continuation of work that was undertaken by the United Counties of Leeds and Grenville in 2005/06. In April of 2006 the United Counties issued a report entitled “United Counties of Leeds and Grenville, County Road 43 Corridor Master Plan.” The purpose of the Master Plan was to address transportation needs associated with a rapidly growing and developing corridor.

The intent of the Master Plan was to provide a sufficient level of planning to meet environmental assessment (EA) requirements for all Schedule ‘B’ projects in the Study Area. Various alternative solutions were considered to address the corridor’s evolving transportation needs (Phases 1 and 2 of the Municipal Class EA process).

The study concluded with a decision by the Technical Steering Committee (TSC) to widen the corridor to four through lanes in the Kemptville urban area (from Highway 416 westerly to Somerville Road) which put this portion into a Schedule ‘C’ Municipal Class EA category. Schedule ‘C’ projects require more detailed environmental assessments, the Master Plan includes a recommendation that this work be completed, which is the objective of this study. Recommendations for the remainder of the corridor (from Highway 416 easterly to South Gower Drive) do not involve widening and will consist of a series of Schedule ‘A’ projects. Schedule ‘A’ projects are pre-approved and can proceed without further study. Construction of a roundabout is a Schedule ‘A’ project and may proceed at any time. Projects which are approved under the Planning Act may also proceed without an Environmental Assessment.

The Master Plan also looked in detail at alternative intersection controls, as these have significant impact on overall corridor requirements. With strong public support the Master Plan recommended that CR43 between Somerville Road and Highway 416 be developed as a four lane roundabout corridor.

In general, it was not the intent of this study to revisit the recommendations of the Master Plan. This study picks up at Phase 3 of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment, looking at alternative design concepts for the Corridor Cross-Section Features, Centre Corridor Intersection Control and the CR43 Bridge.

The public consultation process for this project was initiated immediately at the project outset, with publication of a Notice of Study Commencement. The Notice advertised availability of a Study Design Report and solicited early public input on the project. Public Information Centre No.4 was held on March 5, 2009 in the Municipality of North Grenville’s Municipal centre and presented the public with background information in an effort to obtain early public input into the master planning process. As such a report named **Class EA for the Four Lane Upgrade of County Road 43, Kemptville Corridor – Report on SDR & PIC No.4** was completed which documents Study Commencement, the Public Information Open House and resulting public and agency correspondence. Seeing that this is a continuation of the previous Master Plan study the public information centre held in February 2009 has been named PIC No.4 as there were three public information centres held in the first study.

Since the time of PIC No.4 the study has progressed completing an **Existing Conditions Report - August 2009** and **Report on Analysis and Evaluation of Alternatives and Selection of Technically Preferred Alternative – December 2009**. A team of technical specialists were assembled to provide an inventory of existing corridor features and to consider how different designs would impact important features. The Existing Conditions Report documents the specialist’s work and was used to assist the TSC with its

evaluation of alternatives to assess the alternative design concepts. The Evaluation Report documents the evaluation and analysis process the TSC underwent to determine the Technically Preferred Alternatives.

The TSC has identified and recommends the following Technically Preferred Alternative:

Alternative 5 for the Corridor Cross-section Features – This alternative utilises a 30m corridor to contain a 2m wide centre median, 3.5m wide driving lanes and a landscaped boulevard separating the bicycle path (which is behind the curb) and the side walk.

Option 1 for the Centre Corridor Intersection Control – This alternative results in a complete roundabout corridor where all major intersections are controlled by roundabouts. This alternative is consistent with the philosophy set by the Corridor Master Plan.

Option 6 for the CR43 Bridge – This alternative maintains the existing 2-lane bridge while constructing a new, two-lane, 3-span bridge to the south. Approaches to the new bridge will be minimised and will be constructed with reinforced earth and vertical retaining walls. This alternative has low impacts to the natural, social and cultural environments, and has low property and construction impacts.

After completing the analysis and recommending the Technically Preferred solution for the corridor, the next stage of the public consultation process was initiated with a presentation to the United Counties of Leeds and Grenville Public Works Committee on January 6, 2010. After this, notices were published and forwarded to all interested parties advising of the status of the project and details on Public Information Centre No.5. A presentation to the Municipality of North Grenville Council was then completed on February 8, 2010 while PIC No.5 was held three days later on February 11, 2010. The notices also advertised availability of Existing Conditions Report and Evaluation Report and solicited public input on the recommended designs. The Municipality presentation was televised to the community.

Public Information Centre No.5 was held on February 11, 2010 in the Municipality of North Grenville's Municipal centre and included a presentation. It informed the public with background information on the project and roundabouts. It also explained the evaluation process and Technically Preferred Alternatives. This report documents the consultation process and resulting public and agency correspondence. Seeing that this is continuation of the previous study this public information centre has been named PIC No.5 as there were three Public information centres in the first study and this is the second in this study. All comments will be considered by the Technical Steering Committee and changes or refinements to the preferred alternative may follow.

This report has been prepared by Shane Gray, EIT. and Guy Laporte, P.Eng. of AECOM.

2. Comments received Since PIC No.4 and before the Announcement of PIC No.5.

2.1 Public

There was only one new public comment regarding the study and that was from a person whose comment at PIC No.4 was misinterpreted by the TSC. After receiving the response letter he thanked AECOM for their response but further explained his comment. He recommended that all property acquisitions occur immediately and construct the two outside lanes with a large median for the interim. Then once the growth of the corridor triggers the four lanes to be constructed the median can be easily reduced and the lanes can be constructed on the inside. This email can be found in Appendix A.

2.2 Agency

A number of Agencies were in contact since the PIC No.4 report. A number of them were responding to the study while the majority were contacted by AECOM whilst completing the Existing Conditions Report and evaluation of alternatives.

These agencies and their comments are summarised as follows:

Transport Canada – TC were contacted by AECOM regarding their preferences of the bridge alternatives including height of the Bridge. They have jurisdiction over the navigability of waterways and hence the height of bridges above the water surface. They provided some information on the navigability of the waterway but advised that they will only complete a detailed review the proposal once we have the final design concept. This will be completed at the detailed design stage.

Parks Canada – PC were contacted regarding the current bridge and creek conditions as well as any UNESCO issues that any bridge options to the north would cause and the possibility of dredging the creek. They advised that any bridge options to the north or replacing the existing bridge will have legal issues and will have to go through a special screening process as it is part of the Rideau Canal UNESCO designation. Any work on the north side will require a permit from PC and maybe an additional EA.

They also advised that there are two shallow areas where the water depth is only 4ft (1.2m) deep (stormwater outlets from the Ferguson Forestry Centre) and dredging would not be allowed as it would breach the federal Policy on Wetland Conservation and possibly the Species at Risk Act.

Rideau Valley Conservation Authority – RVCA were contacted regarding the water depth and navigability of Kemptville Creek as well as the clearance of the Bridge St Bridge and the Prescott St Bridge. It was important to investigate these details to determine the creek conditions and the size of boats that would use the creek. They advised that “Kemptville Creek is navigable only by shallow draft vessels which do not require a vertical clearance greater than 8ft”.

Department of Fisheries and Oceans – DFO were contacted regarding the potential HADD area that the bridge footprint may create and the difference between significant wetland and water area. Mark Ferguson from DFO also attended one of the TSC meetings. He advised that PC will be the first point of federal contact.

Ministry of Natural Resources – MNR advised that Kemptville Creek is a Provincially Significant wetland and any work completed near or around the creek bed or shoreline will require permits and approvals. The letter discusses a number of endangered and threatened species in and around the corridor and advises that it includes identified fish nurseries.

Ministry of Culture – Advised that they had received the SDR and asked a number of questions on the status of the project and the archaeological assessment. A status update was forwarded and they advised that they did receive the completed Stage 1 Archaeological Study.

Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency – It should be noted that potential federal funding, land administration or federal permits, licenses or approvals trigger a federal EA. Therefore it was important to involve CEAA early in the process to understand any concerns CEAA may have had with the potential options. They were contacted early before the evaluation of alternatives. However they advised that they generally complete their assessment after a preferred solution has been recommended, this allows them to co-ordinate their assessment with all of the other federal agencies. They also advised that they had responded to the notice of Study Commencement and SDR and forwarded a copy of the letter which must have been lost in the mail. This letter is dated March 7, 2010 and can be found along with this correspondence in Appendix A.

Bell Canada – Were contacted regarding their infrastructure in the corridor and any concerns they may have with widening. They will be running additional cables to the Colonnade Centre once they receive notice that the development is proceeding. They also have a large number of poles on the south side of the road which may have to be relocated. All relocations even at the bridge will most likely be aerial.

Hydro – Hydro was contacted about infrastructure but did not have any plans available. Bell advised that the majority of Hydro infrastructure is overhead on poles on the north side with some road crossings. No plans were available.

Cogeco – Cogeco could not be contacted but Bell advised that the majority of Cogeco infrastructure is overhead and is attached to the Hydro poles.

3. Notification of Public Information Centre No.5

The notice for Public Information Centre No.5 was advertised in the Kemptville Advance Newspaper on Thursday January 28, 2010 and Thursday February 4, 2010. A brochure advertising PIC No.5 was sent to all residents within a 120m radius of the corridor and all people who had previously commented on the study and/or requested to be placed on the mailing list. The brochure was double sided and included the same information as the newspaper advertisement on one side and included a map on the reverse side. These can be found in Appendix B. The newspaper advertisement was also placed on the United Counties website and the Municipalities website along with the Existing Conditions Report and Evaluation Report.

4. Public Information Centre No.5

Public Information Centre No. 5 and presentation was held at the North Grenville Municipal Offices on Thursday, February 11, 2010, from 6:30 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.

All participants were asked to sign in and were given a comment sheet to fill out. 42 people signed into the PIC with a number more opting not to sign in. During the PIC, Members of the TSC were available to discuss and explain the presentation material. Representatives included:

- Les Shepherd, P.Eng.- Director of Public Works and Asset Management, United Counties of Leeds and Grenville
- Guy Laporte, P.Eng.- Consultant Project Manager, AECOM
- Shane Gray, EIT. - Project Engineer/co-ordinator, AECOM
- Steve Sargeant, P.Eng. – Transportation Engineer, AECOM (not part of the TSC)

The PIC followed a “drop in” format from 6:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m. where members of the community and agencies were encouraged to come by and look at the proposed design and ask questions and comment on the project. On display were 30 display boards advising of the study, the technically preferred alternatives, as well as the proposed corridor plans showing the proposed road widening and proposed intersection control. Also on display was a large amount of roundabout information which discussed pedestrian safety concerns and included a vast number of pictures of similar corridors in North America. A copy of the display boards can be found in Appendix C.

A Power Point Presentation was then completed by AECOM's Guy Laporte, P.Eng (Project Manager) and Steve Sargeant, P.Eng (Transportation Engineer). The presentation took place from 7:00 p.m. – 7:40 p.m. and discussed the reasons for the study, the Master Plan, the corridor features, mitigation measures, the alternatives, roundabouts, pedestrian safety, costs and land acquisition. A copy of the presentation is included in Appendix C. This presentation was nearly identical to the presentation made to North Grenville Council on Monday night February 8, 2010. The presentation made to the United Counties Public Works meeting on January 6, 2010 was similar but did not include as much information on pedestrian safety and roundabouts.

The presentation was completed in front of an audience of approximately 50 people. 50 chairs were made available for the presentation with all but two chairs being used because a number of people opted to stand and/or continuing to walk around the display boards. Questions followed the presentation for approximately 15 minutes. Following questions on the presentation everyone was encouraged to discuss any additional questions or comments they have on the display boards and corridor plans. The PIC then closed shortly before 9:00pm.

There were two sets of Corridor Plans on display. The first set showed the proposed corridor including the widening, roundabouts, bicycle lanes, sidewalks and boulevards areas. The second set showed the same information but also included the property impacts, areas showing the amount and location of land to be acquired. The plans were split into five areas extending west to east, these are:

- Area 1 – Somerville Road to Pinehill Road,
- Area 2 – Pinehill Road to the James Street (St Michael's High School),
- Area 3 – James Street (St Michael's High School) to the County Road 43 Bridge,
- Area 4 – County Road 43 Bridge,
- Area 5 – County Road 43 Bridge to the MTO Boundary at Highway 416.

A reference table was set-up at the meeting which included a copy of the:

- Corridor Master Plan (March 2006)
- Municipal Class Environmental Assessment, October 2000 as amended in 2007,
- Environmental Assessment Act,
- Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act,
- Roundabouts – A different kind of Approach and
- Study Design Report
- Report on PIC No.4
- Existing Conditions Report
- Analysis and Evaluation of Alternatives and Selection of Technically Preferred Alternative

5. Public comments received during the Course of Public Information Centre No.5

A total of forty-three (43) public comments were received over the course of this PIC and all are included in Appendix D. Comments 1-21 were received prior to PIC No.5, comments 22-29 were received at PIC No.5 and comments 30-43 were received after PIC No.5. All personal information has been concealed.

5.1 Public Comments received before Public Information Centre No.5

Twenty-One (21) comments were received from the public following the publication and distribution of the Notice for PIC No.5.

The majority of comments received before PIC No.5 came from the Neighbourhood of Glengables. An email chain was started by one of the residents of the neighbourhood who is not in favour of Roundabouts. The email was sent to Les Shepherd and Guy Laporte as well as the majority of the neighbourhood. It started a debate between the residents where approximately 70% of these residents like roundabouts and the other 30% dislike them.

Other public comments were simply requests to be put on the project mailing list and requests for copies of the proposed corridor plans.

5.2 Public Comments received during Public Information Centre No.5

Eight (8) comments were received during PIC No.5. These comments can be found in Appendix D and are numbered comments 22-29.

Three (3) of these comments requested a noise wall be placed along the south side of CR43 from Barnes Street to James Street. A summary of all of the comments received during the course of PIC No.5 can be found below in section 5.4.

5.3 Public Comments received after Public Information Centre No.5

Fourteen (14) comments were received after PIC No.5. These comments can be found in Appendix D and are numbered comments 30-43.

On February 19, 2010 Wendy Chapman from the North Grenville Chamber of Commerce organised a breakfast presentation on the CR43 corridor expansion which included Les Shepherd and Karen Dunlop (Director of Public Works, Municipality of North Grenville – part of the TSC) as guest speakers. The breakfast presentation was organised for local businesses in the Kemptville area and all comments received were forwarded to AECOM by Ms. Chapman. There were a number of business related comments on how roundabouts will affect businesses in the corridor.

Comments received after PIC No.5 varied and it should be noted that the majority of these people did not attend the PIC. The range of comments included support for the corridor design to detailed design issues to dislikes of roundabouts. A full summary can be found on the next page and in Appendix D.

**5.4 Summary of Comments Received during the Course of Public Information Centre
No.5**

Table 5-1 Public Comments Received

6. Agency comments received since the announcement of PIC No.5

Agency comments and responses received since the commencement of this study have been included in Appendix E. Agency comments were received from the Ontario Provincial Police, The North Grenville Chamber of Commerce, The Ferguson Forestry Centre, Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs, Blaney McMurtry Barristers & Solicitors, Embridge Gas and Bell Canada.

Their comments are summarized below.

Ontario Provincial Police (OPP):

- Updating contact information.

The North Grenville Chamber of Commerce:

- Updating Contact Information
- Advised that they will be holding a CR43 information breakfast and invited AECOM to attend.
- Later forwarded a number of comments from local business owners to AECOM.

The Ferguson Forestry Centre,

- The existing watermain for the Forestry Centre will be in the road widening occurring to the north. It should be removed and relocated so it will not create any problems in the future.
- The bank into the Ferguson Forestry Centre (slope from the Road) should be steepened in order to reduce the impacts on the Ferguson Forestry Centre but not too steep otherwise it will be a safety hazard during maintenance (mowing etc.).
- The Municipality will be building some equalisation ponds to the north of CR43 at Grenville Street. This will close Grenville St. The roundabout at Grenville St should be designed to ensure that there is as little intrusion on the nursery property as possible.

Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs:

- Updating contact information

Blaney McMurtry Barristers & Solicitors:

- Forwarded the letter to the Algonquin of Ontario Consultation Office in Pembroke for further handling.

Embridge Gas:

- There will be conflicts between Embridge's existing infrastructure and the proposed corridor plans.
- Conflicts cannot be confirmed until detailed design plans are completed for the corridor.
- It is predicted that numerous mains and services will be affected and may need to be relocated
- A GIS plot has been forwarded of their current infrastructure.

Bell Canada:

- Most infrastructure is aerial on the south side of CR43. The majority of cables are copper with some fibre cables.
- Colonnade development is proceeding this year and Bell has to place additional cables (mostly overhead with some buried). Bell will be applying to the United Counties for municipal consent once plans are firm.
- The Bell pole line on the south side of the bridge will need to be relocated.

7. Responses

A number of comments requesting information from agencies and the public have already been responded to by AECOM staff.

Where comments and input on the study have been provided a response has not been issued by AECOM at this time. The next meeting proposed for the Technical Steering Committee is Tuesday March 8, 2010 where each of these comments will be discussed individually. After this meeting a frequently asked questions brochure will be prepared and will be sent out to everyone who made a comment and will also be posted on the United Counties and Municipality website.

The Technical Steering Committee may revise or amend any of the recommendations before completing a Notice of Completion and advertisement of the Environmental Assessment Report. Comments and questions are still welcomed throughout this process.