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Agency Consultation
SIX NATIONS LANDS & RESOURCES

P.O. Box 5000  OHSWIEKEN, ONTARIO  CANADA N0A 1M0
PHONE: 519-753-0665  FAX: 519-753-3449

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

To: CHRISTINE LEE-MORRISON  From: JO-ANN E.C. GREENE
   SENIOR PROJECT MANAGER  DIRECTOR

Fax: 905-546-4435  Pages: 2

Phone:

Date: Wednesday, 02 November 2005

Company: CITY OF HAMILTON – PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Re: Rymer Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands) Master Plan, Class Environmental Assessment

☐ Urgent  ☐ For Review  ☐ Please Comment  ☐ Please Reply  ☐ Please Recycle

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED LETTER.

ORIGINAL BY MAIL:  NO  OPERATOR: GARNETTE

If you do not receive all pages, please call 519-753-5799, as soon as possible.
November 2, 2005

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager

City of Hamilton
320 – 77 James Street North
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3

VIA FAX 905-546-4435

Dear Ms. Lee-Morrison:

Re: Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands) Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment

I attended the Public Information Centre (PIC) held on October 3, 2005, on the Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands) Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment.

While I have no comment at this time on the proposed study as presented at the PIC, there are overarching concerns and issues for Six Nations of the Grand River (Six Nations) that are outlined briefly.

- There are areas within the City of Hamilton where Six Nations resource users still exercise their Aboriginal and treaty rights.
- The study is within two kilometres of a substantial number of known archaeological sites.
- There is a significant natural site in the Eramosa Karst area.
- The study area does have streams that feed into the Red Hill Creek and Twenty Mile Creek watersheds.

Six Nations would like to see included in the study at the time that the preferred alternative options are presented at the next PIC mitigation and measures to address the above concerns and issues. Further, we would like copies of the reports generated for this project, especially, the archaeological reports and to be included in any notices of future meetings.

Please forward communications to Six Nations Lands and Resources, 2498 Chiefswood Road, P.O. Box 5000, Ohsweken, ON N0A 1M0.

Sincerely,

Jo-Ann E.C. Greene, Director
Six Nations Lands & Resources
Lee-Morrison, Christine

From: Darlene Truax [darlene@meridianplan.ca]
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2005 8:14 AM
To: Lee-Morrison, Christine
Subject: Rymal Road Planning Area Master Plan - Class EA

Hi Christine,

Please see attached comments with respect to the above-noted EA. Let me know if you need any further information.

Thanks,

Darlene Truax,
Planning Coordinator

Meridian Planning Consultants Inc.
113 Collier St.
Barrie, ON L4M 1H2

Ph. 705-737-4512, ext. 236
Fx. 705-737-5078
October 25, 2005

Ms. Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager,
City of Hamilton
320-77 James Street North
Hamilton, ON
L8R 2K3

Dear Christine:

Re: Rymal Road Planning Area Master Plan – Class Environmental Assessment
   Our File No. PAR 4314

We are in receipt of notice that the City of Hamilton has initiated the EA process for the lands in the Rymal Road Planning Area and have the following comments to offer.

TransCanada has two high pressure natural gas pipelines within our right-of-way that crosses through the study area in a cast-west direction. Any development within 200 metres of TransCanada’s facilities may affect the safety and integrity of those facilities. Should any development occur within 200 metres of our facilities, the following conditions of development would apply:

1. All permanent structures and excavations shall be located at least 7m from the limits of TransCanada’s right-of-way. Accessory structures and lots with side-yards abutting the right-of-way shall have a minimum setback of at least 3m from the limit of the right-of-way.

2. All crossings of TransCanada’s right of way by roads, access ramps, fairways, trails or pathways, and above or below ground services and utilities must have TransCanada’s prior authorization. The crossing applicant will be required to sign a crossing agreement that will be binding upon all subsequent owners of the crossing. The Owner agrees to meet all clearances and design requirements outlined in the crossing agreement had the NEB Pipeline Crossing Regulations.

3. Any grading not otherwise permitted by the NEB Act or Crossing Regulations Part 1, that will affect the right-of-way or drainage onto it, regardless of whether or not the grading is conducted on the right-of-way, must receive TransCanada’s prior written approval. Grading activities on the right-of-way
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will only be permitted when a TransCanada representative is present to inspect and supervise them.

4. The Owner shall contact TransCanada for written approval prior to commencement of construction works for any blasting undertaken within 300m of the right-of-way. Prior to any blasting being undertaken within 60m of the right-of-way, a report on the methods and charges to be used must be prepared, at the owner's expense, by a qualified blasting engineer and submitted for TransCanada's written approval. Blasting within 30m of a federally regulated pipeline is prohibited by the NEB (National Energy Board).

5. Section 112 of the National Energy Board Act requires that anyone excavating with power-operated equipment or explosives within 30 metres of the pipeline must obtain leave from the National Energy Board before starting any work. To satisfy this NEB requirement, you may send your request for leave directly to TransCanada with supporting information explaining how the work will be carried out. Once you obtain written approval for your excavation request, you must notify TransCanada at 1-800-827-5094 three business days before the start of any excavation using power-operated equipment and seven business days before the use of explosives within 30 metres of the pipeline right-of-way limits.

6. No fill or building material may be stored on the pipeline easement before, during or after any construction unless prior written approval is obtained from TransCanada.

7. During construction of the site, temporary fencing must be erected and maintained along the limits of the right-of-way by the owner(s) to prevent unauthorized access by heavy machinery. The fence erected must meet TransCanada’s specifications concerning type, height and location. Please note that Section 112 of the NEB Act states that “…no person shall operate a vehicle or mobile equipment across a pipeline unless leave is first obtained from the company…” The Owner is responsible for ensuring proper maintenance of the temporary fencing for the duration of construction.

8. Notice must be given to TransCanada directly (1-800-827-5094) or through Ontario One Call (1-800-400-2255) a minimum of three business days before the start of any construction on or within 30m of the pipeline right-of-way and 7 business days minimum advance notice for any work involving explosives.

9. Landscaping of TransCanada’s right-of-way must be approved in writing by TransCanada and done in accordance with TransCanada’s Planting Guidelines.
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in business to deliver
10. Any roads or streets designed to run parallel to our right-of-way, must not have any portion of the road allowance limits located within the pipeline right-of-way.

11. Vehicle barriers, of a design acceptable to TransCanada or as may be required by law, shall be installed across the width of the right-of-way, where public roads cross the right-of-way. The location of these barriers must be approved by TransCanada.

12. The Owner shall ensure through all contracts entered into, that all contractors and subcontractors are aware of and observe the foregoing conditions.

13. The developer or Owner must invite TransCanada to a pre-job meeting prior to any construction at this site. At this meeting, TransCanada must be given the opportunity to make a presentation to all job supervisors responsible for construction on this project. This presentation will be a maximum of 30 minutes in length.

While we believe the above addresses TransCanada's concerns, this does not preclude the recommendation for additional clauses at the time of final circulation. We would appreciate receiving a copy of all reports, including proposed options, and the final Environmental Study Report with respect to the above-noted EA. If the decision can be provided either by email to darlene@meridianplan.ca or by fax at 705-737-5078 it would be greatly appreciated. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact our offices.

Yours truly,

Wesley Crown, BES, MCIP, RPP
Associate
October 21, 2005

City of Hamilton
Public Works Department
Strategic and Environmental Planning
320-77 James Street North
Hamilton, Ontario
L8R 2K3

Attn: Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP

Re: Rymal Road Planning Area ("ROPA 9" Lands) Master Plan – Class Environmental Assessment (EA)

In response to your request for comments regarding the above, the application has been reviewed by Waste Management Division staff.

There is no impact on the City of Hamilton’s Solid Waste Management System.

If you require further information, please contact Colleen Brakewell at (905) 546-2424 ext. 5252.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Pat Parker, MCIP
Manager of Solid Waste Planning

cb/
Ms. Christine Lee-Morrison, M.C.I.P., R.P.P.
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning & Implementation
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
Suite #320
77 James Street, N.
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3

RE: Rymal Road Planning Area ("ROPA 9" Lands) Master Plan – Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Our File I03 - IIA

Dear Ms. Lee-Morrison:

Thank you for circulating this environmental assessment to the Hamilton Harbour Remedial Action Plan office.

Please be advised that the Hamilton Harbour Remedial Action Plan office coordinates the many programs and projects of the Remedial Action Plan. It does not, however, provide formal comments on planning and policy-related projects.

Our RAP partners are asked to incorporate RAP interests in their specific comments. Those directly commenting on this environmental assessment would include the City of Hamilton and the Hamilton Conservation Authority.

Sincerely

[Signature]

Mr. John D. Hall, M.C.I.P., R.P.P.
Hamilton Harbour Remedial Action Plan Coordinator

CC: Kathy Menyes, Hamilton Conservation Authority
    Mary Lou Tanner, City of Hamilton (BAIT)
Dear Christine,

As a major stakeholder Hydro One would like to review detailed plans of the proposed EA. We have 4 x 230,000 v lines in behind the proposed area, which in the study appears to go right to the Hydro One right of way. If you could send those plans to me that will further aid my decision.

Andrew MacLean
Asset Management
Hydro One Networks Inc.
463 Bay St, TCT15 (North) – A10 - Toronto, Ontario M5G 2P5
Office: 416-345-6855
andrew.maclean@hydroone.com
August 29, 2005

Margaret Fazio
Project Manager
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 320
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3

RE: ORC Initial Comments on Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands) Master Plan - Class EA

Thank you for circulating Ontario Realty Corporation (ORC) on your notice related to your environmental assessment undertaking.

ORC is the strategic manager of the government's real property with a mandate of maintaining and optimizing value of the portfolio, while ensuring real estate decisions reflect public policy objectives of the government.

We are writing to provide you with the following initial comments for consideration and inclusion in your EA project file.

Potential Negative Impacts to ORC Tenants and Lands

Our preliminary review of your notice and supporting information indicates that ORC managed lands are within the vicinity of your study area. As a result, your proposal may have the potential to impact these lands and/or the activities of tenants present on ORC managed lands. Attached please see a map that identifies ORC managed lands within your study area to assist you in identifying and avoiding potential impacts.

Negative environmental impacts associated with the project design and construction, such as the potential for dewatering, dust, noise vibration impacts, and impacts to natural heritage features/habitat and functions, should be avoided and/or appropriately mitigated in accordance with applicable regulations best practices and MNR and MOE standards. Avoidance and mitigation options that characterize baseline conditions and quantify the potential impacts should be present as part of the EA project file. Details of appropriate mitigation, contingency plans and triggers for implementing contingency plans should also be present.

Negative impacts to land holdings, such as taking of developable parcels of ORC managed land or fragmentation of utility or transportation corridors, should be avoided. If the potential for such impacts is present as part of this undertaking, you should contact the undersigned to discuss these issues at the earliest possible stage of your study.

If takings are suggested as part of any alternative these should be appropriately mapped and quantified within EA report documentation. In addition, details of appropriate mitigation and or next steps related to compensation for any required takings should be present. ORC requests
circulation of the draft EA report prior to finalization if potential impacts to ORC managed lands are present as part of this study.

**Cultural Heritage Issues**

If proposed alternatives may impact cultural heritage features on ORC managed lands, we would request that the examination of cultural heritage features be enhanced to include issues such as cultural landscapes and places of sacred and secular value.

**Potential Triggers Related to ORC’s Class EA**

The ORC Class Environmental Assessment (ORC Class EA) applies to a range of realty and planning activities that may be triggered as part of environmental assessment (EA) undertakings. The range of activities includes leasing or letting, planning approvals, selling, demolition and property maintenance/repair, all of which could be triggered if an EA undertaking involves land takings or work on ORC managed lands. If the potential to trigger the ORC Class EA is present as part of this undertaking you should contact ORC’s General Manager of Environment and Heritage to discuss these issues at the earliest possible stage of your study. For details on the ORC Class EA please visit the Environment and Heritage page of our website found at [http://www.orc.gov.on.ca/english/environmental.html](http://www.orc.gov.on.ca/english/environmental.html). If the ORC Class EA is triggered consideration should be given to explicitly referring to the ORC’s undertaking in your EA study.

**Specific Comments**

ORC has reviewed the properties on the attached map and has identified areas 1 through 7 as having future development potential. Since the proposed study area is not solely focused south of Rymal Road East but also includes the lands to the north of Stonechurch Road East, it is recommended that the study area be expanded to include areas 1 through 7 (refer to reference map).

ORC staff is currently in discussion with City of Hamilton Planning Staff about opportunities for facilitating the urban development of and conservation uses on ORC managed lands. Inclusion of ORC managed lands would be an important step in facilitating this discussion and achieving the highest and best use of provincial lands.

**Concluding Comments**

Thank you for the opportunity to provide initial comments on this undertaking. If you have any questions on the above I can be reached at 416-212-6456 or by email at john.Mackenzie@orc.gov.on.ca.

Sincerely,

John, MacKenzie, MCP, RRP
General Manager, Planning Services
Reference Map – Provincial Landholdings in Study Area
Remedial Action Plan for Hamilton Harbour  
P. O. BOX 5050  
867 Lakeshore Road  
BURLINGTON, Ontario  
L7R 4A6  
Tel: (905) 336-6279  
Fax: (905) 336-4966  

September 23, 2005

Ms. Christine Lee-Morrison, M.C.I.P., R.P.P.  
Senior Project Manager  
Capital Planning & Implementation  
Public Works Department  
City of Hamilton  
Suite #320  
77 James Street, N.  
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3

RE: Rymal Road Planning Area ("ROPA 9" Lands) Master Plan - Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Our File 103 - HA

Dear Ms. Lee-Morrison:

Thank you for circulating this environmental assessment to the Hamilton Harbour Remedial Action Plan office.

Please be advised that the Hamilton Harbour Remedial Action Plan office coordinates the many programs and projects of the Remedial Action Plan. It does not, however, provide formal comments on planning and policy-related projects.

Our RAP partners are asked to incorporate RAP interests in their specific comments. Those directly commenting on this environmental assessment would include the City of Hamilton and the Hamilton Conservation Authority.

Sincerely

[Signature]

Mr. John D. Hall, M.C.I.P., R.P.P.  
Hamilton Harbour Remedial Action Plan Coordinator

CC: Kathy Menyes, Hamilton Conservation Authority  
Mary Lou Tanner, City of Hamilton (BAIT)
February 9, 2006

To: Christine Lee-Morrison  
Senior Project Manager  
Capital Planning & Implementation  
Public Works Department  
320-77 James Street N.  
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3  

RE: Rymal Road Planning Area ("ROPA 9" Lands) Master Plan - Class Environmental Assessment

This office has had the opportunity to review the information provided with your letter of January 12, 2006 regarding the above. A principal concern of this office is the adverse effects that development activities might have on cultural heritage resources. Cultural heritage resources include built heritage, archaeological resources and cultural heritage landscapes. If the preferred alternatives will have the potential to impact cultural heritage resources, then our office would recommend that a heritage assessment be conducted as part of the environmental assessment. If any significant heritage or archaeological resources are identified, then any negative impacts would need to be mitigated by either avoidance or documentation.

Given the above, potential impacts to cultural heritage resources should be considered during the selection process for the preferred alternatives. When the preferred alternatives have been selected, it would be useful to be provided with detailed information and mapping, outlining the extent and type of land disturbance anticipated and what portions of the project, if any, may exhibit potential for impacting heritage resources, and thus would require an assessment to inventory all heritage resources present, and determine what mitigation work, if any, may be required.

I trust that this is of assistance. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require further information.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Neal Ferris  
Heritage Planner/Archaeologist  
Southwestern Ontario Region
MEMORANDUM

Hamilton
Community Services Department
CULTURE & RECREATION DIVISION

Date: February 6, 2006

To: Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
    Senior Project Manager
    Strategic and Environmental Planning

From: Dale Wood, District Manager
      West Hamilton, Glanbrook & Winona (Wards 1,7,8,11)

Subject: Rymal Road Planning Area ("ROPA 9" Lands) Master Plan – Class
         Environmental Assessment (EA)

After reviewing your memorandum dated January 12, 2006, Culture and Recreation
staff share the concerns expressed by the residents. In particular, Culture and
Recreation wishes to encourage that consideration be given to secondary commuter
routes for cyclists and that they be identified outside of road allowances or at the
minimum, protected from vehicular traffic by a barrier or buffer. Pedestrian routes
should be considered as separate from cycling where possible to maximize safety.

The study makes note of the need to consider the cycling pedestrian routes but does
not identify them as separate.

[signature]

Dale Wood

:sv

c.c.: Bill Fenwick, Director, Culture & Recreation
Hi Christine,

After reviewing your submittal dated January 12, 2006 my only comment is as follows:

Fig 2.2 - Existing Watermains of District 7
- there is a new water tower in operation on the north side Binbrook Road (west of 56) - it is tied into the watermains from the booster station on 56.

Steve Barley, C.E.T.
Elect/Instr. Technologist,
Operations & Maintenance
January 24, 2006

Our File No. CEA-MUN/05-04

City of Hamilton
Public Works Department
320 – 77 James Street north
Hamilton, Ontario
L8R 2K3

Attention: Christine Lee-Morrison, Senior Project Manager
Strategic and Environmental Planning

Dear Mrs. Lee-Morrison:

SUBJECT: Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9) Master Plan
Class Environmental Assessment (EA)

Further to our meeting of December 15, 2005 and your January 12, 2006 notice of the EA undertaking and request for comments. The following comments are provided to assist the city with this undertaking.

As you are aware, a traffic plan is being undertaken as part of this overall EA. Traffic volumes on neighbourhood streets in the area of the ROPA 9 lands have been increasing significantly and the City is seeking a solution to this problem. As such, 4 alternatives for route alignments have been proposed and assessed. One alternative is ‘do nothing’ which will not assist in alleviating the traffic problems. The other 3 alternatives provide for a new north-south collector road connection through the Trinity neighbourhood, bounded on the north by Highland Road West, on the south by Rymal Road, on the west by the Trinity Church Road allowance and on the east by Second Road West.

As you are aware, the Eramosa Karst Area of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI) is located within the Trinity neighbourhood and extends north and south of this neighbourhood as well. This ANSI is 195.7 hectares in size and its area and features are depicted on the attached map, which was provided to you at our December meeting. The Eramosa Karst is a provincially significant earth science ANSI and contains numerous diverse karstic features, including dry valleys, overflow sinks, sinking streams and a post glacial stream cave of significant length – the Nexus Cave. Provincial and Conservation Authority goals respecting this ANSI pertain to preserving its geomorphology and the hydrological function of the karst.

The April 2003 Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) report (Earth Science Inventory and Evaluation of the Eramosa Karst Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest) provides guidance to decision-makers on how best to manage the Eramosa Karst and recommends...
certain technical studies that need to be undertaken as part of development within the karst and its three main subareas – Developed Area, Core Area, Feeder Area.

In addition to the above, the Hamilton Conservation Authority has recently secured 60 hectares of the Core and buffer areas of the Eramosa Karst from the province as part of our efforts to preserve this significant resource. Attached is a map depicting this land area. This is the same map that we provided to you at our December meeting.

We have had an opportunity to review Sheet 3 (Collector Road – Potential Alignments) of the Class EA which was forwarded earlier this month. This map depicts the 3 alternatives noted above as they may or may not impact the HCA Karst property and other karst features not under public ownership.

As you are aware, Alternative 2, which traverses the Core, Buffer and Feeder Areas of the Karst is not recommended by our agency as it dissected some of the most significant features of the Eramosa Karst – the Nexus Cave and its feeder areas.

Alternatives 3 and 4 appear to be more viable and appropriate than Alternatives 1 and 2. The alignments for Alternatives 3 and 4 avoid the Core Area of the Karst, the Buffer Area around the Core Area and some buffers around the surface streams feeding the Core Area. These alignments also traverse a portion of the Nexus Cave Feeder Area, the Developed Area of the Karst and part of the alignments avoid the Karst altogether.

The MNR report does, however, recommend that several studies be undertaken in the Feeder Areas, in particular, as well as the Developed Area should development proposals arise. These studies relate to ensuring that any new development does not adversely impact the ability of surface flows from the Feeder Area to continue to recharge the karst in the Core Area. The MNR report provides more detailed direction as follows:

“It is recommended that the Feeder Area be afforded a level of protection to ensure that:

1. the flows of the creeks into the Core Area are substantially maintained (i.e. stream discharge including low flow and high flow characteristics, and discharge response to runoff events),
2. water quality is improved (i.e. primarily a reduction in sediment load, since the sediment load is currently quite high as a result of agriculture),
3. protective measures are employed to reduce the risk of contamination of surfact streams by substances that would significantly impact the karst.

It is also recommended that prior to any development in the Feeder Area, development plans be reviewed to ensure that these objectives will be met. As well as expertise in civil engineering, reviewers should have expertise in environmental hydrology and geomorphology. A sound knowledge of karst hydrology and geomorphology would be an asset.”
Recommendations pertaining to the protection of buffers along the streams upstream from the sinkpoints in the Core Area using specific criteria are included as well.

As can be seen, detailed hydrological and geomorphological studies need to be undertaken to ensure that Alternatives 3 and 4 can proceed to a design stage.

The HCA will be investigating this matter further in order to provide the City with more detailed information on the above-noted studies in light of the locations of proposed alignments depicted under Alternatives 3 and 4. We will keep you apprised of our findings and will continue to work closely with you to find a solution to the traffic challenges in this neighbourhood while protecting this significant karst feature.

We trust the above provides adequate input to this Master Plan process at this time. We have copied the City's Planning Department as we are aware of their upcoming work on the Trinity Neighbourhood Plan Review and will be responding to their request for background information in the near future. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at extension 130.

Yours sincerely,

Katherine J. Menyes
Director, Watershed Planning & Engineering
Hamilton Conservation Authority
Tel – 905-525-2181
Fax – 905-648-4622

KJM/

cc: Nathalie Baudais, iTRANS Consulting Inc.
- Vanessa Grupe, Community Planning and Design Section, Planning and Economic Development Department, City of Hamilton
Figure 2. Boundary of the Eramosa Karst ANSI

Internal boundaries are indicated for the Core, Developed and Feeder Areas within the ANSI. A buffer within the Feeder Area is shaded gray. Surface areas in hectares are indicated at the top right corner. Features relevant to the boundaries are also illustrated, including some of the streams, drainage divides and karst features. The base map is a 1:10,000-scale Ontario Base Map. Points labeled 1 to 5 and A to O are referenced in the text.
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Public Notices
NOTICE OF STUDY COMMENCEMENT
Rymal Road Planning Area (“ROPA 9” Lands) Master Plan
Class Environmental Assessment

THE STUDY
The City of Hamilton has initiated the Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process to assess the transportation, water supply, and sewage needs for the Rymal Road Planning Area. The Study Area is shown below.

Amendment No. 9 to the Region of Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan (ROPA 9) redesignated approximately 190 hectares (470 acres) of land in this area, to allow urban development. The Rymal Road Planning Area will require growth related infrastructure and service improvements.

THE PROCESS
This project is being carried out as a Master Plan project under the guidelines of the Municipal Engineers Association Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (June 2000). All requirements for Schedule B and C projects within the Study Area will be fulfilled.

Two Public Information Centres will be held during the study to present findings and receive public input. Notices providing the time and location of these meetings will be published in local newspapers.

Upon completion of the study, an Environmental Study Report will be available for public review and comment. Another advertisement will be published at that time, indicating where and how the public can have access to the report.

PUBLIC COMMENTS INVITED
There is an opportunity at any time during this process for interested persons to review outstanding issues and bring concerns to the attention of the Project Manager. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record.

If you have any questions or comments or wish to be added to the study mailing list, please contact:

Margaret Fazio
Project Manager
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 320
Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 4173
Email: mfazio@hamilton.ca

Liza Sheppard, P.Eng.
Consultant Project Co-ordinator
iTRANS Consulting Inc.
100 York Boulevard, Suite 300
Richmond Hill, ON L4B 1J8
Phone: 905-882-4100, ext. 5232
Email: lsheppard@itransconsulting.com

This Notice issued March 4th, 2005.
NOTICE OF PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE
Rymal Road Planning Area (“ROPA 9” Lands) Master Plan
Class Environmental Assessment

THE STUDY

The City of Hamilton has initiated the Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process to assess the transportation, water supply, and sewage needs for the Rymal Road Planning Area. Amendment No. 9 to the Region of Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan (ROPA 9) redesignated approximately 190 hectares (470 acres) of land in this area, to allow urban development. The Study Area is shown below. The Rymal Road Planning Area will require growth related infrastructure and service improvements, including the following potential projects:

- the widening of Rymal Road;
- the extension of Trinity Church Road to the Lincoln Alexander Parkway;
- the construction of a new signalized collector road intersection with Regional Road 56 and the widening of Regional Road 56 between the new collector road and Rymal Road;
- storage and pumping capacity improvements to the water distribution system; and
- wastewater improvements to connect the proposed sanitary sewer system to the City’s trunk system.
THE PROCESS

This project is being planned under Section A.2.7. Master Plans as defined in the Municipal Engineers Association, Municipal Class Environmental Assessment document (June 2000) and will satisfy the planning and design process for Schedule ‘B’ and ‘C’ projects. This Public Information Centre (PIC) is the first of two PICs to be held for this project. A further notice will be issued advising of the date, time and location for the second PIC. Upon completion of the study, a Master Plan/Environmental Study Report will be available for public review and comments. Another advertisement will be published at that time, indicating where and how the public can have access to the report.

PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE

The purpose of the first Public Information Centre is to present the needs and opportunities, preliminary alternative solutions to address the above noted servicing issues; an inventory of the natural, social, and economic environments; preliminary criteria used to evaluate the alternatives, an evaluation of the alternatives, and a preliminary preferred alternative for each project. The PIC will also be held to receive public input.

Details of the date, time, and location of the PIC are as follows:

Date: Monday, October 3, 2005
Open House: 6:00 to 9:00 p.m.
Presentation and Question & Answer Period: 7:00 to 8:00 p.m.
Location: Salvation Army Church, Gymnasium
300 Winterberry Drive (at Paramount Drive)

PUBLIC COMMENTS INVITED

There is an opportunity at any time during this process for interested persons to review outstanding issues and bring concerns to the attention of the Project Managers. If you have any questions or comments or wish to be added to the study mailing list, please contact:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP  
Senior Project Manager,  
Capital Planning & Implementation,  
Public Works Department  
City of Hamilton  
320-77 James St. N.  
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3  
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390  
Fax: 905-546-4435  
Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Liza Sheppard , P.Eng.  
Senior Project Manager,  
iTRANS Consulting Inc.  
100 York Boulevard, Suite 300  
Richmond Hill, ON L4B 1J8  
Phone: 905-882-4100, ext. 5232  
Fax: 905-882-1557  
Email: lsheppard@itransconsulting.com

Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record.

This Notice issued September 16 and 23, 2005
BACKGROUND

The City of Hamilton is undertaking an Environmental Assessment for lands located on the south side of Rymal Road East (Highway No. 53), east of Trinity Church Road, west of Regional Road 56, and north of the hydro corridor, in the former Township of Glanbrook, called the ROPA 9 lands, and for lands in an area bounded by Winterberry Drive to the east, Paramount Drive to the south, the new Red Hill Creek/Mud Street interchange to the west, and the Lincoln Alexander Parkway-Mud Street West to the north, called Special Policy Area ‘C’. The first Public Information Centre (PIC #1) for the study was held on October 3, 2005.

PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE PURPOSE

Members of the community in the vicinity of the ROPA 9 Lands have expressed concerns regarding traffic operations in the area, specifically, traffic infiltration (resulting in increased traffic volumes on neighbourhood streets), travel speeds, traffic control compliance, and safety for pedestrians and cyclists.

Various options, including “Do Nothing”, have been identified and assessed in an attempt to address these concerns. We would like to present these options to members of the community and gather your input. As such, a Public Information Centre (PIC #2) will be held to discuss the concerns, and the results of the assessment.

The format of the meeting will be an Open House with a short presentation at 6:30 p.m. This will be followed by a discussion period to allow attendees to ask questions and comment on the proposed options. Following the meeting and review of public input, a recommended option will be documented in the Trinity Community Traffic Plan report. It will serve as a background document to the Rymal Road Planning Area (“ROPA 9” Lands) Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment.
We want to ensure that anyone with an interest in these issues has the opportunity to get involved and provide input. As such, you are invited to attend and participate in the meeting. City staff and their consultants will be available at the meeting to provide details. Details of the date, time, and location of the meeting are as follows:

Date: Thursday, January 26, 2006
Open House: 6:00 to 8:00 p.m.
Presentation: 6:30 p.m.
Location: Salvation Army Church, Gymnasium
300 Winterberry Drive (at Paramount Drive)

PUBLIC COMMENTS INVITED

If you cannot attend and would like to provide comments, please contact:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager,
Capital Planning & Implementation,
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
320-77 James St. N.
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Liza Sheppard, P.Eng.
Senior Project Manager,
iTRANS Consulting Inc.
100 York Boulevard, Suite 300
Richmond Hill, ON L4B 1J8
Phone: 905-882-4100, ext. 5232
Fax: 905-882-1557
Email: lsheppard@itransconsulting.com

Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record.

This Notice issued January 13 and 20, 2006
THE STUDY

The City of Hamilton has completed the Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process to assess infrastructure needs for the Rymal Road Planning Area. The study area includes lands located on the south side of Rymal Road East (Highway No. 53), east of Trinity Church Road, west of Regional Road 56, and north of the hydro corridor, called the ROPA 9 lands, and lands in an area bounded by Winterberry Drive to the east, Paramount Drive to the south, the new Red Hill Valley / Mud Street interchange to the west, and the Lincoln Alexander Parkway-Mud Street West to the north, called Special Policy Area ‘C’. These areas are shown on the map below.

THE PROCESS

This study has been undertaken in accordance with Section A.2.7. Master Plans as defined in the Municipal Engineers Association, Municipal Class Environmental Assessment document (June 2000) and will satisfy Phase 1 and 2 of the planning and design process. The study was presented at two public information centres held on October 3, 2005 and January 26, 2006, and via a Newsletter in late April 2006. No comments were received that cannot be addressed. Due to the need to coordinate the water/wastewater assessments for the subject lands with on-going City-wide infrastructure planning, the water and wastewater components will be merged with the City-wide Water and Wastewater Master Plan.
The Master Plan Class EA recommends several transportation solutions. The Schedule ‘A’ projects are pre-approved and may proceed to implementation. The Schedule ‘C’ projects will proceed to Phase 3 and 4 of the planning and design process, including:

- Widen Rymal Road from Trinity Church Road to Regional Road 56 and widen Regional Road 56 from Rymal Road to approximately 900 m to the south;
- A new road link from Stone Church Road / Red Hill Valley Parkway (RHVP) ramps to Rymal Road (on an alignment to be determined);
- Widen Stone Church Road to 4 lanes from the RHVP ramps to Upper Mount Albion Road; and,
- A new collector road in the Trinity Neighbourhood, between Rymal Road and Highland Road.

The above noted Phase 3 and 4 study processes will include all localized intersection improvements associated with the specific road projects.

This Notice of Completion is issued with respect to the following Schedule ‘B’ projects:

- Closure of Second Road West (design details to be coordinated with the new Trinity Neighbourhood collector road Schedule ‘C’ project);
- Monitoring of Second Road West for the appropriateness of physical traffic calming measures in the future, and implementation of traffic calming measures if required, prior to the road closure;
- Closure of Upper Mount Albion Road (design details to be coordinated with the new road link from Stone Church Road / RHVP ramps to Rymal Road Schedule ‘C’ project; and,
- Monitoring of Upper Mount Albion Road for the appropriateness of physical traffic calming measures in the future, and implementation of traffic calming measures if required, prior to any road closure.

PUBLIC COMMENT INVITED

A Class EA Master Plan documenting the planning process undertaken and conclusions reached, will be on public record for a minimum of 30 calendar days in accordance with the municipal Class EA. The “Review Period” will begin on June 16, 2006 and end on July 18, 2006. The Class EA Master Plan Report is available for public review at the following locations:

| Hamilton Public Library, Valley Park Branch 970 Paramount Drive Hamilton, Ontario L8J 1Y2 (905) 573-3141 | Office of the City Clerk 71 Main Street West City Hall, 2nd Floor Hamilton, Ontario L8P 4Y5 (905) 546-CITY | City Centre Public Works Department 77 James Street North Suite 320 Hamilton, Ontario L8R 2K3 (905) 546-CITY |

Subject to comments received as a result of this notice, the City of Hamilton intends to proceed with the implementation of the recommended Schedule A and B projects included in the Class EA Master Plan. If after reading the Class EA Master Plan, you have questions or concerns, please follow the following procedure:
1. Contact the following City staff to discuss your questions or concerns:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager,
Capital Planning & Implementation,
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320-77 James St. N.
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

2. Arrange a meeting with the above if you have significant concerns that may require more detailed explanation.

3. If you raise major concerns, the City will attempt to negotiate a resolution of the issues. A mutually acceptable time period for this negotiation will be set. If the issues remain unresolved, you may request the Minister of the Environment, by order, to require the City to comply with Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act before proceeding with the Schedule B projects. This is called a Part II Order (“bump up”). Part II Orders cannot be submitted in respect of the Master Plan itself, but must be made in respect of one or more Schedule B projects listed in this Notice. The Minister may make one of the following decisions:

- Deny the request
- Refer the matter to mediation
- Require the City to comply with Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act by undertaking one of the following:
  - Submitting the Class EA Master Plan for government review and approval; or,
  - Completing an Individual Environmental Assessment for government review and approval; or,
  - Preparing Terms of Reference governing the preparation of an Individual Environmental Assessment.

Requests for a Part II Order must be submitted in writing to the Minister of the Environment within the June 16 to July 18, 2006 review period:

Minister of Environment
Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch
135 St. Clair Avenue West, 12th Floor
Toronto, ON M4V 1P5

A copy of the Part II Order must also be sent to the City of Hamilton, to the attention of the Project Manager (address above).

Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record.

This notice issued June 16 and 23, 2006
Appendix B.2
Public Information Centres Materials
and Public Information Centres
Summaries
Appendix B.2.1

Public Information Centre #1

Materials and Summary
WELCOME

PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #1

Rymal Road Planning Area
(ROPA 9 Lands) Master Plan
Class Environmental Assessment Study

Monday, October 3, 2005

City of Hamilton
STUDY AREA

The subject lands are located on the south side of Rymal Road East (Highway No. 53), east of Trinity Church Road, west of Regional Road 56, and north of the hydro corridor, in the former Township of Glanbrook.

Special Policy Area ‘C’ is also included in the study. This area is bounded by Mud Street West to the north, Paramount Drive to the south, Winterberry Drive to the east, and the Mud Street / Red Hill Creek interchange to the west.

The Study Area is shown below.
STUDY BACKGROUND

- In June 2001, the Ontario Municipal Board issued an interim decision approving Amendment No. 9 to the Region of Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan (ROPA 9), to redesignate approximately 190 hectares (470 acres) of land from rural to urban, to allow residential and related urban development.

- In March 2002, the Ontario Municipal Board approved Amendment No. 36 to the Former Township of Glanbrook Official Plan, comprised of the Rymal Road Planning Area, to set out the detailed policy framework for development of the subject lands for urban purposes.

- In August 2003, City of Hamilton Council approved the recommendation to initiate a Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment in accordance with Section A.2.7 of the Municipal Engineers Class Environmental Assessment (June 2000) for the Rymal Road Planning Area. This would include Environmental Assessment studies for infrastructure improvements to service the planning area, including all necessary transportation, water and wastewater (sanitary sewer collection) improvements. The Master Plan may also include new collector roads within lands to be developed by draft plans of subdivision.

- The City has received applications for development of the lands known as Special Policy Area ‘C’. Upon review of the development proposals, City staff identified potential improvements required to City infrastructure to support such development. Given the proximity of Special Policy Area ‘C’ to the ROPA 9 area, and overlap of servicing, these lands were added to the study scope for the Rymal Road Planning Area Master Plan Class EA.
STUDY GOAL AND SCOPE

The study will be carried out in accordance with the Master Plan provisions of the Municipal Engineers Association, Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) document (June 2000). Following this approach, all of the transportation and water/wastewater infrastructure projects will be combined into one study.

The goal is:
- To identify transportation and water/wastewater infrastructure requirements to allow urban development, including residential and commercial uses, within the Rymal Road Planning Area, and Special Policy Area ‘C’.

The project scope includes an assessment of the following:

- Improvements to the Rymal Road corridor between Regional Road 56 and Trinity Church Road
- Extension of Trinity Church Road to the Lincoln Alexander Parkway
- Realignment of the Trinity Church Road / Rymal Road intersection
- Construction of a new signalized collector road intersection with Regional Road 56
- Improvements to Regional Road 56 from Rymal Road southerly to the new collector road intersection
- Increase water capacity (supply) in the area through expansion of the existing HD007 Pumping Station and HDR07 reservoir, as well as provision of additional facilities
- A new sanitary sewer to connect to the City’s trunk system
- Transportation and water/wastewater needs for Special Area ‘C’

Completion of this Environmental Assessment is a part of the process to enable the City to address both the short-term and the long-term transportation and water/wastewater infrastructure needs for ROPA 9 and for Special Policy Area ‘C’.
Class Environmental Assessment Process

Exhibit 1-2

City of Hamilton

MUNICIPAL CLASS EA PLANNING AND DESIGN PROCESS

PHASE 1  PROBLEM OR OPPORTUNITY

- IDENTIFY PROBLEM OR OPPORTUNITY

PHASE 2  ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS

- SELECT SCHEDULE (APPENDIX 1)

PHASE 3  ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPTS FOR PREFERRED SOLUTION

- APPROVED - MAY PROCEED

PHASE 4  ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY REPORT

- COMPLETE ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY REPORT (ESR)

PHASE 5  IMPLEMENTATION

- FINALIZE DESIGN

NOTE: This flow chart is to be read in conjunction with Part A of the Municipal Class EA

City of Hamilton

Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9)

Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment

June 2005

iTRANS
CLASS EA REQUIREMENTS

This study is following the approved environmental planning process for Master Plans under the Municipal Engineers Association, *Municipal Class Environmental Assessment* (June 2000).

Under the Class EA there are three project schedules, with each schedule having different requirements to fulfill the environmental planning process. This Master Plan is intended to fulfill:

- All Phase 1 and 2 requirements for all Schedule ‘B’ projects (transportation and water / wastewater) that are identified;

- All Phase 1 to 4 requirements for all Schedule ‘C’ projects that are identified (construction of new road facilities and major expansions to existing road facilities, greater than $1.5 million), except for the Trinity Church Road extension; and,

- All Phase 1 and 2 requirements for the Trinity Church Road extension. In this case, the Master Plan will be used as input into a further Class EA study and Environmental Study Report (ESR), which will finalize the Phase 3 and 4 requirements for Trinity Church Road improvements north and south of Rymal Road.
STUDY PUBLIC CONSULTATION PLAN

- Opportunities for public input are provided throughout the process. Public input is gathered through public meetings, telephone inquiries, letters, email and faxes.

- Comments are always welcome. Formal public consultation points, which are also shown on the EA Process panel, are as follows:
  - Phase 2 - Public Information Centre #1 – October 3, 2005 (Tonight)
  - Phase 3 - Public Information Center #2 - Winter 2005
  - Phase 4 - Master Plan Environmental Study Report (ESR) to Council - Spring 2006; File Master Plan ESR on public record - Spring 2006

- Upon filing of the Master Plan ESR, a public notice of the study completion will be published in the "At Your Service", "Mountain News", "Stoney Creek News", and the Hamilton Spectator.

- The Master Plan ESR will be available for public review and comment for a required minimum 30-day review period.

- During the 30-day review period, you may request that the project be ‘bumped-up’ to a Part II Order (formerly known as the “bump-up” request), if you feel, after consulting with the City, that serious environmental concerns remain unresolved. Any Part II Order request must be made with respect to specific project(s) subject to the Class EA. A Part II Order Request cannot be submitted with respect to the Master Plan as a whole. The decision to ‘bump-up’ the project to a Part II Order rests with the Minister of the Environment.
NEEDS AND OPPORTUNITIES

ROPA 9 LANDS

Transportation and water/wastewater needs assessments were conducted for servicing the ROPA 9 lands. These included an assessment of existing conditions, and future conditions with projected growth and development in the area. Key findings to the needs and opportunity are as follows:

Transportation

- Additional east-west capacity (equivalent to one lane per direction), as early as 2006.

- Additional north-south capacity (equivalent to 2 lanes per direction) by 2011.

- Accommodation of high southbound left turn demand from the freeway network by 2021.

- Traffic management measures on Upper Mount Albion Road to keep its road function local, to be coordinated with the extension of Trinity Church Road.

- Improving services for transit usage, and facilities for cycling and pedestrian usage to serve the community, as development of the Rymal Road Planning Area proceeds.
NEEDS AND OPPORTUNITY (Cont’d)

ROPA 9 LANDS

Water and Wastewater

- Future needs of the water distribution system include additional fire and emergency storage to maintain adequate operating pressure within the system.

- Higher pumping capacity is required to accommodate the increased demands resulting from new development in ROPA 9, Binbrook as well as the remainder of water pressure district 7.

- New sewers having capacity to accommodate sanitary sewage from the Study Area are required to convey flows to the existing sanitary sewer system. Alternative routes are being considered.

- Improvements may be required to increase the capacity of the existing collection system to accommodate the additional sanitary flows from both Binbrook and ROPA 9 under ultimate build-out conditions.

SPECIAL POLICY AREA ‘C’

Transportation and water / wastewater analyses are currently being conducted for Special Policy Area ‘C’.

It is anticipated that additional capacity will be needed on the road network in the vicinity of Special Policy Area ‘C’, consistent with the type and magnitude of proposed land uses.

The results of the analyses and design will be presented at the next Public Information Centre.
PROBLEM STATEMENT

A Problem Statement as follows has been developed:

Transportation solutions, which support Municipal Official Plans, are necessary:

(1) To address projected capacity deficiencies in the Rymal Road corridor,
(2) To accommodate projected demands on Regional Road 56 at the new collector road connection south of Rymal Road,
(3) To provide additional north-south capacity to accommodate future traffic demands, and
(4) To better accommodate service for autos, commercial vehicles, transit vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists through the area.
(5) To manage traffic impact on local roads adjacent to the study area

Water and wastewater solutions are necessary to:

(1) Provide adequate reservoir storage and pumping capacity to provide sufficient water supply and maintain adequate water pressure in the H-7 Pressure District.
(2) Provide adequate conveyance capacity to convey wastewater from ROPA 9 to the existing sanitary sewer system and ensure that the existing system has sufficient capacity to convey flows to treatment.
### EXISTING OFFICIAL PLAN POLICIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Current Designation</th>
<th>Designated Right-of-Way</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rymal Road (Highway 53)</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>36 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Church Road</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>36 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Road 56</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>36 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Mount Albion Road</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>20 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher Road</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>26 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Road West</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>26 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitedeer Road</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>20 to 26 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swayze Road</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>20 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Local Road:** provide direct access to abutting properties and carry traffic predominantly of local nature.
- **Collector Road:** function as connecting road links between arterial and local roads; generally carry lower traffic volumes than arterial roads.
- **Arterial Road:** strategic links in the road network, the main functions of which are to carry relatively high volumes of long distance traffic.
The Region of Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan states that:
- The movement of people and goods is vital to the prosperity of the Region.
- An integrated transportation system (combining transit, vehicles, bicycles, air and water transport and pedestrian movements) is required.
- The Region will provide a sustainable system of water supply and sewage treatment, and is responsible for providing water and sewage treatment to the urban areas of Hamilton-Wentworth.

City of Stoney Creek Official Plan aims:
- To provide a safe and efficient road network.

Township of Glanbrook Official Plan intends:
- To facilitate the satisfactory movement of both people and goods; and
- To ensure the orderly movement of through traffic.

City of Hamilton Official Plan aims:
- To provide an effective circulation and movement system that will maximize accessibility in all parts of the City;
- To reduce conflicts between pedestrian and vehicular circulation; and
- To provide mode choices.

City-Wide Transportation Master Plan (Phase 2) aim:
- To provide a strong and vibrant economy;
- To build livable communities;
- To improve public transit; and
- To provide a balanced transportation network.
EXISTING CONDITIONS

Roadway

- Rymal Road is an east-west arterial with a basic 2-lane cross-section between Regional Road 56 and Trinity Church Road.
- Trinity Church Road is a north-south arterial with a basic 2-lane cross-section.
- Regional Road 56 is a primary north-south link with a basic 2-lane cross-section in the Study Area.

Existing deficiencies include:

- The maximum existing volume/capacity (v/c) ratio on Rymal Road is 0.93 for westbound direction during AM peak hour. This indicates that Rymal Road is currently operating close to capacity within the Study Area.
- Given the local designation of Upper Mount Albion Road, existing volumes are approaching the typical capacity of a local road (approximately 1,000 vehicles per day).
- The road network is discontinuous within the Trinity Church Road corridor between Rymal Road and the Lincoln Alexander Parkway.

Water and Wastewater Infrastructure

- There are currently no existing watermains within the Rymal Road Planning Area. ROPA 9 is within the H-7 Pressure District that contains the HD007 Pumping Station and HDR07 Reservoir.
- Currently, no sanitary sewers exist within the Rymal Road Planning Area.
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EXISTING CONDITIONS (Cont’d)

Environmental

Socio-Economic

- Land use in the Study Area is predominantly agricultural and residential, with some commercial uses.
- Active development is occurring within the Study Area.
- Commercial uses include an existing retail commercial plaza, located in the northwest quadrant of the Rymal Road / Upper Centennial Parkway intersection.
- A pocket of industrial uses is located within the Rymal Road / Swayze Road / Upper Centennial Parkway boundary.
- The Rymal Road Community Church is located at 1957 Rymal Road opposite Fletcher Road.
- Several residential dwellings are also located along the Trinity Church Road corridor.
- The Trinity United Church and Cemetery is located along this corridor at 10 Trinity Church Road.
- Existing land uses in Special Policy Area ‘C’ are comprised of residential and agricultural uses.
- Residences are located on both sides of Upper Mount Albion Road.
- Buried utilities and above ground utility lines are present throughout the Study Area.
Existing Land Use
EXISTING CONDITIONS (Cont’d)

Natural Environment – Aquatic and Terrestrial

- No Environmentally Significant Areas (ESAs) or Evaluated Wetlands are located within the Study Area.

- The Eramosa Karst Area of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI) spans Rymal Road between Upper Mount Albion Road and Second Road West in the Study Area.

- The vegetation communities identified within the Study Area are considered common and widespread throughout Ontario and include Oak-Sugar Maple Deciduous Forest, a Cattail Mineral Shallow Marsh and Pondweed Submerged Shallow Aquatic Community, a Field Meadow, and Gray Dogwood Cultural Thicket.

- The wildlife habitat in the Study Area comprises roadside ditches, agricultural fields, hedgerows, a cultural thicket, a few small creeks and one roadside woodlot.

- A total of 54 wildlife species were recorded during field investigations. The habitat types found include a total of 65 wildlife species (four herpetofauna, 48 birds and 13 mammals).

- A total of five tributaries of Red Hill Creek pass through the Study Area. A total of two tributaries of Sinkhole Creek pass through the Study Area.

- Red Hill Creek and Sinkhole Creek tributaries typically support warmwater baitfish communities, with species such as brook stickleback, goldfish, fathead minnow, and largemouth bass.
Natural Environment
EXISTING CONDITIONS (Cont’d)

Natural Environment – Stormwater

- The Study Area falls into two different watersheds: Red Hill Creek and a tributary of Twenty Mile Creek.

- Surface runoff from the western portion of the Study Area travels through a variety of tributaries and watercourses into Hannon Creek (west of Trinity Church Road) or Upper Davis Creek (north of Rymal Road) that eventually connect to Red Hill Creek.

- In contrast, the eastern portion of the Study Area drains easterly to the Twenty Mile Creek Watershed via Sinkhole Creek.

- Currently four storm drainage outfalls are available for the sub-catchments.
EXISTING CONDITIONS (Cont’d)

Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

- At least 55 archaeological sites are within 2 km of the Study Area.

- None of the registered sites are located within or immediately adjacent to the ROPA9 study corridors.

- 12 sites are located within Special Policy Area ‘C’. Potential for sites on the adjacent agricultural lands.

- Two cemeteries are also noted within the Study Area.

- A number of residences identified as built heritage features and a farm complex of 40 years or older are located along Rymal Road East within the Study Area. The intersection of Trinity Church Road is also identified as sensitive to change.

- The historical community of Elfrida was located on the township line between Binbrook and Saltfleet Townships. Only the former church building and the residence located at No. 2190 Rymal Road East remain of the community.

- All identified built heritage features and cultural heritage landscapes have a local interest designation.

- Two buildings identified within the Study Area are listed in the Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 2: Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.
Existing Built Heritage and Cultural Features

- **BHF 1** (No. 2251 Elfrida Church)
- **BHF 2** (No. 2190)
- **BHF 3** (No. 1970)
- **BHF 4** (No. 1865 Rymal Road Church / Cemetery)
- **BHF 5** (No. 4)
- **BHF 6** (No. 31)
- **CHL 1** (Rymal Road Cemetery)
- **CHL 2** (Roadscape)
- **CHL 3** (Trinity Church / Cemetery)
- **CHL 4** (No. 1824)
- **CHL 5** (Roadscape)
- **CHL 6** (Agricultural Land)

**LEGEND**

★ Heritage or Cultural Feature

* Heritage Feature listed in Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 2: Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical
ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS

Transportation:

- Do Nothing
- Travel Demand Management - Promote transit, cycling, walking and ride sharing / carpooling
- Upgrade Other Routes / Build Other Routes
- Operational Improvements
- Widen Rymal Road to provide additional through lanes throughout the corridor
- Extend Trinity Church Road north of Rymal Road to provide additional north-south capacity
- Widen Regional Road 56 to provide additional through lanes throughout the study section
ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS (Cont’d)

**Water:**

- Do Nothing
- Water Conservation
- Operational changes to the HD007 Pumping Station and expand the HDR07 Reservoir
- New booster pumping station and expand the HDR07 Reservoir to service the ROPA 9 lands.
- Operational changes to the HD007 Pumping Station and Construct new storage.
- New Booster Pumping Station and Construct New Storage.

**Wastewater:**

- Construct new sanitary sub-trunk to Red Hill Creek Interceptor and improvements to the Red Hill Creek Interceptor.
- Construct new sanitary sub-trunk to Davis Creek Sub-Trunk and downstream improvements to the Red Hill Creek Interceptor.
- Construct new sanitary sub-trunk to Mount Albion Sub-Trunk and improvements to the Red Hill Creek Interceptor.
Water Servicing
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Alternative Solutions

1. Do nothing

2. Water conservation

3. Increase capacity of HD007 PS and expand HDR07 reservoir

4. New booster PS and expand HDR07 reservoir

5. Increase capacity of HD007 PS and new storage

6. New booster PS and new storage
ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

The Planning alternatives were evaluated based on their ability to address the problem statement, including impacts to infrastructure, and environmental and cost impacts.

The alternative planning solutions were assessed based on the following criteria.

Addresses Problem Statement / Impacts to Transportation
- Accommodation of future demand (impact on capacity and operating conditions on the road)
- Safety (impact on collision potential on the roadway)
- Access to adjacent lands (impact on access to properties)
- Accommodation of pedestrians and cyclists

Addresses Problem Statement / Impacts to Water / Wastewater
- Accommodation of future demand (impact on existing / proposed infrastructure)
- Ease of operation
- Integration with existing infrastructure

Socio-economic Impacts
- Noise Impacts (effect of traffic-related noise)
- Residents
- Dwellings/property
- Businesses
- Institutions
- Recreational Facilities adjacent to the corridor
- Archaeological/Cultural Heritage Resources
- Visual/Aesthetics
- Impacts on adjacent local roads
- Potential for Contamination
ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA (Cont’d)

Natural Environmental Impacts
- Vegetation
- Wildlife
- Aquatic Habitat
- Stormwater
- Eramosa Karst / ANSIs or other recognized features

Costs
- Utility Relocation
- Capital Costs
- Operating Costs
- Property Acquisition
## Evaluation of Transportation Planning Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>DO NOTHING</th>
<th>TRAVEL DEMAND MANAGEMENT</th>
<th>UPGRADE OTHER ROUTES / BUILD OTHER ROUTES</th>
<th>OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS</th>
<th>RYMAL ROAD WIDENING</th>
<th>TRINITY CHURCH ROAD EXTENSION</th>
<th>REGIONAL ROAD 56 WIDENING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Represents continuation of existing conditions and would involve no changes</td>
<td>Involves methods to modify existing and future travel demand, to reduce the growth</td>
<td>Involves constructing new east-west,</td>
<td>Involves methods to increase the capacity of the existing road network, such as</td>
<td>Involves providing additional lanes on Rymal Road throughout the study corridor</td>
<td>Involves extending Trinity Church Road to connect with the Red Hill Creek Expressway</td>
<td>Involves providing additional lanes on Regional Road 56 from Rymal Road southerly for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or improvements to the existing transportation network</td>
<td>or north-south corridors, and/or widening existing east-west or north-south corridors</td>
<td>west or north-south corridors in the</td>
<td>changes to traffic signal timing and phasing, localized roadway section and intersection</td>
<td>Significant increase to corridor capacity and to overall study area roadway capacity</td>
<td>interchange at Mud Street</td>
<td>approximately 900 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in the vicinity</td>
<td>capacity</td>
<td>geometric improvements, adding or changing exclusive turn lanes at intersections</td>
<td>Significant increase to overall study area roadway capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant increase to corridor capacity and to study area roadway capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION SERVICE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant increase to corridor capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor Capacity and Level</td>
<td>No increase to corridor capacity;</td>
<td>Increase to corridor capacity with potential for less traffic congestion</td>
<td>Slight increase to corridor capacity</td>
<td>Significant increase to corridor capacity and to overall study area roadway capacity</td>
<td>Significant increase to overall study area roadway capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Service</td>
<td>Increase in traffic congestion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant increase to corridor capacity and to study area roadway capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Safety within the</td>
<td>No change from existing</td>
<td>Potential increased safety for pedestrians / cyclists due to improvements to sidewalks</td>
<td>Localized improvement in safety</td>
<td>Potential for improvement in safety performance along length of study corridor</td>
<td>New corridor, safety performance would be built in along length of corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>study corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td>/ bike lanes and decreased auto traffic.</td>
<td>performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to/from Rymal Road and</td>
<td>No change from existing</td>
<td>Improvement for cross streets accessibility with potential for less traffic congestion on Rymal Road</td>
<td>Potential improvement with new traffic</td>
<td>Improvement for cross streets accessibility with less traffic congestion; however,</td>
<td>Potential for new cross streets connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Road 56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>signals facilitating access to / from Rymal Road and to / from Regional Road 56.</td>
<td>additional lanes to cross when turning left</td>
<td>Allows for new street connection with Regional Road 56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Operations within the</td>
<td>No current transit operations within the study corridor; potential for</td>
<td>Potential for slight reduction in transit delays (should transit service be considered) as a result of decrease in corridor auto demand</td>
<td>Potential for reduction in transit</td>
<td>Potential for transit and resulting improvement in transit service within the study</td>
<td>Potential for transit and resulting improvement in transit service within the study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>study corridor</td>
<td>transit service in the future could be hampered by traffic congestion.</td>
<td>as a result of increase in corridor capacity</td>
<td>delays (should transit service be</td>
<td>corridor</td>
<td>corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation for</td>
<td>No bicycle routes or sidewalks currently exist within the study</td>
<td>Could result in new pedestrian/cyclist network</td>
<td>considered) as a result of slight</td>
<td>Potential for transit and resulting improvement in transit service within the study</td>
<td>Potential for transit and resulting improvement in transit service within the study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians and Cyclists</td>
<td>corridors. The impact of Do Nothing will be the worsening of conditions for</td>
<td>Could also result in sidewalks being built as a result of the policy recommendations</td>
<td>increase in corridor capacity</td>
<td>corridor</td>
<td>corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within the study</td>
<td>pedestrians and cyclists because of the increase</td>
<td>from the TMP City-wide Phase 2 in regard to Upgrading of routes and new construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in traffic and the fact that no</td>
<td>Note: This is not in the study corridor. These improvements however, would not improve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>improvements to the ped/cyclist</td>
<td>conditions within the ROPA 9 lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>network will be done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR</td>
<td>DO NOTHING</td>
<td>TRAVEL DEMAND MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>UPGRADE OTHER ROUTES / BUILD OTHER ROUTES</td>
<td>OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>RYML ROAD WIDENING</td>
<td>TRINITY CHURCH ROAD EXTENSION</td>
<td>REGIONAL ROAD 56 WIDENING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Represents continuation of existing conditions and would involve no changes or improvements to the existing transportation network.</td>
<td>Involves methods to modify existing and future travel demand, to reduce the growth of single-occupant vehicular travel during the peak travel periods, such as carpooling, improved transit service, accommodation for pedestrians and cyclists.</td>
<td>Involves constructing new east-west, or north-south corridors, and/or widening existing east-west or north-south corridors in the vicinity.</td>
<td>Involves methods to increase the capacity of the existing road network, such as changes to traffic signal timing and phasing, localized roadway section and intersection geometric improvements, adding or changing exclusive turn lanes at intersections.</td>
<td>Involves providing additional lanes on Rymal Road throughout the study corridor.</td>
<td>Involves extending Trinity Church Road to connect with the Red Hill Creek Expressway interchange at Mud Street.</td>
<td>Involves providing additional lanes on Regional Road 56 from Rymal Road southerly for approximately 900 m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACTS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise Impacts</th>
<th>Increase in noise levels with future traffic growth</th>
<th>Potential reduction in noise levels with less traffic congestion</th>
<th>Increase in noise levels with future traffic growth</th>
<th>Increase in noise levels with future traffic growth</th>
<th>No anticipated noise impacts on existing residents.</th>
<th>Potential noise impacts on any future residents within the study corridor.</th>
<th>Increase in noise levels with future traffic growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents Impacts</td>
<td>No direct impact to residents</td>
<td>No direct impact to residents – Encourages positive impacts of active lifestyle</td>
<td>No direct impact to residents</td>
<td>No direct impact to residents</td>
<td>Potential negative impact to residents with corridor widening</td>
<td>No anticipated impact to residents with corridor widening</td>
<td>No anticipated impact to residents with this corridor widening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings displacement / property requirements</td>
<td>No impact to existing dwellings / property</td>
<td>No impact to existing dwellings / property</td>
<td>Potential impact to existing dwellings / property along new / widened corridor</td>
<td>Potential impact to existing property at intersections</td>
<td>Potential impact to existing dwellings / property along Rymal Road</td>
<td>Impact to property along a Trinity Church Road extension</td>
<td>Potential impact to property along Regional Road 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business impacts</td>
<td>No impact to existing businesses. No changes to existing private driveways</td>
<td>No impact to existing businesses. No changes to existing private driveways</td>
<td>No impact to existing businesses along new / widened corridor</td>
<td>No impact to existing businesses along new / widened corridor</td>
<td>No anticipated impact to businesses along new / widened corridor</td>
<td>New corridor, no impact to existing businesses</td>
<td>No anticipated impact to existing businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional impacts</td>
<td>No institutions currently located along corridor</td>
<td>No institutions currently located along corridor</td>
<td>Potential impact on institutional uses along new / widened corridor</td>
<td>No institutions currently located along corridor</td>
<td>No institutions currently located along corridor</td>
<td>No institutions currently located along corridor</td>
<td>No institutions currently located along corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Facilities adjacent to the corridor</td>
<td>No recreational facilities adjacent to the corridor</td>
<td>No recreational facilities adjacent to the corridor</td>
<td>Potential impact on recreational facilities along new / widened corridors</td>
<td>No recreational facilities adjacent to the corridor</td>
<td>No recreational facilities adjacent to the corridor</td>
<td>Potential connection to proposed bicycle routes (Regional OP)</td>
<td>No recreational facilities adjacent to the corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological/Cultural Heritage Resources</td>
<td>No impacts to existing archaeological / cultural heritage resources</td>
<td>No impacts to existing archaeological / cultural heritage resources</td>
<td>Potential for impact on archaeological / cultural heritage resources along new / widened corridors</td>
<td>No anticipated impact to archaeological / cultural heritage resources</td>
<td>Potential for impact on archaeological / cultural heritage resources</td>
<td>Potential for impact on archaeological resources; no anticipated impact on cultural heritage resources</td>
<td>No anticipated impact on archaeological / cultural heritage resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual/Aesthetics</td>
<td>No change to existing aesthetics</td>
<td>Existing aesthetics could be improved by the addition of sidewalks, cycling lanes and transit shelters</td>
<td>Impact on aesthetics, due to increased pavement width along widened corridors. However, potential for streetscaping</td>
<td>No anticipated significant impact on aesthetics, though increased pavement width at intersections. However, potential for streetscaping</td>
<td>Impact on aesthetics due to increased pavement width on Rymal Road. However, potential for streetscaping</td>
<td>Potential for streetscaping with a Trinity Church Road extension</td>
<td>Impact on aesthetics due to increased pavement width on Regional Road 56; however, potential for streetscaping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation of Transportation Planning Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>DO NOTHING</th>
<th>TRAVEL DEMAND MANAGEMENT</th>
<th>UPGRADE OTHER ROUTES / BUILD OTHER ROUTES</th>
<th>OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS</th>
<th>RYMAL ROAD WIDENING</th>
<th>TRINITY CHURCH ROAD EXTENSION</th>
<th>REGIONAL ROAD 56 WIDENING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Represents continuation of existing conditions and would involve no changes or improvements to the existing transportation network</td>
<td>Involves methods to modify existing and future travel demand, to reduce the growth of single-occupant vehicular travel during the peak travel periods, such as carpooling, improved transit service, accommodation for pedestrians and cyclists</td>
<td>Involves constructing new east-west, or north-south corridors, and/or widening existing east-west or north-south corridors in the vicinity</td>
<td>Involves methods to increase the capacity of the existing road network, such as changes to traffic signal timing and phasing, localized roadway section and intersection geometric improvements, adding or changing exclusive turn lanes at intersections</td>
<td>Involves providing additional lanes on Rymal Road throughout the study corridor</td>
<td>Involves extending Trinity Church Road to connect with the Red Hill Creek Expressway interchange at Mud Street</td>
<td>Involves providing additional lanes on Regional Road 56 from Rymal Road southerly for approximately 900 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjacent Local Roads (Potential for Traffic Infiltration) | Potential for traffic infiltration due to increased traffic congestion | Potential for reduction in traffic infiltration as a result of decrease in corridor auto demand | Potential for traffic infiltration due to potential for less traffic congestion | Potential for traffic infiltration as a result of increase in corridor and overall study capacity | Less potential for traffic infiltration as a result of increase in corridor and overall study capacity | Potential for traffic infiltration as a result of increase in corridor and overall study capacity |

Potential for Contamination | No change | Not applicable | Potential for contamination, depending upon locations. | Potential for contamination, due to commercial uses (e.g. services stations). Further investigations may be required | Potential for contamination, due to commercial uses. Further investigations may be required |

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT IMPACTS:

- **Vegetation**
  - No anticipated impact on vegetation
  - No anticipated impact on vegetation along new / widened corridors
  - No anticipated impact on vegetation / trees along Rymal Road, potential for planting
  - Potential for impact on vegetation along Regional Road 56, potential for planting
  - Potential for impact on vegetation along Regional Road 56, potential for planting

- **Wildlife**
  - No anticipated impact on wildlife
  - No anticipated impact on wildlife along new / widened corridors
  - No anticipated impact on wildlife / trees along Rymal Road, potential for planting
  - Potential for impact on wildlife, due to agricultural uses.

- **Aquatic Habitat**
  - No anticipated impact on aquatic habitat
  - No anticipated impact on aquatic habitat along new / widened corridors
  - No anticipated impact on aquatic habitat / trees along Rymal Road, potential for planting
  - Potential for impact on aquatic habitat, due to agricultural uses.

- **Eramosa Karst**
  - No anticipated impact on Karst features
  - Potential for impact on Karst features along new / widened corridors
  - Potential for impact on Karst features along new / widened corridors
  - Potential for impact on Karst features along new / widened corridors

- **Stormwater**
  - No anticipated additional impact on stormwater quality or quantity
  - No anticipated additional impact on stormwater quality or quantity along new / widened corridors
  - No anticipated impact on stormwater quality and quantity along new / widened corridors
  - No anticipated impact on stormwater quality and quantity / trees along Rymal Road, potential for planting

COSTS

- **Utility Relocation**
  - No anticipated impact on utilities
  - No anticipated impact on utilities along new / widened corridors
  - Potential relocation of utilities
  - Potential relocation of utilities / trees along Rymal Road, potential for planting
  - Potential relocation of utilities along new / widened corridors

- **Capital Costs**
  - Capital costs of developing and implementing TDM program (Showcase)
  - High capital costs for road improvements
  - Anticipated minor capital costs for operational improvements
  - High capital costs for road improvements
  - High capital costs for road improvements
  - High capital costs for road improvements
### Evaluation of Transportation Planning Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>DO NOTHING</th>
<th>TRAVEL DEMAND MANAGEMENT</th>
<th>UPGRADE OTHER ROUTES / BUILD OTHER ROUTES</th>
<th>OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS</th>
<th>RYMAL ROAD WIDENING</th>
<th>TRINITY CHURCH ROAD EXTENSION</th>
<th>REGIONAL ROAD 56 WIDENING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Represents continuation of existing conditions and would involve no changes or improvements to the existing transportation network.</td>
<td>Involves methods to modify existing and future travel demand, to reduce the growth of single-occupant vehicular travel during the peak travel periods, such as carpooling, improved transit service, accommodation for pedestrians and cyclists.</td>
<td>Involves constructing new east-west, or north-south corridors, and/or widening existing east-west or north-south corridors in the vicinity.</td>
<td>Involves methods to increase the capacity of the existing road network, such as changes to traffic signal timing and phasing, localized roadway section and intersection geometric improvements, adding or changing exclusive turn lanes at intersections.</td>
<td>Involves providing additional lanes on Rymal Road throughout the study corridor.</td>
<td>Involves extending Trinity Church Road to connect with the Red Hill Creek Expressway interchange at Mud Street.</td>
<td>Involves providing additional lanes on Regional Road 56 from Rymal Road southerly for approximately 900 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Costs</td>
<td>Potential for increase in operating cost with higher roadway maintenance costs, due to road surface and road base deterioration.</td>
<td>Maintenance costs related to roadway, sidewalks and cycling lanes to better respond to the needs of the residents.</td>
<td>Maintenance costs related to roadway, sidewalks and cycling lanes to better respond to the needs of the residents along new widened corridors.</td>
<td>Maintenance costs related to roadway, sidewalks and cycling lanes to better respond to the needs of the residents at localized improvement areas.</td>
<td>Maintenance costs related to roadway, sidewalks and cycling lanes to better respond to the needs of the residents along the corridor.</td>
<td>Maintenance costs related to roadway, sidewalks and cycling lanes to better respond to the needs of the residents along the new corridor.</td>
<td>Maintenance costs related to roadway, sidewalks and cycling lanes to better respond to the needs of the residents along the corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Acquisition</td>
<td>No anticipated property acquisition, therefore no property cost.</td>
<td>Anticipated high property acquisition along new / widened corridors.</td>
<td>Potential minor property acquisition costs for operational improvements.</td>
<td>Potential moderate property acquisition costs along Rymal Road.</td>
<td>Property major property acquisition costs.</td>
<td>Potential moderate property acquisition costs along Regional Road 56.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATION BY CONSULTANTS – For Discussion Purposes Only**

- **The current study area road network is insufficient to meet the current traffic demand. With future development planned, improvements must be made to meet the future demand.**
  - Not Recommended
  - Recommended in conjunction with the preferred solutions

- **Travel Demand Management initiatives will contribute to reduced vehicular traffic in the corridors, but these will not address capacity or operational conditions within the study corridors. As such, they are recommended for further consideration, but it is recognized that they cannot address the problems alone.**
  - Not Recommended
  - Recommended in conjunction with the preferred solutions

- **Constraining new east-west corridors and/or widening existing east-west corridors have an overall potential high impact on the socio-economic and natural environments, and is associated with potentially very high capital costs.**
  - Not Recommended
  - Recommended in conjunction with the preferred solutions

- **Operational improvements on their own will not address all of the existing and future capacity and operational concerns within the study corridors. As such, they are recommended for further consideration, but it is recognized that they cannot address the problems alone.**
  - Recommended
  - Recommended in conjunction with the preferred solutions

- **Widening Rymal Road provides for additional capacity on the roadway, and allows for safety and operations improvements within the corridor.**
  - Recommended
  - Recommended in conjunction with the preferred solutions

- **Extending Trinity Church Road provides for additional capacity in the study area.**
  - Recommended
  - Recommended in conjunction with the preferred solutions

- **Widening Regional Road 56 provides for additional capacity on the roadway, and allows for any safety and operations improvements within the corridor.**
  - Recommended
  - Recommended in conjunction with the preferred solutions
## Evaluation of Planning Alternatives for Water / Wastewater Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>DO NOTHING</th>
<th>UPGRADE THE HD007 PUMPING STATION AND H7 RESERVOIR</th>
<th>NEW BOOSTER PUMPING STATION AND UPGRADE THE H7 RESERVOIR</th>
<th>UPGRADE THE HD007 PUMPING STATION AND CONSTRUCT NEW STORAGE</th>
<th>NEW BOOSTER PUMPING STATION AND CONSTRUCT NEW STORAGE</th>
<th>CONSTRUCT NEW SANITARY SUB-TRUNK TO RED HILL CREEK INTERCEPTOR</th>
<th>CONSTRUCT NEW SANITARY SUB-TRUNK TO MOUNT ALBION SUB-TRUNK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WATER / WASTEWATER SERVICE:</td>
<td>No accommodation of future demand</td>
<td>New pressure reducing valves (PRVs) required to control pressure in existing areas to acceptable levels. Adequate pressure and supply can be provided.</td>
<td>New pressure release valves required within existing HD007 pressure zone to control pressure within existing areas. Adequate pressure and supply can be provided.</td>
<td>New pressure release valves required within existing HD007 pressure zone to control pressure within existing areas. Adequate pressure and supply can be provided.</td>
<td>Upgrade of Red Hill Creek Interceptor required from MH 9 to MH 49.</td>
<td>Upgrade of Red Hill Creek Interceptor required from MH 9 to MH 49.</td>
<td>Upgrade of Red Hill Creek Interceptor required from MH 9 to MH 49.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation of future demand (impact on existing / proposed infrastructure)</td>
<td>No change from existing</td>
<td>Additional operational requirements associated with new booster pumping station.</td>
<td>Alternative requires new pumping station.</td>
<td>Alternative requires new pumping station and elevated storage facility.</td>
<td>Alternative will utilize existing trunk sewers to convey wastewater to Woodward Avenue WWTP for treatment.</td>
<td>Alternative will utilize existing sub-trunk and trunk sewers to convey wastewater to Woodward Avenue for treatment.</td>
<td>Alternative will utilize existing sub-trunk and trunk sewers to convey wastewater to Woodward Avenue WWTP for treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of operation/ Reliability</td>
<td>No change from existing</td>
<td>New PRVs required to control pressure in existing areas to acceptable levels.</td>
<td>Alternative requires new pumping station.</td>
<td>Alternative requires new pumping station and elevated storage facility.</td>
<td>Alternative will utilize existing trunk sewers to convey wastewater to Woodward Avenue WWTP for treatment.</td>
<td>Alternative will utilize existing sub-trunk and trunk sewers to convey wastewater to Woodward Avenue for treatment.</td>
<td>Alternative will utilize existing sub-trunk and trunk sewers to convey wastewater to Woodward Avenue WWTP for treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration with existing infrastructure</td>
<td>No change from existing</td>
<td>No additional operational requirements.</td>
<td>No additional operational requirements.</td>
<td>No additional operational requirements.</td>
<td>No additional operational requirements.</td>
<td>No additional operational requirements.</td>
<td>No additional operational requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACTS:</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Impacts</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Residents and other Land Owners</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Facilities adjacent to ROPA9</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation of Planning Alternatives for Water / Wastewater Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>DO NOTHING</th>
<th>UPGRADE THE HD007 PUMPING STATION AND H7 RESERVOIR</th>
<th>NEW BOOSTER PUMPING STATION AND UPGRADE THE H7 RESERVOIR</th>
<th>UPGRADE THE HD007 PUMPING STATION AND CONSTRUCT NEW STORAGE</th>
<th>NEW BOOSTER PUMPING STATION AND CONSTRUCT NEW STORAGE</th>
<th>CONSTRUCT NEW SANITARY SUB-TRUNK TO RED HILL CREEK INTERCEPTOR</th>
<th>CONSTRUCT NEW SANITARY SUB-TRUNK TO DAVIS CREEK SUB-TRUNK</th>
<th>CONSTRUCT NEW SANITARY SUB-TRUNK TO MOUNT ALBION SUB-TRUNK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Represents continuation of existing conditions and would involve no changes or improvements to the existing network.</td>
<td>Upgrade and expansion of existing pumping station and expansion of existing H7 reservoir.</td>
<td>Construction of a new booster pumping station in ROPA9 lands and expansion of the existing H7 Reservoir</td>
<td>Upgrade and expansion of existing pumping station and construct new elevated storage facility within ROPA9 lands</td>
<td>Construction of a new booster pumping station in ROPA9 lands and construct new elevated storage facility within ROPA9 lands</td>
<td>No impact to existing archaeological, cultural or heritage resources.</td>
<td>No impact to existing archaeological, cultural or heritage resources.</td>
<td>No impact to existing archaeological, cultural or heritage resources.</td>
<td>No impact to existing archaeological, cultural or heritage resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological/Cultural Heritage Resources</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact to existing archaeological, cultural or heritage resources.</td>
<td>No impact to existing archaeological, cultural or heritage resources.</td>
<td>No impact to existing archaeological, cultural or heritage resources.</td>
<td>No impact to existing archaeological, cultural or heritage resources.</td>
<td>No impact to existing archaeological, cultural or heritage resources.</td>
<td>No impact to existing archaeological, cultural or heritage resources.</td>
<td>No impact to existing archaeological, cultural or heritage resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual/Aesthetics</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No visual or aesthetic impact.</td>
<td>Minor visual impacts associated with new pumping station can be mitigated.</td>
<td>No change in visual impacts resulting from existing pumping station. New elevated storage facility will result in visual impacts.</td>
<td>Minor visual impacts associated with new pumping station can be mitigated. New elevated storage facility will result in visual impacts.</td>
<td>No new visual or aesthetic impacts.</td>
<td>No new visual or aesthetic impacts.</td>
<td>No new visual or aesthetic impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for Contamination</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Potential for contamination, depending upon locations. Further investigations may be required.</td>
<td>Potential for contamination, depending upon locations. Further investigations may be required.</td>
<td>Potential for contamination, depending upon locations. Further investigations may be required.</td>
<td>Potential for contamination, due to adjacent uses (e.g. commercial). Further investigations may be required.</td>
<td>Potential for contamination, due to adjacent uses (e.g. commercial). Further investigations may be required.</td>
<td>Potential for contamination, due to adjacent uses (e.g. commercial). Further investigations may be required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NATURAL ENVIRONMENT IMPACTS:

| Wildlife | No impact on existing wildlife populations. | No impact on existing wildlife populations. | No impact on existing wildlife populations. | No impact on existing wildlife populations. | No impact on existing wildlife populations. | No impact on existing wildlife populations. |
| Aquatic Habitat | No impact on aquatic habitat or species. | No impact on aquatic habitat or species. | No impact on aquatic habitat or species. | No impact on aquatic habitat or species. | No impact on aquatic habitat or species. | No impact on aquatic habitat or species. |
| Impacts on the Karst | No impact on Karst. | No impact on Karst. | No impact on Karst. | No impact on Karst. | No impact on Karst. | No impact on Karst. | No impact on Karst. | No impact on Karst. |

### COSTS

| Capital Costs | $0 | Low | Medium | Medium | High | Low | Medium | High |
| Annual Operating Costs | $0 | Low | Medium | Medium | High | Low | Low | Low |

---

**Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment Study**
### Evaluation of Planning Alternatives for Water / Wastewater Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>DO NOTHING</th>
<th>UPGRADE THE HD007 PUMPING STATION AND UPGRADE THE H7 RESERVOIR</th>
<th>NEW BOOSTER PUMPING STATION AND UPGRADE THE H7 RESERVOIR</th>
<th>UPGRADE THE HD007 PUMPING STATION AND CONSTRUCT NEW STORAGE</th>
<th>NEW BOOSTER PUMPING STATION AND CONSTRUCT NEW STORAGE</th>
<th>CONSTRUCT NEW SANITARY SUB-TRUNK TO RED HILL CREEK INTERCEPTOR</th>
<th>CONSTRUCT NEW SANITARY SUB-TRUNK TO DAVIS CREEK SUB-TRUNK</th>
<th>CONSTRUCT NEW SANITARY SUB-TRUNK TO MOUNT ALBION SUB-TRUNK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Represents continuation of existing conditions and would involve no changes or improvements to the existing network.</td>
<td>Upgrade and expansion of existing pumping station and expansion of existing H7 reservoir.</td>
<td>Construction of a new booster pumping station in ROPA9 lands and expansion of the existing H7 Reservoir</td>
<td>Upgrade and expansion of existing pumping station and construct new elevated storage facility within ROPA9 lands.</td>
<td>Construction of a new booster pumping station in ROPA9 lands and construct new elevated storage facility within ROPA9 lands</td>
<td>Construct new sanitary sub-trunk sewer from ROPA9 area to Red Hill Creek Sub-Interceptor at MH 9</td>
<td>Construct new sanitary sub-trunk sewer from ROPA9 area to Davis Creek Sub-Trunk at Highland Road</td>
<td>Construct new sanitary sub-trunk sewer from ROPA9 area to Mount Albion Sub-Trunk at Upper Mount Albion Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATION BY CONSULTANTS – For Discussion Purposes Only**

- The current design of the study area is insufficient to meet future demand requirements. With future development planned, improvements must be made to meet the future demand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Recommended</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Not Recommended</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Not Recommended</th>
<th>Not Recommended</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Not Recommended</th>
<th>Not Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
- This alternative has the fewest natural and social environment impacts and has the lowest cost for water servicing.
- This alternative will require additional property in ROPA 9 for the construction of a new pumping station. This alternative also has medium costs.
- This alternative will require additional property in ROPA 9 for the construction of an elevated storage facility. The elevated storage facility will also have significant visual impacts. This alternative also has medium costs.
- This alternative will require two additional properties, has significant visual impacts due to the new elevated storage facility and has high costs.
- This alternative has few impacts and has the lowest cost.
- This alternative has few impacts and a medium cost.
- This alternative has few impacts and a high cost.
PRELIMINARY PREFERRED SOLUTION
TRANSPORTATION

The recommended alternative solution, in conjunction with Travel Demand Management initiatives, is to:

- Widening Rymal Road from Trinity Church Road to RR56.
- Extend Trinity Church Road from Rymal Road to the Lincoln Alexander Parkway, as a 4-lane facility.
- Widening RR56 from Rymal Road southerly for approximately 900 m.
- Coordinate future Trinity Church Road improvements north and south of Rymal Road as a separate planning and design initiative.

These options fully address the problem statement.
Conceptual Alternative Solutions

Design and alignments of preferred solutions to be examined in Phase 3.
Preliminary Preferred Solution
Water / Wastewater

The recommended alternative solutions are to:

- Upgrade the HD007 Pumping Station and HDR07 Reservoir.
- Construct a new Sanitary Sub-trunk to Red Hill Creek Interceptor.

These options fully address the problem statement.
FUTURE ACTIONS

- We will review all comments and suggestions received from the public and agencies.

- Based on public input, we will:
  - Reassess the Alternative Solutions and impacts
  - Confirm the Preferred Planning Solutions
  - Identify and assess the Alternative Designs
  - Identify a Preferred Design Alternative
  - Prepare a preliminary design for the Preferred Alternative

The next Public Information Centre is tentatively scheduled for Winter 2005. At this meeting, we will present and request your input on:

- A summary of Impacts of the Alternative Designs
- The evaluation of Alternative Designs
- A preliminary Preferred Design
YOUR INPUT IS IMPORTANT

Your input is important.

We invite you to fill in the comment sheet with your comments and suggestions.

If you wish to be put on our mailing list, require further information, or wish to provide input to the study, you can contact us in the following ways:

Christine Lee-Morrison  
Project Manager  
City of Hamilton  
Public Works Department  
320-77 James Street North  
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3  
Phone: (905) 546-2424 ext. 6390  
Fax: (905) 546-4435  
E-Mail: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Liza Sheppard  
Consultant Project Coordinator  
iTRANS Consulting Inc.  
100 York Boulevard, Suite 300  
Richmond Hill, ON L4B 1J8  
Phone: (905) 882-4100, ext. 5232  
Fax: (905) 882-1557  
Email: lsheppard@itransconsulting.com
TRINITY CHURCH ROAD

NEEDS AND OPPORTUNITY

Transportation assessments were conducted for servicing the ROPA 9 lands, and the North Glanbrook Industrial Business Park. Key findings of these studies to the needs and opportunity for the Trinity Church Road corridor are as follows:

- Additional north-south capacity (equivalent to 2 lanes per direction) by 2011, to service the increasing north-south traffic demands.

- Accommodation of high southbound left turn demand from the freeway network by 2021.

- Maintaining the existing north-south capacity between Rymal Road to south of Twenty Road, and protecting for additional capacity in the long term.

- Improving services for transit usage, and facilities for pedestrian usage to serve the community, as development of the Rymal Road Planning Area and the North Glanbrook Industrial Business Park proceeds.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Transportation solutions are necessary:

1. To provide additional north-south capacity to facilitate growth in the surrounding areas of ROPA 9, Special Policy Area ‘C’, North Glanbrook and the Airport area
2. To resolve transportation network discontinuities
3. To improve service for autos, commercial vehicles, transit vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists, and
4. To manage traffic impact on local roads adjacent to the study area
Welcome

Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands)
Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment Study

Public Information Centre No. 1
Agenda

- Study Background, Goals and Scope
- Explanation of EA Process
- Transportation, and Water / Wastewater Needs
- Potential Alternative Solutions
- Answer questions / receive comments
Study Area

- Special Policy Area ‘C’
- Rymal Road Planning Area
Study Background

- In 2001, the OMB approved redesignating 190 ha (470 ac) of the ROPA 9 lands from rural to urban to allow residential and related urban development.
- In 2002 the OMB approved a detailed policy framework for development of the lands.
- In 2003, City of Hamilton Council approved recommendations to initiate a Master Plan Class EA for development of these lands.
- In 2005 Special Policy Area ‘C’ was added to the scope of work of the Master Plan Class EA, as a result of development applications the City received for these lands, and the identification of infrastructure needs.
Other Studies

- GRDS is the City wide growth management study, including:
  - Transportation Master Plan
  - Water / Wastewater Master Plans
  - Stormwater Master Plan
- Glanbrook Industrial Business Park Transportation Master Plan will address transportation needs in the Trinity Church Road Corridor south of Rymal Road
- South Mountain Area Transportation Master Plan is being reviewed
- Trinity Church Road Class EA will address Phase 3 and 4 of the Class EA process
Study Goals

- To identify transportation and water/wastewater infrastructure requirements to allow development of the ROPA 9 Lands, and Special Policy Area ‘C’.
- To accommodate currently approved developments.
- To support municipal land use and development objectives as set out in the Municipal Official Plans.
Study Scope

- Improvements to Rymal Road corridor
- Need for improvements/extension of Trinity Church Road
- Improvements to RR56 corridor adjacent to the ROPA 9 Lands
- Need for additional water capacity: new booster station or, Water capacity improvements to the HD007 Pumping Station and HDR07 reservoir
- New sanitary sewer to connect to City’s system
- Transportation and water/wastewater needs for Special Policy Area ‘C’
MUNICIPAL CLASS EA PLANNING AND DESIGN PROCESS

PHASE 1
- Problem or Opportunity
  - Identify Problem or Opportunity
  - Review Problem or Opportunity

PHASE 2
- Alternative Solutions
  - Identify Alternative Solutions to Problem or Opportunity
  - Select Schedule (Appendix 1)
  - Inventory Natural, Social, Economic Environment
  - Identify Impact of Alternative Solutions on the Environment and Mitigating Measures
  - Evaluate Alternative Solutions (Crony Recommended Solutions)
  - Consult Review Agencies & Public
  - Select Preferred Solution
  - SWP & Con-RM Choice of Schedule

PHASE 3
- Alternative Design Concepts for Preferred Solution
  - Identify Alternative Design Concepts for Preferred Solution
  - Schedule A
  - EIA
  - Impact of Alternative Designs on Human and Economic Environment
  - Identify Impact of Alternative Designs on Human and Economic Environment
  - Evaluate Alternative Designs (Crony Recommended Design)
  - Select Preferred Design
  - Review Environmental Significance & Choice of Schedule
  - Preliminary Finances of Preferred Design

PHASE 4
- Environmental Study Report
  - Complete Environmental Study Report (CSR)
  - Place on Public Record
  - Notice of Completion to Review Agencies & Public
  - Copy of Notice of Completion to Ministry or LA Branch

PHASE 5
- Implementation
  - Opportunity to Request Minister Within 30 Days of Notification to Request an Order
  - Discretionary Public Consultation to Review Preferred Design

NOTE: This flow chart is to be read in conjunction with Part A of the Municipal Class EA.
Needs Assessment and Potential Solutions

Transportation
Existing and Future Traffic Conditions
Transportation Needs

Existing Link Operations – with 2 travel lanes on Rymal Road

Legend
- Signalized Intersections
- Unsignalized Intersections
- Volume to Capacity Ratio
  - Below 0.90
  - 0.9 - 0.99
  - Above 1.00

Existing Link V/C Ratios

Not To Scale
September 2005
Transportation Needs

Future Link Operations – with 2 travel lanes on Rymal Road

Legend
- Signalized Intersections
- Unsignalized Intersections
- Volume to Capacity Ratio
  - Below 0.90
  - 0.9 - 0.99
  - Above 1.00

Not To Scale

September 2005

City of Hamilton

Rymal Road Secondary Planning Area (ROP 9 Lands)
Master Plan Class EA

2 Travel Lanes

Future Link V/C Ratios
Transportation Needs

Future Link Operations – with 4 travel lanes on Rymal Road

Legend

- Signalized Intersections
- Unsignalized Intersections

Volume to Capacity Ratio
- Green: Below 0.90
- Yellow: 0.9 - 0.99
- Red: Above 1.00

Not To Scale

September 2005

Rymal Road Secondary Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands)
Master Plan Class E.A.

City of Hamilton
Summary Transportation Needs

- Additional east-west capacity (equivalent to one lane per direction) as early as 2006.
- Additional north-south capacity (equivalent to 2 lanes per direction) by 2011.
- Accommodation of high southbound left turn demand from the freeway network by 2021.
- Traffic management measures on Upper Mount Albion Road - coordinated with the additional north-south capacity on other routes.
- Improving services for transit usage, and facilities for cycling and pedestrian usage, as development of the ROPA 9 Area proceeds.
Transportation Problem Statement

- To address projected capacity deficiencies in the Rymal Road corridor,
- To accommodate projected demands on RR56 at a new collector road connection,
- To provide additional north-south capacity to accommodate future traffic demands,
- To manage traffic impact on local roads adjacent to the study area
- To improve service for all road users.
What are potential Transportation Solutions?

- Do Nothing
- Travel Demand Management
- Upgrade / Build Other Routes
- Operational Improvements
- Widen Rymal Road
- Extend Trinity Church Road
- Widen RR 56
Evaluation of Alternatives

Alternatives evaluated based on a number of criteria:
- Transportation service
- Socio economic impacts
- Natural environment impacts
- Costs

A number of sub criteria as shown on the display panels.
Transportation Preliminary Preferred Alternative

The recommended alternative solution, in conjunction with Travel Demand Management initiatives, is to:

- Widening Rymal Road from Trinity Church Road to RR56.
- Extend Trinity Church Road from Rymal Road to the Lincoln Alexander Parkway, as a 4-lane facility.
- Widening RR56 from Rymal Road southerly for approximately 900 m.
- Coordinate future Trinity Church Road improvements north and south of Rymal Road as a separate planning and design initiative.

These options fully address the problem statement.
Needs Assessment and Potential Solutions

Water and Wastewater
Existing and Future Conditions
Water / Wastewater Needs

- Future needs include additional fire and emergency storage to maintain adequate operating pressure.
- Higher pumping capacity to accommodate the increased demands resulting from new development in ROPA 9, Binbrook, and the remainder of Pressure District 7.
- New sewers with capacity to accommodate sanitary sewage from the Study Area and to convey flows to the existing sanitary sewer system. Alternative routes are being considered.
- Improvements may be required to increase the capacity of the existing collection system to accommodate the additional sanitary flows from both Binbrook and ROPA9 under ultimate build-out conditions.
Water / Wastewater Problem Statement

- Water and wastewater solutions are necessary to:
  - Provide adequate reservoir storage and pumping capacity to provide sufficient water supply and maintain adequate water pressure in the H-7 Pressure District.
  - Provide adequate conveyance capacity to convey wastewater from ROPA9 to the existing sanitary sewer system and ensure that the existing system has sufficient capacity to convey flows to treatment.
What are potential Water Solutions?

- Do Nothing
- Water Conservation
- Operational changes to the HD007 Pumping Station and expand the HDR07 Reservoir
- New booster pumping station and expand the HDR07 Reservoir to service ROPA9 lands
- Operational changes to the HD007 Pumping Station and Construct new storage
- New Booster Pumping Station and Construct New Storage
What are potential Wastewater Solutions?

- Do Nothing
- Construct new sanitary sub-trunk to Red Hill Creek Interceptor and improvements to the Red Hill Creek Interceptor.
- Construct new sanitary sub-trunk to Davis Creek Sub-Trunk and downstream improvements to the Red Hill Creek Interceptor.
- Construct new sanitary sub-trunk to Mount Albion Sub-Trunk and improvements to the Red Hill Creek Interceptor.
Evaluation of Alternatives

Alternatives evaluated based on a number of criteria

- Water / Wastewater service
- Socio economic impacts
- Natural environment impacts
- Costs

A number of sub criteria as shown on the display panels.
The recommended alternative solutions are to:

- Upgrade the HD007 Pumping Station and HDR07 Reservoir.
- Construct a new Sanitary Sub-trunk to Red Hill Creek Interceptor.

These options fully address the problem statement.
Special Policy Area ‘C’

- Transportation and water / wastewater analyses are currently being conducted for Special Policy Area ‘C’.

- It is anticipated that additional roadway capacity will be needed on the road network in the vicinity of Special Policy Area ‘C’, consistent with the type and magnitude of proposed uses.

- The results of the analyses and design will be presented at the next Public Information Centre.
Trinity Church Road Needs Assessment

Transportation assessments conducted for servicing the ROPA 9 lands, and the North Glanbrook Industrial Business Park. Key findings of these studies include:

- Additional north-south capacity (equivalent to 2 lanes per direction) by 2011.
- Accommodation of high southbound left turn demand from the freeway network by 2021.
- Maintaining the existing north-south capacity between Rymal Road to south of Twenty Road, and protecting for additional capacity in the long term.
- Improving services for transit usage, and facilities for pedestrian usage, as development of the ROPA 9 Area and the North Glanbrook Business Park proceeds.
Trinity Church Road
Problem Statement

Transportation solutions are necessary to:

- Provide additional north-south capacity to facilitate growth in the surrounding areas of ROPA 9, Special Policy Area ‘C’, North Glanbrook and the Airport area
- Resolve transportation network discontinuities
- Improve service for autos, commercial vehicles, transit vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists, and
- Manage traffic impact on local roads adjacent to the study area.
Next Steps

- Confirm the preferred planning solutions (Transportation, water and wastewater)
- Identify and assess alternative designs (Transportation)
- Select preferred design alternative (Transportation)
- Prepare preliminary design of the preferred alternative (Transportation)
- Present results, including needs for Special Policy Area ‘C’ at Public Meeting No.2 (Transportation, water and wastewater)
We Value Your Input

- Please fill out a comment sheet with your comments; sheets can be mailed or faxed by October 21
- Opportunity to ask questions after the presentation
- You may speak with any of the project representatives here at the meeting tonight
THANK YOU!
Summary of

PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #1

Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands)
Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment

Monday, October 3rd, 2005
From 6:00 PM to 9:00 PM

City of Hamilton
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1. INTRODUCTION

The first Public Information Centre (PIC#1) was held on Monday, October 3rd, 2005, at the Salvation Army Church Gymnasium, 300 Winterberry Drive, in the City of Hamilton. The purpose of PIC#1 was to provide information about the study to the public and at the same time obtain public input. The format was an informal drop-in centre from 6:00 to 7:00 PM to meet the project team and to view the display panels and drawings. There was a presentation at 7:00 PM, followed by a question and answer period. The PIC continued until 9:00 PM, which provided participants the opportunity to further discuss the project with the study team. Approximately 100 members of the public attended the PIC. The following representatives from the project team were in attendance:

City of Hamilton: Christine Lee-Morrison, Project Manager – Strategic Planning
Helene T. Ellermeyer – Strategic Planning
Kimberley Grimwood – Strategic Planning
Lisa de Angelis – Systems Planning
Leanne Ryan – Traffic Engineering

iTRANS Consulting: Ray Bacquie, Study Project Manager
Liza Sheppard, Project Engineer
Nathalie Baudais, Transportation Planner

XCG: Christine Hill, Municipal Engineering Lead

Urban Strategies: Cyndi Rottenberg-Walker (facilitator)

Councillor Phil Bruckler of Ward 9 of the City of Hamilton was also in attendance.

2. NOTIFICATION

Advertisements were placed in the Hamilton Spectator on Friday, September 16, 2005 and Friday, September 23, 2005, and in the Brabant paper on Friday, September 16, 2005 informing the public of the PIC. Notification letters were also mailed out to property owners within the study area, to other individuals who had responded with an interest in the study since its commencement, to conservation authorities, Federal and Provincial agencies, and utility companies.

3. PIC PRESENTATION MATERIAL

Upon arrival at the PIC, attendees were asked to sign a visitor registration sheet. One hundred and twenty two people signed the registration sheet.

Twenty-four panels were displayed. The information panels included the following:
Welcome and study area
Description of the study background, study goal and scope
Chart of the EA process and Class EA requirements
Description of the public consultation plan
Summary of the needs and opportunities for the study for transportation, water, and wastewater
Problem statement for transportation, water, and wastewater
Existing official plan policies and other applicable policies
Description of existing conditions
Description of transportation alternative solutions
Description of water alternative solutions
Description of wastewater alternative solutions
Description of alternative solutions assessment criteria
Evaluation tables of the transportation, water, and wastewater planning alternatives
Identification and description of the preferred transportation, water, and wastewater planning alternative
Future actions
Contact information

4. SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

The questions asked and comments received verbally or via comment sheets at the PIC and comments/questions received after the PIC via e-mail, letters and telephone calls are summarized below:
Comments

Since Summit Ridge will be up and running in the near future, I feel construction of the Trinity Church Road extension north of Rymal Road should have first priority over Rymal Road. A good portion of the traffic from Summit Park will be North/South and to wait 5 years for the extension to be built makes no sense. Also travel demand management, promote ride share / carpooling. A noble idea, but people won’t do it. Another idea and this would require provincial / federal input, I am sure. Reclaim the rail trail. The road bed is there. A bridge would be needed for Stone Church Road, otherwise, new tracks for light rail or GO service to the East Mountain and Binbrook area. Lots of people are moving to Hamilton from Toronto but commute to Toronto. Just a thought. If not now, in the future. Also, are there anyone from the School Boards and the Hamilton Conservation Authority sitting in at these meetings? I think that they should be represented.

I am positive that there will be a need for all that you have planned. Unlike other communities off of Rymal Road or South Mountain subdivisions, the east mountain has insufficient north/south direct routes for the volumes of traffic. Instead of roads like Upper Sherman, Gage or Ottawa, etc. we have winding roads or series of roads to go north/south causing a lot of traffic to travel through residential areas. To me, these aren’t problems, they are necessary in order for this area to accommodate the large growth of the area both for residents and commercial land. I think the problem is that it is taking too long to make a reality. You don’t give us time to pay our taxes so why should we continue to be silent and patient while we wait for you!

The need for a widening of Rymal Road and an extension of Trinity Church Road, has been identified in the needs assessment for the ROPA 9 lands. The Master Plan Class EA is therefore considering both corridors for improvement in the overall road network in the future. The Hamilton Conservation Authority has been advised of the project and we will be coordinating with them throughout the process. The school boards have been advised of the project.

I am positive that there will be a need for all that you have planned.

Unlike other communities off of Rymal Road or South Mountain subdivisions, the east mountain has insufficient north/south direct routes for the volumes of traffic. Instead of roads like Upper Sherman, Gage or Ottawa, etc. we have winding roads or series of roads to go north/south causing a lot of traffic to travel through residential areas.

To me, these aren’t problems, they are necessary in order for this area to accommodate the large growth of the area both for residents and commercial land. I think the problem is that it is taking too long to make a reality. You don’t give us time to pay our taxes so why should we continue to be silent and patient while we wait for you!

Comment noted.

The need for a widening of Rymal Road and an extension of Trinity Church Road, has been identified in the needs assessment for the ROPA 9 lands. The Master Plan Class EA is therefore considering both corridors for improvement in the overall road network in the future. The Hamilton Conservation Authority has been advised of the project and we will be coordinating with them throughout the process. The school boards have been advised of the project.

Comment noted. The City of Hamilton continues to improve the City’s road network as feasible.

We question the need to widen any part of Trinity Church Road because the majority of the road lies within the GREENBELT where major development is NOT PERMITTED. It is our preferred plan to have no road from the Glenbrook prestigious business park to enter onto Trinity Church Road. Rather, our plan, as given to and accepted by the road planner for the Park is to be presented as a viable choice – with the most eastern road in the Park extending to Pritchard Road.

Comment noted. Further study will be carried out on the Trinity Church Road corridor, as part of the Trinity Church Road Corridor Class EA.

The committees must follow guidelines and criteria when addressing growth issues; however the area is growing so fast that the City’s plans and traffic intentions are already too late. Those plans should have been implemented at least 5 years ago instead of today, just to keep one step ahead of the problems.

Comment noted. Additional studies west of the Study Area are being undertaken (e.g. North Glenbrook Industrial Park Study), or will be undertaken (e.g. Rymal Road west of Trinity Church Road, as appropriate).

Comment noted.

The evaluation is evident. There will be impacts everywhere. You need to start action!

Comment noted.

The study is not large enough.

Comment noted. Additional studies west of the Study Area are being undertaken (e.g. North Glenbrook Industrial Park Study), or will be undertaken (e.g. Rymal Road west of Trinity Church Road, as appropriate).

Comment noted.

The criteria seem fine.

Comment noted.

Transportation service, socio-economic impacts, natural environment impacts and costs all seem like reasonable criteria to consider. It will be great for our City to see business boom and expand in the area south of Rymal. However, the nearby residential neighbourhoods will lose a lot, facing negative socioeconomic impacts if the traffic and congestion cannot be contained to the major roads outlined in the study (i.e. Rymal Road and Trinity Church Road).

Comment noted.

Page 3, Bottom Paragraph – No more than 550 units can be built until required environmental assessments and respective capital budgets are finalized. What does this refer to specifically? Does it refer to new libraries, community centres, annual road costs (snow/ice), waste pickup?

The 550 units refer to single family homes. The capital budget refers to the budget required for any infrastructure needs identified by the Class Environmental Assessments.

Comment noted.

The evaluation is evident. There will be impacts everywhere. You need to start action!

Comment noted.

The study is not large enough.

Comment noted. Additional studies west of the Study Area are being undertaken (e.g. North Glenbrook Industrial Park Study), or will be undertaken (e.g. Rymal Road west of Trinity Church Road, as appropriate).

Comment noted.

The criteria seem fine.

Comment noted.

Transportation service, socio-economic impacts, natural environment impacts and costs all seem like reasonable criteria to consider. It will be great for our City to see business boom and expand in the area south of Rymal. However, the nearby residential neighbourhoods will lose a lot, facing negative socioeconomic impacts if the traffic and congestion cannot be contained to the major roads outlined in the study (i.e. Rymal Road and Trinity Church Road).

Comment noted.
Comments
The criteria re: widening Trinity Church Road being that it was once a Regional Road between 2 townships, Mount Hope and Binbrook no longer applies. The 2 townships joined to become Glanbrook. Trinity Church Road was allowed to become a rural residential road. Please do not turn it into another Centennial Parkway with heavy truck traffic and accompanying pollution. That would be an abomination in this enlightened age. Develop to the east of Centennial and Highway 56, nearer the Rymal / Centennial commercial area and NOT south of the hydro corridor.

Responses
Comment noted. Further study will be carried out on the Trinity Church Road corridor, as part of the Trinity Church Road Corridor Class EA.

Transportation Alternative Solutions

Why build a 4-lane road for a short section? Rymal Road is a thoroughfare to James Street.

Responses
The section of Rymal between Regional Road 56 and Trinity Church Road with a north-south connection to the Linc, will be a highly utilized corridor. This additional capacity is required to accommodate development of the ROPA 9 lands and surrounding areas. Improvements to Rymal Road west of the study area will be addressed as a separate study by the City.

Will Trinity Church Road and Upper Centennial Parkway remain the main north-south connections to the ROPA 9 lands and Binbrook?

Responses
The ROPA 9 lands needs assessment has identified the need for a new north-south connection between Rymal Road and the Linc. This corridor and Upper Centennial Parkway will be the main north-south connectors in the future road network.

Dartnall Road should be considered and evaluated as an alternative to the Trinity Church Road extension.

Responses
All possible and feasible alignments will be examined as part of the Trinity Church Road Corridor EA. The public will be provided opportunities to comment on the Trinity Church Road alignment and design.

Will the Trinity Church Road extension be for 4-lanes from south of Twenty Road to the Lincoln Alexander?

Responses
An alternative solution to a left-turn off the LINC to Trinity Church Road is to use Dartnall – presently linked to the LINC on both east and west lanes – a commercial road which will be extended into Glanbrook prestigious business park. Trucks will need to take that route to service businesses within the Park. Failing that solution – connect another ramp off the LINC to Pritchard Road – also a commercial road which will be extended into the Glanbrook prestigious business park. Trinity Church Road is a rural residential road.

The ROPA 9 Master Plan will assess improvements to transit. The study will consider the road width requirements to accommodate other modes of transportation.

Special Policy Area C seems to be getting buried in the ROPA 9 lands and the First Pro commercial. Rymal Road should be improved to 4-lanes with a 5th centre turn lane from Upper James to Tappet Road.

Responses
The west limit of the ROPA 9 Master Plan study is Trinity Church Road. Improvements to Rymal Road west of the study area will be assessed as a separate study by the City, as appropriate.

Need alternate route study Binbrook Road to Lincoln Alexander Parkway via Nebo.

Suggest extending #20 Road Glanbrook east to 56 Highway to take traffic off Rymal Road.

Suggest study traffic load on Paramount Road to relieve congestion on Rymal Road East.

Responses
Comments noted. The need for a widening of Rymal Road east of Trinity Church Road and an extension of Trinity Church Road, has been identified in the needs assessment for the ROPA 9 lands. The Master Plan Class EA is therefore considering both corridors for improvement in the overall road network in the future.

I do not agree because the study only concentrates on 56 Highway to Trinity Church Road (lack of vision by the planners).

Responses
The Trinity Church Road extension should be built right away since the interchange is already in place.

The Trinity Church Road extension should be put in place before the Rymal Road widening? It is important to serve the needs of the current residents before planning for the needs of potential residents. The Trinity Church Road extension should be put in place first to relieve the local residential streets.

Responses
The closing of Upper Mount Albion Road ASAP. If not, major road repairs and sidewalks of some description that will serve until 2011.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why is the study for Special Policy Area ‘C’ not done?</td>
<td>There are two types of studies being conducted for Special Policy Area ‘C’ - one through the EA process and one through the development process. The EA process addresses the broader infrastructure needs. Since Special Policy Area ‘C’ and the ROPA 9 lands are geographically close and the result of the studies could be interrelated, Special Policy Area ‘C’ was added to the ROPA 9 Master Plan Class EA study. The developer is preparing a traffic impact study as part of development approvals for the Special Policy Area ‘C’ lands. Separate public meetings will be held as part of the development approvals. The developer’s traffic impact study will be taken into account during the ROPA 9 Master Plan Class EA study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What type of traffic controlling measures will be assessed for Second Road West?</td>
<td>General traffic control measures for local or collector roads could include physical calming measures (e.g. speed humps, diverters, closures) or passive calming measures, such as line painting, additional signs, etc. The need for traffic control measures on 2nd Road West and on Upper Mount Albion Road, and the appropriate measures would be assessed at a later stage in the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would traffic calming or traffic control measures include for Upper Mount Albion Road? The ROPA 9 development has an access point connecting to Upper Mount Albion Road.</td>
<td>The 1989 City of Stoney Creek council decision to close 2nd Road West demonstrates that it was not intended to be a collector road, but rather a neighbourhood street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 1989 City of Stoney Creek council decision to close 2nd Road West demonstrates that it was not intended to be a collector road, but rather a neighbourhood street.</td>
<td>The Official Plan designation for 2nd Road West is a collector road south of Gatestone Drive and a local road north of Gatestone Drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When will the stores open in ROPA9? As soon as they do, the streets will be a mess.</td>
<td>The Walmart development will open in January, 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What will happen at the S-curve at Rymal Road and Trinity Church Road? This will present a problem if it merges from 4-lanes to 2-lanes at this location.</td>
<td>This will be addressed in the design stage of the study. Appropriate transition lengths based on the City design standard would be applied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What type of traffic controlling measures will be assessed for Second Road West?</td>
<td>The need for traffic control measures on 2nd Road West and on Upper Mount Albion Road, and the appropriate measures would be assessed at a later stage in the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents expressed concerns with directing the development traffic to the Lincoln Alexander rather than all directions.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please peruse my comments and sketch regarding the Trinity Church Road and Rymal Road intersection. Regarding Regional Road 56 south of Rymal Road, try to make it safer as there have been a number of accidents with at least one fatality.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These are fine and are essential to the development of the area.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree that Rymal Road will need to be widened, and signalized intersections introduced. I agree that north/south traffic must be accommodated, and support plans to extend Trinity Church Road and widen or improve Trinity Church Road as necessary. From a logical standpoint, north/south traffic should be provided easy access to the Lin, and future Red Hill Creek Expressway. Only the Trinity Church Road extension or Upper Mount Albion offer direct proximity to these high volume routes. I agree with promoting traffic flow along the main arteries, designed specifically for high volume commuter traffic while eliminating or reducing effects on residential areas (i.e., I would support a road closure for Second Road West and Upper Mount Albion). The ‘preliminary Preferred Transportation Solution’ in the written study does not include any measures to protect the nearby residential area. The road closures listed above work hand-in-hand with the planned solutions, to funnel traffic directly to the recommended routes (Rymal &amp; Trinity Church). If Second Road West and Upper Mount Albion can no longer be used as ‘shortcuts’, the troublesome traffic on Highland Road will also decrease.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Water / Wastewater Alternative Solutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is still a resident on Upper Mount Albion Road who is on a well. How would he be impacted? Has the Conservation Authority been involved in this assessment? What effect will this have on the Karst rock formation?</td>
<td>The City is currently undertaking a City-wide Water/Wastewater Master Plan that will address the future needs for the City, where issues such as this will be addressed. The conservation authority is involved in the ROPA 9 Master Plan Class EA study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The water line up Trinity Church Road is 30 years old. Should it be checked? There have already been sections replaced. Definitely a new pumping station and reservoir is needed to meet the demands of the growing community. Our present system barely works efficiently now much less adding so many new homes to the area. In the last 20 years, we have noticed a marked decline in the water pressure. Levies on new development should automatically cover the costs of such issues. Do not want sanitary subtrunk to Mount Albion subtrunk when I don’t even have sewers. I was told this would run down Upper Mount Albion Road if it were built. We would like information regarding the expansion of water and sewer services along Fletcher Road and into Binbrook to accommodate Phase 2 of the Binbrook development project.</td>
<td>The City is currently undertaking a City-wide Water/Wastewater Master Plan that will address the future needs for the City, where issues such as these will be addressed. Notification of public meetings will be provided to the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water needs are evident for the projected growth! Common sense!</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water services must be supplied and maintained for the health and safety of the general population of the City; anything less is not acceptable.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree with the (water) solutions.</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no reason to disagree (with the wastewater solutions).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no other alternatives to offer (for the wastewater solutions).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The wastewater solutions seem to be reasonable for the new development areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree with the solutions. Both preferred alternatives do not pose any long-term detriment or inconvenience to citizens. If upgrading or new construction does inconvenience anyone, it would only be temporary.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check the locations of all the man holes north and south of Rymal Road in this area and Glover Road, Dartnall, 2nd Road West, Fletcher Road.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater services must be supplied and maintained for the health and safety of the general population of the City; anything less is not acceptable.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trinity Church Road

As a property owner on Trinity Church Road, I would hope you would not touch the Trinity United Church parking lot. When making the connection from Trinity Church Road to the Lincoln Alexander Parkway, crossing Rymal Road east of the present intersection joining south behind the existing house then swinging west back to existing Trinity Church Road past the south side of the cemetery, you would only need to deal with one property owner. All possible and feasible alignments will be examined as part of the Trinity Church Road Corridor EA. The alignments will be presented to the public at a Public Information Centre to provide the public with an opportunity to provide comments.

RE: roads to service the Glanbrook prestigious business park – the residents of Trinity Church Road were promised a high, treed berm on the west side behind the existing houses to be a buffer between Trinity Church Road and the business park. There was to be no access roads from Trinity Church Road into the business park. No need to widen Trinity Church Road. We, on Trinity Church Road chose to live in a rural area and that is our right. Development was to be curtailed to the north of the hydro corridor. Rural areas NEED TO BE PRESERVED. Comment noted. This comment has been provided to the North Glanbrook Industrial Business Park study team.
The majority of Trinity Church Road lies within the Greenbelt under regulations which do not permit major development on that land. Prior to amalgamation, City staff advised the Council against the plans of several developers to build residential and commercial properties south of Rymal Road between Highway 56 and Trinity Church Road citing that the development plan would initiate negative urban sprawl. However, the former council in its final days, proceeded to vote in favour of Aldo De Santis, allowing him to build the residential area called Summit Park. That development was to extend southward ONLY to the hydro corridor. Thereby leaving the farm fields from the hydro corridor southward to Golf Club Road undeveloped. South of Golf Club Road lies within the Provincial Green Belt. If Hamilton City council keeps its promise to curtail the development to the north of the hydro corridor, there will be no further significant development along Trinity Church Road to accommodate in the distant future and no need to create a four-lane highway on this road. Land behind the present strip-housing is farmland. Change those parameters and you change our quality of life.

Another criteria stated by the planners was that Trinity Church Road was once a Regional Road between two townships, Mount Hope and Binbrook. Since Regional Government was created in 1973 and the two townships joined to become Glanbrook that designation ceased to exist. Trinity Church Road has been a rural, residential road since 1973. That is our choice and our right to live in a rural, residential area. We do not ask for services like sewers, sidewalks or street lights. We prefer to live the rural lifestyle.

Young children ride their bikes on Trinity Church Road, and residents of the care facility, Participation House, drive their wheelchairs on the road.

Trinity Church Road is NOT a through street. It ends at Lake Niapenco. It would be preferable to have a north-south route that could potentially join into the proposed, Mid-Peninsula freeway. Nebo Road, which transverses the North Glanbrook Prestigious Industrial Business Park already extends beyond White Church Road which is the western extension of Binbrook Road.

The halfway point between Highway 6 (Upper James Street) and Highway 56 (the extension of Centennial Parkway into Binbrook) lies halfway between Nebo Road and Dartnall Road. Thus either one of those two roads would be most appropriate for a middle north-south highway. Both Nebo Road and Dartnall Road traverse the North Glanbrook Prestigious Industrial Business Park. Highways (truck routes) ought to service local business areas. Nebo Road should have been the road of choice for an off ramp from the LINC but bad municipal planning positioned the Ottawa Street dump as an obstacle for such an exit route. Dartnall Road then was the obvious choice. Dartnall is also as commercial road with businesses that will need truck delivery service. With Dartnall being the exit route off the LINC and Nebo being a through road, it would seem most feasible for the four lane truck route (highway) to exit the LINC on Dartnall and then gradually curved through the North Glanbrook Prestigious Industrial Business Park to join into Nebo Road at some point and progress southward to join the future, proposed Mid-Peninsula Highway.

The only businesses requiring truck traffic on Trinity Church Road are the Army Sewer Contractors near Rymal Road and the sod farm on White Church Road. The Army Sewer Company could access their business onto the new road to be built in the North Glanbrook Prestigious Industrial Business Park directly behind their property. Trucks servicing the sod farm likewise could use a road through the above said Park.

Enclosed with this information is the revised road plan for the North Glanbrook Prestigious Industrial Business Park which was submitted by my husband, a retired building contractor and draftsman, to Gavin Norman, P.Eng. Senior Project Manager, City of Hamilton, re: the North Glanbrook Prestigious Industrial Business Park – Transportation Master Plan. Public Information Centre #1. The plan was received and a reply was sent to us citing that the plan which my husband submitted would be incorporated into the study route alternatives. Plan A, as included, was the preferred plan. Thus no roads from the Park would exit onto Trinity Church Road, making the need to widen the north end of said road to the former City of Hamilton boundary unnecessary. Note also that a buffer strip (an earthen berm with a MINIMUM height of 5 feet – higher would be preferable – with trees planted along it) was promised to separate our RURAL / RESIDENTIAL road completely from the said PARK. Trinity Church Road was allowed by Glanbrook and the City of Hamilton to develop as a Residential road of strip housing. (Not to mention that housing permits were issues to build residential homes right within the North Glanbrook Prestigious Industrial Business Park.) It is obscene that this was allowed to happen, and now a slaughterhouse is to be built in those people’s midst. This is BAD PLANNING. Turning Trinity Church Road into a 4-lane highway would be the final insult.
### Comments

**Special Policy Area ‘C’**

Special Policy Area ‘C’ development should not be approved before this study is done. Perhaps offices and restaurants would be a better choice. Keep in mind that there is an elementary school across the road. The traffic of Big Box development would raise safety issues in traffic as well as large vehicles. Also, I was disappointed to hear that there is no plan to make Rymal Road, west of Pritchard Road, a 5-lane artery. For the present, as well as future development, this should have been 5 lanes years ago. Rymal is the fastest growing commercial artery, don’t wait 10 years before you realize that oops the road is too small, then rip it apart and upset the thousands of drivers when you upgrade the road. Imagine if Mohawk or Fennel Roads were left as 2 lanes. Traffic on Rymal will only get worse!!!

The infrastructure needed to support SPA ‘C’ will be assessed and identified as part of the Master Plan Class EA. The recommendations will be presented to the public.

The west limit of the ROPA 9 Master Plan study is Trinity Church Road. Improvements to Rymal Road west of the study area will be assessed as a separate study by the City, as appropriate.

**Closure of Second Road West**

Approximately 92 comments regarding traffic operations on 2nd Road West were received. Typical concerns included:

- Speeding
- Traffic volumes
- Impacts of ROPA 9 on future traffic volumes
- Driveway access
- Safety
- Pedestrian accommodation
- Traffic control compliance
- Setback of homes to street and high traffic volumes
- Drag racing
- Collisions
- Proximity to two elementary schools
- Property taxes
- Designation/classification of the road
- Previous plans for closure
- Width of the road cannot accommodate traffic volumes
- Upper Mount Albion and Pritchard are more suitable options for through traffic.

These concerns were addressed at a PIC held in January 2006. The PIC presented the results of the following keys tasks:

- A review of the function and design of existing roads adjacent to the study area
- Analysis of the traffic volumes on adjacent roads, and assessment of the need for traffic management measures, including road closures/realignments.
- Assessment of potential traffic impacts that could be created with traffic management measures.
- Identification and evaluation of potential traffic management options.

Further details are provided in the body of the Master Plan report.

---

Every time I drive on Highland Rd. and look at the Nursing Home, I always have a question in mind. I wonder how the owner of that nursing home obtained a building permit to build the nursing home on the core of the Karsts. That area from 2000 was forbidden to have any sort of construction on it. HOW DID THIS HAPPEN? Even Aldo DeSantis had to stop building houses in that area. The nursing home was built in 2002-2003.
Comments | Responses
---|---
**Other Questions / Comments / Suggestions**

When the City decides to extend Red Hill Expressway to Rymal Road and Trinity Church Road, please let me know. | Your name will be added to the mailing list.

This meeting of October 3rd was more for City workers and staff, not for general public. For us, we should have been told how this development will affect our lives and neighbourhood. My son and I think that this discussion is too late. Aldo De Santis is in the process of building 3,200 new homes. Al Fisina is building a Walmart. A car dealership is already operating. Now, a Maple Leaf factory is planning to be built. | Comment noted.

Following the presentation, my son and I asked the iTRANS representative what businesses are planning to be built. His answer was that he himself didn’t know. How can someone who doesn’t know what types of businesses are being built conclude that there should be 4 lanes on Rymal Road extending from Highway 20 to Trinity Church Road? Based on the types of businesses being built, we believe that 4 lanes should be extended to Upper James. Furthermore, my son believes that the view is one way so to speak. When these businesses are built, people from Upper James, Upper Wentworth, Upper Gage, and Garth will be taking Rymal. Should we not think ahead and accommodate them too? What’s more, if the experts believe that Second Road West can accommodate 8,000 cars per day (roughly 340 per hour) then anything is possible. | Comment noted.

With regards to extending Trinity Church Road to the LINC, the discussion is about 6 years too late because in the Winterberry area, 2 bridges have been built, which to this day not 1 car has driven over it, connect the LINC to Trinity Church Road. | Comment noted.

We don’t have any comments for questions 4 and 5 because the experts have decided pipe sizes, numbers of people to accommodate, what to do with pump stations. We don’t know that problems that are occurring in the Binbrook subdivision. | Comment noted.

With regards to question 6, displays were outdated since the new plans weren’t presented in the maps so people were confused. | All future displays will have current mapping. Updated aerial and other base mapping were not available at the time of the meeting.

Acceptable up to date. More information in the future is required. | Comment noted.

I feel that this is a good thing that the City is finally looking into improving this area. We are the owners of two properties in the Portside Drive area and welcome these improvements. | The City is currently undertaking a City-wide Water/Wastewater Master Plan that will address the future needs for the City, where issues such as these will be addressed. Notification of public meetings will be provided to the public.

A question that I had for Christine Hill was: who will be responsible for installing and paying for the main sewer and water services for those of us on Portside Drive. (We are assuming this is Portside Street at Rymal Road and RR56) | Comment noted.

A big concern of ours is that this area has always had a problem with collecting runoff water from rain or melting snow and as new development is being allowed in this corner we are seeing this problem increase. The water that is being generated or collected in this area cannot escape fast enough; we would greatly appreciate it if this is taken into consideration when Highway 86 is being worked on. | Stormwater management will be assessed as part of the Master Plan study, and we will take this concern into consideration.
5. CONCLUSIONS

In general, the public was supportive of the project, and provided concerns to be addressed. An additional Public Information Centre was held in January 2006 to address some of these concerns.

Copies of the comments are on file with the City.
Appendix B.2.2
Public Information Centre #2
Materials and Summary
WELCOME

PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #2

TRINITY NEIGHBOURHOOD STUDY
Neighbourhood Adjacent to the
Rymal Road Planning Area
(“ROPA 9” Lands)

Thursday, January 26, 2006

City of Hamilton
ROP A 9 STUDY

The City of Hamilton is undertaking a Master Plan Environmental Assessment for the ROPA 9 lands located on the south side of Rymal Road East (Highway No. 53), east of Trinity Church Road, west of Regional Road 56, and north of the hydro corridor, in the former Township of Glanbrook. The study is assessing transportation, water and wastewater requirements for the area.

Special Policy Area ‘C’ will form part of the study. This area is bounded by Mud Street West to the north, Paramount Drive to the south, Winterberry Drive to the east, and the Mud Street / Red Hill Creek interchange to the west.

The Study Area is shown below.
ROP A 9 STUDY CONT’D

The first Public Information Centre (PIC #1) for the ROPA 9 Study was held on October 3rd, 2005. At that meeting, we presented the need for infrastructure improvements (roads, water and wastewater) for the area.

As a recap to the recommendations and plans discussed at PIC #1, the following are the planning recommendations for the Rymal Road Planning Area:

- Widen Rymal Road from Trinity Church Road to Regional Road 56.
- Widen Regional Road 56 from Rymal Road to approximately 900 m to the south.
- A new road link from Stone Church Road / Red Hill Creek Expressway ramps to Rymal Road (on an alignment to be determined).
- Travel demand management.
- Operational improvements, such as changes to traffic signal timing and phasing, localized roadway section and intersection geometric improvements, adding or changing turn lanes at intersections.
- Upgrade the HD007 Pumping Station and HDR07 Reservoir.
- Construct a new Sanitary Sub-trunk to Red Hill Creek Interceptor.

Community comments received during the study will be addressed prior to completion of the EA.
BACKGROUND TO THIS MEETING

- Through the public consultation process for the ROPA 9 Study, members of your community have expressed concerns regarding traffic operations in the area of the ROPA 9 Lands. Specifically:
  - traffic infiltration (resulting in increased traffic volumes on neighbourhood streets)
  - travel speeds
  - traffic control compliance, and
  - safety for pedestrians and cyclists
- The City of Hamilton is taking this opportunity to address these issues and to gather community input.
- Various options have been identified and assessed in an attempt to address these concerns.
- We have completed the following key tasks in addressing the issues:
  - Assessed the function and design of existing roads adjacent to the study area
  - Analyzed the traffic volumes on adjacent roads, and assessed the need for traffic management measures, including road closures / new routes
  - Identified and evaluated potential traffic management options, including an assessment of potential traffic impacts that could be created with traffic management measures
- The results of this assessment will be documented in a report (Trinity Neighbourhood Traffic Assessment Report) that will serve as a background document to the ROPA 9 Lands Master Plan Class EA.
OVERALL PROJECT CONTEXT

A number of studies will form part of Phases 1 and 2 of the ROPA 9 Master Plan Class EA. The flow chart below provides a summary:

1. Special Policy Area ‘C’ Servicing Study
2. Trinity Neighbourhood Traffic Study
3. North Glanbrook Industrial Business Park Transportation Master Plan

Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9) Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment Study
Phases 1 and 2

- Collector Road and Trinity Neighbourhood Improvements Environmental Assessment for Phases 3 and 4
- ROPA9 Improvements Environmental Assessment for Phases 3 and 4
- Trinity Church Corridor Environmental Assessment for Phases 3 and 4
- Special Policy Area ‘C’ improvements implemented through the Development Approval Process
Study Area
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City of Hamilton
The following is a summary of the existing characteristics for roadways within the Trinity Neighbourhood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Posted Speed Limit</th>
<th>Pavement Width (~m)</th>
<th>Vertical Geometry</th>
<th>Cross-Section / Setback*</th>
<th>Sidewalk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd Road West (north of Gatestone)</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>flat</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 to 20 m setback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Road West (south of Gatestone)</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>flat</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>one side (east)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 m setback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatestone Drive</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>50/40</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>flat</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>both sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 m setback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitedeer Road</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>flat</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>both sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 to 15 m setback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highbury Drive</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>40/50</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>flat</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>both sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 to 20 m setback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Mount Albion Road</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>rolling</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 to 30 m setback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Represents front yard setbacks from roadway
## EXISTING CONDITIONS CONT’D

The following is a summary of the existing traffic demand versus the appropriate capacity for each roadway being assessed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Capacity (24-hr)</th>
<th>Existing Traffic Demand (24-hr)</th>
<th>Demand/Capacity</th>
<th>Comments on Acceptability for Road Design Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd Road W N of Gatestone</td>
<td>&lt;1,500</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>Over</td>
<td>North of Gatestone Drive, traffic volumes are above levels associated with the road class and design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S of Gatestone</td>
<td>&lt;8,000</td>
<td>2,000*</td>
<td>Under</td>
<td>South of Gatestone Drive, the road class and design of 2nd Road W. (collector road, wide pavement width) is appropriate for the daily volumes experienced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatestone Drive</td>
<td>&lt;8,000</td>
<td>1,450 / 4,400</td>
<td>Under</td>
<td>The road class and design of Gatestone Drive (collector road, wide pavement width) is appropriate for the daily volumes experienced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitedeer Road</td>
<td>&lt;8,000</td>
<td>2,900*</td>
<td>Under</td>
<td>The road class and design of Whitedeer Road (collector road, very wide pavement width) is appropriate for the daily volumes experienced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highbury Drive</td>
<td>&lt;8,000</td>
<td>1,700 / 1,900</td>
<td>Under</td>
<td>The road class and design of Highbury Drive (collector road, wide pavement width) is appropriate for the daily volumes experienced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Mount Albion Road</td>
<td>&lt;1,500</td>
<td>1,300 (N of Rymal) 1,100 (N of Highland)</td>
<td>Over</td>
<td>Traffic volumes are above levels associated with the road class, the rolling vertical geometry, and a very narrow pavement width on Upper Mount Albion Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimated from the available PM peak hour traffic volumes
EXISTING CONDITIONS CONT’D

The following is a summary of existing speed survey results on 2nd Road West, and on Upper Mount Albion Road.

2nd Road West (50 km/h posted speed limit)

- Speed survey conducted between Fairhaven Drive and Shadetree Crescent
- The speed at which 85% of the vehicles on 2nd Road West travel at or below, falls within a range of 45 to 55 km/h.
- 5% to 25% of the total daily traffic was operating above the posted speed limit.
- 15 to 40 vehicles were observed traveling at a speed of 70 km/h or higher on this section of local road (20 km/h above the posted speed limit), within a 24 hour period.

Upper Mount Albion Road (60 km/h posted speed limit)

- Speed survey conducted between Rymal Road and Highland Road.
- During the PM peak hour, the speed at which 85% of the vehicles on Upper Mount Albion Road travel at or below, is observed to be 71 to 76 km/h.
- 74 to 85% of the total traffic was operating above the posted speed limit.
- 40 vehicles were observed traveling at a speed of 80 km/h or higher (20 km/h above the posted speed limit), within a 24 hour period.
## EXISTING CONDITIONS CONT’D

Road Collision Summary in Trinity Neighbourhood (2001-2004, 4-year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Fatal</th>
<th>Injury</th>
<th>PDO¹</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Collision Rates (collisions per million vehicle-km per year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd Road West</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Rd to Rymal Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatestone Drive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Rd W to N Isaac Brock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitedeer Road</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highbury to Rymal Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highbury Drive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highbury Rd to Gatestone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Mount Albion Road</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.42³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramount to Rymal Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1, PDO-Property Damage Only  
2, One collision occurred in 2005  
3, One collision occurred in 2005

- 5 collisions were reported on road sections of the five major north-south roads during the four-year period. One collision was reported on 2nd Road West in the last 5 years. Two collisions were reported on Upper Mount Albion Road in the last 5 years.

- Property damage only (PDO) collisions accounts for 60% of the total collisions (3/5).

- Collision rates are typical for the road functions.
SUMMARY OF EXISTING CONDITIONS

The traffic demands on Second Road West north of Gatestone Drive, and on Upper Mount Albion Road are over the volumes typically associated with local roads of 1,000 to 1,500 vehicles per day. Second Road West is observed to be carrying approximately 2,200 vehicles per day, and Upper Mount Albion Road approximately 1,300 vehicles per day.

The pavement width of Second Road West, north of Gatestone Drive is narrow for the daily traffic volumes it currently experiences.

Upper Mount Albion Road between Rymal Road and Highland Road has a rolling vertical alignment at the north section, and a very narrow pavement width, which makes the geometry undesirable for the volumes it is currently experiencing.
FUTURE TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

Official Plan Amendments for the ROPA 9 lands, allow future development for a mix of uses including approximately 3,590 residential units and 21.4 hectares (53 acres) of land for local, general, and neighbourhood commercial uses. The Secondary Plan also designates land for stormwater management facilities and establishes a proposed collector road system.

A first phase of development allows for the construction of up to 550 residential units and 19,000 m² of general commercial space. Draft plans of subdivision have been approved accounting for the allotted 550 residential units. A draft plan of subdivision has also been approved that would allow development of 19,000 m² of general commercial space.

Additional specifics include:

- Hamilton Mountain Development Inc. commercial site on the south side of Rymal Road between Whitedeer Road and Swayze Road. The site comprises 7.6 ha (18.8 acres), including a Wal-Mart store.

- Summit Park subdivision located south of Rymal Road between the southerly extension of Upper Mount Albion Road and Fletcher’s Road. The proposed development will ultimately consist of approximately 680 residential units and approximately 11,935 m² (128,470 ft²) of gross floor area of commercial development.

There is a potential that future development of the ROPA 9 lands will exacerbate the existing traffic conditions on roadways within the Trinity Neighbourhood. As a result, solutions are necessary to address these issues.
**PROBLEM/OPPORTUNITY STATEMENT**

Objective (5) of the ROPA 9 Master Plan problem statement states: *Transportation solutions, which support Municipal Official Plans, are necessary to manage traffic impact on local roads adjacent to the study area.*

Based on the foregoing analyses, transportation solutions are required to:

1. Ensure successful transportation service for the ROPA 9 and the Trinity Neighbourhood areas with future development, and while minimizing negative impacts to the existing conditions.

2. Provide sufficient capacity and appropriate access to accommodate increasing traffic demands throughout the road network.

3. Manage and direct traffic to appropriate routes to maintain designated road functions, with arterial roads serving long distance travel, and local roads mainly serving local trips.

4. Implement and time a road network strategy to ensure the success of traffic operations on the whole road network.

Objective (5) of the ROPA 9 Lands Master Plan problem statement is intended to address the requirements outlined above.
ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS - TRINITY NEIGHBOURHOOD

To address the identified existing and future problems, the following alternative solutions were identified:

- Do Nothing

- Enhanced Traffic Control - for example:
  - Additional signage
  - Painted stop bars
  - Painted cross-walks at stop controlled intersections
  - Physical traffic calming (e.g. speed humps, diverters)
  - Roadway edge pavement markings

- New Road Connections - for example:
  - Collector road between Rymal Road / 2nd Road West and Highland Road
  - New north-south roadway from Stone Church Road/Red Hill Creek Expressway to Rymal Road

- Road Closures - for example:
  - Upper Mount Albion
  - 2nd Road West
  - Gatestone Drive / Whitedeer Road
ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

The alternatives were evaluated based on their ability to address the problems, and based on the following criteria.

Appropriateness of Network Plan
- Consistency with Road Designation
- Network Continuity
- Accessibility

Traffic Operational Issues
- Volume / Capacity
- Operating Speeds
- Overall Safety

Impacts on Other Routes
- Traffic Diversion
- Turning Demand

Emergency Services Implications
- Routing of Emergency Services
- Response Time

Natural Environment
- Vegetation
- Wildlife
- Eramosa Karst

Costs
- Capital
- Maintenance

Impacts / Benefits to Communities
- Noise Impacts (effect of traffic-related noise)
- Residents
- Dwellings/property
- Accessibility
- Schools
# Evaluation of Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>1-DO NOTHING</th>
<th>2-ENHANCED TRAFFIC CONTROL</th>
<th>3-BUILD NEW ROAD (RYMAL ROAD TO STONE CHURCH ROAD)</th>
<th>4-BUILD NEW COLLECTOR ROAD (RYMAL ROAD TO HIGHLAND ROAD)</th>
<th>5-POTENTIAL CLOSURE OF UPPER MOUNT ALBION ROAD</th>
<th>6-POTENTIAL CLOSURE OF SECOND ROAD WEST</th>
<th>7-POTENTIAL CLOSURE OF GATESTONE DR. / WHITEDEER RD.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPROPRIATENESS OF NETWORK PLAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with Road Designation</td>
<td>Official Plan road network not complete; local roads will continue to carry high levels of traffic</td>
<td>Applicable to local roads, though some measures have limited use for local rural roads; Intent of the Official Plan to have a complete road network is not met</td>
<td>Comply with the intent of the Official Plan to complete the Arterial road network</td>
<td>Comply with the intent of the Official Plan to complete the Collector road network</td>
<td>Closure is consistent with a local road designation</td>
<td>Closure is consistent with the local road designation north of Gatestone Dr.</td>
<td>Closure is not consistent with a collector road designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Continuity</td>
<td>Trinity Church Road dead ends at Rymal Road; no collector road available between Pritchard Road and Second Road West; network continuity could be improved</td>
<td>Same as Option 1</td>
<td>Provides good network continuity with good north-west connection</td>
<td>Provides north-south connection from Highland Road to Rymal Road</td>
<td>Will impact network continuity with limited north-south routes.</td>
<td>Same as Option 5</td>
<td>Same as Option 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Remain consistent as existing, generally accessible</td>
<td>Same as Option 1</td>
<td>Enhanced accessibility between ROPA 9 and areas to the north and west</td>
<td>Enhanced north-south accessibility</td>
<td>Road closure will impact local traffic accessibility</td>
<td>Same as Option 5</td>
<td>Same as Option 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRAFFIC OPERATIONAL ISSUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume / Capacity</td>
<td>Potential increase in through traffic volumes on neighbourhood roads, resulting in volumes over available capacity</td>
<td>Potential to reduce / maintain acceptable traffic volumes on area roads that is below road capacity</td>
<td>Provides additional north-south capacity to accommodate future traffic demand, and potentially reduce through traffic on neighbourhood roads</td>
<td>Same as Option 3</td>
<td>Closure will resolve high volume issues since roadway use limited to adjacent residents and businesses</td>
<td>Same as Option 5</td>
<td>Roadway use limited to adjacent residents; no volume or capacity issues expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Speeds</td>
<td>Current speeding issues will persist on area local roads</td>
<td>Potential to address speeding issues on area local roads</td>
<td>Operating speeds on new corridor could be controlled through appropriate roadway designation, geometry, etc.</td>
<td>Same as Option 3</td>
<td>Closure will address speeding issues since roadway use limited to adjacent residents and businesses</td>
<td>Same as Option 5</td>
<td>Roadway use limited to adjacent residents; no speeding issues expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Safety</td>
<td>Potential for increase in number of collisions on local roads, due to increase in traffic volume</td>
<td>Potential for increased safety for pedestrians and motorists</td>
<td>No anticipated safety issues with new corridor; also, a new corridor could improve safety for pedestrians and motorists on other routes with traffic diverted to the new route</td>
<td>Same as Option 3</td>
<td>Potential for increased safety for pedestrians and motorists with a reduction in traffic volumes</td>
<td>Same as Option 5</td>
<td>Same as Option 5; however traffic diversion could have safety implications on other routes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Evaluation of Alternatives

### IMPACTS ON OTHER ROUTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1 - Do Nothing</th>
<th>2 - Enhanced Traffic Control</th>
<th>3 - Build New Road (Rymal Road to Stone Church Road)</th>
<th>4 - Build New Collector Road (Rymal Road to Highland Road)</th>
<th>5 - Potential Closure of Upper Mount Albion Road</th>
<th>6 - Potential Closure of Second Road West</th>
<th>7 - Potential Closure of Gatestone Dr. / White Deer Rd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Diversion</td>
<td>With capacity constraints traffic will divert; no additional capacity provided for traffic diversion</td>
<td>Minor traffic diversion may occur from local roads with enhanced traffic controls</td>
<td>New corridor will accommodate diverted traffic from area roads such as Upper Mount Albion and Second Road West.</td>
<td>Same as Option 3</td>
<td>Potential for significant traffic diversion to other area roads, with no new alternative routes provided. However, if implemented after new alternative routes (e.g. Options 3 and/or 4) are implemented, no adverse impacts anticipated.</td>
<td>Same as Option 5</td>
<td>Same as Option 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning Demand</td>
<td>Dartnall Road / Rymal Road intersection will experience excessive southbound left and westbound right turning volumes; Turning demands at local road intersections could increase</td>
<td>Same as Option 1</td>
<td>Significant improvement and balance of the turning demands resulting from the ROPA 9 development, particularly at Dartnall Road / Rymal Road intersection</td>
<td>The new collector will result in acceptable turning movements at the intersections of the new collector road with the existing roads</td>
<td>Closure could result in an increase in turning volumes at other intersections</td>
<td>Same as Option 5</td>
<td>Same as Option 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EMERGENCY SERVICES IMPLICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1 - Do Nothing</th>
<th>2 - Enhanced Traffic Control</th>
<th>3 - Build New Road (Rymal Road to Stone Church Road)</th>
<th>4 - Build New Collector Road (Rymal Road to Highland Road)</th>
<th>5 - Potential Closure of Upper Mount Albion Road</th>
<th>6 - Potential Closure of Second Road West</th>
<th>7 - Potential Closure of Gatestone Dr. / White Deer Rd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Routing of Emergency Services (Ambulance, Fire, Police)</td>
<td>Same as existing</td>
<td>Same as Option 1</td>
<td>Additional route choice to local community</td>
<td>The existing fire station is located north of Trinity (Mud/Isaac Brock). Closure at the south end will have little impact on residents on Upper Mount Albion Road. However, communities south of Rymal Road would now be accessed via Fletcher Road and Upper Centennial Parkway</td>
<td>The existing fire station is located north of Trinity (Mud/Isaac Brock). Closure at the south end will have little impact on residents on 2nd Road West. However, communities south of Rymal Road would now be accessed via Gatestone Drive where an elementary school is present.</td>
<td>Impact to available routes for emergency vehicles since these roads are designated emergency routes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Time</td>
<td>Same as existing</td>
<td>Varying types of traffic control could impact response time.</td>
<td>Potential for improved response time with an additional route</td>
<td>Same as Option 3</td>
<td>Potential increase in response times to the communities south of Rymal Road</td>
<td>Same as Option 5</td>
<td>Potential increase in response times to access local communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation of Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>1-DO NOTHING</th>
<th>2-ENHANCED TRAFFIC CONTROL (RYMAL ROAD TO STONE CHURCH ROAD)</th>
<th>3-BUILD NEW ROAD (RYMAL ROAD TO HIGHLAND ROAD)</th>
<th>4-BUILD NEW COLLECTOR ROAD (RYMAL ROAD TO HIGHLAND ROAD)</th>
<th>5-POTENTIAL CLOSURE OF UPPER MOUNT ALBION ROAD</th>
<th>6-POTENTIAL CLOSURE OF SECOND ROAD WEST</th>
<th>7-POTENTIAL CLOSURE OF GATESTONE DR. / WHITEDEER RD.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATURAL ENVIRONMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td>No anticipated impact on vegetation</td>
<td>Same as Option 1</td>
<td>Impact on vegetation / trees</td>
<td>Impact on vegetation / trees, potentially including small woodland</td>
<td>Same as Option 1</td>
<td>Same as Option 1</td>
<td>Same as Option 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>No anticipated impact on wildlife</td>
<td>Same as Option 1</td>
<td>Potential for impact on wildlife</td>
<td>Potential for impact on wildlife</td>
<td>Same as Option 1</td>
<td>Same as Option 1</td>
<td>Same as Option 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eramosa Karst</td>
<td>No anticipated impact on the Eramosa Karst</td>
<td>Same as Option 1</td>
<td>No anticipated impact on Karst features</td>
<td>Potential impact on Karst features</td>
<td>Same as Option 1</td>
<td>Same as Option 1</td>
<td>Same as Option 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COSTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>No capital cost</td>
<td>Low cost to implement control devices</td>
<td>Potentially high construction costs</td>
<td>Potentially moderate construction cost</td>
<td>Low construction cost for road closure</td>
<td>Same as Option 5</td>
<td>Same as Option 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Potential for increase in maintenance cost, due to road surface and road base deterioration created by higher volumes</td>
<td>Low increase in maintenance costs over existing</td>
<td>Will require relevant maintenance</td>
<td>Same as Option 3</td>
<td>Lower maintenance costs due to less traffic volumes on closed road, but notable traffic diversion could increase maintenance needs on other roads</td>
<td>Same as Option 5</td>
<td>Same as Option 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPACTS / BENEFITS TO COMMUNITIES (SOCIO-ECONOMIC)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Noise</td>
<td>Potential increase due to increased traffic volumes</td>
<td>Noise conditions may improve on roads with enhanced traffic controls</td>
<td>No significant noise impacts anticipated</td>
<td>Same as Option 3</td>
<td>Improved noise conditions on closed road, but could increase noise impact on other roads due to traffic diversion</td>
<td>Same as Option 3</td>
<td>Same as Option 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>Impacts to residents along local roads will persist and could become worse</td>
<td>Impacts to residents along local roads may be controlled in the short-term</td>
<td>Diversion of traffic to new route from adjacent local roads will benefit residents</td>
<td>Same as Option 3</td>
<td>Elimination of through traffic on closed road will benefit local residents; however may impact residents on other roads due to traffic diversion</td>
<td>Same as Option 5</td>
<td>Same as Option 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings/property</td>
<td>No anticipated property or dwelling impacts</td>
<td>No anticipated property or dwelling impacts</td>
<td>New alignment may require property acquisition</td>
<td>Same as Option 3</td>
<td>Potential for property impact with closure design</td>
<td>Same as Option 5</td>
<td>Same as Option 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveway Access</td>
<td>Driveway access on local roads with high volumes of traffic could be compromised</td>
<td>Potential for improved driveway access with enhanced traffic controls</td>
<td>Potential for improved driveway access on local roads with diversion of</td>
<td>Same as Option 3</td>
<td>Enhanced driveway access along closed road; however may</td>
<td>Same as Option 5</td>
<td>Same as Option 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Evaluation of Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>1-DO NOTHING</th>
<th>2-ENHANCED TRAFFIC CONTROL</th>
<th>3-BUILD NEW ROAD (RYMAL ROAD TO STONE CHURCH ROAD)</th>
<th>4-BUILD NEW COLLECTOR ROAD (RYMAL ROAD TO HIGHLAND ROAD)</th>
<th>5-POTENTIAL CLOSURE OF UPPER MOUNT ALBION ROAD</th>
<th>6-POTENTIAL CLOSURE OF SECOND ROAD WEST</th>
<th>7-POTENTIAL CLOSURE OF GATESTONE DR. / WHITDEER RD.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do Nothing</td>
<td>Traffic diversion to other routes</td>
<td>Traffic to the new corridor.</td>
<td>Impact residents on other roads due to traffic diversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>No anticipated impacts on schools</td>
<td>Same as Option 1</td>
<td>Same as Option 1</td>
<td>Same as Option 1</td>
<td>Same as Option 1</td>
<td>Potential for higher traffic exposure on Gatestone Elementary School, and on St Mark’s Elementary School with use of these routes by diverted traffic, and by emergency vehicles, if no new alternative route is provided.</td>
<td>Accessibility of Gatestone Elementary School, and St Mark’s Elementary School will be impacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>Road network improvements are required to accommodate existing and future development. The Do Nothing Option will not address these requirements, and will compound the traffic network deficiencies.</td>
<td>Enhanced Traffic Control will provide short-term solution for traffic issues on local roads; additional road network improvement will be required for the long-term</td>
<td>A necessary high order road link to accommodate future long distance north-south traffic demands</td>
<td>A necessary road link and function between Rymal Road and Highland Road in the Trinity neighbourhood; Necessary connection to carry north-south through traffic</td>
<td>Closure of Upper Mount Albion Road will allow it to functions as designated - a Local Road. Closure is however only feasible in conjunction with a new north-south connection between Rymal Road and Stone Church Road which will provide the capacity for future growth and traffic diverted from a closed Upper Mount Albion Road</td>
<td>Closure of Second Road West will allow it to functions as designated - a Local Road; Closure is however only feasible in conjunction with a new collector road that provides connection between Rymal Road and Highland Road. If a new collector is not feasible due to the Karst Area or other constraints, a closure will be dependent on implementation of an additional north-south route such as a new link between Rymal Road and Stone Church Road</td>
<td>Closure of Gatestone Drive or of Whitedeer Road is not recommended, since closure is not consistent with a Collector Road designation. Also, closure will impact emergency routes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not Recommended**

Recommended for Phase 1 Implementation

Recommended for Phase 2 Implementation

Recommended for Phase 2 Implementation

Recommended for Phase 2 Implementation

Recommended for Phase 2 Implementation

Recommended for Phase 2 Implementation
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RECOMMENDED SOLUTIONS

Based on the evaluation of the options, the recommended alternative solution is to:

Phase 1 Solutions

Second Road West

- Implement enhanced traffic control on 2nd Road West, north of Gatestone Drive as phase 1 measures to enhance the visibility of the stop-controlled intersections.

- Implementation of physical traffic calming measures on 2nd Road West does not meet the City policy requirements, and is therefore not recommended as a potential solution at this time. However, the City will continue to monitor 2nd Road West for the appropriateness of physical traffic calming measures in the future, prior to any road closure.

Upper Mount Albion Road

- Consideration of enhanced traffic control measures (pavement markings) for Upper Mount Albion Road as phase 1 solutions, appropriate for a rural cross-section.

- Implementation of physical traffic calming measures on Upper Mount Albion Road is not consistent with the City policy requirements for PRIMARY emergency / fire services routes, and is therefore not recommended as a potential solution.
RECOMMENDED SOLUTIONS (CONT’D)

Phase 2 Solutions

- Implement new road connections as soon as possible to provide additional north-south capacity
  - A new collector road in the Trinity Neighbourhood
  - New roadway from Stone Church Road / Red Hill Creek Expressway to Rymal Road

- Implement road closure on Second Road West north of Gatestone Drive, and on Upper Mount Albion Road
  - Closure of Second Road West should be coordinated with the construction of the new collector road
  - Closure of Upper Mount Albion Road should be coordinated with a new north-south link from Stone Church Road to Rymal Road

Identification of Closure Details

Since the closure of Second Road West should be coordinated with the construction of a new collector road between Rymal Road / Second Road West and Highland Road, it is appropriate that the identification of closure details be linked to the process of determining the details for a new collector road. As such, it is recommended that the details for the closure of Second Road West be determined in the proposed Trinity Neighbourhood Improvements Environmental Assessment.

Similarly, the closure of Upper Mount Albion Road should be coordinate with a new north-south roadway linking Stone Church Road / Red Hill Creek Expressway to Rymal Road. As such, it is recommended that the details for the closure of Upper Mount Albion Road be determined in the Trinity Church Corridor Environmental Assessment, which will soon commence.
FUTURE ACTIONS

- We will review all comments and suggestions received from the community.

- Based on public input, we will confirm the recommended solutions.

- The process and the results for this study will be documented in a report (Trinity Neighbourhood Traffic Assessment Report) that will serve as a background document to the ROPA 9 Lands Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment (EA).

- File Phases 1 and 2 of the ROPA 9 Master Plan report on Public Record for a required 30 calendar day review period.

The next Public Information Centre for the ROPA 9 Lands Class EA (Phases 3 and 4) is tentatively scheduled for late Spring. At this meeting, we will present and request your input on:

- A summary of the infrastructure needs in the area of Special Policy Area ‘C’

- A summary of Impacts of Alternative Designs for Rymal Road and for Regional Road 56

- The evaluation of these Alternative Designs

- Preliminary Preferred Designs

Responses to additional comments and questions received at PIC#1 in relation to the ROPA 9 Study will also be provided at PIC#3.
YOUR INPUT IS IMPORTANT

Your input is important.

We invite you to fill in the comment sheet with your comments and suggestions.

If you wish to be put on our mailing list, require further information, or wish to provide input, you can contact us in the following ways:

Christine Lee-Morrison
Project Manager
City of Hamilton
Public Works Department
320-77 James Street North
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3

Phone: (905) 546-2424 ext. 6390
Fax: (905) 546-4435
E-Mail: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Liza Sheppard
Consultant Project Coordinator
iTRANS Consulting Inc.
100 York Boulevard, Suite 300
Richmond Hill, ON L4B 1J8

Phone: (905) 882-4100, ext. 5232
Fax: (905) 882-1557
Email: Isheppard@itransconsulting.com

Please also note that information on the project can be found on the City’s website at the following address:

www.hamilton.ca/ropa9
Welcome

TRINITY NEIGHBOURHOOD STUDY
Rymal Road Planning Area
(“ROPAL 9” Lands)
Public Information Centre No. 2
January 26, 2006
Agenda

- Study Background, Context
- Existing Conditions
- Potential Solutions and Recommendations
- Answer questions / receive comments
Study Background

- ROPA 9 PIC #1 held on October 3, 2005
- Existing traffic operations concerns raised in the vicinity of ROPA 9 lands (2nd Road West, Upper Mount Albion, Trinity Church Road)
- Issues related to Trinity Church Road will be addressed in the Trinity Church Road EA
- This Meeting to address Trinity Neighbourhood (2nd Road West and Upper Mt. Albion issues)
Study Context

- Special Policy Area ‘C’ Servicing Study
- Trinity Neighbourhood Traffic Study
- North Glanbrook Industrial Business Park Transportation Master Plan

Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9) Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment Study Phases 1 and 2

- Collector Road and Trinity Neighbourhood Improvements Environmental Assessment for Phases 3 and 4
- ROPA9 Improvements Environmental Assessment for Phases 3 and 4
- Trinity Church Corridor Environmental Assessment for Phases 3 and 4
- Special Policy Area ‘C’ improvements implemented through the Development Approval Process
Study Objectives

Objective (5) of the ROPA 9 problem statement is: “Transportation solutions, which support Municipal Official Plans, are necessary to manage traffic impact on local roads adjacent to the study area.” This includes the following:

- To ensure successful transportation service for the whole area while minimizing negative impacts
- To provide sufficient capacity and convenient access
- To manage and direct traffic to appropriate routes to maintain appropriate road functions
- To implement and time a road network strategy
Study Approach

1. Identify specific operational issues on 2\textsuperscript{nd} Road West and Upper Mount Albion Road

2. Measure the operational conditions of each issue

3. Determine potential solutions

4. Assess the implications of changes (closures) to all parties, operations and the environment

5. Develop a coordinated strategy to address the issues
1. Identify Operational Issues

- Public input suggests traffic volumes are inconsistent with the road function and design leading to:
  - High speeds
  - Vehicles running through stop signs
  - Pedestrian exposure
  - Difficult driveway operations
2. Measure Operational Conditions

Road Function and Traffic Volumes

- 2nd Road West is designated a local road with an urban cross-section north of Gatestone Drive.

- Upper Mount Albion Road is designated a local road with a rural cross-section and is also a truck route and primary emergency services route.

- Volumes on 2nd Road West and on Upper Mount Albion Road are beyond levels typical for a local road.

- Measurable increases in traffic anticipated on both roads with ROPA 9 development.
2. Measure Operational Conditions

Existing Operating Speeds

- **2nd Road West** (50 km/h posted speed limit)
  - 85% of vehicles traveling at 45 to 55 km/h or below
  - 5-25% of total traffic operating above the posted speed limit
  - 15-40 vehicles traveling at or above 70 km/h

- **Upper Mount Albion Road** (60 km/h posted speed limit)
  - 85% of vehicles traveling at 71 to 76 km/h or below
  - 74-85% of total traffic operating above the posted speed limit
  - 40 vehicles traveling at or above 80 km/h
  - Vertical curve on Upper Mount Albion south of Highland Road
2. Measure Operational Conditions

Stop Sign Compliance

- Factors affecting Stop Sign compliance
  - 2\textsuperscript{nd} Road West
    - Intersections and All-Way Stops not conspicuous
    - Low driver expectancy for unfamiliar drivers
    - Closely spaced stop signs at cross-streets with low volumes
  - Upper Mount Albion Road
    - Cross-streets with low volumes
2. Measure Operational Conditions

Stop Sign Compliance

- Risk associated with non-compliance
  - 2nd Road West
    - Pedestrian crossing activity at Hillcroft Drive (and Fairhaven Drive in future)
    - Potential for vehicle-vehicle conflicts
  - Upper Mount Albion Road
    - Potential for vehicle-vehicle conflicts
2. **Measure Operational Conditions**

**Pedestrian Safety Issues**

- **Pedestrians within the boulevard**
  - Sidewalk discontinuous on 2\textsuperscript{nd} Road West
  - No sidewalk on Upper Mount Albion Road

- **Pedestrian crossing**
  - Three All-Way Stop crossings on 2\textsuperscript{nd} Road West
  - No crosswalk markings
  - Affected by compliance at All-Way Stops
2. Measure Operational Conditions

Ease of Driveway Access/Egress

- Traffic volumes on 2nd Road West and on Upper Mount Albion Road comparable or lower than many roads with direct frontage

- Operating speeds and vertical curve affect driveway operations on Upper Mount Albion Road
2. Measure Operational Conditions

Collision History

- 1 collision on 2nd Road West in 5 years
- 2 collisions on Upper Mount Albion Road in 5 years
- Collision rates are typical for the road functions
2. Measure Operational Conditions

Road Network

- Limited number of north-south collector roads within the Trinity neighbourhood

- No continuous north-south collector roads between future arterial from Stone Church Road to Rymal Road and Upper Centennial Parkway (approximately 3.7 km apart)

- Highbury Drive, Gatestone Drive, 2nd Road West South of Gatestone Drive and Whitedeer Drive, the only collectors

- Future collector road options limited due to Karst area
3. What are Potential Transportation Solutions?

- Do Nothing
- Enhanced Traffic Control
- New Road Connections
- Road Closures
4. Assess Implications of Changes

Evaluation of Alternatives

Alternatives evaluated based on a number of criteria:

- Appropriateness of Network Plan
- Traffic Operational Issues
- Impacts on Other Routes
- Natural Environment
- Emergency Services
- Costs
- Impacts / Benefits to Communities

A number of sub criteria as shown on the display panels
4. Assess Implications of Changes

Key Considerations

Implications of 2\textsuperscript{nd} Road West closure / Traffic diversion:

- Increased traffic on Gatestone (currently > 4,000 vpd)
- Increased interaction in front of Gatestone School
- Impact to emergency response time (2\textsuperscript{nd} Road West is a secondary emergency services route)
- Increased traffic on Upper Mount Albion Road
4. Assess Implications of Changes

Key Considerations Continued

Implications of Upper Mount Albion Road closure / Traffic diversion:

- Impact to emergency response times (Upper Mount Albion Road is a PRIMARY emergency services route)
- Increased traffic on 2nd Road West
- More circuitous routing for residents
5. Coordinated Strategy

Transportation Preferred Alternative

The recommended alternative solution, is to:

- Provide new routes: a new arterial from Stone Church Road to Rymal Road and a new collector for Trinity neighbourhood (Phase 2)
- Close 2\textsuperscript{nd} Road West when new collector road is in place (Phase 2)
- Close Upper Mount Albion Road when new arterial from Stone Church Road to Rymal Road is completed (Phase 2)
- Implement traffic control measures until the above are completed (Phase 1)
5. Coordinated Strategy

Transportation Preferred Alternative Continued

Phase 1 traffic control measures could include:

- Supplementary stop signs at All-Way Stops
- Stop bar/crosswalk markings at All-Way Stops
- Pavement markings
5. Coordinated Strategy
Details for Closure

- Closure details for Second Road West should be linked to the Trinity Neighbourhood Improvements Environmental Assessment
- Closure details for Upper Mount Albion Road should be linked to the Trinity Church Road Environmental Assessment, which will soon commence
We Value Your Input

- Please fill out a comment sheet with your comments; sheets can be mailed or faxed by February 15
- Opportunity to ask questions after the presentation
- You may speak with any of the project representatives here at the meeting tonight
- Visit the project website at: www.hamilton.ca/ropa9
THANK YOU!
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1. INTRODUCTION

The second Public Information Centre (PIC#2) was held on Thursday, January 26th, 2006, at the Salvation Army Church Gymnasium, 300 Winterberry Drive, in the City of Hamilton. Members of the community in the vicinity of the ROPA 9 lands had expressed concerns regarding traffic operations in the area, specifically, traffic infiltration (resulting in increased traffic volumes on neighbourhood streets), travel speeds, traffic control compliance, and safety for pedestrians and cyclists. The purpose of PIC#2 was to present to members of the community, options that were identified and assessed in an attempt to address these concerns, and to gather public input. The format was an informal drop-in centre from 6:00 to 6:30 PM to view the display panels and drawings, and to have discussions with the project team. There was a presentation at 6:30 PM, followed by a question and answer period. The PIC continued until 8:00 PM, which provided participants the opportunity to further discuss the project with the study team. Approximately 100 members of the public attended the PIC. The following representatives from the City of Hamilton, and the project team were in attendance:

City of Hamilton: Christine Lee-Morrison, Project Manager – Strategic Planning
Mohan Philip – Strategic Planning
Leanne Ryan – Traffic Engineering

iTRANS Consulting: Ray Bacquie, Study Project Manager
Liza Sheppard, Project Engineer
Nathalie Baudais, Transportation Planner

Urban Strategies: Cyndi Rottenberg-Walker (facilitator)

Councillor Phil Bruckner of Ward 9, and Councillor Dave Mitchell of Ward 11 of the City of Hamilton were also in attendance.

2. NOTIFICATION

Advertisements informing the public of the PIC, were placed in the Hamilton Spectator on Friday, January 13th and on Friday, January 20th, 2006, and in the Stoney Creek News, Mountain News and Glanbrook Gazette (Brabant) on Friday, January 13th 2006. Notification letters were also mailed out to property owners in an area bounded by Pritchard Road to the west, Mud Street-Winterberry Drive-Highland Road to the north, the Hydro corridor to the south and Whitedeer Road - Regional Road 56 to the east. Other individuals who had responded with an interest in the study since its commencement, and conservation authorities, Federal and Provincial agencies, and utility companies were also notified.
3. PIC PRESENTATION MATERIAL

Upon arrival at the PIC, attendees were asked to sign a visitor registration sheet. One hundred and fourteen people signed the registration sheet.

Twenty-six panels were displayed. The information panels included the following:

- Welcome
- ROPA9 Study information and study area
- Background to the meeting
- Overall project context
- Trinity Neighbourhood study area
- Road network and road classifications
- Description of existing conditions
- Future traffic conditions
- Problem/opportunity statement
- Description of 4 alternative transportation solutions
- Description of alternative solutions assessment criteria
- Evaluation tables of the transportation alternatives
- Recommended solutions
- Future actions
- Contact information

4. SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

The questions asked and comments received verbally or via comment sheets at the PIC, and comments/questions received after the PIC via e-mail, letters and telephone calls are summarized below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you have any comments regarding the existing and future conditions presented?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are more than 15-40 cars going over 50 km/hour on Second Road West. If you sit at a stop sign of course speeds will be lower. You should have a few points between sign for accurate readings.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please Note: As part of the Red Hill Open Space Replacement Strategy – Public Works of the Hamilton Conservation Authority wish to create a trail from the Karst lands west through this area to align with the extension of Arbour Road, ideally the trail could be aligned with a proposed road or utility corridor.</td>
<td>Comment noted. The City will continue discussions with the Hamilton Conservation Authority to determine the status of the trail planning. The City will incorporate any concepts or route objectives as background information to the Master Plan. If the plans for the trail are sufficiently developed, the City will determine if there are opportunities to coordinate the trail with other infrastructure recommended through the Master Plan. Information on the planned trail will be brought forward into Phases 3 and 4 of any follow-up environmental assessments resulting from the Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homes on Highland between Second Road West and Upper Mount Albion have increased greatly in the 6 years we have lived on Highland – you have reported 7,000 cars/day – high for a collector. Speeding and stop sign compliance continue to be a problem along Highland. There are a great many kids who live and/or walk along Highland, safety is a concern! It is very difficult to get out of our driveway now, especially during peak hours.</td>
<td>The concerns regarding speeding and overall safety on Highland Road will be passed on to the City’s Traffic Section. The existing volumes on Highland Road are high on sections east of Upper Mount Albion Road, but the traffic volumes are within the range associated with it’s designation as a collector road. While in the short term it is recognized that there are delays to motorists exiting driveways or unsignalized cross-streets during peak periods, it is anticipated that the recommendations of the Master Plan (i.e. new road links and a widening of Rymal Road), will reduce traffic demand on Highland Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing both Second Road West and Upper Mount Albion Road doesn’t make sense. Having several routes available would spread out the traffic and have less congestion.</td>
<td>The recommendation is to close Second Road West, and Upper Mount Albion Road, only when alternative options are available. The recommendation is to close Second Road West in conjunction with the construction of a new road connection between Rymal Road and Highland Road, and to close Upper Mount Albion Road in conjunction with a new north-south link from Stone Church Road to Rymal Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no comments on the existing conditions. However, as for future conditions, I am very concerned with the increased traffic on Gatestone that would result from the closure of Second Road West. We purchased our house on Gatestone in February 2004. One of our major criteria for location was the volume of traffic on the street. When we bought, we were very comfortable with traffic volumes – for ourselves and our grandchildren.</td>
<td>The recommendation is to close Second Road West in conjunction with the construction of a new road connection between Rymal Road and Highland Road. As such, an alternative route to Second Road West for this traffic movement will be available. It is therefore not anticipated that traffic volumes will increase on Gatestone Drive as a result of the closure of Second Road West.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presentation was very informative. I’m pleased about the conclusions drawn from the study (closing Upper Mount Albion Road). I am concerned about time frame (3 to 5 years) and also what traffic calming measures you will be able to use that will be effective on Upper Mount Albion.</td>
<td>The City is proceeding with the Trinity Church Road Class Environmental Assessment (EA) that will assist in clearly identifying the timing for the closure of Upper Mount Albion Road. The timing is however dependent on a number of factors including completing the EA process, detail design, and construction. The City will endeavour to carry out each process as quickly as possible. As presented at the Public Meeting, implementation of physical traffic calming measures on Upper Mount Albion Road is not consistent with the City policy requirements for PRIMARY emergency / fire services routes, and is therefore not recommended as a potential solution. Short-term proposed calming measure for Upper Mount Albion Road would therefore be limited to pavement markings and signage, which will help in giving a message to drivers that the pavement width is narrower. This can result in reduced travel speeds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My concerns for the future of this region are as follows: Your studies should include the following in and around the (ROPA9 lands) area.</td>
<td>The City is currently conducting a Transportation Master Plan that encompasses the future traffic, transportation, pedestrians and cyclists needs for the City. The study aims to:  - Provide a strong and vibrant economy;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. The movement quickly and safely of fire trucks, ambulances, other emergency vehicles, school buses and public transportation is very important. | • Build livable communities;  
• Improve public transit; and  
• Provide a balanced transportation network |
| 2. Safety for the walking public, people on bicycles, motorized wheel chairs, moving about the area. | The Master Plan study will include a review of all City Roads and their function. A study is also currently being conducted to review the transportation needs for the North Glanbrook Industrial lands, which is being coordinated with the ROPA 9 Class Environmental Assessment, the Trinity Neighbourhood Study, and the Trinity Church Road Class Environmental Assessment. |
| 3. Roads such as Upper Centennial Parkway north and south, Second Road West, Upper Mount Albion Road, Pritchard Road, Nebo Road will self regulate (too much traffic, people will not use them). |  |
| 4. At this meeting, the City was using the Karst lands as an excuse to do nothing. A study is necessary which would include traffic flow along with the development of the Glanbrook Industrial lands, they will have a huge impact on the moving of the east and west traffic along Highland Road, Rymal Road and Golf Club Road. |  |
| 5. I would also suggest that the study recommend a road from Regional Road 56 to the west. This road would be south of the Summit Park development and terminate with a connection to the Red Hill expressway. |  |

The risks associated with Stop sign compliance do not indicate that pedestrians walking along Upper Mount Albion and crossing Highland are affected. Now with Desantis’ development there could be pedestrians crossing Rymal which is cause for even more concern.

I am also concerned that the quality of the road on Upper Mount Albion Road was not highlighted considering it’s also a truck route and emergency route.

Future conditions of higher populations do not seem to be addressed to me.

The criterion is – don’t just move the problem from one area to another area. This is an important consideration. You need to consider the impact of proposed changes on Highland – traffic volumes need to be decreased from 7,000 cars/day, not increased.
### Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I went to a meeting a few months ago held at Trinity United Church regarding traffic flow for the industrial Park on Nebo. It discussed major roads as Nebo and extending Dartnall further South. What surprised me the most was that the consultant doing the study knew nothing of the ROPA9 study and therefore the two studies are independent of each other and are not planning to link up together. The City needs to look at the whole picture.</td>
<td>The ROPA 9 Master Plan Class EA needs assessment includes development potential of the North Glanbrook Industrial lands. We have had several meetings with the project team on that study (North Glanbrook Industrial Business Park Transportation Master Plan), and both studies are being coordinated. A flow chart presented during the presentation portion of the Trinity Neighbourhood Public Meeting, illustrated the relationship between the 2 studies and how they will both contribute to the design phase of the environmental assessment process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe another criteria should be added “maintain the streets the way they were when people moved into the community”. This criteria should be weighted more than the others since some of the other criteria are considered by purchasers like us when considering the location of a new home, such as traffic operational issues, natural environment, emergency services, benefits to the communities of what exists at the time of purchase.</td>
<td>The study assessment criteria include ‘traffic diversion’ which is intended to reflect the desire to direct traffic away from established communities and streets where traffic volumes are expected to exceed values typically associated with the designated road function. We believe this criterion reflects the intent of your comment. Your comments related to the weighting of evaluation criteria are noted and will be considered along with input from other stakeholders and members of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I question the accuracy of speeds and volume of traffic. I feel that the speeds on Upper Mount Albion are actually higher overall, but are skewed lower due to residents on the street going at or below the limits.</td>
<td>We acknowledge your comment, and note that the information provided on traffic volumes and the speed surveys on Upper Mount Albion Road were conducted over several different days and time periods. The methodology was consistent with generally accepted traffic engineering practices. Not withstanding this, your comments have been noted and will be passed on to the City Traffic Section for consideration in any future monitoring of traffic conditions that they plan to undertake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were there any statistics on how many trucks and emergency vehicles actually use Upper Mount Albion Road on an annual basis?</td>
<td>Statistics in terms of the numbers of emergency vehicles using Upper Mount Albion Road per year were not available but emergency response crews confirmed their use of Upper Mount Albion Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please provide comments regarding the Phase 1 Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the recommended Phase 1 Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adding stop signs, cross-walks, etc. will NOT slow down or alleviate traffic volumes. Closing the roads will end our problems. Use Pritchard, Dartnall as north-south collectors.</td>
<td>We acknowledge that these measures are for the short-term, and will not fully address the needs in the longer-term. We have recommended the closure of Upper Mount Albion Road, and of Second Road West, in conjunction with other alternatives in the form of new roads being in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We would be glad to see increased police presence on Highland to address the speed and stop sign compliance issues. What tangible measures are proposed for Phase 1? How will you evaluate their effectiveness? What targets/changes are you trying to achieve with the measures? How can I, as a resident, be sure that the measures will be adequate? Will you ask our opinion along the way (ie Ask us if we think the measures are making a difference)?</td>
<td>Speed monitoring assesses average speeds, 85th percentile speeds (speeds at which 15% of traffic exceeds) and high-end speeds. Compliance to speed limits are typically measured against the 85th percentile speed (or top 15%). Based on judgments from the courts, police stopping drivers traveling 10 km/hr or more above posted speeds may have success with convictions. Ten kilometers per hour above the posted speed limit is also typically associated with the design speed of the road. On this basis, the City of Hamilton and most other jurisdictions measure the effectiveness of speed compliance based on whether the 85th percentile speed is larger than 10-15 km/hr above the posted speed limit. The measures are intended to keep the vast majority of drivers (85th percentile) within 10 km/hr of the posted speed limit and most drivers (average speed) at the posted limit. As part of the Master Plan, recommendations can include a monitoring program that can be made available to the public. On this basis, the public may suggest further traffic control measures for consideration by the City as an interim measure, until all of the Master Plan recommendations have been implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 OK.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree with the Phase 1 solutions. They improve safety for vehicles and pedestrians on Second Road West, while not transferring safety</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>issues to another street, like Gatestone.</td>
<td>The recommendation will be reviewed with the City of Hamilton Traffic Section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One additional recommendation would be to increase police enforcement of speed and adherence to stop signs on Second Road West for a time period.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build the roads (new ones) before all the development comes. The existing roads (Upper Mount Albion and Second Road West) will be destroyed with the additional traffic (both local residential and construction) just waiting to use the new roads. Also why get new residents used to old roads when new ones will be built properly.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My main objective as representative of Upper Mount Albion Road residents was to get the road closed at Rymal Road. It looks like that will be the plan that will be included in Phase 1. However, because of the major changes and future development, I will continue to follow through as the representative of the road and to monitor any changes to come that will affect the residents.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If it could be considered moving the truck route and emergency vehicle route to Pritchard Road. (Only 1 to 2 residential homes on this street.) If not, then I believe consideration to widening and improving road and installing sidewalks on at least one side of the road. Slow speed limit, higher police presence, and consider 4-way stoplight at Rymal Road until Upper Mount Albion Road is closed.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please provide comments regarding the Phase 2 Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the recommended Phase 2 Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.</td>
<td>Second Road West should be closed ASAP! What are your timelines? When will Phase 2 be complete? We’ve waited long enough! Gatestone residents knew when purchasing homes that their road would be more busy than Second Road! The closure of Second Road West is recommended in conjunction with a new collector road being built west of Second Road West, to connect Rymal Road and Highland Road. There are a number of considerations in the timing for the construction of such a road, including the EA approval process, detail design, and funding for construction. The City will endeavour to carry out each process as quickly as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We agree that a new arterial (Stone Church to Rymal) is essential – the sooner the better! Alternative 2 for the collector (behind the nursing home and connect to Highland at Winterberry) is the best of the 5 alternatives because it avoids spilling more traffic onto Highland where there is more residential (and 7,000 cars/day already) and more kids. Alternatives 3 and 4 don’t make sense – they just move the problem from one area to another (Highland). They would also negatively impact what’s already been planned (walkway, etc).</td>
<td>Alternative 2, as previously planned in the road network for the Trinity Neighbourhood area, would undoubtedly be a favourable route, were it not for the impacts on the Karst lands, that have since been discovered. This alternative traverses directly through the Karst Area of Natural and Scientific Interest, which would result in significant impacts to the Karst. Alternative 2 will likely not be acceptable to the Conservation Authority and may not be a viable option. All of the options will be evaluated in detail, including impacts on residents, amenity areas, the environment, etc., to determine a preferred option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An alternative could be to line up the off-ramp of the North-South</td>
<td>This suggestion will be taken into consideration in the Trinity Church Road Class Environmental Assessment study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expressway with Pritchard and then extend Pritchard past Rymal Road to link up with Binbrook Road etc. I do not agree to link up with Trinity Church Road and making it a major throughway.</td>
<td>The recommendation is to close Second Road West in conjunction with the construction of a new road connection between Rymal Road and Highland Road. As such, an alternative route to Second Road West for this traffic movement will be available. It is therefore not anticipated that traffic volumes will increase on Gatestone Drive as a result of the closure of Second Road West.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not agree with the Phase 2 solutions of closing Second Road West. My reasoning is that this will create additional traffic flow on Gatestone which I see as unacceptable as explained in questions 1 and 2 above. People who purchased their home on Second Road West did so knowing that it was a through street to Rymal Road!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, but time frames are too long. Also order of construction seems backwards, build the roads for the new developments, build developments and close the old roads.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To give priority to the Trinity Church Road extension over the widening of Rymal Road. Traffic can still use Rymal Road. However, with the expressway coming on line in 2007 (next year) it would seem to me that it would make sense to have the extension completed ASAP to give expressway traffic easy access to Rymal Road.</td>
<td>Comment noted. Both studies are currently being conducted concurrently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe Upper Mount Albion Road should be closed at the same time as the Silvestri development is completed. The Trinity Church extension is absolutely essential for the economic growth of the City and further bus services should be part of the Silvestri development (hubs). The Trinity Church extension should be built at the same time as Silvestri development to maximize growth potential not only of land south of Stone Church but Glanbrook Industrial Park. Then close Upper Mount Albion Road at Rymal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have any other comments regarding the material and displays you have seen today?</td>
<td>Phases 3 and 4 for the Trinity Neighbourhood study, and for the Trinity Church Road Class EA study, are expected to be completed by the end of 2006 or the beginning of 2007. The recommended Phase 1 measures can however be implemented before the completion of Phases 3 and 4 of the studies. Comment noted. This summary of the Public Meeting includes all comments / questions provided during, and pre and post the meeting, with responses to all comments / questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The letter sent out as notice of the meeting described that there would be discussion regarding traffic and road construction south of Rymal Road but there was no discussion of that at the meeting.</td>
<td>The notice does not specifically refer to road construction south of Rymal Road, but rather residential and commercial development south of Rymal Road. If there are specific concerns or issues related to road construction south of Rymal Road, those comments may still be forwarded to the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well presented. A little dry, perhaps more picture diagrams to</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As I live on Upper Mount Albion Road, I have concerns of the anticipated growth in vehicular traffic though our road is designated as a truck route – its condition does not in my opinion support this type of vehicular traffic. Further in fact it’s a truck route it’s extremely unsafe for anyone living there to even get their mail out of their rural mailbox, let alone walk to your next door neighbour’s for a cup of sugar.

We have been advised the road won’t be closed until the Trinity Church extension is complete. I would suggest our safety is paramount and secondly, growth in the lands west of Upper Mount Albion Road would be best served by completing the Trinity Church extension at the same time as you allow the Silvestri development, between Winterberry & Pritchard. If this doesn’t occur then – we need Upper Mount Albion Road improved with sidewalks – for our own safety. PS. Why couldn’t Pritchard be designated truck route?

We have been advised the road won’t be closed until the Trinity Church extension is complete. I would suggest our safety is paramount and secondly, growth in the lands west of Upper Mount Albion Road would be best served by completing the Trinity Church extension at the same time as you allow the Silvestri development, between Winterberry & Pritchard. If this doesn’t occur then – we need Upper Mount Albion Road improved with sidewalks – for our own safety. PS. Why couldn’t Pritchard be designated truck route?

This future study for the arterial road will take into consideration the impacts to properties, environmental features, geographical features, and major utilities. In developing alternative conceptual alignments further, the City will consider properties such as yours at 60 Highland Road, and others. It will be in the interest of the City to avoid as much as possible these properties in the development of the alignments to minimize impacts to the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>accompany talking.</td>
<td>The Special Policy Area ‘C’ study was initiated by the developer. There are two types of studies being conducted, one is through the EA process and one is through the development process. The EA process addresses the broader infrastructure needs. Since Special Policy Area C and the ROPA 9 are geographically close and the result of the studies could be interrelated, the Special Policy Area C was added to the ROPA 9 Master Plan Class EA study. The developer is still working on their traffic impact study for the Special Policy Area C lands. They will hold a separate public meeting as a part of their study. The developer’s traffic impact study will be taken into account during the ROPA 9 Master Plan Class EA study. The findings for the EA process will be circulated to members of the public for review and comment once completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Thank you for bringing forward your interest and concerns regarding this project. As you may know, the City of Hamilton is undertaking a Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment study for lands located on the south side of Rymal Road East (Highway No. 53), east of Trinity Church Road, west of Regional Road 56, and north of the hydro corridor, in the former Township of Glanbrook, called the ROPA 9 lands; and Special Policy Area ‘C’, an area bounded by Winterberry Drive to the east, Paramount Drive to the south, the new Red Hill Creek/Mud Street interchange to the west, and the Lincoln Alexander Parkway-Mud Street West to the north. The first Public Information Centre (PIC#1) for the study was held on October 3rd, 2005. At that meeting the City presented the need for infrastructure improvements (roads, water and wastewater) for the area. Concerns were subsequently expressed by the community in the vicinity of the ROPA 9 Lands regarding traffic operations in the area, specifically, traffic infiltration (resulting in increased traffic volumes on neighbourhood streets), travel speeds, traffic control compliance, and safety for pedestrians and cyclists. As such, the study schedule was revised to hold an additional meeting on January 26th, 2006 (PIC#2) to address community concerns. The focus of the Master Plan study was to determine the magnitude of the road capacity need and the type of solutions required for the Rymal Road Planning Area. One of the recommended infrastructure improvements of the Master Plan study, is a new 4-lane arterial road (previously referred to as the Trinity Church corridor extension), from Stone Church Road / Red Hill Creek Expressway ramp to Rymal Road, on an alignment to be determined. The Region of Hamilton Wentworth Official Plan (December 2000) and City of Stoney Creek Official Plan (April 2001 consolidation) also designate a new road link referred to as the Trinity Church corridor extension as a proposed Arterial road. Some of the potential alignments for this arterial road were presented at the January 26th, 2006 public meeting. All alignments illustrated at the public meeting for this proposed new arterial road were purely schematic. The actual alignment of the future road, the design (divided or undivided, urban or rural drainage) is subject to further study, and will be determined in the environmental assessment for the arterial road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After attending the public meeting regarding the “Trinity Neighbourhood Study” on January 25 2006, I have some grave concerns regarding the construction of a new arterial route from Stone Church Road to Rymal Road. My mother has owned the property at 60 Highland Road for almost 40 years. The maps provided at the meeting indicate that the new arterial, option one or two, will be built directly beside our property. Mr. Ray Bacquie of iTRANS Consulting indicated that the details of the final route would be decided within the next six to eight months with property acquisition occurring in the subsequent six to eight months. However, he was unable to answer my queries regarding the size of the arterial (two lane, four lane, divided) or the potential development of the lands in the area (residential, commercial, industrial.). Though vague discussion of a possible new road in this area has occurred periodically over the years, we were shocked at the designation of this road as arterial and the seemingly short timeline for planning and implementation. Since we have a large financial and emotional investment in 60 Highland, we are concerned about the impact of all of these variables on our property, property value, and utilities. In developing alternative conceptual alignments further, the City will consider properties such as yours at 60 Highland Road, and others. It will be in the interest of the City to avoid as much as possible these properties in the development of the alignments to minimize impacts to the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 2006

We are residents of Willowridge Way, just east of 2nd Road West. Reading the article "Looks like residents will get their wish" in the Stoney Creek News surely has left concern in this household. We have three children who attend school in this community. Surely the "30" residents who have plotted to close 2nd Road West have not considered the ramifications of doing so. That is, the traffic flow will be forced to detour into the side streets whereby the local schools will be congested with traffic. This will surely cause havoc and at worst risking our school children walking to school.

In my opinion, the smartest thing to do is to put a traffic light at Fairhaven - wouldn't it be a cost-efficient solution as well? Also, one of the signs placed on 2nd Road last summer was that it was not safe for the children to play on the street. Well surely, children should not be playing in the streets - and the local park is being built where children should safely play. Shutting down 2nd Road West is not a solution.

I understand that there was a "former city of Stoney Creek's in 1989 approved neighbourhood plan"; however, that was almost twenty years ago and developments change. And in Stoney Creek's case, surely the housing and commercial market has sky-rocketed. With two elementary schools, Gatestone & St. Marks (right in the heart of community and to limit costs.

Thus, it is imperative that we be informed of any and all factors and decisions related to this section of the project. Any information or avenues of information that you could provide at this time would be greatly appreciated. We eagerly await your reply.

The City is intending to finalize the Rymal Road Planning Area Class EA Master Plan this spring. The Master Plan would establish the need for the new road link between Rymal Road and Stone Church Road as one of the solutions required for the Rymal Road Planning Area. Once the Rymal Road Planning Area Master Plan is complete, the City will commence with the next level of study required to evaluate the design concepts (road alignments) for the new road. A further Public Information Centre will be held during this study to present and discuss corridor options. The City will also undertake supplementary consultation with parties that will be directly impacted by any designs proposed.

Regarding land uses along the new road link, the existing land uses between Pritchard Road and Upper Mount Albion Road, and between Highland Road and Rymal Road are agricultural and residential. The City of Stoney Creek Official Plan (April 2001 consolidation) designates the lands as service commercial. The future designations will be reviewed by the City as development in the area proceeds.

The City acknowledges your comments and reiterates that dialogue will be undertaken with affected property owners such as yourselves through the course of the environmental assessment study for the arterial road.

Your name has been added to our study mailing list and we will be sure to keep you informed as the study proceeds and future notices are sent out. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any further questions. Also, additional information is available on our project site at: www.hamilton.ca/ropa9.

As presented at the public meeting held on January 26th, we have conducted an extensive review of key roadways within the Trinity Neighbourhood, including 2nd Road West, Upper Mount Albion Road, Gatestone Drive, Whitedeer Road and Highbury Drive. We looked at the roadway designations (function e.g., local road, collector road), the posted speed limit, pavement width, presence of sidewalks, setback distances of homes from the roadway, and the existing traffic demand versus the appropriate capacity (the volume of traffic the roadway was designed to carry). The review explicitly considered the nature of the road, including the presence of schools and pedestrian activity. We also looked at the collision history for the roadways, and speed survey data available for 2nd Road West, and for Upper Mount Albion Road.

Key finding of this review, as presented at the meeting, are as follows:

- Traffic volumes on 2nd Road West, north of Gatestone Drive are above levels associated with the road class (local road) and design.
- Traffic volumes on Upper Mount Albion Road are above levels associated with the road class (local road), the rolling vertical geometry, and a very narrow pavement width.
- The road class and design of Gatestone Drive, Highbury Drive and Whitedeer Road (collector roads, with wide pavement width) is appropriate for the daily volumes experienced.
- Travel speeds is an issue on Upper Mount Albion Road, and high end speeds are being experienced on 2nd Road West
- Collision rates are typical for the road functions.

We also looked at future traffic conditions, and noted that there is also a potential that future development of the ROPA 9 lands will exacerbate the existing traffic conditions on roadways within the Trinity Neighbourhood. As a result, we concluded that solutions are necessary to address the traffic conditions we identified.

In recognition that the operation of the roadway system should relate to residents' activities, we conducted a detailed evaluation of a number of
where the traffic will be detoured), I don't think it makes sense and at the cost with school children in the area. I don't think it makes sense and at the cost with school children in the area. Suggestion: would it not make sense to use enforced signage i.e. Speeding - School Zone - with maximum fines etc. If it is prudent, I can start a petition and collect signatures. Parents in the area will be affected and will gladly sign the petition. We are talking about 30 residents vs. a whole neighbourhood. Please understand that my intentions are not based on the following: "However, petitions should not necessarily be a numbers game about the many vs. 30; but rather, about what is the safest decision for all residents based on all pertinent information." My sole concern is redirected traffic into a school community whereby hundreds of children walk to school every day. Closing off 2nd Road West at Fairhaven absolutely makes no sense to anyone in this area I am talking to, and it puts a greater number of children at risk.

As a resident of the area bounded by Mud St., Rymal Rd, Dartnall Rd. and Upper Centennial, I have great concerns, as do many of my neighbours, about the traffic flow which is about to clog up the arteries of our small community. We have lived here, on Bywood Crescent, for 27 years and have seen many changes, from the three small distinct areas know as phase 1, 2 and 3, to a sprawling metropolis of new homes and neighbourhoods. Some of the older areas such as Upper Mount Albion Rd. and Second Road West have issues regarding excess traffic. First Road W. got a lucky break having direct access to Rymal Rd. cut off, Second Road W. wasn't as lucky, however most of the homes on that street are new and they bought homes knowing that they were going to be subject to traffic, but at least the city widened the road properly. Unfortunately, the residents on Upper Mount Albion didn't ask for all the extra traffic and the city never widened their road to help the situation. We can't cut off all the access routes to Rymal, for the residents north of Highland Road, but the city planners can surely divert enormous amounts of new incoming traffic away from these "local access only" roads. There are no direct north/south routes through our neighbourhoods to facilitate traffic looking for a quick access from the Line or from the soon to be completed Red Hill Expressway to Rymal Road and the

options to address the identified issues. These options included: (1) Keeping the road network as is today, (2) Enhanced traffic control (for example, additional signage and pavement markings), (3) New road connections, and (4) Road closures. The evaluation included a number of factors, including potential impacts on area residents, and on schools (specifically Gatestone Elementary, and St. Mark's Elementary), with any of the four options in place. The results of this evaluation showed that a combination of solutions is required to address the Trinity Neighbourhood traffic issues. We therefore recommended implementation of the preferred solutions in 2 phases. The first phase would provide Option 2 measures (enhanced traffic control) on 2nd Road West, and on Upper Mount Albion Road. The second phase would include a combination of Options 3 (new road connections) and 4 (road closures). The recommendation is therefore that closure of 2nd Road West is warranted, but that this should occur in combination with a new road connection between Rymal Road and Highland Road (west of 2nd Road West). As such, closure of 2nd Road West would not occur until such time that another roadway option is available for traffic between Rymal Road and Highland Road. This will address your concern of redirecting traffic into a school community where hundreds of children walk to school every day. The information presented at the January 26th, 2006 Public Meeting is available for review on the City's website at www.hamilton.ca/ropa9.
new development area along that route. Drivers will not "GO AROUND" to Dartnall or Upper Centennial. They already cut through in huge numbers. This will only get worse.

In doing so, they are driving past three elementary schools, Janet Lee, Gatestone and St. Mark, subjecting these children to increasing amounts of traffic that could be otherwise avoided by having the Trinity Church Road extension completed to coincide with the completion of the Red Hill Expressway. It's the only way to get the traffic to flow directly from the Linc directly to the Rymal Road development area with little or no impact on the surrounding areas. It also diverts the traffic away from the children in the 3 elementary schools. It doesn't make sense to "plan" the completion on the Trinity Church Rd. extension until the year 2011.

I implore you to take this proposal back to city planning committee and have this issue resolved as soon as possible, especially if the Red Hill Expressway is to be completed ahead of schedule. If the road is being built anyway, please do it now to save the patience and tempers of the residents and probably at least one child, if not more, from being hurt from the onslaught of traffic which is about to bear down on these "back streets".

Thank you very much for having the meeting at the Salvation Army site to update the community on future plans for this area. I have a few questions before I send my comments sheet in.

1. Could I have a graphic of the now decided Karst lands?
2. Could you please send the graphic of the proposed route to bypass Second Road West and where Second Road would be cul-de-sac?
3. Also, with that, how would the new roadway be configured and signed? Would the City want to divert most traffic from Highland onto this new roadway or would it be a "T" junction? What would happen to the lands between the proposed cut off on Second (Fairhaven?) south to Rymal?

The information requested in items 1 and 2 has been provided.

In response to item 3, the details of the new road design, and of the closure of Second Road West, will be determined in Phases 3 and 4 of the Class Environmental Assessment for the study. Also, it is anticipated that Second Road West would be closed at Gatestone Drive and not at Fairhaven Drive. The properties with access on Second Road West, south of Gatestone Drive will continue to have access on Second Road West.

Culture and Recreation wishes to encourage that consideration be given to secondary commuter routes for cyclists and that they be identified outside of road allowances or at the minimum, protected from vehicular traffic by a barrier or buffer. Pedestrian routes should be considered as separate from cycling where possible to maximize safety.

Comment noted.

I live in the "Summit Park" area. Drive to and from work (Lower

Further to your recent submission of comments regarding this study, the following additional information is provided by our study team.
As presented at the public meeting held on January 26th, we have conducted an extensive review of key roadways within the Trinity Neighbourhood, including 2nd Road West, Upper Mount Albion Road, Gatestone Drive, Whitdeeer Road and Highbury Road. We looked at the roadway designs / function (e.g., local road, collector road), the posted speed limit, pavement width, presence of sidewalks, setback distances of homes from the roadway, and the existing traffic demand versus the appropriate capacity (the volume of traffic the roadway was designed to carry). The review explicitly considered the nature of the road, including the presence of schools and pedestrian activity. We also looked at the collision history for the roadways, and speed survey data available for 2nd Road West, and for Upper Mount Albion Road.

Key finding of this review, as presented at the meeting, are as follows:

- Traffic volumes on 2nd Road West, north of Gatestone Drive are above levels associated with the road class (local road) and design.
- Traffic volumes on Upper Mount Albion Road are above levels associated with the road class (local road), the rolling vertical geometry, and a very narrow pavement width.
- Travel speeds is an issue on Upper Mount Albion Road, and high end speeds are being experienced on 2nd Road West.
- Collision rates are typical for the road functions.

Also, as shown in Schedule A3 of the former City of Stoney Creek Official Plan, a collector road connecting Gatestone Drive and Winterberry Drive is planned. This planned collector road provides important future north-south connection between Rymal Road and Highland Road within the Trinity Neighbourhood. Upper Mount Albion Road and Second Road West were both planned to be closed as part of the Trinity Neighbourhood Plan adopted by former City of Stoney Creek Council in the early 1990’s. The City of Hamilton has recently initiated the Trinity Neighbourhood Land Use Review Study to update and prepare a future land use plan for the Trinity Neighbourhood. This will be conducted in recognition of the intended closure of Second Road West and of Upper Mount Albion Road, and construction of a new collector road to allow access through the neighbourhood. The collector road alignment study (currently underway) will be coordinated with the Trinity Neighbourhood Land Use Review Study.

Based on the results of the study conducted prior to the January 26th Public Meeting, we confirmed the need for closure of Second Road West, and of Upper Mount Albion Road. We recommended that the closure of Second Road West be implemented in coordination with construction of the planned new collector road in the Trinity Neighbourhood. We also recommended that the closure of Upper Mount Albion Road be implemented in coordination with construction of a planned new arterial road link between Rymal Road and Stone Church Road / Redhill Expressway. A study for this new arterial road is currently underway.

We are also working closely with the Hamilton Conservation Authority to ensure that a proposed new collector road within the Trinity Neighbourhood, will not adversely impact the Karst. The collector road alignment will have to avoid the Karst core area, which results in an alignment shift to the east compared to the original alignment shown in Schedule A3 of the former City of Stoney Creek Official Plan. A preferred alignment for the new collector road will be determined under a separate study which is currently underway. One of the key objectives in determining a preferred alignment will be to minimize impacts on not only the Karst and other environmental features, but also on existing residents. We have added your name to our study mailing list and will ensure that you receive any future Notices and invitations to public meetings. Please feel free to contact me if you have any further questions or comments.

Of the seven listed Alternatives given on the Trinity Church Conceptual Alignments Map, almost every resident of this road and these suggestions will be taken into consideration in the Trinity Church Road Class Environmental Assessment study.
members of the Trinity Church Road Citizen’s Committee agree that only Alternative 2 or a combination of Alternatives 2+2a or 2+2b would resolve and alleviate our concerns. Not only would it accomplish that, but it would also circumvent the problems of the congregation of Trinity Church located immediately at the intersection of Trinity Church and Rymal Road and its accompanying cemetery. These choices would additionally maintain the safety of church goers who must park their cars in the church parking lot opposite the church and then cross Trinity Church Road to enter the church to attend services and/or banquet and wedding events, etc.

Alternatives 2+2a and/or 2b would not only avoid the above complications, but would also more rapidly aid in opening up the core of the industrial park to the west where the development is desirable.

Thus, if the concerns of the Trinity community are respected, as we believe the Alternatives we have cited do achieve, then Hamilton’s future as it evolves, will do so more successfully and expeditiously.

Thank you for the information that you provided regarding land and road development in our neighbourhood. My husband and I appreciated your knowledgeable and thoughtful responses to our queries at last Monday’s meeting.

In your e-mail response to my initial questions, you indicated “the existing land uses between Pritchard Road and Upper Mount Albion Road, and between Highland Road and Rymal Road are agricultural and residential. The City of Stoney Creek Official Plan (April 2001 consolidation) designates the lands as service commercial. The future designations will be reviewed by the City as development in the area proceeds.” While we understand that the land and road development in the area is currently under review, we hope that you can clarify a few points.

1) Not all of the land between Pritchard and Upper Mount Albion and between Highland and Rymal was part of the former City of Hamilton. What are the current and proposed future designations for Hamilton portion of the land?

2) What are the current and future designations for the lands bounded by Paramount/ The L.I.N.C. and Highland, and by Pritchard

In reply to your recent e-mail inquiry, the following information is provided.

1) The lands in the former City of Hamilton are west of the approximate location of the proposed Trinity Church Road corridor extension. They are located within the East Mountain Industrial Business Park, which includes various types of restricted light industrial and commercial designations. The former City of Hamilton portion of your family's lands at 60 Highland Road are split into two equal portions each in a different zoning district. The western portion, closest to the Hydro corridor, is designated “Restricted Industrial (M-14 and M-15).” The portion just east of this, up to the former Hamilton boundary, is designated "Restricted Industrial - Commercial (M-12 & M-13).” Planning staff would be glad to provide a map and details to illustrate.

2) Planning staff can provide you with a map to illustrate these designations. For the lands bounded by Highland, the LINC, Pritchard and the former Hamilton boundary, the western portion is presently designated "Restricted Industrial (M-14 & M-15)” in the East Mountain Industrial Business Park approved plan. A Utilities (Hydro) corridor runs north-south through this area. The eastern third is "Restricted Industrial - Commercial (M-11 and M-12)."

For lands in the former City of Stoney Creek, between Paramount and Highland, west of Upper Mount Albion, lands are presently designated “Service Commercial” for the westerly third. The centre third is Neighbourhood Park in the south, and Medium High Density Residential in the north. The eastern third is Medium High Density Residential. These designations are all contained in the approved Heritage Green Secondary Plan, which is under review in this area. Due to the identification of the Karst boundary, the Trinity Neighbourhood portion of this Secondary plan is under review. North of Paramount Drive in this area is the Special Policy C area, which is designated for mixed commercial and residential land.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and Upper Mount Albion (both the former Stoney Creek and Hamilton sections)?</td>
<td>3) The future designation of the eastern part of your lands is presently Service Commercial, under the above-noted Stoney Creek plans approved in the early 1990’s. Yes, it is possible that this designation will change within the Trinity Neighbourhood land use review, depending on input from staff, property owners and the general public. Planning staff are targeting to have land use options for public review by June of this year. It is anticipated that a final land use plan will be taken to Planning Committee and City Council by fall of this year for approval, if all issues can be resolved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Assuming that the future designation of any of the lands surrounding our property is anticipated to be service commercial, as proposed by the Stoney Creek Official Plan, is it possible that this future designation will change? At what point in the review process will the designation be finalized?</td>
<td>4) Assuming that the future designation of any of the lands surrounding our property is anticipated to be service commercial, as proposed by the Stoney Creek Official Plan, is it possible that this future designation will change? At what point in the review process will the designation be finalized?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) At what point will public input regarding the exact route of the arterial road begin? What sort of timeframe is anticipated before construction on the arterial road actually begins?</td>
<td>4) At what point will public input regarding the exact route of the arterial road begin? What sort of timeframe is anticipated before construction on the arterial road actually begins?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We would be glad to speak with you or meet if needed to explain the land use designations further. Planning staff will forward copies of the relevant portions of these plans under separate cover. Should you have any questions regarding the land use designations, please contact: 
Vanessa Grupe, Senior Planner  
Community Planning & Design Section  
Planning & Economic Development Department City of Hamilton  
Phone: 905-546-2424 Ext. 1263

Please feel free to contact me with any further questions on the Class EA studies, or any general inquiries you may have.

We met last night at the meeting to discuss the land issues around Trinity Church. I just wanted to send a quick email to say that I was just devastated to hear what is being planned for the roads. I can't state loud enough how much I oppose the new road plan. In talks late last night with many of my neighbours we are going to start a campaign/petition to keep Second Road and Albion Road open and stop what I think would be a complete travesty in opening a new road behind my house, so that a handful of people who live on second road get a quieter street. I don't want to get into this right now, this is just a quick email to say that I and many others are not pleased with the current proposal. 

Thanks and I look forward to working with you on this issue.

Feel free to contact me at any time, and I invite you to my neighbourhood to see what this road would do to our community.

Thank you for your interest in this study.

As presented at the public meeting held on January 26th, we have conducted an extensive review of key roadways within the Trinity Neighbourhood, including 2nd Road West, Upper Mount Albion Road, Gatestone Drive, Whitedeer Road and Highbury Drive. We looked at the roadway designations / function (e.g., local road, collector road), the posted speed limit, pavement width, presence of sidewalks, setback distances of homes from the roadway, and the existing traffic demand versus the appropriate capacity (the volume of traffic the roadway was designed to carry). The study explicitly considered the nature of the road, including the presence of schools and pedestrian activity. We also looked at the collision history for the roadways, and speed survey data available for 2nd Road West, and for Upper Mount Albion Road.

Key finding of this review, as presented at the January 26th meeting, are as follows:

- Traffic volumes on 2nd Road West, north of Gatestone Drive are above levels associated with the road class (local road) and design.
- Traffic volumes on Upper Mount Albion Road are above levels associated with the road class (local road), the rolling vertical geometry, and a very narrow pavement width.
- Travel speeds is an issue on Upper Mount Albion Road, and high end speeds are being experienced on 2nd Road West
- Collision rates are typical for the road functions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Also, as shown in Schedule A3 of the former City of Stoney Creek Official Plan, a collector road connecting Gatestone Drive and Winterberry Drive is planned. This planned collector road provides important future north-south connection between Ryalm Road and Highland Road within the Trinity Neighbourhood. Upper Mount Albion Road, and Second Road West, were both planned to be closed as part of the Trinity Neighbourhood Plan adopted by former City of Stoney Creek Council in the early 1990’s. The City of Hamilton has recently initiated the Trinity Neighbourhood Land Use Review Study to update and prepare a future land use plan for the Trinity Neighbourhood. This will be conducted in recognition of the intended closure of Second Road West and of Upper Mount Albion Road, and construction of a new collector road to allow access through the neighbourhood. The collector road alignment study (currently underway) will be coordinated with the Trinity Neighbourhood Land Use Review Study. Based on the results of the study conducted prior to the January 26th Public Meeting, we confirmed the need for closure of Second Road West, and of Upper Mount Albion Road. We recommended that the closure of Second Road West be implemented in coordination with construction of the planned new collector road in the Trinity Neighbourhood. We also recommended that the closure of Upper Mount Albion Road be implemented in coordination with construction of a planned new arterial road link between Ryalm Road and Stone Church Road / Redhill Expressway. A study for this new arterial road is currently underway. We are also working closely with the Hamilton Conservation Authority to ensure that a proposed new collector road within the Trinity Neighbourhood, will not adversely impact the Karst. The collector road alignment will have to avoid the Karst core area, which results in an alignment shift to the east compared to the original alignment shown in Schedule A3 of the former City of Stoney Creek Official Plan. A preferred alignment for the new collector road will be determined under a separate study which is currently underway. One of the key objectives in determining a preferred alignment will be to minimize impacts on not only the Karst and other environmental features, but also on existing residents. We have added your name to our study mailing list and will ensure that you receive any future Notices and invitations to public meetings. Please feel free to contact me if you have any further questions or comments. I was at the meeting, (Trinity development) and the feeling was overwhelming against a new road: as follows “why build a new road to close down two others”: See my info forwarded to Vanessa Grupe. Always remember any study can bring out any conclusions (case in point) the same traffic department lowered the speed limit on Mount Albion road from 50km to 40km (back in 1990) that was also based on study data (at the time). The decision was overturned and the limit was raised again back to 50km: when everyone realized what a mistake it was. How about as a compromise: 1. Build the trinity church rd extension. 2. wait for the Red-Hill valley to be completed 3. Re-study traffic problems under the long term conditions. Please do not make another mistake like the politically motivated 50km–40km speed limit change: one of the most misinformation decisions ever. Building yet another road to satisfy a few unhappy
Comments | Response
--- | ---
people on First Rd, would be in the top ten for sure. | Use Review Study to update and prepare a future land use plan for the Trinity Neighbourhood. This will be conducted in recognition of the intended closure of Second Road West and of Upper Mount Albion Road, and construction of a new collector road to allow access through the neighbourhood. The collector road alignment study (currently underway) will be coordinated with the Trinity Neighbourhood Land Use Review Study.

Thanks very much for your information. | Based on the results of the study conducted prior to the January 26th Public Meeting, we confirmed the need for closure of Second Road West, and of Upper Mount Albion Road. We recommended that the closure of Second Road West be implemented in coordination with construction of the planned new collector road in the Trinity Neighbourhood. We also recommended that the closure of Upper Mount Albion Road be implemented in coordination with construction of a planned new arterial road link between Rymal Road and Stone Church Road / Redhill Expressway. A study for this new arterial road is currently underway.

I am a resident of Richdale Drive. I was at the meeting on January 26 2006. I was under the impression that the neighbors would be included in the discussions and decision making regarding the roads and construction in the area. I have just noticed on the web site that you are having a meeting regarding “ROPA 9 Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2” I was wondering why the people that live in the area are not being included in this meeting.

I will be forwarding this information to all the neighbors in my immediate area and would hope that this meeting is open to the public!! | Thank you for your interest in this project. The Stakeholder Committee was formed at the commencement of the Rymal Road Planning Area Class EA Master Plan study, to (1) provide the Project Team with an understanding of the public issues, (2) provide comments and concerns related to road and water/waste water servicing, and (3) provide feedback on alternative solutions and their impacts, so that these issues can be considered throughout the study process, particularly in preparation for the public meetings. So the role of the Stakeholders Group is to provide a community perspective on issues, planning processes and solutions, which the general public has been involved with at the public meetings.

Please forward any communications regarding this matter as soon as possible | The Committee is comprised of residents from the community, other property owners, developers, and Councillors Bruckler (Ward 9) and Mitchell (Ward 11). These focus group meetings are unfortunately not public meetings. However, all information is presented to the public at the public meetings.

Thanks in Advance | The focus of the upcoming meeting is to review the transportation Alternatives and Evaluation for the Special Policy Area C lands. There will be a second public meeting to discuss the Trinity Collector alignment in the Fall. Your name will be placed on the mailing list and you will be kept informed as public meetings are scheduled. Also, for your information, I understand that the Planning Department will be forming an Advisory Committee for the Trinity Neighbourhood Land Use Review and you may contact Vanessa Grupe (e-mail address above) if you are interested in sitting on the Trinity Neighbourhood Land Use Review Committee.

Thank you for your prompt reply. But I need to disagree with you regarding the Stakeholder Members they all appear to be members of council, City employees and staff from iTRANS. As a rate payers and Hamiltonian, I would like to think that I am a Stakeholder regarding this matter and therefore feel that these meeting should not be held behind closed doors.

As for what you said about a second public meeting, I was at the last | I trust this provides clarification on the matter. Please call me if you have questions.
Comments | Response
--- | ---
one and we where all told that "we are not here to talk about roads tonight" So if I missed a meeting where we talked about road alternatives please inform me of when it was. Also I noticed that on the web site you have placed the Newsletter for the month of April. You have a paragraph that says "Your Input" I have spoken to a few neighbors and they have not received this news letter yet either. Could you please tell me when I and my neighbor might expect to receive this?

I have reviewed the minutes of the meeting and the comments that you have mentioned and was wondering where the comments regarding actually closing Second Rd where and the opposition that was voiced by at least 10 people at the meeting.

I look forward to discussing this matter with you in more detail and perhaps with Mr. Bruckler.

Thanks again for your time

Other verbal comments included:

There is a need to look at the operation of the intersection of Rymal Road and Fletcher Road. The northbound left turn in the morning is impossible.

The truck route should be moved off of Upper Mount Albion and onto Pritchard.

Highland Road west of Upper Mount Albion needs to be upgraded and east of Upper Mount Albion it is too wide and needs to be restriped.

This comment has been forwarded to the City’s Traffic Department.

The City is planning to undertake a comprehensive review of its truck route network.

Comment noted and will be taken into consideration in the study.
5. SUMMARY OF QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dartnall Road should be an alternative to Trinity Church Road.</td>
<td>This alternative would not be sufficient to address the capacity needs with the North Glanbrook Industrial Business Park, and the closure of Upper Mount Albion Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where does the City stand with the Karst lands and the timing of this issue?</td>
<td>The lands have been transferred to the Conservation Authority. Another series of public meetings will be held for the Trinity Neighbourhood review. This review will study road patterns for the new roads. These meetings will likely begin in the Spring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the new road connection (Trinity Church extension) address capacity enough to allow closure?</td>
<td>As a point of clarification, several alignments will be assessed in Phases 3 and 4 of the Trinity Church Road Class Environmental Assessment. It will not be restricted to an extension of Trinity Church Road. When this additional connection is in place, Upper Mount Albion would be closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rymal Road widening should be extended to James Street.</td>
<td>An additional study will be done for the Rymal Road section west of this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Church Road is a local residential road. Do not want it to be a corridor, a collector road or an arterial road. Do not want truck traffic on Trinity Church Road. I have submitted sketches for a Pritchard alignment as comments to the 1st PIC.</td>
<td>Several alignments will be studied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the timeframe for building the new roads?</td>
<td>Phases 3 and 4 of the EAs ~ 6 to 8 months, detail design. It is likely a 3 to 5 year timeframe before implementation of the new roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will all development be halted for that 3 to 5 year period?</td>
<td>The City cannot stop development proposals from coming in. Each proposal is assessed individually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many stoplights will be put on Rymal?</td>
<td>This study assessed physical infrastructures, such as widening and new links. The City’s Traffic Department monitors the need for traffic signals. We can look at this issue if there are specific areas of concern.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What will be the speed limit of Rymal Road?

This was not assessed but can be studied. The posted speed limit is based on geometrics and sight distance. This would be studied during Phases 3 and 4.

Concerned that Phase 1 improvements will not be sufficient for the 3 to 5 year time frame. Upper Mount Albion had 2 rollover accidents in 2005. Would it be possible to close Upper Mount Albion Road and use Pritchard? What is the difference between the two streets?

It is uncertain that traffic would reroute to Pritchard if Upper Mount Albion was closed. Much of the traffic would likely divert to Second Road West and to Gatestone Drive. Traffic controls would be implemented if possible, but calming is not recommended on primary emergency services routes.

Could the primary emergency routes be rerouted to Pritchard?

The City does not designate the primary emergency routes. They are determined by operational needs of the emergency services departments.

### 6. COMMENTS PROVIDED BY THE HAMILTON CONSERVATION AUTHORITY

The City of Hamilton has been consulting with the Hamilton Conservation Authority regarding the potential new road alignments west of 2nd Road West, and impacts on the Karst lands. The following are the primary comments provided by the Conservation Authority:

- The adverse effects that development activities might have on cultural heritage resources, including built heritage, archaeological resources and cultural heritage landscapes, is a principal concern; any negative impacts on any significant heritage or archaeological resources would need to be mitigated by either avoidance or documentation.

- The Eramosa Karst Area of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI) is located within the Trinity neighbourhood and extends north and south of this neighbourhood. The Eramosa Karst is a provincially significant earth science ANSI and contains numerous diverse karstic features, including dry valleys, overflow sinks, sinking streams and a post glacial stream cave of significant length – the Nexus Cave. Provincial and Conservation Authority goals respecting this ANSI pertain to preserving its geomorphology and the hydrological function of the karst.

- The April 2003 Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) report (Earth Science Inventory and Evaluation of the Eramosa Karst Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest) provides guidance to decision-makers on how best to manage the Eramosa Karst and recommends certain technical studies that need to be undertaken as part of
development within the karst and its three main subareas – Developed Area, Core Area, Feeder Area.

• The Hamilton Conservation Authority has recently secured 60 hectares of the Core and buffer areas of the Eramosa Karst from the Province as part of efforts to preserve this significant resource.

• We have had an opportunity to review the Collector Road – Potential Alignments of the Class EA. Alternative 2, which traverses the Core, Buffer and Feeder Areas of the Karst is not recommended by our agency as it dissects some of the most significant features of the Eramosa Karst – the Nexus Cave and its feeder areas.

• Alternatives 3 and 4 appear to be more viable and appropriate than Alternatives 1 and 2. The alignments for Alternatives 3 and 4 avoid the Core Area of the Karst, the Buffer Area around the Core Area and some buffers around the surface streams feeding the Core Area. These alignments also traverse a portion of the Nexus Cave Feeder Area, the Developed Area of the Karst and part of the alignments avoid the Karst altogether.

• Studies, including detailed hydrological and geomorphology, are to be conducted to ensure that any new development does not adversely impact the ability of surface flows from the Feeder Area to continue to recharge the karst in the Core Area. The MNR report provides more detailed direction as follows,

“it is recommended that the Feeder Area be afforded a level of protection to ensure that:

1. the flows of the creeks into the Core Area are substantially maintained (i.e. stream discharge including low flow and high flow characteristics, and discharge response to runoff events)

2. water quality is improved (i.e. primarily a reduction in sediment load, since the sediment load is currently quite high as a result of agriculture), and,

3. protective measures are employed to reduce the risk of contamination of surfact streams by substances that would significantly impact the karst.

It is also recommended that prior to any development in the Feeder Area, development plans be reviewed to ensure that these objectives will be met. As well as expertise in civil engineering, reviewers should have expertise in environmental hydrology and geomorphology. A sound knowledge of karst hydrology and geomorphology would be an asset.”

• The HCA will be investigating this matter further in order to provide the City with more detailed information on the above-noted studies in light of the locations of proposed alignments. We will continue to work closely with you to find a solution to the traffic challenges in this neighbourhood while protecting this significant karst feature.
7. CONCLUSIONS

In general, the public was supportive of the recommendations. Copies of the comments are on file with the City.

The most common concern expressed at the public meeting and on the comment forms was the timing for implementation of the new road connections, and the potential impacts that these connections would have on other routes.
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Newsletter
A project Update Since Public Information Centre No.1 (October 3, 2005)

December 2005
As you are aware, the City of Hamilton is undertaking an Environmental Assessment for lands located on the south side of Rymal Road East (Highway No. 53), east of Trinity Church Road, west of Regional Road 56, and north of the hydro corridor, in the former Township of Glanbrook, called the ROPA 9 lands; and Special Policy Area ‘C’, an area bounded by Winterberry Drive to the east, Paramount Drive to the south, the new Red Hill Creek /Mud Street interchange to the west, and the Lincoln Alexander Parkway-Mud Street West to the north. The first Public Information Centre (PIC#1) for the study was held on October 3, 2005.

At that meeting we presented the need for infrastructure improvements (roads, water and wastewater) for the area. Many comments and questions were received from the public before, during, and after the meeting. As a result of public input, the study schedule has been revised to accommodate the needs of the Community.

This newsletter is to provide you with a study update since the first PIC, and on future actions to complete the project. **We would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your input to date.**

**Local Area Traffic Operations - Neighbourhoods Adjacent to Study Area**

A number of concerns were raised by residents of the existing neighbourhoods adjacent to the Study Area, regarding traffic operations in the vicinity of the ROPA 9 Lands. Discussions have been held with residents, and the City will be holding an additional PIC to respond to these issues. To date, we have completed the following key tasks in addressing the issues:

- Assessed the function and design of existing roads adjacent to the study area
- Analyzed the traffic volumes on adjacent roads, and assessed the need for traffic management measures, including road closures/realignments.
- Assessed potential traffic impacts that could be created with traffic management measures.
- Identified and evaluated potential traffic management options.

The PIC is scheduled for January 2006, and will present the findings and recommendations. A PIC notice will be issued in January providing details including date, time and location.

**ROPA 9 Study**

As a recap to the recommendations and plans discussed at PIC#1, the following are the recommendations for the Rymal Road Planning Area:

- Widen Rymal Road from Trinity Church Road to Regional Road 56.
- Widen Regional Road 56 from Rymal Road to approximately 900 m to the south.
- A new road link from Stone Church / Red Hill Creek Expressway ramps to Rymal Road (on an alignment to be determined).
- Travel demand management.
- Operational improvements, such as changes to traffic signal timing and phasing, localized roadway section and intersection geometric improvements, adding or changing turn lanes at intersections.
- Upgrade the HD007 Pumping Station and HDR07 Reservoir.
- Construct a new Sanitary Sub-trunk to Red Hill Creek Interceptor.

The PIC to present the design concepts for these recommendations will be held in the Spring of 2006. Responses to comments and questions received at PIC#1 in relation to the ROPA 9 Study will be provided at PIC#3.

**Future Actions**

- Conduct PIC No.2 - January 2006
- Conduct PIC No.3 - Spring 2006
- Prepare and file project Environmental Study Report

**Contact Information**

Christine Lee Morrison  
Senior Project Manager, Environmental Planning  
Public Works Department  
City of Hamilton  
320-77 James St. N.  
Hamilton, Ontario, L8R 2K3  
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext 6390  
Fax: 905-546-4435

Liza Sheppard, P. Eng.  
Consultant Project Coordinator  
iTRANS Consulting  
100 York Boulevard, Suite 300  
Richmond Hill, ON L4B 1J8  
Phone: 1-905-882-4100 ext. 5282  
Fax: 1-905-882-1557
Rymal Road Planning Area
(ROPA 9 Lands) Master Plan Class
Environmental Assessment

Newsletter
Special Policy Area ‘C’ Transportation Needs
# Rymal Road Planning Area

## (ROPA 9 Lands) Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment

### Special Policy Area ‘C’ Transportation Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction and Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As you are aware, the City of Hamilton is undertaking an Environmental Assessment for lands located on the south side of Rymal Road East (Highway No. 53), east of Trinity Church Road, west of Regional Road 56, and north of the hydro corridor, in the former Township of Glanbrook, called the ROPA 9 lands; and Special Policy Area ‘C’, an area bounded by Winterberry Drive to the east, Paramount Drive to the south, the new Red Hill Creek/Mud Street interchange to the west, and the Lincoln Alexander Parkway-Mud Street West to the north. The City has received applications for development of the lands known as Special Policy Area ‘C’. Upon review of the development proposals, City staff identified potential improvements required to City infrastructure to support such development. Given the proximity of Special Policy Area ‘C’ to the ROPA 9 area, and overlap of servicing, these lands were added to the study scope for the Rymal Road Planning Area Master Plan Class EA. The first Public Information Centre (PIC#1) for the study was held on October 3, 2005. At PIC#1, we presented the need for infrastructure improvements (roads, water and wastewater) for the ROPA 9 lands, and noted that the transportation and water/wastewater analyses for the Special Policy Area ‘C’ lands were being conducted, and that the results would be provided at a later date. This newsletter documents the results of the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area ‘C’. Given the coordination of the water/wastewater component for Special Policy Area ‘C’, with the on-going GRIDS City wide Water and Wastewater Master Plan study, it has become necessary to report the water/wastewater needs for Special Policy Area ‘C’, in conjunction with completion of the City wide Master Plan study. This study is anticipated to be completed in the fall of this year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Conditions in Special Policy Area ‘C’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The existing conditions for the Rymal Road Planning Area and Special Policy Area ‘C’ were presented at PIC#1. As a recap, the existing conditions for Special Policy Area ‘C’ are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing land uses in Special Policy Area ‘C’ are comprised of residential and agricultural uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residences are located on both sides of Upper Mount Albion Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No Environmentally Significant Areas (ESAs) or Evaluated Wetlands are located within the Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Land Uses in Special Policy Area ‘C’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application for redevelopment of the Special Policy Area ‘C’ lands are currently registered with the City of Hamilton. These applications are being processed through the City’s planning process. To date, proposal for redevelopment of the lands include the following uses:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General Office space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Large format retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Specialty retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low to mid rise residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Policy Area ‘C’ Transportation Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation analyses was carried out for the proposed land uses for Special Policy Area ‘C’. The analyses indicated that with the development of Special Policy Area ‘C’, travel demand will exceed capacity on Stone Church Road, at the Red Hill Creek Expressway (RHCE) ramps, at unsignalized intersections, at access to the site and for queuing on Winterberry Drive at Mud Street. Therefore, based on the results of the analyses, additional capacity will be needed on the road network in the vicinity of Special Policy Area ‘C’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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**Problem / Opportunity Statement**
Objectives (4&5) of the ROPA 9 Master Plan problem statement, as presented at PIC#1, states:
*Transportation solutions, which support Municipal Official Plans, are necessary to (4) better accommodate service for autos, commercial vehicles, transit vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists through the area, (5) manage traffic impact on local roads adjacent to the study area.*

Based on the analyses, transportation solutions are required to:

1. Ensure successful transportation service for Special Policy Area ‘C’, and the ROPA 9 area with future development.
2. Provide sufficient capacity and appropriate access to accommodate increasing traffic demands throughout the road network, and
3. Implement and time a road network strategy to ensure the success of traffic operations on the whole road network.

Objectives (4) & (5) of the ROPA 9 Lands Master Plan problem statement is intended to address the requirements outlined above.

**Identification of Alternatives**
To address the travel needs and the problem and opportunity statements, the following alternatives were considered:

- Do Nothing
- Transit and Travel Demand Management Initiatives
- Operational Improvements
- New major infrastructure and road widenings.

**Evaluation of Alternatives**
The following evaluation criteria were considered in the evaluation of alternatives:

- Effect on Transportation System
- Effect on Socio-Economic Environment
- Effect on Natural Environment
- Cost Effectiveness

A copy of the evaluation tables will be provided on the project website at: www.hamilton.ca/ropa9. For those without access to the internet, a copy will also be provided at the City of Hamilton office. For details on accessing this copy, please contact Christine Lee-Morrison (contact information provided on the next page).

**Recommended Solutions**
The following are the recommended transportation solutions for Special Policy Area ‘C’, in conjunction with Travel Demand Management initiatives, and a new north-south roadway between Rymal Road and Stone Church Road:

- Exclusive turn lanes at: Stone Church Road/Upper Mount Albion Road, Winterberry Drive/Proposed site access, Winterberry Drive/Mud Street, Red Hill Creek Expressway (RHCE) Ramp/Stone Church Road
- Dual southbound left turn lanes at RHCE Ramp/Stone Church Road
- Traffic controls (signals or roundabout) at Stone Church Road/Upper Mount Albion Road
- Widening of Stone Church Road to 4 lanes from the RHCE Ramp to Upper Mount Albion Road
- Traffic controls (signals or roundabout) at Winterberry Drive/Site access
- Extension of the existing northbound left turn lane on Winterberry Drive at Mud Street

It is necessary to coordinate development with infrastructure requirements.

**Your Input**
We request your input on the proposed transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area ‘C’. We have attached a comment/questionnaire sheet for you to complete. Please provide your comments by May 5, 2006.
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Special Policy Area ‘C’ Transportation Needs

Next Steps
We will review all comments and suggestions received from the public and agencies. Based on public input, we will:

- Confirm the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area ‘C’ (Master Plan EA - Phases 1 and 2)
- Identify Alternative Designs (Special Policy Area ‘C’ Transportation EA - Phases 3 and 4)
- Prepare a preliminary design for the Preferred Alternative (Special Policy Area ‘C’ Transportation EA - Phases 3 and 4)

Future Actions

- Prepare and file Phases 1 and 2 (Needs and Opportunity) of the Master Plan Class EA. It is anticipated that this report will be filed on public record in June 2006.
- Phases 3 and 4 (Design alternatives) for the Special Policy Area ‘C’ Transportation EA will be carried out upon completion of Phases 1 and 2, and will be documented under a separate report.

Contact Information

Christine Lee Morrison
Senior Project Manager, Environmental Planning
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
320-77 James St. N.
Hamilton, Ontario, L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext 6390
Fax: 905-546-4435

Liza Sheppard, P. Eng.
Consultant Project Coordinator
iTRANS Consulting
100 York Boulevard, Suite 300
Richmond Hill, ON L4B 1J8
Phone: 1-905-882-4100 ext. 5282
Fax: 1-905-882-1557

Project Website
For additional information and project updates, please visit the project website at:
Summary of
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1. INTRODUCTION

The City has received applications for development of the lands known as Special Policy Area ‘C’. Upon review of the development proposals, City staff identified potential improvements required to City infrastructure to support such development. Given the proximity of Special Policy Area ‘C’ to the ROPA 9 area, and overlap of servicing, these lands were added to the study scope for the Rymal Road Planning Area Master Plan Class EA.

The first Public Information Centre (PIC#1) for the Master Plan study was held on October 3, 2005. At PIC#1, the need for infrastructure improvements (roads, water and wastewater) for the ROPA 9 lands were presented. Information on existing land uses and environmental conditions were also presented for Policy Area ‘C’. It was noted that the transportation and water/wastewater analyses for the Special Policy Area ‘C’ lands were being conducted, and that the results would be provided at a later date. Given the coordination of the water/wastewater component for Special Policy Area ‘C’, with the on-going GRIDS City wide Water and Wastewater Master Plan study, it has become necessary to report the water/wastewater needs for Special Policy Area ’C’, in conjunction with completion of the City wide Master Plan study. This study is anticipated to be completed in the fall of 2006.

The newsletter therefore documented the results of the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area ’C’ and provided the public with an opportunity to provide input.

2. NOTIFICATION

A newsletter update was sent to those on the mailing lists, including property owners within the study area, individuals who had responded with an interest in the study since its commencement, conservation authorities, Federal and Provincial agencies, and utility companies, on Friday, April 21st, 2006. Members of the public were referred to the project website and to the City of Hamilton’s office by contacting Christine Lee-Morrison, to review the detailed evaluation tables. Contact information and the project website were included in the newsletter.

A comment form was included with the newsletter and the public was invited to submit their comments via mail, fax, email and/or telephone within a 2-week time-frame. Contact information and a pre-paid return envelope were included in the newsletter. Public comments were still received after the 2-week period.

3. NEWSLETTER MATERIAL

A brief summary of the existing conditions was also included for thoroughness although the information was presented at PIC #1 for ROPA. The newsletter documented:
- proposed land uses;
- transportation needs assessment;
- problem and opportunity statement;
- identification of planning alternatives;
- evaluation criteria for planning alternatives (members of the public were referred to the project website to view the evaluation tables);
- recommended solutions;
- next steps;
- future actions; and
- contact information.

4. SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

The questions asked and comments received via comment sheets after the newsletter was sent out are summarized below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing or Future Traffic/ Transportation Conditions in Special Policy Area “C”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My greatest concern is traffic noise for the residential area directly across from Policy Area C. There will be constant traffic noise 7 days a week all day. I am also concerned about traffic noise levels after 11pm when the planned theater lets out. Will noise barriers be erected to protect residents at 800 Paramount specifically?</td>
<td>The need for noise attenuation will be determined as part of the development approvals for Special Policy Area C. The City also has a noise by-law in place that limits noise levels at night.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Policy Area “C” seems to be covered adequately. You seem to think this area will be mostly commercial.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK (i.e. existing conditions as presented).</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (i.e. existing conditions as presented). We have enough traffic on Upper Mount Albion Rd now. Sounds like a good future plan.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not think that the traffic problem have been addressed yet. It takes a lot longer to get on the link and as a resident of 2nd Rd. W. we are getting all the bypass traffic and our road is not even on the map. We need to have a less densely populated road made wider and close 2nd Rd. and 53.</td>
<td>As discussed in the newsletter, a new north-south road link is recommended from the RHCE ramp to Rymal Road which will carry much of the traffic destined to/from SPA ‘C’. The closure of 2nd Road W was recommended at the second PIC for ROPA 9. The closure of 2nd Road W will be implemented when a new north-south collector road is provided in the vicinity of Gatestone Drive to Highland Road. The closure of 2nd Road W and details regarding the north-south collector road will be addressed during the Phase 3 and 4 EA study for Trinity Neighbourhood. An additional opportunity for public input will be provided for the Trinity Neighbourhood EA study (scheduled for the fall). A separate notice with details for this public information centre will be sent out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree with your recommended solutions for Special Policy Area “C”. Also Stone Church Rd should be widened from Winterberry to at least Prichard Rd. A stop light at Mount Albion and 53 is a must and lowering the speed from Nebo Rd. to 20 and 56 to 60 km would help.</td>
<td>Comments noted. Traffic signals have been recommended at the Rymal Road / Upper Mount Albion Road intersection as per the ROPA 9 needs assessment. The posted speed limit on Rymal Road will be reviewed in the Phase 3 and 4 study for ROPA 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regarding the intersection of Fletcher and Rymal Roads: In the past there have been a number of accidents and fatalities at this intersection. Vehicles traveling at the posted speed limit of 80kmh on Rymal Rd., make an entry from Fletcher Rd., very risky because the west-bound side is single lane. On Rymal Rd. this intersection is not well marked and drivers unaccustomed to this are not able to recognize the potential danger of incoming traffic. At certain times of the day there is a heavy flow of traffic on Rymal Rd. Taking into consideration that this area is immediately taken to improve the safety of this intersection and reduce the posted speed limit on Rymal Rd.</td>
<td>Our review of the collision history along Rymal Road (2001 to 2004) did not show any fatalities at the Rymal Road / Fletcher Road intersection, and only 2 collisions were identified at this intersection within the 4-year period. However, traffic signals have been recommended at this intersection as per the ROPA 9 needs assessment. This will provide a more safe opportunity for vehicles to exit Fletcher onto Rymal Road and vice versa. The posted speed limit on Rymal Road will be reviewed in the Phase 3 and 4 study for ROPA 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree that if there is going to be so much development in the area, it is critical to improve traffic conditions.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find the newsletter verbose and technical which makes for difficulty in digestion. This results in lack of attention. Is this by design or neglect?</td>
<td>The newsletter was intended to provide adequate information regarding the traffic needs and recommendations related to SPA ‘C’. Additional information is provided on the project website at <a href="http://www.hamilton/ropa9.ca">www.hamilton/ropa9.ca</a>. We would be happy to clarify the information with you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic in the area is generally poorly planned and poorly monitored. Schools are on main throughways, streets are too narrow for parking on both sides without causing unsafe conditions, cars park on the wrong side of streets, and speed limits and stop signs are not observed. We need better planning, better bylaws and better enforcement.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presently, traffic has greatly increased in the entire area. Roads cannot handle the flow. Roads are in poor condition. Without major improvements to all roads in the area surrounding Special Policy “C” chaos will prevail.</td>
<td>The constraints of the existing road infrastructure are noted. The road improvements recommended for the SPA ‘C’ area are deemed adequate to address future traffic demands. Additional improvements will be made in the area, as recommended at PIC #1 and PIC #2 for ROPA 9, such as the widening of Rymal Road, widening of Regional Road 56, provision of a new arterial road link from RHCE ramps / Stone Church Road to Rymal Road, provision of a new collector road link in the Trinity Neighbourhood, and closure of 2nd Road W and of Upper Mount Albion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the peak oil issue, Greenfield development may cease, making excessive roads and widening of other roads unnecessary. Also shipping of products will be too expensive to use truck transport. It seems that all this road planning is now premature.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not familiar with existing and future uses/developments in this area.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic signals are usually a good idea.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection at Pritchard and Mountain Brow dangerous when cars are going to parking lot to walk the Red Hill Creek path.</td>
<td>This intersection is outside of the study area for SPA ‘C’. However, your concerns will be forwarded to the City’s traffic department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You don’t mention Highland Rd. People drive at extreme high speeds. We need sidewalks; with sidewalks down the road you would allow people to walk to the Karst area on Mount Albion and a lot of joggers jog this stretch.</td>
<td>Highland Road is outside of the study area for SPA ‘C’ which explains why it was not mentioned in the newsletter. We will bring the issue of the need for sidewalks on Highland Road to the City’s attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ministry will not be commenting on Special Policy Area ‘C’ as this area is well outside of MTO’s jurisdiction and area of control, and Red Hill Creek Expressway will be under the City of Hamilton’s control and jurisdiction.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please minimize stop signs and traffic lights in the area. Too many now.</td>
<td>Comment noted. However traffic control where warranted will be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please close Second Road West soon!</td>
<td>Second Road West is outside of the study area for SPA ‘C’. However, it was addressed at a PIC held on January 26, 2006 for the Master Plan which presented the findings and recommendations of an additional study undertaken by the City to address similar concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Second Road West.</td>
<td>The study identified Phase 1 and 2 solutions for Second Road West as part of the recommended alternative solution. These Phase 1 and 2 solutions are described below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| There is speeding, running of stop signs.                               | Phase 1 Solutions
  Second Road West
  • Implement enhanced traffic control, north of Gatestone Drive to enhance the visibility of the stop-controlled intersections.
  • Implementation of physical traffic calming measures on 2nd Road West does not meet the City policy requirements, and is therefore not recommended as a potential solution at this time. However, the City will continue to monitor 2nd Road West for the appropriateness of physical traffic calming measures in the future, prior to any road closure. |
## Comments

I think that there would be positive changes to reduce congestion in the area especially with the upcoming development at Winterberry and Paramount.

The RHCE ramp to Stone Church must be completed BEFORE the development of “Area C” to minimize the traffic on Winterberry near the school zone. Extending the RHCE ramp at Stone Church to Trinity Church Road sooner than planned would also remove excess traffic trying to exit the RHCE and “Linc” to get to “ROPA 9” area.

I am not in favor of roundabouts on major arteries. This would be a better solution for First Road West than closing it to Rymal Road.

I do agree with your studies that all existing roads around area “C” need to be adjusted to take the new traffic conditions expected in the “future”.

## Responses

### Phase 2 Solutions

- Implement new road connections as soon as possible to provide additional north-south capacity
  - A new collector road in the Trinity Neighbourhood
  - New roadway from Stone Church Road / Red Hill Valley Parkway to Rymal Road
- Implement road closure on Second Road West north of Gatestone Drive
- Closure of Second Road West should be coordinated with construction of the new collector road

Infrastrucure requirements will be coordinated with development. The study (Phase 3 and 4 for the Trinity Church Corridor EA) to identify a preferred alignment for a connection between the RHCE and Rymal Road in the vicinity of Trinity Church Road is currently underway. A public meeting is scheduled for late June 2006. The project team is aware of the need for this new roadway.

## Potential Transportation Solutions Presented and Criteria for Analysis and Additional Solutions Not Identified

The connection between RHCE, Trinity Church Rd, Rymal Rd, and Stone Church Rd.

While your Newsletter is headed “Rymal Road Planning Area” it speaks exclusively about the issues involving “Special Policy Area “C””. I am more interested in “Rymal Road Planning Area”.

In that connection, I praise you for mentioning on page 3, right column, a new north-south roadway between Rymal Road and Stone Church Road. I suggest this be the straight connection between the existing RHCE south ramp and Rymal Road, flowing south into Trinity Church Road. – When will this new road be built and what capacity will it have? Thank you for your commentaries.

You mention dual southbound left turn lanes from Stone Church Rd. ramp off the Red Hill Creek expressway. I am still anxious to know in which direction the purely southbound traffic is going to be directed; towards Pritchard and through the Business Park or due south to funnel all traffic down the “residential” Trinity Church Rd. thus creating another Centennial Parkway nightmare.

I would prefer to see any new north/south road between Rymal and Stone Church to be located west of Upper Mount Albion Rd.

Use of roundabouts is sufficient unless traffic flow is expected to be very high level – then signal may be more prudent.

I agree since you think this Area “C” is going to be mostly commercial.

Roundabouts have been proven to be a safe and efficient form of traffic control. The use of roundabouts versus traffic signals at the two referenced intersections, is still to be determined.

Comment noted.
Comments

Please plan for sidewalks throughout.
Consider that Janet Lee School is crammed with traffic during morning and afternoon school drop-off times.
Please maintain or improve bicycle route access – there is no suitable route to get from east of Winterberry to the Rail Trail west of Mount Albion.
Finish road to Trinity Rd. first.
No comment. Proposals seem fine.

Been around Janet Lee school at dismissal time!! What is going to happen when you add the traffic from the business? Our roads are not wide enough to accommodate extra traffic. We need to have a direct route from 53 to the residential and from Area ‘C’ to Rymal (53), widened Upper Mount Albion to 4 lanes and make the densely populated area have slower traffic patterns.

I understand there is talk of closing 2nd Rd W. between Highland Road and Rymal Road. PLEASE DO NOT CLOSE 2nd Rd W., as this is a critical access from those neighbourhoods. I believe it is extremely important to keep 2nd Rd W. as a through street, or the traffic problems in Special Policy Area “C” will be even worse!!!! Blocking that access to Rymal Road would cause all kinds of problems!!!!

The city should really look into the corner at 53 Hwy and Swayze Rd. Where the new Walmart is and also at that corner, the drive thru and Tim Horton’s. Major traffic pile ups and the public trying to enter onto 53 Hwy. I see it everyday. It is a death trap for accidents. Needs stop lights.

Perhaps – but what else is new? I need some convincing that my input actually has value.
I think a shoddy political office in Hamilton still remains in power.
Your “solutions” are too numerous and too general to be of value. Without proper map reference it is difficult to “see” how your proposals work.
Why not provide proper map reference including current and known roadways (such as Red Hill) so that your solutions could be understood?
Widen Stone Church to 4 lanes from Winterberry to Dartnall Rd. Include dedicated turning lanes off Stone Church to Area “C”. Widen Winterberry from Mud to the Linc Exchange to 4 lanes with dedicated turn lanes into Area “C”. Widen Upper Mount Albion from Highland to Stone Church (4 lanes), widen Highland from Winterberry to Upper Mount Albion. Make Winterberry a one way street from Paramount to Highland. This gets a lot of traffic away from Janet Lee School and makes people go around.

There is a large volume of traffic in the morning around school areas, which will increase with NEW development, as parents are rushing to bring their children to school and then rushing to get to work.

Responses

Sidewalks are recommended on both sides of Stone Church Road and Winterberry Drive to accommodate pedestrians. We have also recommended a continuation of the bicycle route on Stone Church Road through the area between Winterberry Drive and Pritchard Road.

Comment noted.

Comment noted.

The constraints of the existing road infrastructure are noted. The road improvements recommended for the SPA ‘C’ area are deemed adequate to address future traffic demands. Additional improvements will be made in the area, as recommended at PIC #1 and PIC #2 for ROPA 9, such as the widening of Rymal Road, widening of Regional Road 56, provision of a new arterial road link from RHCE ramps / Stone Church Road to Rymal Road, provision of a new collector road link in the Trinity Neighbourhood, and closure of 2nd Road W and of Upper Mount Albion.

The closure of 2nd Road W was recommended at the second PIC for ROPA 9. The closure of 2nd Road W will not be implemented until an additional north-south collector road is provided in the vicinity of Gatestone Drive to Highland Road. The closure of 2nd Road W and details regarding the north-south collector road will be addressed during the Phase 3 and 4 EA study for Trinity Neighbourhood. An additional opportunity for public input will be provided for this study (scheduled for the fall). A separate notice with details for this public information centre will be sent out.

Thank you for bringing this issue to our attention. We will review this comment with the City’s traffic operations department and will include in the Phase 3 and 4 study for Rymal Road.

All public input does have value. As shown in this summary of comments, all comments are reviewed and taken into consideration.

Comment noted. A map reference was not provided due to limited space in the newsletter. Additional information is available on the project website at: www.hamilton/ropa9.ca. We would be happy to provide you with a map reference to clarify the recommended solutions.

Stone Church Road is recommended for widening from Winterberry Drive to the RHCE ramps. Exclusive turning lanes will be provided to SPA ‘C’ from Stone Church Road. Upper Mount Albion Road is recommended to be closed. The closure of Upper Mount Albion Road will not be implemented until an additional north-south connection is provided from the RHCE ramps to Rymal Road in the vicinity of Trinity Church Road. The road improvements recommended for the SPA ‘C’ area are deemed adequate to address future traffic demands.

Comment noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If public transportation were made more appealing to the parents and students, this would reduce traffic to a limited direction and better flow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If roads are being dug up, are gas lines going to be put in?</td>
<td>The installation of gas lines is dependent on the gas company. However, the City tries to coordinate appropriate construction with other parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer roundabout over light. Very good idea to extend left turn lane at Mud and Winterberry (not enough even now) northbound.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is imperative that the widening of Rymal Road to 4 lanes from Trinity to Upper James be implemented to safely alleviate extra traffic caused on this road as ROPA 9 expands, not just the residential aspect, but the vast commercial venues that will soon be part of that area.</td>
<td>The widening of Rymal Road to 4 lanes from Trinity Church to Upper James falls outside of the study area for the ROPA 9 Master Plan and will be addressed as a separate study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*These are not just my opinions. Since October I’ve heard the same concerns from many area residents, most of whom were not at the fall meetings and/or were not aware of my views on this matter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transportation Recommendations for Special Policy Area “C”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My backyard backs onto Stone Church – Upper Mount Albion Rd. How will noise and exhaust pollution be controlled.</td>
<td>The need for noise attenuation will be determined as part of the development approvals for Special Policy Area C. The City also has a noise by-law in place that limits noise levels at night.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How exactly would roundabouts work and control traffic?</td>
<td>A roundabout consists of a central island that can vary in shape. Each leg of a roundabout has a splitter island, a triangular shaped island, that provides a refuge for pedestrians, prevents drivers from making the “wrong-way” left turn, guides drivers through the roundabout by directing them to the edge of the central island and helps to slow drivers. Roundabouts work by making drivers move to their right as they enter the roundabout, go left as they pass around the center island, and then go right as they exit. The degree of curvature through the roundabout is what governs the vehicle speed. The tighter the curves the lower the speed. Roundabouts reduce delay compared to traffic signal controlled intersections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree. Please implement all of them.</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree completely. It needs to be done. I agree with the recommended solutions. I don’t have any comments. I agree with the recommendations because I feel it’s OK. I do agree with the recommendations. Yes, we do need changes to reduce congestion because this is becoming a high traffic area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish Rd. to Trinity Rd.</td>
<td>The study (Phase 3 and 4 for the Trinity Church Corridor EA) to identify a preferred alignment for a connection between the RHCE and Rymal Road in the vicinity of Trinity Church Road is currently underway. The design concepts for the roadway alignments, and a preliminary preferred alignment will be presented to the public in late June 2006. A separate notice with the details for this public information centre will be sent out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not agree because for years we were promised a grocery store and we had nothing. Now we have too much and are over serviced and stores will not be able to survive.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree with the recommendations because they make a lot of sense.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To my knowledge there is a light at Winterberry with left turn lanes at all 3 intersections.</td>
<td>Traffic signals have been recommended at the Rymal Road / Upper Mount Albion Road intersection as per the ROPA 9 needs assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Traffic Controls, I do not agree with the use of roundabouts. From the volume of traffic, existing and future, traffic signals would be the best solution.</td>
<td>Roundabouts have been proven to be a safe and efficient form of traffic control, not only for motorists, but also for pedestrians and cyclists. However, the use of roundabouts versus traffic signals at the two referenced intersection, is still to be determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundabouts do not slow traffic enough for drivers on Mount Albion to enter Stone Church safely enough and definitely no roundabout at Winterberry. Lights at both intersections ensure stopped traffic to allow crossing or turning onto Stone Church/Paramountsafely, especially pedestrians.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find riding a bicycle along with cars uninspiring. I like access to unspoiled natural land, which I don’t see much of in your plans. What I do see is marvelous design for maximizing monetary revenue and neglect for the natural environment.</td>
<td>Bicycle lanes are recommended on Stone Church Road to provide a continuous link between Pritchard Road Winterberry Drive and to the trail system in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better clarity is required.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People living in Policy Area “C” know best about their transportation needs and what is acceptable. I do not live in that Area.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally, I agree with the recommendations, however, if much of the development along main streets are commercial, traffic controls should be more extensive and accommodating (i.e. Tim Horton’s?)</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The idea of a new north-south roadway between Rymal Road and Stone Church Rd., I think is a good idea. This would take some of the traffic away from the existing roads. With more development in the area and more residents moving in, more roads coming in and out of these areas will be needed!</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

May 2006
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You are going to have people coming to walk the Karst area. Keep it clean looking, sidewalks, nice houses, gardens, planters in roadways. People don’t want to come to see a natural beauty surrounded by stores, highways, and office space. It does not give Stoney Creek a beautiful look.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, so close Second Road West.</td>
<td>The closure of 2nd Road W was recommended at the second PIC for ROPA 9. The closure of 2nd Road W will be implemented when an additional north-south collector road is provided in the vicinity of Gatestone Drive to Highland Road. The closure of 2nd Road W and details regarding the north-south collector road will be addressed during the Phase 3 and 4 EA study for Trinity Neighbourhood. An additional opportunity for public input will be provided for the Trinity Neighbourhood EA study (scheduled for the fall). A separate notice with details for this public information centre will be sent out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are many trucks, buses, etc. using Second.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep sending letters to keep us informed. Thank you.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no mention of the cemetery north of Mud St. West and West of Upper Mount Albion Rd. No provision for car parking for the cemetery. Another thing that bothers me is what is going to happen to the old blacksmith shop on Old Mud Street – north side. When Hamilton Wentworth Conservation takes over the sinkhole area east of Mount Albion Rd the space of connecting the new area to Mount Albion Falls area. Where?</td>
<td>This area is outside of the study area, and potential impact zone of the Special Policy Area ‘C’ development. We will bring the parking issue to the attention of the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It looks very nice on paper but this area is a lot more populate that it is on this map. This map is about 15 years old. It should show the true traffic problem and density of the area. Thank you for your valiant effort to inform the interested parties. Keep the newsletters coming. More importantly, get on with the actual work, rather than merely talking about it.</td>
<td>Comment noted. More current mapping will be used in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As per our letter dated September 8, 2004 attention to Mr. Peter De Lulio, we are strongly disagreeing with the entrance/exit on Paramount Drive. After reviewing the staff report dated April 25, 2006, we can see that entrance/exit will mostly be used by the Theatre customer which will have high traffic between 6pm to 12am and will cause noise and disturbance to the existing multiple residential area (RM3). Therefore we suggest removing the entrance/exit on Paramount Drive. Otherwise, the usage of Block 2 should switch with Block 4 and 5 (Appendix D to Report FED06137 – Page 12 of 12)</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would appreciate getting more information in the Newsletter. It would be better if all pertinent information was provided to facilitate a fully informed decision. Without proper reference maps showing what exist plus known upgrades, your newsletter has been quite successful – you have met the need to communication, but you have not provided meaningful information.</td>
<td>We apologize if enough information was not presented in the Newsletter. Additional information is available on the project website at: <a href="http://www.hamilton/ropa9.ca">www.hamilton/ropa9.ca</a>, or you may contact Christine Lee-Morrison at the City directly. We would be happy to provide you with a map reference to clarify the recommended solutions, etc..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write less and say more or else don’t waste our time.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By the way, I was on vacation in the Caribbean where I met many Ontarians who still know Hamilton as “the armpit of Ontario”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom line → Roads should be improved before my development takes place. Rymal Rd is a mess too. With Walmart, Summit Part etc. going in why is the road not being widened?</td>
<td>Comment noted. A widening of Rymal Road has been recommended through the Master Plan study. The Rymal Road widening design concepts will be assessed during the Phase 3 and 4 EA study for ROPA 9. An additional opportunity for public input will be provided for the ROPA 9 EA study (scheduled for the fall). A separate notice with details for this public information centre will be sent out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhaps nothing should be finalized until after the Nov. 13, 2006 municipal election. Then “needs” will not be as developer driven as they are now.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the time frame for these transportation issues to be implemented and the development timeframe for Special Policy Area ‘C’?</td>
<td>The study (Phase 3 and 4 for the Trinity Church Corridor EA) to identify a preferred alignment for a connection between the RHCE and Rymal Road in the vicinity of Trinity Church Road is currently underway. The design concepts for the roadway alignments, and a preliminary preferred alignment will be presented to the public in late June 2006. Once this study is completed the City would move forward with detail design and construction. Development timeframe for Special Policy Area ‘C’ will be coordinated with the infrastructure needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for the information</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your questionnaire only asks about what is OK for transportation. It does not open to proposal for land use?</td>
<td>The land use options for SPA ‘C’ will be addressed through the development approval process through the planning department. The lands south of Highland Road are being assessed through the Trinity Land Use Review through the City’s planning department. These neighbourhood plans are being updated with the latest Karst boundaries which have been transferred to the Hamilton Conservation Authority. The lands south of Rymal Road are part of the ROPA 9 development and will be developed as residential and ancillary commercial uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a lot of retail and office space use, not a lot of low to mid rise residential. There is already office space not used on Stone Church and Pritchard. What is going to happen with the land south of Highland and Rymal?</td>
<td>SPA ‘C’ is separated from Pritchard by the RHCE ramps, and therefore an access to this roadway is not feasible. One access is proposed on Winterberry Drive, two on Stone Church Road, and one on Paramount Drive west of Winterberry Drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The main concern is what ingress is planned for this property both from Stone Church (opposite the school area) and the part from Stone Church to Paramount on Winterberry. I believe the main access to this property should be from Pritchard area.</td>
<td>The study (Phase 3 and 4 for the Trinity Church Corridor EA) to identify a preferred alignment for a connection between the RHCE and Rymal Road in the vicinity of Trinity Church Road is currently underway. The design concepts for the roadway alignments, and a preliminary preferred alignment will be presented to the public in late June 2006. A separate notice with the details for this public information centre will be sent out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on the school (i.e. Janet Lee). Any potential impact from proposed closure of south leg of Upper Mount Albion at #53? Are the ramps off the RHCE (Trinity Church Road) now warranted? If so, where will they extend to?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please, Please!! Request police in area. Thank you.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With regards to the Rymal Road Planning Area, I think that we desperately need a traffic light at the intersection of Rymal and Upper Mount Albion Road. It is very difficult to make a left turn at this intersection especially with the development of Summit Park.</td>
<td>Traffic signals have been recommended at the Rymal Road / Upper Mount Albion Road intersection as per the ROPA 9 needs assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regarding ROPA 9 Traffic: Everyone knows the commercial aspect of the development will be large (a “Meadowlands East”). With all the traffic this will generate, compounded by the 3,000 extra homes (most have 2 cars), it is very irresponsible of the city not to consider widening Rymal Road to 5 lanes all the way to Upper James. The Linc is already over capacitated and more traffic is on Rymal Road as an alternative. The ongoing growth of ROPA 9 will only compound the East/West traffic problem even more.</td>
<td>A widening of Rymal Road from Trinity Church to Upper James falls outside of the study area for the ROPA 9 Master Plan and will be addressed as a separate study. The ROPA 9 Master Plan study recommends a widening of Rymal Road to 4-lanes from Trinity Church Road to Upper Centennial Parkway – Regional Road 56.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would rather see a “signal” than a roundabout at Stone Church and Upper Mount Albion Road. A roundabout would make this intersection a “raceway”.</td>
<td>Roundabouts have been proven to be a safe and efficient form of traffic control. However, the use of roundabouts versus traffic signals at the two referenced intersection, is still to be determined.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B.4
Minutes of Stakeholder Committee Meetings
Minutes of Meeting

Location: Hamilton City Hall 71 Main St. W. Room 110

Date: September 19, 2005

Re: Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands)
Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment
Stakeholder Meeting #1

1. Welcome
   Brief overview of objectives of the meeting:
   • to establish the committee;
   • to provide team with issues and/or concerns; and
   • to provide input on draft material for PIC #1

2. Introductions
   Round table introductions. Attendees are listed at the end of these minutes.

3. Stakeholder Terms of Reference
   Special Policy Area ‘C’ is not explicitly listed in the Terms of Reference. The Study Area map to be updated to include Special Policy Area ‘C’.

4. Explanation of EA Process
   Master Plan Class EA process allows the study to investigate several improvements. The study will fulfill Phases 1 and 2 for Schedule B projects and Phases 1 to 4 for Schedule C projects.
   
   The timelines are as follows:
   PIC 1: 1st week of October, 2005
   PIC 2: December, 2005
   Draft ESR: late January, 2006
5. Other Studies

Studies related to this EA include:

- GRDS (Growth Related Development Strategy)
  - City wide growth management study
  - Transportation Master Plan
  - Water / Wastewater Master Plans
  - Stormwater Master Plan
- Glanbrook Industrial Business Park Transportation Master Plan
  - Will address transportation needs to service the Business Park
  - Will address potential longer term transportation issues
- Hannon Creek Subwatershed Study
  - This study will be addressed as part of the North Glanbrook Studies
  - Just beginning and will be completed by the end of 2006
- Trinity Church Road
  - ROPA 9 Master Plan ESR will study Phases 1 and 2 of the potential extension of Trinity Church Road to the Mud Street interchange
  - The Glanbrook Industrial Business Park Transportation Master Plan study will study Phases 1 and 2 of the Trinity Church Road EA south of Rymal Road
  - Phases 3 and 4 will be studied in a separate EA for Trinity Church Road on the north and south sides of Rymal Road.
- South Mountain Master Plan
  - Undertaking the 5-year review of the Master Plan

6. Transportation Issues

Some residents are opposed to the traffic on existing Trinity Church Road and there is a proposal to have a “pig hauling” truck route on Trinity Church Road. The study will investigate transportation needs for Rymal Road, Trinity Church extension north of Rymal Road, and Regional Road 56 / Upper Centennial Pkwy.
The study will assess:

- Capacity needs of the arterial road system;
- Impacts of Special Policy Area ‘C’ and the ROPA 9 development on the area road network;
- ROPA 9 collector road system connections to the arterial road system;
- Alternative modes of transportation; and
- Road function, classification, appropriate volumes, and design criteria.

Concerns regarding plans for Upper Mount Albion were raised.

iTRANS noted that traffic control measures will be needed on Upper Mount Albion. The study will identify interim improvements that will be needed before the traffic control measures are put in place.

It was suggested that Upper Mount Albion should be removed from truck routes. It is currently a truck route, but is not designed for this. This could be an initial traffic control measure.

Concerns were raised regarding the collector road system which would service the Karst development area and how it could affect this study.

A separate planning study will be done for the Karst development area. The ROPA 9 study will be flexible for potential future connections to this development but will not rely on these connections. The ROPA 9 study will not be delayed by the Karst development planning study. Christine Lee-Morrison will contact Cathy Plosz for an update on the Karst developments.

Second Road West residents could be concerned with the potential connections and impacts to their neighbourhood and they should be included in the Stakeholder Committee. The closure of Second Road West should be considered. Phil Bruckner will provide Christine Lee-Morrison with names of potential residents to include on the Committee.

David Mitchell will provide Christine Lee-Morrison with the names of Trinity Church Road residents to be added to the stakeholder Committee.
7. Water / Wastewater Issues

The study area has storage capacity deficiencies and the pressures cannot be maintained with the existing pumping facilities.

The study area needs to connect to the existing trunk sewer system.

Concerns were raised regarding the inclusion of the improvements in the development charges. Christine Lee-Morrison will research this issue. Lisa de Angelis will investigate if the downstream needs are also included in the development charges.

8. Alternative Solutions

The evaluation of alternatives will be presented at the first PIC, including a summary of different alternatives, evaluation criteria, evaluation of alternatives, and a preferred alternative from a technical perspective. The public will comment on the technically preferred alternative.

Problem statement and alternative solutions were discussed. The transportation alternative solutions can be a combination of alternatives needed to address the problem statement.

Concerns regarding infiltration were raised. An additional objective, “to manage traffic impacts on local roads” to be added to the transportation factors. This will be reflected in the problem statement, criteria, and alternative solutions.

Concerns regarding the closure of Upper Mount Albion were raised. The Stoney Creek Council approved the closure of Upper Mount Albion in 1989. The Rymal Road construction that took place this summer caused a lot of traffic to use Upper Mount Albion as a detour.

The function of Upper Mount Albion will be assessed. iTRANS will reference standard engineering practices regarding typical traffic volumes based on road function as a method to assess adequate operations on local roads.

Coordination with the Silvestri properties traffic reports will be maintained for the ROPA 9 Master Plan study. Once the City has approved the updated report, iTRANS will draw from the findings. The City will
9. Alternative Solutions (Cont’d)

forward the updated report to iTRANS.

A separate map showing major and minor streets should be prepared for the first PIC.

The neighbourhood plans are not included in this study since they are no longer valid. They are currently being revised for the Karst area.

The water and wastewater options represent alternative solutions to address problem statement. Water conservation should be added to the alternatives.

The map, problem statement and alternatives are to be revised to include Special Policy Area ‘C’.

Concerns were raised regarding the location of elevated storage. It was confirmed that the elevated storage alternative would be a tower located in the ROPA 9 area.

Pressure will be addressed as a part of the alternative solutions to maintain the pressure within City standards.

The interim phasing of ROPA 9 development could trigger short-term wastewater improvements. The alternative solutions will address full build-out of the study area.

Concerns were raised regarding a potential subtrunk along Upper Mount Albion Road.

An existing outlet at Rymal Road and Upper Mount Albion was discussed. This alternative will be added to the list of solutions.

10 Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held in November. The committee members will be contacted regarding a potential date.
## Stakeholder Meeting #1 Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Agency / Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Rottenberg-Walker</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Urban Strategies Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Lee-Morrison</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Strategic and Environmental Planning – City of Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hélène T. Ellermeyer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic and Environmental Planning – City of Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Grimwood</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic and Environmental Planning – City of Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa De Angelis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Systems Planning – City of Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leanne Ryan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic Engineering – City of Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Systems Planning – City of Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavin Norman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Planning – City of Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Bacquie</td>
<td>Consultant Project Manager</td>
<td>iTRANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liza Sheppard</td>
<td>Consultant Project Coordinator</td>
<td>iTRANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathalie Baudais</td>
<td></td>
<td>iTRANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Atlin</td>
<td></td>
<td>XCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy Poon</td>
<td></td>
<td>XCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Bruckner</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>Ward 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Mitchell</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>Ward 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Cunningham</td>
<td></td>
<td>Citizens of Upper Mount Albion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Cote</td>
<td></td>
<td>FirstPro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Boznack</td>
<td></td>
<td>FirstPro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Laverte</td>
<td></td>
<td>Loblawls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don May</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adi Irani</td>
<td></td>
<td>AJ Clarkson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Splicer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelo for Jack Beume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting Minutes

Project: ROPA 9 Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment
Subject: Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2
Meeting Date: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 27, 2006
Location: Room 241 McMaster Facility 50 Main Street E; former Court House, City of Hamilton
Prepared by: Nathalie Baudais
Attendees:
Luis Ponte – Community Representative
Angelo Cameracci – J. Beume Real Estate
Joe Maziarz
Christine Cote – SmartCentres
Don May – Heritage Green
Paul Silvestri – Silvestri Investments
Adi Rani – AJ Clarkson
Councillor David Mitchell – City of Hamilton Ward 11
Councillor Phil Bruckler – City of Hamilton Ward 9
Christine Lee-Morrison – City of Hamilton Project Manager
Mohan Philip – City of Hamilton
Gavin Norman – City of Hamilton Planning
Vanessa Grupe – City of Hamilton Community Planning
Peter De Iulio – City of Hamilton Development Planning
Leanne Ryan – City of Hamilton Traffic
Tim Smith – Urban Strategies
Christine Hill – XCG
Ray Bacquie – iTRANS
Liza Sheppard – iTRANS
Nathalie Baudais – iTRANS

Distribution:
Attendees
Absent Stakeholder Committee Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Welcome &amp; Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>CLM welcomed the group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2 Round table introductions were made.

2.0 Project Update / Project Structure

2.1 CLM provided a project update, including the public consultation that has taken place to date:
- PIC #1 October 3, 2005
- Project update Newsletter December 20, 2005
- PIC #2 January 26, 2006
- Special Policy Area ‘C’ (SPA ‘C’) Newsletter April 21, 2006

At PIC #1, a number of concerns were raised by residents of the existing neighbourhoods adjacent to the Study Area, regarding traffic operations in the vicinity of the ROPA 9 Lands. A Traffic Study for the Trinity Neighbourhood was undertaken to address these concerns. PIC #2 presented the findings and recommendations of the Trinity Neighbourhood Traffic Study.

2.2 CLM explained the Master Plan approach to the Environmental Assessment.
- The Master Plan will fulfill Phases 1 and 2 of the Class Environmental Assessment Process for all the projects, and study completion for Schedule B projects.
- The Phase 3 and 4 studies for the Schedule ‘C’ projects will follow the filing of the Master Plan.
- The water and wastewater components for ROPA 9 and SPA ‘C’ will be coordinated in the City wide Water and Wastewater Master Plan as part of the GRIDS study. The completion for the City wide Water and Wastewater Master Plan is scheduled for the fall.

3.0 ROPA 9 Study Recommended Solution

3.1 LS provided an overview of the recommended solutions for ROPA 9, presented at PIC #1:
- Widen Rymal Road from Trinity Church Road to Regional Road 56.
- Widen Regional Road 56 from Rymal Road to approximately 900 m to the south.
- A new road link from Stone Church Road / Red Hill Valley Parkway ramps to Rymal Road (on an alignment to be determined).
- Travel demand management.
- Operational improvements, such as changes to traffic signal timing and phasing, localized roadway section and intersection geometric improvements, adding or changing turn lanes at intersections.
- Upgrade the HD007 Pumping Station and HDR07 Reservoir.
- Construct a new Sanitary Sub-trunk to Red Hill Creek Interceptor.
3.2 LS provided an overview of the recommended solutions for Trinity Neighbourhood, presented at PIC #2:

- **Phase 1 Solutions**
  - **Second Road West**
    - Implement enhanced traffic control on 2nd Road West, north of Gatestone Drive as phase 1 measures to enhance the visibility of the stop-controlled intersections. Work orders to provide left-hand stop signs and pavement markings have been prepared and the work will be underway shortly.
    - Implementation of physical traffic calming measures on 2nd Road West does not meet the City policy requirements, and is therefore not recommended as a potential solution at this time. However, the City will continue to monitor 2nd Road West for the appropriateness of physical traffic calming measures in the future, prior to any road closure.
  - **Upper Mount Albion Road**
    - Consideration of enhanced traffic control measures (pavement markings) for Upper Mount Albion Road as phase 1 solutions, appropriate for a rural cross-section.
    - Implementation of physical traffic calming measures on Upper Mount Albion Road is not consistent with the City policy requirements for PRIMARY emergency / fire services routes, and is therefore not recommended as a potential solution.

- **Phase 2 Solutions**
  - Implement new road connections as soon as possible to provide additional north-south capacity
    - A new collector road in the Trinity Neighbourhood (Karst feature limits many of the alignment options). In discussion with property owners along Highland Road for the alignment of the new road connection.
    - New roadway from Stone Church Road / Red Hill Creek Expressway to Rymal Road (alignment to be determined)
  - Implement road closure on Second Road West north of Gatestone Drive, and on Upper Mount Albion Road
    - Closure of Second Road West should be coordinated with the construction of the new collector road
    - Closure of Upper Mount Albion Road should be coordinated with a new north-south link from Stone Church Road to Rymal Road
3.3 Discussion regarding other innovative mitigation measures was held. Councillor Bruckler expressed particular concern with the time lag involved in the options.

Other potential mitigation measures will continue to be researched, but they need to be chosen carefully to ensure that the measures don’t create or aggravate problems in other areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>PICs Summary / What we have Heard</th>
<th>Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>LS provided a brief overview of the PIC comments heard to date.</td>
<td>Info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>LS provided an update on the coordination that has taken place with the Conservation Authority and stated that the coordination will continue throughout the process.</td>
<td>Info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>A discussion was held regarding the inclusion of the Water and Wastewater component in the City wide Water and Wastewater Master Plan. It was clarified that delays are not anticipated since the projects are advancing concurrently and the completion dates are in the same time frame. However, if delays occur in the City wide Water and Wastewater Master Plan study, the ROPA 9 and SPA ‘C’ Water and Wastewater components can be filed separately as a project file. Adi Rani requested to be apprised of the findings.</td>
<td>Info</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.0 SPA ‘C’ Needs Assessment and Public Notification

| 5.1 | RB provided a brief update on the Phase 3 and 4 studies for the various recommendations. The Phase 3 and 4 studies are proceeding and potential design alternatives are being assessed. Throughout the process, several comments were received regarding the timing for the Trinity Church extension. The Phase 3 and 4 for the Trinity Church extension is proceeding as quickly as possible. The next PIC for this study is scheduled for the end of June. The PICs for the ROPA 9, Trinity Collector, and SPA ‘C’ are scheduled for the fall. | Info |
5.2 RB provided an overview of the findings of the needs assessment for SPA ‘C’ and the recommendations:

- Exclusive turn lanes at: Stone Church Road/Upper Mount Albion Road, Winterberry Drive/Proposed site access, Winterberry Drive/Mud Street, Red Hill Creek Expressway (RHCE) Ramp/Stone Church Road
- Dual southbound left turn lanes at RHCE Ramp/Stone Church Road
- Traffic controls (signals or roundabout) at Stone Church Road/Upper Mount Albion Road
- Widening of Stone Church Road to 4 lanes from the RHCE Ramp to Upper Mount Albion Road
- Traffic controls (signals or roundabout) at Winterberry Drive/Site access
- Extension of the existing northbound left turn lane on Winterberry Drive at Mud Street
- It is necessary to coordinate development with infrastructure requirements.

5.3 A question was posed regarding the potential for traffic signals at Stone Church and the Red Hill Creek Expressway Ramps. The timing for traffic signals is being assessed and discussed with the City.

5.4 A discussion was held regarding the Trinity Church extension alignment options. Several alignments are being assessed and will be presented to the public at the PIC scheduled for late June.

5.5 LS provided an overview of the public consultation process for SPA ‘C’. A newsletter was sent out on Friday, April 21, 2006. The public was provided a two-week review period, which allows the Master Plan to be presented to Council in June. The Phase 3 and 4 studies will provide additional opportunities for public consultation.

5.6 A discussion was held regarding the potential need for 4-lanes on Winterberry Drive between Mud Street and the access to the SPA ‘C’ development. This will be assessed in detail during Phase 3.

5.7 It was noted that the issue of truck routes and truck traffic was brought up at the SPA ‘C’ development planning meetings.

5.8 A discussion regarding potential issues at the Rymal Road / Pritchard Road intersection was held. Councillor Mitchell stated that a 4-lane cross-section should be provided beyond the bend on Rymal Road, west of Trinity Church Road.
6.0 Next Steps

6.1 CLM provided a brief recap of the next steps for the process:
- Receive public comments for SPA ‘C’
- Complete Master Plan
- Present Master Plan to council in June
- File Master Plan report and issue notice of Study Completion for Schedule B projects
- Phase 3 and 4 will then be carried forward with additional public consultation
- Phase 3 and 4 Environmental Study Reports will be presented to Council, filed, and notices of study completions will be issued.

7.0 Other Items

One additional stakeholder meeting will be held for the ROPA 9 stakeholder committee.
Appendix B.5
Other Public Correspondence
Thank you for reviewing the attached Newsletter on the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area ‘C’. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area ‘C’. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them, by May 5th, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP  
Senior Project Manager  
Capital Planning and Implementation  
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton  
320 - 77 James St. N  
Hamilton, ON  L8R 2K3.  
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390  Fax: 905-546-4435  Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic / transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area ‘C’?

   [Input]

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional transportation solutions that have not been identified?

   [Input]
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area 'C'? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

   I DON'T HAVE ANY COMMENTS
   I AGREE WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS.
   BECAUSE I FEEL IT'S OK.

4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?

   - NO -

Contact information (Optional)

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Phone Number: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?
☑ YES   □ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Thank you for reviewing the attached Newsletter on the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area ‘C’. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area ‘C’. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them, by May 5th, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6930 Fax: 905-546-4435 Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic / transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area ‘C’?

   Please Close Second Road West

   Soon!

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional transportation solutions that have not been identified?

   Close Second Rd
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area 'C'? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

Yes, so close 2nd R.W.

4. Do you have any other comments regarding the Information provided in the Newsletter?

No, but close second.

Act. W.

Contact Information (Optional)

Name: 

Address: 

Phone Number: 

Email: 

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?

☐ YES  ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Thank you for reviewing the attached Newsletter on the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area 'C'. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area 'C'. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them, by May 5th, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390 Fax: 905-546-4435 Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please:

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic / transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area 'C'?

   2nd Rd W must close very soon!

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional transportation solutions that have not been identified?

   There is speeding, running of stop signs
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area 'C'? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

There are many trucks, buses, etc.

4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?

Please request more information in this area.

Thank you

Contact Information (Optional)

Name:

Address:

Phone Number:

Email:

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?

☐ YES  ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Rymal Road Planning Area (ROP A 9 Lands) Master Plan Class
Environmental Assessment Process

Special Policy Area 'C'
Transportation Needs

Comments / Questionnaire

Thank you for reviewing the attached Newsletter on the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area 'C'. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area 'C'. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them, by May 5th, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390 Fax: 905-546-4435 Email: clemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic / transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area 'C'?

   I think that there would be positive changes to reduce congestion in the area especially with the upcoming development at Whiteberry and Stuart-Panmure.

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional transportation solutions that have not been identified?

   No.
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area 'C'? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

Yes, we do need changes to reduce congestion because this is becoming a high traffic area.

4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?

With regards to the Rymal Road Planning Area, I think that we desperately need a traffic light at the intersection of Rymal and Upper Mount Albion Rd. It is very difficult to make a left turn at this intersection especially with the development of Summit Park.

Contact Information (Optional)

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Phone Number: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?

☑ YES  ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Thank you for reviewing the attached Newsletter on the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area 'C'. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area 'C'. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them, by May 5th, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N.
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390 Fax: 905-546-4435 Email: cleemor@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please:

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic / transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area 'C'?

The RHCE ramp to Stoneranch must be completed BEFORE the development of AREA C. To minimize the traffic on Wilsonberry Area the road work extending the RHCE ramp to Stoneranch to Trinity Church Rd. sooner than planned would also remove excess traffic trying to exit the RHCE and "hike" to ROPA 9 "area."

I am in favor of roundabouts on major arteries. This would be a better solution for First Rd West than closing it to Rymal Rd.

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional transportation solutions that have not been identified?

It is imperative that the widening of Rymal Rd. to 4 lanes from Trinity to Upper Jay into the implemented to safely alterate traffic. However, this would be ROPA 9 expanded, not just the residential aspect, but the vast commercial avenues that will come the part of that area.

* THESE ARE NOT JUST MY OPINIONS. SINCE OCTOBER I'VE HEARD THE SAME CONCERNS FROM MANY AREA RESIDENTS, MOST OF WHOSE WERE NOT AT THE FALL MEETINGS AND/OR WERE NOT AWARE OF MY VIEWS ON THIS MATTER.
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area 'C'? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

Roundabouts do not slow traffic enough for drivers on Mount Alpine to enter Strategies safety enough & definitely no Roundabout at Windermere. Right转弯 both intersections requires stopped traffic to allow crossing or turning onto Storrschurch/ Paramount safely, especially pedestrians.

Widening Storrschurch is good & addition of left turn lane on Windermere is good.

4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?

Regarding ROPA 9 Traffic: Everyone knows the commercial aspect of the development will be large (a "Meadowlands East"). With all the traffic this will generate compounded by the 3,000 single family homes (most have 2 cars), it is very irresponsible of the city not to consider widening Rymal Rd to 5 lanes (all the way to upper James). The lane is already over capacitated, & more traffic via on Rymal Rd will only compound the East/West traffic problem even more.

Contact Information (Optional)

Name: 
Address: 
Phone Number: 
Email: 

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?
☐ YES ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Thank you for reviewing the attached Newsletter on the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area ‘C’. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area ‘C’. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them, by May 5th, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390 Fax: 905-546-4435 Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

---

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic / transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area ‘C’?
   
   - please minimize stop signs & traffic lights in the area
   - too many now

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional transportation solutions that have not been identified?
   
   - prefer roundabout over light
   - very good idea to extend left turn lane @ Waida & Wintereary (not enough even now) Northbound
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area 'C'? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?

- Impact on the School (i.e. Janet Lee)

- Any potential impact from proposed closure of South Leg of Upper Mt Atherton #53?

- Are the ramps off the RHCE (Trinity Church Rd) now warranted? If so, where will they extend to?

________________________________________________________________________

Contact Information (Optional)

Name:

Address:

Phone Number:

Email:

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?

☐ YES ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Thank you for reviewing the attached Newsletter on the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area ‘C’. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area ‘C’. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them, by May 5th, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390 Fax: 905-546-4435 Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic/transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area ‘C’?

   Traffic signals are usually a good idea.

   

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional transportation solutions that have not been identified?

   There is a large volume of traffic in the morning around school areas, which will increase with new development, as parents are rushing to bring their children to school and then rushing to get to work. If public transportation were made more appealing to the parents and students, this would reduce traffic to a limited direction and better flow.
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area ‘C’? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

The idea of a new north–south roadway between Rymal Road and Stone Church Rd., I think is a good idea. This would take some of the traffic away from the existing roads. With more development in the area and more residents moving in, more roads coming in and out of these areas will be needed.

4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?

Thank you for the information.

Contact Information (Optional)

Name: [Redacted]

Address: [Redacted]

Phone Number: [Redacted]

Email: [Redacted]

Would you like to be added to our RDPA 9 Lands mailing list?

☐ YES  ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Thank you for reviewing the attached Newsletter on the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area 'C'. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area 'C'. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them, by May 5th, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390 Fax: 905-546-4435 Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic / transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area 'C'?

Intersection at Fitchard & Mountain Brown dangerous when cars are going to parking lot to walk the Red Hill Creek path.

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional transportation solutions that have not been identified?
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area 'C'? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

Contact Information (Optional)

Name:

Address:

Phone Number:

Email:

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?

☐ YES ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic / transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area ‘C’?

   You don't mention Highland Rd
   People drive at extreme high speeds
   We need sidewalks
   With sidewalks down the road you would allow people to walk to the karst area on Mount Albion & allow joggers to jog this stretch

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional transportation solutions that have not been identified?

   If roads are being dug up, are gas lines going to put in
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area 'C'? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

You are going to have people coming to walk the busiest area. Keep it clean looking sidewalks, nice houses, gardens, planters in road ways...

People don't want to come to see a neutral beauty surrounded by stores, highways, office space. It does give Stony Creek a beautiful look.

4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?

You questionnaire only ask about what is on for transportation. It does not open to proposal for land use.

There is a lot of retail & office space, use not a lot of low to mid rise. Residential. There already office space not used on Stone Church.

What is going to happen with the land south of highland to kymulog?

Contact Information (Optional)

Name: __________________________

Address: ________________________

Phone Number: _________________

Email: __________________________

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?

☑ YES I think I am? ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Special Policy Area ‘C’
Transportation Needs

Comments / Questionnaire

Thank you for reviewing the attached Newsletter on the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area ‘C’. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area ‘C’. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them, by May 5th, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390  Fax: 905-546-4435  Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic / transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area ‘C’?

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional transportation solutions that have not been identified?
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area 'C'? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

[Blank lines]

4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?

The main concern is what ingress is planned for the property both from Stone Church (opposite school area) and the part from Stone Church to Paramount on Winterberg.

I believe the main access to this property should be from Ritchard area.

[Blank lines]

Contact Information (Optional)

Name: [Redacted]

Address: [Redacted]

Phone Number: [Redacted]

Email: [Redacted]

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?

☐ YES ☒ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA)
Environmental Assessment

Special Policy
Transportation Needs

Comments / Questionnaire

Thank you for reviewing the attached Newsletter on the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area ‘C’. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area ‘C’. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them by May 5th, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3,
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 8390 Fax: 905-546-4435 Email: clemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic/transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area ‘C’?

The Ministry will not be commenting on Special Policy Area ‘C’ as this area is well outside of MTO’s jurisdiction and area of control, and Red Hill Creek Expressway will be under the City of Hamilton’s control and jurisdiction.

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional transportation solutions that have not been identified?

No
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area 'C'? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

NO - SEE COMMENTS UNDER 1.

4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?

NO

Contact information (Optional)

Name: Greg Roszler, Project Manager
Address: MTO, Corridor Management Section
1201 Wilson Ave., Downsview

Phone Number: (416) 235-5124

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?

☐ YES ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Special Policy Area ‘C’
Transportation Needs

Comments / Questionnaire

Thank you for reviewing the attached Newsletter on the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area ‘C’. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area ‘C’. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them, by May 5th, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390 Fax: 905-546-4435 Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic / transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area ‘C’?

   * My greatest concern is traffic noise. It goes for the residential area directly across from Policy Area 3. There will be constant traffic noise 7 days a week all day. I am also concerned about traffic noise levels after 10pm when the planned theatre lets out. Will noise barriers be erected to protect residents at 320 James Road specifically?

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional transportation solutions that have not been identified?
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area 'C'? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

My back yard backs onto Stoney Church. When Mount Allman Rd. was built, noise and exhaust pollution are being controlled. How exactly would sound about work and control traffic?

4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?

Contact Information (Optional)
Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Phone Number: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?
☐ YES  ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Thank you for reviewing the attached Newsletter on the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area 'C'. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area 'C'. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them, by May 5th, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390 Fax: 905-546-4435 Email: cloemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic / transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area 'C'?

   Special Policy Area 'C' seems to be crowded adequately. You seem to think this area well full mostly commercial.

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional transportation solutions that have not been identified?

   The connection between Rymal Rd and Trinity Church Rd.
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area ‘C’? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

I agree since you think the area going to be mostly commercial.

4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?

There is no mention of the cemetery. Also, no provision for dealing with the cemetery. Another thing that bothers me is what is going to happen to the old blacksmith's shop or the old church. They need some thought about. Would you want anything preserved? I would think about preserving the church.

Contact Information (Optional)

Name: [redacted]
Address: [redacted]
Phone Number: [redacted]
Email: [redacted]

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?

☐ YES  ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for up to two years following this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands) Master Plan Class
Environmental Assessment Process

Hamilton

Special Policy Area ‘C’
Transportation Needs

Comments / Questionnaire

Thank you for reviewing the attached Newsletter on the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area
‘C’. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area ‘C’. It
would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them, by May 5th,
2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390 Fax: 905-546-4435 Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic / transportation
conditions in the area of Special Policy Area ‘C’?

NO COMMENTS

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented
and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional
transportation solutions that have not been identified?

NO COMMENTS
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area 'C'? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

   NO COMMENTS

   I AGREE

4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?

   NO

Contact Information (Optional)

Name:

Address:

Phone Number:

Email:

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?

☐ YES  ☒ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands) Master Plan Class
Environmental Assessment Process

Special Policy Area ‘C’
Transportation Needs

Comments / Questionnaire

Thank you for reviewing the attached Newsletter on the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area ‘C’. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area ‘C’. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them, by May 5th, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390 Fax: 905-546-4435 Email: cleemon@hamilton.ca

---

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic / transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area ‘C’?

   OK.

   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional transportation solutions that have not been identified?

   Please plan for sidewalks throughout.
   Consider that John Lee School is adjacent with traffic during morning & afternoon school dropoff times.
   Please maintain or improve bicycle route access – there is no suitable route to get from east of Winterburn to the Rail Trail west of Mt. Albion
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area 'C'? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

Please implement all of them.

4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?

Contact Information (Optional)

Name: [redacted]

Address: [redacted]

Phone Number: [redacted]

Email: [redacted]

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?

✓ YES  ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Special Policy Area ‘C’
Transportation Needs

Comments / Questionnaire

Thank you for reviewing the attached Newsletter on the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area ‘C’. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area ‘C’. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them, by May 5th, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6380 Fax: 905-546-4435 Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic / transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area ‘C’?

   [Handwritten response: Yes, heavy traffic growth]

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional transportation solutions that have not been identified?

   [Handwritten response: Final read to Trust #1 July]
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area 'C'? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

[Handwritten text]

4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?

[Handwritten text]

Contact Information (Optional)

Name: [Handwritten text]

Address: [Handwritten text]

Phone Number: [Handwritten text]

Email: [Handwritten text]

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?

☐ YES  ☐ NO

To fulfill Environments! Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Thank you for reviewing the attached newsletter on the transportation needs for Special Policy Area 'C'. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area 'C'. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them, by May 5th, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390  Fax: 905-546-4435  Email: clecmorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic/transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area 'C'?

   Sounds as a good future plan.

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional transportation solutions that have not been identified?

   No comment. Proposals seem fine.
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area 'C'? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

I agree completely. It needs to be done.

4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?

Keep sending letters to keep us informed. Thank you.

Contact Information (Optional)

Name: [redacted]

Address: [redacted]

Phone Number: [redacted]

Email: [redacted]

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?

☐ YES  ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Special Policy Area ‘C’
Transportation Needs

Comments / Questionnaire

Thank you for reviewing the attached Newsletter on the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area ‘C’. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area ‘C’. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them, by May 5th, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON  L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-548-2424 ext. 6390  Fax: 905-548-4435  Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic / transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area ‘C’?

   I do not think the traffic problem has been addressed yet. It takes a lot longer to get on the belt, and as a resident of 2nd St. north, we are getting all the extra traffic and our road is not even on the map. We need to have a less dense city population more made wider and house 2nd Rd # 53.

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional transportation solutions that have not been identified?

   Near around Janet Lee school at dismissal time it becomes a disaster when you add the traffic from the business.
   Our roads are not wide enough to accommodate extra traffic. We need to have a direct north to the residence road from 2nd to Rymal and widen 1st to a lower traffic pattern.
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area 'C'? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

I do not agree. For years we were promised a grocery store and we had nothing. Now we have too much and we can never go. Small stores will not last.

4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?

It looks very nice on paper but this area is a lot more popular than it is on this map. The map is about 10 years old. Maybe it should show the true traffic problem and density of area.

Contact Information (Optional)

Name: ____________________________

Address: ____________________________

Phone Number: ________________________

Email: ______________________________

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?

☑ YES ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands) Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment Process

Special Policy Area 'C'
Transportation Needs
Comments / Questionnaire

Thank you for reviewing the attached Newsletter on the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area 'C'. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area 'C'. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them, by May 5th, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext 6380 Fax: 905-546-4435 Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic / transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area 'C'?

I AGREE WITH YOUR RECOMMENDED SOLUTIONS
FOR SPECIAL POLICY AREA 'C'

ALSO

STONE CHURCH RD SHOULD BE WIDENED
FROM WINTERBERRY TO AT LEAST
FRITCHARD RD.

A STOP SIGN AT MT ALBIONA IS A MUST
AND LOWERING THE SPEED FROM 60MPH
TO 40MPH TO 60MPH WOULD HELP.

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional transportation solutions that have not been identified?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area 'C'? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Contact Information (Optional)

Name:

Address:

Phone Number:

Email:

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?

☑ YES  ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands) Master Plan Class
Environmental Assessment Process

Special Policy Area 'C'
Transportation Needs

Comments / Questionnaire

Thank you for reviewing the attached Newsletter on the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area 'C'. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area 'C'. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them, by May 5th, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390 Fax: 905-546-4435 Email: clemmott@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please:

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic/transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area 'C'?

Regarding the intersection of Fletcher and Rymal Roads: In the past there have been a number of accidents and fatalities at this intersection. Vehicles traveling at the posted speed limit of 80KMH on Rymal Rd., make an entry from Fletcher Rd., very risky because the west-bound side is single lane.

On Rymal Rd. this intersection is not well marked and drivers unaccustomed to this area are not able to recognize the potential danger of incoming traffic. At certain times of the day there is a heavy flow of traffic on Rymal Rd. Taking into consideration that this area is prone to winter white-outs and dense fog, I feel that appropriate measures should be immediately taken to improve the safety of this intersection and reduce the posted speed limit on Rymal Rd.

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional transportation solutions that have not been identified?
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area 'C'? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.


4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?


Contact Information (Optional):
Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Phone Number: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]

Would you like to be added to our ROPA & Lands mailing list?
☐ YES ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Thank you for reviewing the attached Newsletter on the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area 'C'. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area 'C'. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them, by May 5th, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP  
Senior Project Manager  
Capital Planning and Implementation  
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton  
320 - 77 James St. N  
Hamilton, ON, L8R 2K3  
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390 Fax: 905-546-4435. Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic / transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area ‘C’?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional transportation solutions that have not been identified?

While your Newsletter is headed "Rymal Road Planning Area"

it speaks exclusively about the issues involving "Special Policy Area 'C'". I am more interested in the "Rymal Road Planning Area".

In that connection, I praise you for mentioning on page 3, right column, ...a new north-south roadway between Rymal Road and Stone Church Road. I suggest, this be the straight connection between the existing RHCE south ramp and Rymal Road, flowing south into Trinity Church Road. - When will this new road be built and what capacity will it have?

Thank you for your commentaries.
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area 'C'? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?

Thank you for your valiant effort to inform the interested parties. Keep the newsletters coming. More importantly, get on with the actual work, rather than merely talking about it.

Contact Information (Optional)

Name: 
Address: 
Phone Number: 
Email: 

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?
☐ YES ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

RECEIVED MAY 02 2006
Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands) Master Plan Class
Environmental Assessment Process

Special Policy Area ‘C’
Transportation Needs

Comments / Questionnaire

Thank you for reviewing the attached Newsletter on the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area ‘C’. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area ‘C’. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them, by May 5th, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390 Fax: 905-546-4435 Email: clemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic / transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area ‘C’?

   Please see attachment

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional transportation solutions that have not been identified?

   ___________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________
As per our letter dated September 8, 2004 attn to Mr. Peter DeLujo, we are strongly disagreeing with the entrance/exit on Paramount Drive.

After reviewing the staff report dated April 25, 2006, we can see that entrance/exit will mostly be used by the Theater customer which will have high traffic between 6pm to 12am and will cause noise and disturbance to the existing multiple residential area (RM3). Therefore we suggest removing the entrance/exit on Paramount Drive. Otherwise, the usage of Block 2 should switch with Block 4 & 5 (Appendix D to Report PED06137 – Page 12 of 12).
Appendix "D" to Report PED08137 (Page 12 of 12)

This is Schedule "A" to By-Law No. 06-

Pursuant to the__ day of ____________, 20__

---

Schedule "A"

Map Forming Part of
By-Law No. 06--

to Amend By-Law No. 3682-92

Subject Property

Linen to be removed from the Neighbourhood Development "ND" Zone for:

- Block 1 - Community Shopping Centre (Hosting) "CC2-20(HI)" Zone
- Block 2 - Neighbourhood Shopping Centre (Hosting) "GC1-3(H)" Zone
- Block 3 - Mixed Use Commercial (Hosting) "NUC-1(H)" Zone
- Block 4 - Multiple Residential (Hosting) "RM0-27(H)" Zone
- Block 5 - Multiple Residential (Hosting) "RM4-6(H)" Zone
- Block 6 - Open Space "OS" Zone

Scale:
Not to Scale

Date: April 26, 2016

Planning and Economic Development Department
Hamilton
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area 'C'? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Contact Information (Optional)
Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Phone Number: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?
☑ YES ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Thank you for reviewing the attached Newsletter on the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area ‘C’. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area ‘C’. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them, by May 5th, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390 Fax: 905-546-4435 Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic / transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area ‘C’?

   I agree that if there is going to be so much development in the area, it is critical to improve traffic conditions.

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional transportation solutions that have not been identified?

   I understand that is talk of closing 2nd Rd W between Highland Road and Rymal Road. PLEASE do NOT close 2nd Rd W, as this is a critical access from those neighborhoods. I believe it is extremely important to keep 2nd Rd W open as a through street for the traffic problems in Special Policy Area ‘C’ will be eaten up!!! Blocking that access to Rymal Rd would cause all kinds of problems!!!
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area ‘C’? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Contact Information (Optional)
Name: ________________________________________________________________
Address: ______________________________________________________________
Phone Number: ___________________________________________________________
Email: _________________________________________________________________

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?
☐ YES  ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Special Policy Area 'C' Transportation Needs

Comments / Questionnaire

Thank you for reviewing the attached Newsletter on the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area 'C'. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area 'C'. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them, by May 5th, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390 Fax: 905-546-4435 Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic / transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area 'C'?

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional transportation solutions that have not been identified?

The city should really look into the corner of 57 Huny Swaize Rd. where the new wall exists and also at that corner the drive thru at Tim Hortons. More traffic for fans and the public trying to enter onto 53 Huny. I see it every day. It is a death trap for children needs stop lights.
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area 'C'? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.


4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?


Contact Information (Optional)
Name: ________________________________
Address: ____________________________________________


Phone Number: ____________________________
Email: ____________________________

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?
☐ YES  ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Thank you for reviewing the attached Newsletter on the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area ‘C’. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area ‘C’. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them, by May 5th, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390 Fax: 905-546-4435 Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic / transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area ‘C’?

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional transportation solutions that have not been identified?
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area 'C'? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

I AGREE WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS BECAUSE THEY MAKE A LOT OF SENSE

TO MY KNOWLEDGE THERE IS A SIGN AT WINTER BERRY WITH LEFT TURN LANES AT ALL 3 INTERSECTIONS.

A SIGN AT MT. ALBION & 53 WOULD BE A BIG HELP

4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?

Contact Information (Optional)

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]

Phone Number: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?

☑ YES ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Thank you for reviewing the attached Newsletter on the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area 'C'. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area 'C'. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them, by May 5th, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone 905-546-2424 ext. 6390 Fax: 905-546-4435 Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic / transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area 'C'?

I am not familiar with the existing or future uses/developments in this area.

Note that existing traffic is a concern.

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional transportation solutions that have not been identified?

I would prefer to see any new north/south road between Rymal and Stone Church to be located west of Upper Mt. Albion Rd. Use of roundabout at sufficient volume traffic flow is expected to be lower than what was expected. Signal may be more prudent.
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special
Policy Area 'C'? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

Generally, I agree with the recommendations, however, if
much of the development along main streets are commercial, traffic
controls should be more extensive and accommodating (i.e. Tim Hortons?)


4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?

What is the time frame for these transportation routes to
be implemented and the development timeline for
Special Policy Area 'C'?


Contact Information (Optional)
Name: 
Address: 
Phone Number: 
Email: 

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?
[ ] YES [ ] NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this
Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments
received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of
Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands) Master Plan Class
Environmental Assessment Process

Special Policy Area ‘C’
Transportation Needs

Comments / Questionnaire

Thank you for reviewing the attached Newsletter on the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area ‘C’. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area ‘C’. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them, by May 6th, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
329 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390 Fax: 905-546-4435 Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic / transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area ‘C’?
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3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area 'C'? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

I agree with the recommended solutions.

4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?

Contact Information (Optional)
Name:
Address:
Phone Number:
Email:

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?

☐ YES ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Special Policy Area ‘C’
Transportation Needs

Comments / Questionnaire

Thank you for reviewing the attached Newsletter on the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area ‘C’. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area ‘C’. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them, by May 5th, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390 Fax: 905-546-4435 Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic / transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area ‘C’?

   With the Peak Oil issue, greenfield development may cease, making excessive roads and widening of other roads unnecessary. Also shipping of products will be too expensive to use truck transport. It seems that all this road planning is now premature.

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional transportation solutions that have not been identified?

   You mention dual southbound left turn lanes from the Stone Church Rd ramp off the Red Hill Creek expressway.

   I am still anxious to know in which direction the purely South bound traffic is going to be directed: towards Pritchard or through the Business Park or due south to funnel all traffic down the "Residential" Trinity Church Rd thus creating another Centennial Parkway nightmare.
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area 'C'? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

People living in Policy Area "C" know best about their transportation needs and what is acceptable. I do not live in that area.

4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?

Perhaps nothing should be finalized until after the Nov. 13, 2006 municipal election. Then "needs" will not be as developer-driven as they are now.

Contact Information (Optional)

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Phone Number: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?
☐ YES ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Thank you for reviewing the attached Newsletter on the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area 'C'. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area 'C'. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them by May 5th, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext 6390 Fax: 905-546-4435 Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic / transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area 'C'?

Presently, traffic has greatly increased in the entire area. Roads cannot handle the flow. Roads are in poor condition; without major improvements to all roads in the area surrounding Special Policy Area 'C', chaos will prevail.

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional transportation solutions that have not been identified?

Widen Stonechurch to 4 lanes from Winterberry to Dartnall Rd. Include dedicated turning lanes.
Widen Winterberry from Mill to the line exchange to 4 lanes with dedicated turning lanes into Area 'C'.
Widen Upper Mountain Road from Highland to Stonechurch (4 lanes).
Widen Highland from Winterberry to Upper Mountain Road. Make Winterberry a one way street from Paramount to Highland. This gets a lot of traffic away from Janet Lee School and makes people go around.
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area 'C'? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

I WANT A SOLUTION THAT WILL NOT INCREASE TRAFFIC ANYMORE ON WINTERBERRY OR FROM HIGHLAND TO PARAMUS. THAT'S WHY I SUGGEST IMPROVING THE ACCESS RDS OF HIGHLAND AND UPPER MT ALBIONI & STONEHURST. THERE ARE NOT ANY HOMES THAT WOULD BE AFFECTED. REDUCING TRAFFIC FLOW ON WINTERBERRY IS MY PRIORITY. MAKING IT ONE WAY WOULD HELP.

4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?

BOTTOM LINE = ROADS SHOULD BE IMPROVED BEFORE ANY DEVELOPMENT TAKES PLACE. ALUN.

NO IS A MESS TOO. WITH WALMART, SUMMIT PLAZA ETC. GOING IN, WHY IS THE ROAD NOT BEEN WIDENED?

Contact Information (Optional)

Name: 
Address: 
Phone Number: 
Email: 

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?
☐ YES ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Special Policy Area 'C'
Transportation Needs

Comments / Questionnaire

Thank you for reviewing the attached Newsletter on the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area 'C'. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area 'C'. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them, by May 5th, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390 Fax: 905-546-4435 Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please:

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic / transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area 'C'?  

Traffic in the area is generally poorly planned and poorly monitored. Schools are on main throughways, streets are too narrow for parking on both sides without causing unsafe conditions. Cars park on the wrong side of streets, and speed limits and stop signs are not observed. We need better planning, better by laws and better enforcement.

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional transportation solutions that have not been identified?

Your solutions are too numerous and too general to be of value without proper map reference it is difficult to see how your proposals work. Why not provide proper map reference including current and known roadways (such as Red Hill) so that your solutions could be understood?
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area 'C'? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

See Point 2 c 4. Better Clarity is Required.

4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?

Without proper reference maps showing what exists plus known upgrades, your newsletter has been quite successful - you have met the need to communicate, but you have not provided meaningful information.

Contact Information (Optional)

Name: 
Address: 
Phone Number: 
Email: 

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?

☐ YES ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Thank you for reviewing the attached Newsletter on the Transportation needs for Special Policy Area 'C'. Your input is important to help the City address transportation solutions for Special Policy Area 'C'. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and mail/fax them, by May 6th, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390 Fax: 905-546-4435 Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing or future traffic / transportation conditions in the area of Special Policy Area 'C'?

   I find the newsletter verbose and technical which makes for difficulty in digestion. This results in lack of attention.

   Is this by design or neglect?

   

2. Do you have any comments regarding the potential transportation solutions presented and criteria used to analyze these transportation solutions? Are there any additional transportation solutions that have not been identified?

   Perhaps - but what else is new? I need some convincing that my input actually has value.

   I think a shoddy political office in Hamilton still remains in power.
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area 'C'? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

I find riding a bicycle along with cars uninspiring. I like access to unspoiled natural land, which I don't see much of in your plans. What I do see is marvelous design for maximizing monetary revenue and neglected for the natural environment.

4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?

Write less and say more or else don't waste our time.

By the way I was on vacation in the Caribbean where I met many Torontonians who still know Hamilton as "the armpit of Ontario."

Contact Information (Optional)

Name: [redacted]

Address: [redacted]

Phone Number: [redacted]

Email: [redacted]

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?

☐ YES  ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
3. Do you have any comments regarding the transportation recommendations for Special Policy Area 'C'? Do you agree with the recommendations? Please indicate why or why not.

Under Traffic Controls, I do not agree with the use of roundabouts. From the volume of traffic, existing and future, traffic signals would be the best solution.

4. Do you have any other comments regarding the information provided in the Newsletter?

I would appreciate getting more information in the Newsletter. It would be better if all pertinent information was provided to facilitate a fully informed decision.

Contact Information (Optional)

Name:

Address:

Phone Number:

Email:

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?

☐ YES  ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Thank you for attending today’s Public Information Centre, to discuss traffic operations in the neighbourhoods adjacent to the Rymal Road Planning area. Your input is important to help the City assess potential solutions to address the Trinity Neighbourhood issues. The purpose of this meeting is to present various options, including “Do Nothing”, that have been identified and assessed in an attempt to address concerns expressed regarding traffic operations in the area, specifically, traffic infiltration (resulting in increased traffic volumes on neighbourhood streets), travel speeds, traffic control compliance, and safety for pedestrians and cyclists.

It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight or mail/fax them, by February 15, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390 Fax: 905-546-4435 Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing and future conditions presented?


2. Do you have any comments regarding the evaluation criteria used to assess the potential solutions?

3. Please provide comments regarding the Phase 1 Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the recommended Phase 1 Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.
Thank you for attending today's Public Information Centre, to discuss traffic operations in the neighbourhoods adjacent to the Rymal Road Planning area. Your input is important to help the City assess potential solutions to address the Trinity Neighbourhood issues. The purpose of this meeting is to present various options, including 'Do Nothing', that have been identified and assessed in an attempt to address concerns expressed regarding traffic operations in the area, specifically, traffic infiltration (resulting in increased traffic volumes on neighbourhood streets), travel speeds, traffic control compliance, and safety for pedestrians and cyclists.

It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight or mail/fax them, by February 15, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390 Fax: 905-546-4435 Email: cleemor@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing and future conditions presented?

   (1) Traffic on Highland between 2nd Rd W & W. Albion have increased greatly in the 6 yrs we have lived on Highland - you have reported 7000 cars/day - high for a collector.
   (2) Speeding & stop sign compliance continue to be a problem along Highland.
   (3) There are a great many kids who live and walk along Highland, safety is a concern!
   (4) It is very difficult to get out of our driveway now especially during peak hours.

2. Do you have any comments regarding the evaluation criteria used to assess the potential solutions?

   - The criterion is - don't just move the problem from one area to another area.
   - This is an important consideration.
   - You need to consider the impact of proposed changes on Highland - traffic volumes are to be decreased from 7000/day - not increased!

3. Please provide comments regarding the Phase 1 Solutions Identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the recommended Phase 1 Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

   - We would be glad to see increased police presence on Highland to address this speed and stop non-compliance issues.
   - What tangible measures are proposed for Phase 1?
   - How will you evaluate their effectiveness?
   - What key targets are you using in order to achieve these measures?
   - How can I, as a resident, be sure that the measures will be adequate - will you ask for my opinion along the way (ie- do we think the measures are making a difference)?
4. Please provide comments regarding the Phase 2 Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the recommended Phase 2 Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

- We agree that a new arterial (Steve Church to Rymal) is essential - the sooner the better!
- Alt. 2 in the collector (behind the Housing Plan & connect to Highland at Winterberry) in the best of the 3, because it avoids spilling new traffic onto Highland and where there is more residential (and more young/already 16) kids.
- Alt 3 & 4 don’t make sense - they just move the problem from one area to another (Highland). They would also negatively impact a path already been planned (walkway, etc.)

5. Do you have any other comments regarding the material and displays you have seen today?


Contact Information (Optional)
Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Phone Number: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?
☑ YES ☐ NO

For more information, visit our project web site at:
www.hamilton.ca/ropa9

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Neighbourhoods Adjacent to The Rymal Road Planning Area ("ROPA 9" Lands)

Comments / Questionnaire

Thank you for attending today's Public Information Centre, to discuss traffic operations in the neighbourhoods adjacent to the Rymal Road Planning area. Your input is important to help the City assess potential solutions to address the Trinity Neighbourhood issues. The purpose of this meeting is to present various options, including "Do Nothing", that have been identified and assessed in an attempt to address concerns expressed regarding traffic operations in the area, specifically, traffic inflation (resulting in increased traffic volumes on neighbourhood streets), travel speeds, traffic control compliance, and safety for pedestrians and cyclists.

It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight or mail/fax them by February 15, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390 Fax: 905-546-4435 Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing and future conditions presented?

   The presentation was very informative. I'm pleased about the conclusions derived from the study (Closing U on Albo). I am concerned about the time frame (3-5 yrs) I also was interested in how existing parks you will be able to use that will be effective on Umt Albo.

2. Do you have any comments regarding the evaluation criteria used to assess the potential solutions?

   I question the accuracy of the violence of traffic and I feel that the data on Umt Albo are actually higher overall but are about normal (3-4K) due to residents at the street going over the limit.

3. Please provide comments regarding the Phase 1 Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the recommended Phase 1 Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

   Build the roads (new and/or) before all the development occurs. The existing roads (U on Albo, 2nd) will be developed with the additional traffic (both local and Industry) that will use the new roads. Also why not have residents use new roads built properly.
4. Please provide comments regarding the Phase 2 Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the recommended Phase 2 Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

5. Do you have any other comments regarding the material and displays you have seen today?

Well-presented. A little dry, perhaps. A more pictorial approach to accompany the talk.

Contact Information (Optional)

Name: [Redacted]

Address: [Redacted]

Phone Number: [Redacted]

Email: [Redacted]

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 8 Lands mailing list? 
☐ YES ☐ NO

For more information, visit our project website at:

www.hamilton.ca/ropas
Neighbourhoods Adjacent to The Rymal Road Planning Area ("ROPA 9" Lands)

Comments / Questionnaire

Thank you for attending today's Public Information Centre, to discuss traffic operations in the neighbourhoods adjacent to the Rymal Road Planning area. Your input is important to help the City assess potential solutions to address the Trinity Neighbourhood issues. The purpose of this meeting is to present various options, including "Do Nothing", that have been identified and assessed in an attempt to address concerns expressed regarding traffic operations in the area, specifically, traffic infiltration (resulting in increased traffic volumes on neighbourhood streets), travel speeds, traffic control compliance, and safety for pedestrians and cyclists.

It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight or mail/fax them, by February 15, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390  Fax: 905-546-4435  Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing and future conditions presented?

   NO

2. Do you have any comments regarding the evaluation criteria used to assess the potential solutions?

   NO

3. Please provide comments regarding the Phase 1 Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the recommended Phase 1 Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

   My main objective as Representative of Upper Mount Albion Rd. Residents was to get the road closed at Rymal Rd. It looks like that will be the plan that will be included in Phase 1. However, because of the major changes and future development I will continue to follow thru as the representative of the road and any changes to come that will effect us the residents.

   [Signature]
4. Please provide comments regarding the Phase 2 Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the recommended Phase 2 Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

To give priority to the Trinity Church Road extension over the widening of Rural Road. Traffic can still use Rural Rd. However, with the expressway coming on line in 2007 (next year), it would seem to me that it would make sense to have the T.R. extension completed ASAP to give expressway traffic easy access to Rural Road.

5. Do you have any other comments regarding the material and displays you have seen today?

NO

__________________________

Contact Information (Optional)

Name: 

Address: 

Phone Number: 

Email: 

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?

☐ YES  ☐ NO

For more information, visit our project web site at:

www.hamilton.ca/rop9

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands) Master Plan Class
Environmental Assessment Process
Public Information Centre No. 2, January 26, 2006

Neighbourhoods Adjacent to The Rymal Road Planning Area (“ROPA 9” Lands)

Comments / Questionnaire

Thank you for attending today’s Public Information Centre, to discuss traffic operations in the
neighbourhoods adjacent to the Rymal Road Planning area. Your input is important to help the City
assess potential solutions to address the Trinity Neighbourhood issues. The purpose of this meeting is to
present various options, including “Do Nothing”, that have been identified and assessed in an attempt to
address concerns expressed regarding traffic operations in the area, specifically, traffic infiltration
(resulting in increased traffic volumes on neighbourhood streets), travel speeds, traffic control
compliance, and safety for pedestrians and cyclists.

It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided
tonight or mail/fax them, by February 15, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N.
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390  Fax: 905-546-4435  Email: delmorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing and future conditions presented?

   My concerns for the future of this area as follows:

   Your studies should include the following in and about
   the (Rymal 9 Lands) area:

   #1. The movement quickly and safely of Fire Trucks, Ambulances,
   other emergency vehicles, school buses and public transportation
   is very important.

   2. Do you have any comments regarding the evaluation criteria used to assess the potential
   solutions?

   #2. Safety for the walking people on bicycles, 
   motorized wheel chairs, moving about the area.

   #3. Roads such as: Centennial Pkwy, north and south, Rymal Rd.
   west, upper: West city: McMichael Rd., Memorial Rd., Mebo Rd. will
   still regulate (Too much traffic, people will not use them).

   #4. At this meeting the city was using the Parish lands

   as a excuse to do nothing. A study is necessary
   which would include traffic flow along with the development
   of the lands. The industrial lands will have a huge
   impact on the moving of the East-West traffic
   along Highland Dr., Rymal Rd., and Golf Club Rd.

   #5. I would also suggest that study be given for a road from
   #56 My west. This road would be south of the Summit Park
   development and terminate with a connection to the Red
   Hill express way.

   OVER
4. Please provide comments regarding the Phase 2 Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the recommended Phase 2 Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

- Second RoadWest should be colored APA. What are your timelines?
- When will Phase 3 be complete?
- We've waited long enough.
- Datastore needed to know when purchasing
  homes that they receive road
  we can't build on.

5. Do you have any other comments regarding the materials and displays you have seen today?

- When will Phase 3 & 4 be complete so Phase 1 & 2 can be implemented?
- We have been waiting 3 years
  already and it is long enough.

- Minutes of meeting should include
  comments/questions/answers made by all attending.

Contact Information (Optional)

Name:
Address:
Phone Number:
Email:

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 8 Lands mailing list?

[ ] YES  [ ] NO

For more information, visit our project website at:
www.hamilton.ca/ropa9

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands) Master Plan Class
Environmental Assessment Process
Public Information Centre No. 2, January 26, 2006

Neighbourhoods Adjacent to The Rymal Road Planning Area ("ROPA 9" Lands)

Comments / Questionnaire

Thank you for attending today's Public Information Centre, to discuss traffic operations in the
neighbourhoods adjacent to the Rymal Road Planning area. Your input is important to help the City
assess potential solutions to address the Trinity Neighbourhood issues. The purpose of this meeting is to
present various options, including "Do Nothing", that have been identified and assessed in an attempt to
address concerns expressed regarding traffic operations in the area, specifically, traffic infiltration
(resulting in increased traffic volumes on neighbourhood streets), travel speeds, traffic control
compliance, and safety for pedestrians and cyclists.

It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided	onight or mail/fax them, by February 15, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-548-2424 ext. 6390 Fax 905-548-4435 Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

1. Do you have any comments regarding the existing and future conditions presented?

2. Do you have any comments regarding the evaluation criteria used to assess the potential
solutions?

3. Please provide comments regarding the Phase 1 Solutions identified. Are there any
additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the recommended
Phase 1 Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

If it could be considered moving the Truck Route (However I did not see
this on the sketch)

If not, how I believe consideration to - widening 1.5m (2.1) residential block on
this street

City speed limit through Police presence
Consider 3-way stop light on Rymal - could be closed.
4. Please provide comments regarding the Phase 2 Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the recommended Phase 2 Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

I believe Mt. Albin Rd should be closed at the same time as the Silvestri development is completed. The Trinity Church extension is absolutely essential for the economic growth of the city. Further, the park should be part of the Silvestri development.

The Trinity Church extension should be built at some time as the Silvestri development is completed for maximum growth potential. The land south of Trinity Church will be developed in partnership with Industry Park. Then close Mt. Albin Rd at Terminal Rd.

5. Do you have any other comments regarding the material and displays you have seen today?

As I live on Upper Mt. Albin Rd I have concerns of the anticipated growth in vehicular traffic through our area. It is anticipated as a truck route - it carries trucks and will support the type of traffic which is extremely undesirable for anyone living there. It is not clear that there would be access to the 4th ward. I have asked the local police to view the area next door to my house for a cup of sugar.

We have been advised the road won’t be closed until the Trinity Church extension is completed. I would suggest safety is paramount and secondly growth is on the horizon. Mt. Albin Rd would be best served by completing the Trinity Church extension at the same time as it allows the Silvestri development between Whitter Yard & Pritchard. If this doesn’t occur then - we need Mt. Albin Rd improved with sidewalks - for our own safety.

Contact Information (Optional)

Name: __________________________
Address: __________________________
Phone Number: __________________________
Email: __________________________

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?
☐ YES ☐ NO

For more information, visit our project website at:

www.hamilton.ca/ropa9

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Commentsheet.doc (143 KB)

Christine, Please find attached my completed comment/questionnaire regarding the ROPA 9 Lands Master Plan. Thank you for taking into consideration the opinions and insight of people, myself included, who will be directly and monumentally affected by this Transportation Plan.
Thank you for attending today’s Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands) Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment Open House. Your input is important to help the City evaluate the proposed recommendations in the Rymal Road Planning Area. The purpose of the first Public Information Centre is to present the needs and opportunities, preliminary alternative solutions to address servicing issues, the natural and socio-economic environmental inventories, the preliminary criteria used to evaluate the proposed alternatives, the evaluation of the alternatives, and a preliminary preferred alternative for each project.

It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight or mail/fax them by October 21, 2005 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390
Fax: 905-546-4445
Email: cleemon@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!
Please provide your comments about the information presented during the Public Information Centre.

1. Do you have any comments regarding the needs, opportunities and problem statement presented?

   The list of Summary Transportation Needs should also reflect. “Traffic management measures on SECOND RD. W.” Also, somewhere in the Transportation Needs section traffic from the Linc (and eventually Redhill Creek Expressway) flowing to/from Rymal Road should be considered in detail. The least cumbersome route (free of traffic lights) from the Linc to the new commercial development (eg. Walmart) utilizes Winterberry, Highland Road and Second Rd. W. It involves only one traffic light and a few stop signs (which are ignored at an alarming rate). This short-cut is already used with great frequency by large numbers of vehicles speeding through our neighbourhood on their way to Fortino’s, Binbrook or other destinations on Rymal and south of Rymal. This pattern is evidenced by the problems on Highland Rd., already acknowledged by the City and the police, and the problems on Second Rd. W., attested to at length by the residents and our representative, Phil Braddock. Large volumes of travelers heading to or from the new Meadowlands East or Binbrook area will opt for the speed of the line, by-passing all the traffic lights on Rymal Rd., and utilizing this ‘shortcut’ across Highland and down Second Rd. W., unless a road closure helps funnel the traffic to Rymal Rd. and Trinity Church Rd., which are being engineered for this level of access.

2. Do you have any comments regarding the evaluation criteria used to assess the potential solutions?

   I was pleased to read in the City guide to the EA process that assessing effects on the environment would involve a broad definition including the social, cultural and economic environments. The ROPA 9 Lands study in question lists socio-economic impacts second on its list of evaluation criteria. The social and cultural impact of too much high speed traffic on Second Rd. W., has already been seen. Parents shelter children in backyards, fearing the speeders and those who disregard the stop signs. Our children are denied simple pleasures of shopping or other sidewalk games, bike rides or rollerblading – as we walk for the long-promised road closure and the neighbourhood park. To honour the long planned road closure would bring life back to this street. From an economic standpoint, it would help maintain the value of housing in this area, which would surely plummet should the road closure not be honoured. Closing Second Rd. W., will not deter shoppers from visiting the new stores, or homebuyers from purchasing in the developments south or Rymal since the study addresses adequate access routes. The road closure will simply ensure that people use the planned routes, instead of desecrating life on Second Rd. W., in the name of a quick ‘shortcut’. Please keep the high volume of traffic, which will surely come, out of our residential neighbourhood.
3. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Transportation Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Transportation Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

I agree that Rymal Rd. will need to be widened, and signalised intersections introduced. I agree that north/south traffic must be accommodated, and support plans to extend Trinity Church Rd., and widen or improve Trinity Church Rd. as necessary. From a logical standpoint, north/south traffic should be provided easy access to the Linc, and future Redhill Creek Expressway. Only the Trinity Church Rd. extension or U. Mt. Albion offer direct proximity to these high volume routes. I agree with promoting traffic flow along the main arteries, designed specifically for high volume commuter traffic while eliminating or reducing effects on residential areas (i.e., I would support a road closure for Second Rd. W. and U. Mt. Albion). The 'preliminary Preferred Transportation Solutions' in the written study do not include any measures to protect the nearby residential areas. The road closures listed above work hand-in-hand with the planned solutions, to funnel traffic directly to the recommended routes (Rymal & Trinity Church).

If Second Rd. W. and U. Mt. Albion can no longer be used as 'short-cuts', the troublesome traffic on Highland Rd. will also decrease.

4. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Water Servicing Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Water Servicing Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

I agree with the solutions. Both preferred alternatives do not pose any long-term detriment or inconvenience to citizens. If upgrading or new construction does inconvenience anyone, it would only be temporary.

5. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Wastewater Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Wastewater Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

I have no other alternatives to offer.

6. any other comments regarding the material and displays you have seen today?

The report makes mention of improving transportation service for pedestrians and cyclists too. The pedestrian situation on Second Rd. W., is perilous. A significant portion of the street (south of Fairhaven) has no sidewalk on either side.

Contact Information (Optional)

Name: 
Address: 
Phone Number: 
Email: 

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list? □ YES!! □ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Lee-Morrison, Christine

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2005 8:03 PM
To: Lee-Morrison, Christine
Subject: ROPA 9 Comment Sheet
Importance: High

Here are my comments, the earlier one I e-mailed today was a rough version from my work computer, these are my actual comments from home. Please replace them with these. If you still have difficulty opening the file please call me on my cell [Redacted]

Thank you

[Redacted]
Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands) Master Plan
Class Environmental Assessment
Public Information Centre No. 1, October 3, 2005

Comments / Questionnaire

Thank you for attending today's Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands) Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment Open House. Your input is important to help the City evaluate the proposed recommendations in the Rymal Road Planning Area. The purpose of the first Public Information Centre is to present the needs and opportunities, preliminary alternative solutions to address servicing issues, the natural and socio-economic environmental inventories, the preliminary criteria used to evaluate the proposed alternatives, the evaluation of the alternatives, and a preliminary preferred alternative for each project.

It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight or mail/fax them, by October 21, 2005 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: clemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!
Please provide your comments about the information presented during the Public Information Centre. Do you have any comments regarding the needs, opportunities and problem statement presented?

Below please find my comments on this whole process: (copies have been forwarded to Mr. Dianni (Mayor) and Mr. Bruckler (Councillor).

I have been following this issue closely as I am directly impacted by the excessive nightly noise from Highland and Second roads. I am also somewhat disappointed in the way this issue has been handled and comments by the city's staff and its hired consultants.

The comment at the meeting about Second road being able to handle up to 8000 vehicle trips per day was an off-hand remark by a staffer (city or outside consultant). It was not in any of the documentation handed out. That, to me was an obvious oversight and has greatly offended myself many of my neighbours. Gatestone Dr. was designed and engineered to handle the traffic and excessive noise by its width and house setbacks. Second Rd. was not.

The fact that all this money spent on the study only reached the somewhat "surprising" conclusion that "we will need to widen Rymal" was, again to me, a statement of the obvious, given the existing traffic chaos in the Meadowlands every weekend. (sarcasm intended)
Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands) Master Plan
Class Environmental Assessment
Public Information Centre No. 1, October 3, 2005

Comments / Questionnaire

To hear one of the City of Hamilton employees make the comment to the effect that "Wow, I couldn't believe the traffic on Mount Albion Road to get here tonight," was again appalling as this meeting was about a traffic study of this very area. To put all three incidents together makes the due diligence of this process extremely questionable. Who is the city hiring to do these studies and then have them make such bizarre comments in public about what they are supposed to be qualified to do?

It seems to me that traffic in the Upper Stoney Creek is going to be a considerable problem given the rapid expansion this area is about to go under. By not closing Second Rd. W. as per the original plans shown to all the residents of this area when they purchased and still being shown on master plans by developers in this area, will just create more upset and chaos in this neighbourhood. Traffic was to be diverted onto Gatestone. We have already had one recent accident on Second and a few at the corner Highland and Second Rd. Drag racing is a common occurrence on weekend nights on Highland and the police are already stretched to the limit on weekend evenings to regularly patrol this area for speeders and racers. This is another issue that needs to be addressed by city government not just the police.

By closing Upper Mount Albion, a sparsely populated road and keeping Second open makes little sense. The area around Upper Mt. Albion can easily allow it to be widened, there are minimal children in the area and houses are set back from the road. Second Road on the other hand:

- only has sidewalks on one side,
- has 2 packed elementary schools nearby,
- has considerable pedestrian traffic to both schools from Shadetree, Fairhaven and Richdale,
- has housing is located closer to the front curb
- cannot be widened to allow for the expected increase in traffic.

I have asked city staff for information as to the actual (current) and total capacity of Second Rd. W. (e-mailed to Mr. Ed. Switenky October 11, 2005) and to date no reply has been received nor was it addressed at the meeting. It certainly is not as wide as Highland or Gatestone Rd.

I ask you to respect and remember the original neighbourhood plans and advise for the closing off of Second Road W. before someone gets seriously hurt. As homebuyers, most of us did our homework in purchasing our houses. I know I did. The sales agents for my home (Multi Area Developments) showed my wife and I the original site plans for the neighbourhood. We were invited to and did see how First Rd. was closed to show how Second would look in the future. As a homeowner who is directly impacted by this potential and inherently wrong change in the site plan, I was never directly consulted or informed of the proposed changes in my neighbourhood by direct letter or mass mailing. This whole issue came from an off-hand remark. This is not proper planning policy I hope.

Thank you for your time.
Contact Information (Optional)

Name: 

Address: 

Phone Number: 

Email: 

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?

X YES

□ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands) Master Plan
Class Environmental Assessment
Public Information Centre No. 1, October 3, 2005

Comments / Questionnaire

Thank you for attending today’s Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands) Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment Open House. Your input is important to help the City evaluate the proposed recommendations in the Rymal Road Planning Area. The purpose of the first Public Information Centre is to present the needs and opportunities, preliminary alternative solutions to address servicing issues, the natural and socio-economic environmental inventories, the preliminary criteria used to evaluate the proposed alternatives, the evaluation of the alternatives, and a preliminary preferred alternative for each project.

It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight or mail/fax them, by October 21, 2005 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCTP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: clemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!

Please provide your comments about the information presented during the Public Information Centre.

1. Do you have any comments regarding the needs, opportunities and problem statement presented?

The problem statement and need requirements should highly address the traffic havoc that the new commercial and residential developments taking place on Rymal Road (east of Trinity Church Rd) will cause the residents of Second Road, Highland Road and Winterberry Drive. Motorists are going to follow this path (starting at Second Rd) to get quick access to the Linc. Do not convince yourselves otherwise as even adding 4 lanes to Rymal Road will not have them divert to Highway 20. No one wants to take highway 20. There are too many vehicles taking this route (north and south bound to/from Binbrook) and with your proposition to have lights at every intersection of Rymal Road to Highway 20, this will only divert them from using it even more. As put by one of your own City planning managers – the traffic will travel the path of least resistance – which thank you will be using Second Rd. They don’t adhere to stop signs and zip through the road as it is so, this becomes the quickest route. They will surely not want to wait for traffic lights and take highway 20 when they can easily get access to the Linc via Second Rd. We have been attesting to this for the past 4-5 years and have had many discussions with Mr. Phil Bruckler and other City constituents regarding this problem. Mr. Bruckler has agreed that our road can not handle the 8000 vehicles that Mr. Bacque believes it can. This is surely evident by the fact that Second Rd is not wide enough to allot for sidewalks on both sides of the road nor wide enough to allow for cars to pass when
others are parked. Our road was engineered to be closed as was evident via City plans and not engineered for the traffic problems that these developments will bring with them.

2. Do you have any comments regarding the evaluation criteria used to assess the potential solutions?

The comments I have again is that Second Road was and is engineered to be closed so that high volumes of traffic, which will come with these developments, can be funneled to more appropriate roads; such as the proposed Trinity Church extension, Rymal Road and Upper Mount Albion. To look at Upper Mount Albion as a possible closure to Second Road is absurd. The road is sparsely populated, can accommodate sidewalks on either side of the road, and the houses are set back much further from the road. Seeing as the speed limit has not changed from 60 Kms, further depicts that this road is less populated. We already witness high volumes of traffic that at times I need to wait for 8-10 vehicles to go by my home before I can pull out of my driveway. And the fear that one of them will go right through the stop sign (which is in front of my home) is always on my mind because it occurs all the time. Closing our road will not deter shoppers from visiting the commercial sector nor deter homebuyers from purchasing homes at Summit Park. This will only have them use the planned and engineered roads (as mentioned before) as they should be used and not use our road which was engineered to be closed. We were promised and shown again, by City plans that our road was to be closed. It is only unfair and unconstitutionalized that the City has the power to not honor their plans. The plans, that we all viewed prior to making a large investment, not only in purchasing our homes but, in raising our children in a neighbourhood that we thought would be safe. We kept our promise to our children in providing them with a good neighbourhood now don’t go back on your commitment in closing our road.

3. Please provide comments re: alternative transportation solutions identified. Do you agree?

I agree that north/south bound traffic will need to be addressed with the implementation of these developments. I do NOT agree that this should be dealt with by having Second Road be a throughway to Highland Road. I fully support that the Trinity Church Road extensions should be honoured and traffic should be accommodated via that route and Highway 20. This will only hold true if Second Road is closed. As stated, do not continue to try to convince yourselves otherwise. You can not tell me that a consulting firm based out of Toronto knows our neighbourhood better than the residents that deal with these traffic issues on a daily basis. Engineered calculations are not the key factors here - experience and relevant facts hold the greatest value. This is the whole reasoning behind these questionnaires which I hope will be respectfully evaluated and considered. Logically, you would think that Trinity Church and Upper Mount Albion should be directly linked to the Line and the Redhill Creek Expressway. Upper Mount Albion is
already in very close proximity to the Linc and would continue to make sense in this respect. NOT Second Road – again, high volumes of traffic would need to travel down highly populated residential areas – how does this make sense?? The assessments thus far are not looking at protecting the nearby residential areas; i.e – Highland Road and Second Road. Their views thus far will only create larger problems with the higher amounts of traffic on these routes. The Second Road closure, which no doubtedly should happen as this is what was planned and engineered, will aid in the new planned solutions on diverting traffic to Rymal Road, Highway 20 and Trinity Church. The road closure will also benefit the traffic problems on the south side of Highland Road which is now evidenced again by the new stop sign to go in at Glenhollow and Highland. It is a win-win situation and the City honours their original plans to have Second Road closed.

4. Any other comments?

We continue to put emphasis on improving residential areas for accessibility for pedestrians walking and cyclists, etc. The planned road closure for Second Road will do just that. We will have a designated path for both pedestrians and cyclists to enjoy the neighbourhood. Again, partial sidewalks on Second Road and the increased traffic do not allow for families to go for walks or children to ride their bikes – the road is too congested with traffic and too unsafe for children to ride on the road. This all points to the fact that the road was engineered to be closed.

The road closure benefits far outweigh any possible disadvantages this consulting firm can come up with. To confirm, we are the residents that deal with these horrid traffic problems on a daily basis and the residents that will have to tolerate the unacceptable traffic volumes if the road is not closed as was promised!

No engineers or project managers can tell us otherwise!!

Contact Information (Optional)

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Phone Number: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?

X YES ☐ NO
To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Thank you for attending today's Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands) Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment Open House. Your input is important to help the City evaluate the proposed recommendations in the Rymal Road Planning Area. The purpose of the first Public Information Centre is to present the needs and opportunities, preliminary alternative solutions to address servicing issues, the natural and socio-economic environmental inventories, the preliminary criteria used to evaluate the proposed alternatives, the evaluation of the alternatives, and a preliminary preferred alternative for each project.

It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight or mail/fax them, by October 21, 2005 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!
Please provide your comments about the information presented during the Public Information Centre.

1. Do you have any comments regarding the needs, opportunities and problem statement presented?

   Since Summit Ridge will be up and running in near future, I feel construction of the Trinity Church Rd. extension north of Rymal Rd. should have the highest priority over Rymal Rd. A good portion of the traffic from Summit Park will be north/south and it will take 5 years for the extension to be built. Makes no sense. Also are there anyone from the School Boards and the Hamilton Conservation Authority sitting in at these meetings? I think they should be represented.

2. Do you have any comments regarding the evaluation criteria used to assess the potential solutions?

   Page 3. Bottom paragraph: No more than 550 units can be built until required environmental assessments and respective capital budgets are finalized. What does this refer to specifically? Does it refer to new buildings, community centers, annual road costs (snow/ice) waste pick up?

3. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Transportation Solutions Identified. Are there any additional alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Transportation Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

   See no. 1. Also travel demand management: promote ride share, car pools, a noble idea, why people won't do it? Another idea and this would require provincial/federal input and of course reclaim the rail line. The road bed is there, a bridge would be needed for stone church, otherwise new tracks for light rail or go service to the east mountain and Pinbrook area. Lots of people are moving to Hamilton from To but commute to Toronto, just a thought if not know in the future.
4. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Water Servicing Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Water Servicing Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

There is still a resident on Upper Mt Albion Rd who is on a well. How would he be impacted. Has the Conservation Authority been involved in this assessment? What effect will this have on the karst rock formation?

5. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Wastewater Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Wastewater Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

I do not want sanitary sewer hook to Mt Albion Sub Station when I don't even have severs. I was told this would run down Upper Mt Albion Road if it were built.

6. Do you have any other comments regarding the material and displays you have seen today?

Once again the closing of Upper Mt Albion Rd as a P.A. IF not major Rd repairs and sidewalks of some description that will serve until new ONE AGAIN SEE NO #1 THE TRINITY CHURCH NORTH EXTENSION GIVEN FIRST PRIORITY

Contact Information (Optional)

Name: 
Address: 

Phone Number: 
Email: 

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?

☐ YES  ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Thank you for attending today's Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPÁ 9 Lands) Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment Open House. Your input is important to help the City evaluate the proposed recommendations in the Rymal Road Planning Area. The purpose of the first Public Information Centre is to present the needs and opportunities, preliminary alternative solutions to address servicing issues, the natural and socio-economic environmental inventories, the preliminary criteria used to evaluate the proposed alternatives, the evaluation of the alternatives, and a preliminary preferred alternative for each project.

It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight or mail/fax them, by October 21, 2005 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 0390
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: clemom@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!
Please provide your comments about the information presented during the Public Information Centre.

1. Do you have any comments regarding the needs, opportunities and problem statement presented?

   [Handwritten comment]

   [Handwritten comment]

2. Do you have any comments regarding the evaluation criteria used to assess the potential solutions?

   [Handwritten comments]

   [Handwritten comments]

3. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Transportation Solutions Identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been Identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Transportation Solutions? Please Indicate why or why not.

   [Handwritten comments]

   [Handwritten comments]

   [Handwritten comments]

   [Handwritten comments]
4. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Water Servicing Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Water Servicing Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

Yes. We live on Trinity Church Rd and have been for 30 years and have the same issues. There have already been sections replaced.

5. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Wastewater Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Wastewater Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

Check box for all applicable: 1. Install a Septic Tank in the area.
2. Replace the sewer line to the nearest road.
3. Replace the sewer line to the nearest creek.

6. Do you have any other comments regarding the material and displays you have seen today?

A man at Trinity United Church (opinion) was really helpful. I would hope you would seek out similar people and promote it. (Trinity UCC)

We need to make the connection from Trinity Church to the nearest underground sewer line. Crossing Roy St. east of the current intersection might be able to solve the current issues. We are working toward a solution for the other issues. Any other candidates would help the SCAC.

Contact Information (Optional)

Name:
Address:
Phone Number:
Email:

Would you like to be added to our RCPA 9 Lands mailing list?

☐ YES  ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA & Lands) Master Plan
Class Environmental Assessment
Public Information Centre No. 1, October 3, 2005

Comments / Questionnaire

Thank you for attending today's Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA & Lands) Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment Open House. Your input is important to help the City evaluate the proposed recommendations in the Rymal Road Planning Area. The purpose of the first Public Information Centre is to present the needs and opportunities, preliminary alternative solutions to address services issues, the natural and socio-economic environmental inventories, the preliminary criteria used to evaluate the proposed alternatives, the evaluation of the alternatives, and a preliminary preferred alternative for each project.

It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight or mail them in by October 21, 2005 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
530 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-7424 ext. 6300
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: clemor@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!
Please provide your comments about the information presented during the Public Information Centre.

1. Do you have any comments regarding the needs, opportunities and problem statement presented?

   Unlike other communities off of Rymal Rd. or could unreasonably encourage the east mountain. It's a sufficient north/south link. These are time lines of traffic. Instead of winds, like Beech Street, Haldimand, and others etc. have some winding roads or series of roads to go north/south reducing a lot of traffic to travel through residential areas.

2. Do you have any comments regarding the evaluation criteria used to assess the potential solutions?

   The committees must follow guidelines & criteria when addressing growth issues, however, the area is allowing so many that the city's plans have already been put off. The plans should have been implemented at least 3 years ago. Instead, they just keep one up ahead of the game.

3. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Transportation Solutions Identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Transportation Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

   Like most neighbors, I agree the Trinity Church Rd. extension should not be delayed until 2011. It should be immediately upon completion of the REDEX Expressway.

   This is not just for the bus service, it is also for other commercial activity and residential growth. Drivers using the Lake of Breeze Parkway will have to drive through our neighborhood.
4. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Water Servicing Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Water Servicing Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

Definitely in need of a NEW pumping station and storage. Our community feels under served. Please consider an area not as crowded and busy. Many people come to the area only once or twice a year. 20 years ago, there were no traffic issues.

5. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Wastewater Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Wastewater Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

The solutions seem to be reasonable for the new development area.

6. Do you have any other comments regarding the material and displays you have seen today?

Regarding 'plan B', I think it's a bad idea to build big box stores in the middle of a residential area. Big box stores are not the best choice for the area.

Also, I was disappointed to hear that the city is not planning to make Ryland Road a fire lane, which is a shame as it will make safety issues in the area.

Contact Information (Optional):

Name:
Address:
Phone Number:
Email:

Would you like to be added to our RCPA email list?
YES
NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Thank you for attending today's Rymal Road Planning Area (ROP.A. 9 Lands) Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment Open House. Your input is important to help the City evaluate the proposed recommendations in the Rymal Road Planning Area. The purpose of the first Public Information Centre is to present the needs and opportunities, preliminary alternative solutions to address serving issues, the natural and socio-economic environmental inventories, the preliminary criteria used to evaluate the proposed alternatives, the evaluation of the alternatives, and a preliminary preferred alternative for each project.

It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight or mail/fax them by October 21, 2005 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: cleemor@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!
Please provide your comments about the information presented during the Public Information Centre.

1. Do you have any comments regarding the needs, opportunities and problem statement presented?

2. Do you have any comments regarding the evaluation criteria used to assess the potential solutions?

3. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Transportation Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Transportation Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.
4. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Water Servicing Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Water Servicing Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

5. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Wastewater Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Wastewater Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

6. Do you have any other comments regarding the material and displays you have seen today?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Contact Information (Optional)
Name:
Address:
Phone Number:
Email:

Would you like to be added to our ROPA & Lands mailing list?
☐ YES ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Thank you for attending today's Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands) Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment Open House. Your input is important to help the City evaluate the proposed recommendations in the Rymal Road Planning Area. The purpose of the first Public Information Centre is to present the needs and opportunities, preliminary alternative solutions to address servicing issues, the natural and socio-economic environmental inventories, the preliminary criteria used to evaluate the proposed alternatives, the evaluation of the alternatives, and a preliminary preferred alternative for each project.

It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight or mail/Send them by October 21, 2005 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: clemor@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!
Please provide your comments about the information presented during the Public Information Centre.

1. Do you have any comments regarding the needs, opportunities and problem statement presented?

   To me these aren't problems: they are necessary in order for this area to accommodate the large growth of the area both for residential and commercial use. I think the problem is that it is taking too long to make a reality. You don't give us time to pay our taxes, why should we continue to be silent and patient while we wait for you?

2. Do you have any comments regarding the evaluation criteria used to assess the potential solutions?

   The evaluation is evident! There will be impacts everywhere, you need to act now, act now.

3. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Transportation Solutions identified. Are there any additional alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Transportation Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

   These are fine and are essential to development of the area.
4. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Water Servicing Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Water Servicing Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

5. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Wastewater Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Wastewater Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

6. Do you have any other comments regarding the material and displays you have seen today?

Many of the efforts - if not all - were a repeat of the meeting held in 2000. The fact still remains that the residents of Second St West are still enduring our road closure, which we were informed of when we purchased our home from the developer in 2000. The material on the same is we are now situated in the plans to implement the plans and place the home on completing the project. We are becoming very tired of empty promises. Our expectations the last deadline is too far away!

Contact Information (Optional)

Name: 
Address:  
Phone Number:  
Email:  

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list? □YES □NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this study and may include them in study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Thank you for attending today's Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands) Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment Open House. Your input is important to help the City evaluate the proposed recommendations in the Rymal Road Planning Area. This purpose of the first Public Information Centre is to present the needs and opportunities, preliminary alternative solutions to address servicing issues, the natural and socio-economic environmental inventories, the preliminary criteria used to evaluate the proposed alternatives, the evaluation of the alternatives, and a preliminary preferred alternative for each project.

It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight or mail/fax them, by October 21, 2006 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6360
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: cleemorr@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!
Please provide your comments about the information presented during the Public Information Centre.

1. Do you have any comments regarding the needs, opportunities and problem statement presented?

2. Do you have any comments regarding the evaluation criteria used to assess the potential solutions?

3. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Transportation Solutions Identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Transportation Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.
4. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Water Servicing Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Water Servicing Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

5. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Wastewater Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Wastewater Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

6. Do you have any other comments regarding the material and displays you have seen today?

We would like information regarding the expansion of water and sewer services along Highway 11 and into Barrie. To recommend Phase 2 of the Todd development project.

Contact Information (Optional)

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]

Phone Number: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?

✓ YES ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Thank you for attending today's Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands) Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment Open House. Your input is important to help the City evaluate the proposed recommendations in the Rymal Road Planning Area. The purpose of the first Public Information Centre is to present the needs and opportunities, preliminary alternative solutions to address servicing issues, the natural and socio-economic environmental inventories, the preliminary criteria used to evaluate the proposed alternatives, the evaluation of the alternatives, and a preliminary preferred alternative for each project.

It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight or mail/fax them, by October 21, 2005 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390
Fax: 905-540-4455
Email: cleemorrison@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!
Please provide your comments about the information presented during the Public Information Centre.

1. Do you have any comments regarding the needs, opportunities and problem statement presented?

   Please Close Second Road West!

2. Do you have any comments regarding the evaluation criteria used to assess the potential solutions?

   Please Close Second Road West!

3. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Transportation Solutions Identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Transportation Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

   Please Close Second Road West!
4. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Water Servicing Solutions Identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been Identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Water Servicing Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

5. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Wastewater Solutions Identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been Identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Wastewater Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

6. Do you have any other comments regarding the material and displays you have seen today?

Contact Information (Optional)

Name: 
Address: 
Phone Number: 
Email: 

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 8 Lands mailing list?

☐ YES  ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this study and may include them in study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
Thank you for attending today's Rymal Road Planning Area (ROP A 9 Lands) Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment Open House. Your input is important to help the City evaluate the proposed recommendations and the Rymal Road Planning Area. The purpose of the first Public Information Centre is to present the needs and opportunities, preliminary alternative solutions to address servicing issues, the natural and socio-economic environmental inventories, the preliminary criteria used to evaluate the proposed alternatives, the evaluation of the alternatives, and a preliminary preferred alternative for each project.

It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight or mail/fax them by October 21, 2005 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCPP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
360-77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K1,
Phone: 905-646-2424 ext. 6590
Fax: 905-646-4435
Email: chlmm@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!
Please provide your comments about the information presented during the Public Information Centre.

1. Do you have any comments regarding the needs, opportunities and problem statement presented?

   "No."

2. Do you have any comments regarding the evaluation criteria used to assess the potential solutions?

   "Yes: Study not large enough.

3. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Transportation Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Transportation Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

   "Need to route Study Brock Rd through "
   "Suggest extending Grandravine east to 30th St NW."
   "Suggest study traffic load on Bannock Rd at 4th Pl E.
   "Suggest study traffic load on Bannock Rd at 4th Pl E to Iroquois Rd E.

   I do not agree because the study only evaluated 56th to Trinity church Rd. (Lack of vision by the Planners)"
4. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Water Servicing Solutions Identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Water Servicing Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

Water services must be supplied and maintained for the health and safety of the general population of the city. Anything less is not acceptable.

5. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Wastewater Solutions Identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Wastewater Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

Some questions

6. Do you have any other comments regarding the material and displays you have seen today?

Acceptable up to date.
More information in the future required.

Contact Information (Optional)
Name:
Address:
Phone Number:
Email:

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?
☐ YES ☐ NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
1. Do you have any comments regarding the needs, opportunities and problem statement presented?

We live in the neighborhood and are concerned about the traffic that will travel on nearby Second Rd. W. On a daily basis we utilize Second Rd. W, and see the speeding and the people who ignore stop signs. What will happen when more people flock into the area for shopping? Our friends on Second Rd. W have told us about the planned road closure and we think closing Second Rd. W would protect our neighborhood.

2. Do you have any comments regarding the evaluation criteria used to assess the potential solutions?

The criteria seems fine.

3. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Transportation Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Transportation Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

Why were only Kyra Rd. and Trinity Church Rd. planned in detail? Where are the plans for our local roads such as Second Rd. W.? Will Second Rd. W be closed, etc. to stop speeders endangering our streets on their way to Walmart etc.? 
4. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Water Servicing Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Water Servicing Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

   OK

5. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Wastewater Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Wastewater Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

   OK

6. Do you have any other comments regarding the material and displays you have seen today?

   

Contact Information (Optional)

   Name: [Redacted]

   Address: [Redacted]

   Phone Number: [Redacted]
Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands) Master Plan
Class Environmental Assessment
Public Information Centre No. 1, October 3, 2005

Comments / Questionnaire

Thank you for attending today's Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands) Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment Open House. Your input is important to help the City evaluate the proposed recommendations in the Rymal Road Planning Area. The purpose of the first Public Information Centre is to present the needs and opportunities, preliminary alternative solutions to address servicing issues, the natural and socio-economic environmental inventories, the preliminary criteria used to evaluate the proposed alternatives, the evaluation of the alternatives, and a preliminary preferred alternative for each project.

It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight or mail/fax them by October 21, 2005 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6390
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: clemorr@hamilton.ca

---

Your Comments Please!
Please provide your comments about the information presented during the Public Information Centre.

1. Do you have any comments regarding the needs, opportunities and problem statement presented?

   The problem statement regarding Transportation clearly acknowledges the need to manage traffic on local roads adjacent to the study area.
   The written study does not do this. Verbally, Mr. Bagnall discussed closing Upper Mt. Albion. A road closure for 2nd Rd. W. should also be included to address the very real problem of speeding on Highland Rd. and 2nd Rd. W. Without this closure, the high volume of traffic will cripple this residential neighborhood with commuters looking for a quick North/South route to Rymal Rd. and the Linc.

2. Do you have any comments regarding the evaluation criteria used to assess the potential solutions?

   Transportation service, socio-economic impacts, natural environment impacts, and costs all seem like reasonable criteria to consider. It will be great for our city to see business boom and expand in the area South of Rymal. However, the nearby residential neighborhoods will lose a lot, facing negative socio-economic impacts of traffic and congestion can not be contained to the major roads outlined in the study (i.e., Rymal Rd. and Trinity Church Rd.).

3. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Transportation Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Transportation Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.
The written study does not do this. Verbally, Mr. Bocqve, discussed closing Upper St. Albion. A road closure for 2nd Rd. W. should also be included to address the very real problem of speeding on这儿的纸质图片中无法确认的地方。Meanwhile Rd. and 2nd Rd. W. Without this closure, the high volume of traffic will cripple this residential neighborhood with commuters looking for a quick North/South route to Kymal Rd. and the Line.

2. Do you have any comments regarding the evaluation criteria used to assess the potential solutions?

Transporation service, socio-economic impacts, natural environment impacts and costs all seem like reasonable criteria to consider. It will be great for our city to see business boom and expand in the area South of Kymal. However, the nearby residential neighborhoods will lose a lot, facing negative socio-economic impacts if the traffic and congestion can not be contained to the major roads outlined in the study (i.e., Kymal Rd. and Trinity Church Rd.).

3. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Transportation Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Transportation Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

Plans listed in the study deal with only Kymal Rd. and Trinity Church Rd., and providing adequate passage for large volumes of traffic on these routes. Plans discussed verbally by Mr. Bocqve were inadequate in dealing with 2nd Rd. W. My daughter and grandchildren live on 2nd Rd. W. I am very familiar with the current traffic concerns. I must insist that in order to curb commuter traffic through the residential neighborhood 2nd Rd. W. must be eliminated as a North/South shortcut!
4. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Water Servicing Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Water Servicing Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

I agree with the solutions.

5. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Wastewater Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Wastewater Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

I have no reason to disagree.

6. Do you have any other comments regarding the material and displays you have seen today?

(104th 2nd Rd. W.)

Contact Information (Optional)
Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Phone Number: [Redacted]
Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 LANDS) Master Plan
Class Environmental Assessment
Re: Response to Oct. 3, 2005 Public Information Centre No. 1.

Transportation re: TRINITY CHURCH ROAD

Study initiative statement, "to accommodate future development"

Reply: by [redacted]

- The majority of Trinity Church Road lies within the Greenbelt under regulations which do not permit major development on that land.

- Prior to amalgamation, city staff advised the council against the plans of several developers to build residential and commercial properties south of Rymal Road between HWY 56 and Trinity Church Road citing that the development plan would initiate negative urban sprawl. However, the former council in its final days, proceeded to vote in favour of Aldo De Santis, allowing him to build the residential area called Summit Park. That development was to extend southward ONLY to the hydro corridor. Thereby leaving the farm fields from the hydro corridor southward to Golf Club Road undeveloped. South of Golf Club Road lies within the Provincial Green Belt.

  If Hamilton City council keeps its promise to curtail the development to north of the hydro corridor, there will be no further significant development along Trinity Church Road to accommodate in the distant future and no need to create a four-lane highway on this road. Land behind the present strip-housing is farmland.

  Change these parameters and you change our quality of life.

- Another criteria stated by the planners was that Trinity Church Road was once a Regional Road between two townships, Mount Hope and Binbrook. Since Regional Government was created in 1973 and the two townships joined to become Glenbrook that designation ceased to exist. Trinity Church Road has been a rural, residential road since 1973. That is our choice and our right to live in a rural, residential area. We do not ask for services like sewers, sidewalks or street lights. We prefer to live the rural lifestyle.

- Young children ride their bikes on Trinity Church Road, and residents of the care facility, Participation House, drive their wheelchairs on the road.

- Trinity Church Road is NOT a through street. It ends at Lake Niapenco. It would be preferable to have a north-south route that could potentially join into the proposed, Mid-Peninsula freeway. Nebo Road, which transverses the North Glenbrook Prestigious Industrial Business Park already extends beyond White Church Road which is the western extension of Binbrook Road.
• The halfway point between highway 6 (Upper James Street) and Highway 56 (the extension of Centennial Parkway into Binbrook) lies half way between Nebo Road and Dartnall Road. Thus either one of those two roads would be most appropriate for a middle north-south highway. Both Nebo Road and Dartnall Road traverse the North Glenbrook Prestigious Industrial Business Park. Highways (truck routes) ought to service local business areas. Nebo Road should have been the road of choice for an off ramp from the LINC but, bad municipal planning positioned the Ottawa Street dump as an obstacle for such an exit route. Dartnall Road then was the obvious choice. Dartnall is also a commercial road with businesses that will need truck delivery service. With Dartnall being the exit route off the LINC and Nebo being a through road, it would seem most feasible for the four lane truck route (highway) to exit the LINC on Dartnall and then gradually curved through the North Glenbrook. Prestigious Industrial Business Park to join into Nebo Road at some point and progress southward to join the future, proposed Mid Peninsula Highway.

• The only businesses requiring truck traffic on Trinity Church Road are the Army Sewer Contractors near Rymal Road and the sod farm on White Church Road. The Army Sewer company could access their business onto the new road to be built in the North Glenbrook Prestigious Industrial Business Park directly behind their property. Trucks servicing the sod farm likewise could use a road through the above said Park.

• Enclosed with this information is the revised road plan for the North Glenbrook. Prestigious Industrial Business Park which was submitted by my husband, a retired building contractor and draftsman, to Gavin Norman, P. Eng. Senior Project Manager, City of Hamilton, re: the North Glenbrook. Prestigious Industrial Business Park - Transportation Master Plan, Public Information Centre #1. The plan was received and a reply was sent to us citing that the plan which my husband submitted would be incorporated into the study route alternatives. Plan A, as included, was the preferred plan. Thus no roads from the Park would exit onto Trinity Church Road, making the need to widen the north end of said road to the former City of Hamilton boundary unnecessary. NOTE also; that a buffer strip (an earthen berm with a MINIMUM height of 5 feet - higher would be preferable - with trees planted along it) was promissed to separate our RURAL/RESIDENTIAL road completely from the said PARK. Trinity Church Road was allowed by Glenbrook and the City of Hamilton to develop as a Residential road of strip housing. (Not to mention that housing permits were issued to build residential homes right within the North Glenbrook Prestigious Industrial Business Park.) It is obscene that this was allowed to happen, and now a slaughterhouse is to be build in those people's midst. This is BAD PLANNING. Turning Trinity Church Road into a 4-lane highway would be the final insult.

Yours truly,
September 21, 2005

File No.: 30.30.04/72

Re: North Glenbrook Industrial Business Park - Transportation Master Plan Public Information Centre #1

Dear [Name],

Thank you for attending the first North Glenbrook Industrial Business Park (NGIBP) Public Information Centre on June 29, 2005 and for providing us with your thoughts on the transportation and land use issues along Trinity Church Road including the alternative route alignments you'd like the City to consider (attached).

Currently the City is undertaking two Environmental Assessment (EA) studies in the area; this study and the Rymal Road Planning Area (RRPA) EA Study. The result of travel demand forecasting undertaken for both studies indicate a need for additional north-south lane capacity between Stone Church Road and Rymal Road east of Pritchard Road to support growth in the area. South of Rymal Road, future demand which is based primarily on future growth in the NGIBP, translates into a need for Trinity Church Road to be a two lane arterial road (with protection for four lanes) feeding into the park from Rymal Road.

It should be noted that except for the future Dartnall Road Extension, this study is intended to identify the basic requirements of the preferred road network for the NGIBP; i.e. satisfy Schedule B requirements (Phase 1 - problem / opportunity statement and Phase 2 - evaluation of alternative solutions) of the Class EA. For future Dartnall Road, Schedule C requirements (Phase 3 - alternative route evaluation and Phase 4 - Environmental Study Report) are also being completed in order to get approval for the future route's alignment.

For Trinity Church Road, it was the intention of the City, and defined in this study's scope as such, to defer the determination of the road's future alignment (i.e. Phases 3 and 4) to a future study, recognizing that the role of Trinity Church Road as an access to the NGIBP was a longer term requirement; however, based on the
Re: North Glenbrook Industrial Business Park - Transportation Master Plan
Public Information Centre #1

September 21, 2005
Page 2 of 3

concerns brought forward by residents along Trinity Church Road, the City has decided to advance phases 3 and 4 of the study in order to act on the resident's concerns and develop a recommended alignment for the road.

In that regard, Phase 3 and 4 (Schedule C) requirements for Trinity Church Road south of Rymal Road are being combined with the concurrent RRPA EA Study that is assessing the need for an extension of Trinity Church Road to Stone Church Road; in that way planning for the road can be completed using a consistent and holistic approach. The alternatives you've submitted will be incorporated into the study route alternatives.

Through the course of the summer the project team has been finalizing the preferred road network based on input received at the Information Centre, beginning preparation of a Master Plan Report in accordance with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (2000), and developing specific details of the recommended road projects to be determined as part of this study. In particular, we will be generating and evaluating road alignment alternatives for the future Dartnell Road Extension. These items will be presented at a subsequent Public Information Centre in late 2005 or early 2006 for stakeholder review and comment.

Should you require further information regarding this study, please feel free to contact one of the project team members listed below.

Gavin Norman, P. Eng.
Senior Project Manager
City of Hamilton
71 Main Street West
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5
Phone: (905) 546-2424 ext 1322
Fax: (905) 546-4202
email: gnorman@hamilton.ca

Mr. Mike Bricks
Consultant Project Manager
Ecoplans Limited
2655 North Sheridan Way
Mississauga, ON L5K 2P8
Phone: (905) 823-4988
Fax: (905) 823-2669
email: mbricks@ecoplans.com

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Gavin Norman, P. Eng.
Senior Project Manager
Planning and Economic Development
City of Hamilton

attach.

cc. M. Bricks, Ecoplans Limited
C. Lee Morrison, Public Works
4. Preferred route in red dotted line.

2. Trinity Church Rd. resident want no traffic from the park coming onto our road as discussed with residents.

3. The berm (with trees was promised, if the industrial park was developed). (Berm 5'4 screen of trees)

This needs a compromise for residents.

On both sides of Trinity Church Rd.

Drew up by Robert Wm. Smith 3/11/1994

561 Trinity Church Rd. (Room 1110) (203) 622-3101
1. Preferred route in red dotted line
2. Trinity Church Rd residents want no traffic from the Park coming onto our road (as discussed with residents)
3. The Berm (with trees was promised) if the industrial park was developed (Berm 5' + screen of trees)

This meets a compromise for residences on both sides of Trinity Church Rd

Drawn up by Robert Wm. Smith (905-692-8292@sympatico.ca) 561 Trinity Church Rd/Erin Hannon, Ont. (905) 692-210
THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF GLANBROOK
BY-LAW NO. 464-56-00
TO AMEND ZONING BY-LAW NO. 464

WHEREAS the Region of Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan designates the lands subject to this By-law as URBAN, which permits industrial uses; and

WHEREAS the Township of Glanbrook Official Plan designates the lands subject to this By-law as NORTH GLANBROOK INDUSTRIAL-BUSINESS PARK, and

WHEREAS the North Glanbrook Industrial Business Park Secondary Plan of the Township Official Plan designates the lands subject to this By-law as "Prestige Business/Industrial"; and

WHEREAS the Corporation of the Township of Glanbrook deems it desirable and expedient that By-law No. 464 be amended as hereinafter set forth.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE COUNCIL OF THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF GLANBROOK ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. SCHEDULE "G" – North Glanbrook Industrial-Business Park of Zoning By-law No. 464 of the Township of Glanbrook, is hereby amended by changing from the Prestige Business/Industrial "M1" Zone to a modified Prestige Business/Industrial "M1" Zone, which is to be identified by Exception Number "M1-155", part of the lands located on the west side of Trinity Church Road, north of the future extension of Twenty Road East, and being Part of Lot 16, Concession 1, in the former Township of Glanford, now in the Township of Glanbrook, and as more particularly shown in hatched lines and identified as Lots 25 and 26 on the attached Schedule A, which is hereby declared to form part of this By-law.

2. In addition to the permitted accessory uses of SECTION 30: PRESTIGE BUSINESS/INDUSTRIAL "M1" ZONE, Subsection 30.1 PERMITTED USES, Clause (i) of Township Zoning By-law No. 464, a single detached dwelling, accessory to a permitted industrial use, shall be permitted on each of the lots identified as Lots 25 and 26 on the attached Schedule "A", subject to the following additional regulations:

(a) Required Setback from Trinity Church Road........................................ 30 metres (100 feet)

(b) Minimum Lot Size for Lot 25................................................................. 0.8 hectares (1.9 acres)

(c) Minimum Lot Size for Lot 26................................................................. 0.5 hectares (1.3 acres)
(d) Maximum Dwelling Size .................180 square metres (1,937 square feet)

(e) Occupancy of the Dwelling

The resident/occupant of the accessory single detached dwelling shall be restricted to the owner/manager of the principal industrial use on the same lot.

3. Notwithstanding the regulations associated with the buffer strip adjacent to Trinity Church Road of **SECTION 30: PRESTIGE BUSINESS/INDUSTRIAL "M1" ZONE**, Subsection 30.3 **REGULATIONS FOR USES PERMITTED IN PARAGRAPHS (a) TO (i) INCLUSIVE OF SUBSECTION 30.1 Clause (n) of Township Zoning By-law No. 464**, the following additional specific regulations shall apply to the lands shown in hatched lines and identified as Lots 25 and 26 identified on the attached Schedule A:

(a) That one (1) temporary access driveway shall be permitted from Trinity Church Road through the required Buffer Strip provided pursuant to Clause 30.1(n)(i) of Zoning By-law No. 464, where both an industrial building and accessory single detached dwelling are constructed at the same time;

(b) That this permitted temporary access driveway shall be removed and replaced with the required Buffer Strip immediately upon the construction and opening of the required adjacent internal public road, shown as Future Street 'B' on the attached Schedule A, which will provide the ultimate permanent access to the subject lands;

(c) That the landscaped area which forms a part of the required Buffer Strip adjacent to Trinity Church Road shall also include, among the current identified matters, an earthen berm with a minimum height of 1.5 metres (5 feet), with a planting strip, and

(d) That this required earthen berm shall be provided along the entire frontage of the subject lands adjacent to Trinity Church Road, save and except where the permitted temporary access driveway is located, however, upon the provision of the ultimate permanent access to the subject lands from the adjacent Future Street B to the west and the concurrent removal of the temporary driveway access, the earthen berm and planting strip shall be provided along the remaining frontage of the subject lands in the location of the former temporary driveway access.
4. Notwithstanding the Minimum Building Size regulations of **SECTION 30: PRESTIGE BUSINESS/INDUSTRIAL “M1” ZONE; Subsection 30.3 REGULATIONS FOR USES PERMITTED IN PARAGRAPHS (a) TO (i) INCLUSIVE OF SUBSECTION 30.1** Clause (d) of Township Zoning By-law No. 464, where the accessory single detached dwelling(s) is constructed along with the industrial building(s) on the subject lands shown in hatched lines on the attached Schedule A, as permitted by Paragraph 2 of this By-law, the Minimum Industrial Building Size shall be reduced to 278 square metres (3,000 square feet).

5. Notwithstanding anything in Zoning By-law No. 464, where the industrial building(s) and accessory single detached dwelling(s) are constructed at the same time on the lands subject to this By-law, and the related temporary driveway access is established pursuant to Paragraph 3 of this By-law, no vehicle exceeding a gross vehicle weight of 5 tonnes per axle shall be parked and/or stored on the subject lands shown in hatched lines on the attached Schedule A.

6. All development of the lands subject to this By-law shall be subject to Site Plan Control.

7. **SECTION 44: EXCEPTIONS TO THE PROVISIONS OF THIS BY-LAW of Township Zoning By-law No. 464 shall be amended to include Exception Number “M1-155”, in accordance with Paragraph 1 of this By-law and the specific provisions established by Paragraphs 2 to 6 inclusive of this By-law.**

8. The metric numerical figures contained within this By-law shall be the actual requirements of this By-law. The imperial figures are approximate and are provided for information purposes only.

9. This By-law shall come into force and take effect on the day of the final passing thereof.


________________________________________
Glen Etherington
Mayor

________________________________________
Brian Rodgers
Clerk-Treasurer
Thank you for attending today's Rymal Road Planning Area (ROPA 9 Lands) Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment Open House. Your input is important to help the City evaluate the proposed recommendations in the Rymal Road Planning Area. The purpose of the first Public Information Centre is to present the needs and opportunities, preliminary alternative solutions to address servicing issues, the natural and socio-economic environmental inventories, the preliminary criteria used to evaluate the proposed alternatives, the evaluation of the alternatives, and a preliminary preferred alternative for each project.

It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight or mail/fax them by October 21, 2005 to:

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
320 - 77 James St. N
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3.
Phone: 905-546-2404 ext. 6300
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: clemom@hamilton.ca

Your Comments Please!
Please provide your comments about the information presented during the Public Information Centre.

1. Do you have any comments regarding the needs, opportunities and problem statement presented?

We question the need to widen any part of Trinity Church Rd. because the majority of the road lies within the GREENBELT where major development IS NOT PERMITTED. It is our preferred plan to have no road from the Glenbrook prestigious business park to enter onto Trinity Church Rd. Rather our plan - as given to accepted by the road planner for the Park is to be presented as a viable choice - with the most eastern road in the Park extending to Pritchard Rd.

2. Do you have any comments regarding the evaluation criteria used to assess the potential solutions?

The criteria re-widening Trinity Church Rd. being that it was once a Regional Rd. between 2 townships /Mount Hope & Binbrook, no longer applies. The 2 townships joined to become Glenbrook. Trinity Church Rd was allowed to become a rural residential road. Please do not turn it into another Centennial Parkway with heavy truck traffic & accompanying pollution. That would be an abomination in this enlightened age. Develop to the east of Centennial'swy. nearer the Rymal/ Centennial Commercial area & not south of the hydro

3. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Transportation Solutions Identified. Corridor.

Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Transportation Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

An alternative solution to a left turn off the LINC to Trinity Church Rd. is to use Partnell - presently linked to the LINC on both east-west lanes - a commercial road which will be extended into the Glenbrook prestigious business park. Trucks will need to take that route to service businesses within the park.

Failing that solution - connect another ramp off the LINC to Pritchard Rd - also a commercial road which will be extended into the Glenbrook prestigious business park.

Trinity Church Rd is a rural residential road - no place for
4. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Water Servicing Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Water Servicing Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

5. Please provide comments regarding the Alternative Wastewater Solutions identified. Are there any additional Alternatives that have not been identified? Do you agree with the preliminary preferred Wastewater Solutions? Please indicate why or why not.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

6. Do you have any other comments regarding the material and displays you have seen today?

Re: roads to service the Glenbrook prestigious business park — the residents of Trinity Church Rd. were promised a high, tree berm on the west side behind the existing houses to be a buffer between Trinity Church Rd. & the business park. There was to be no access roads from Trinity Church Rd. into the business park. No need to widen the road on Trinity Church Rd. chose to live in a rural area. Yes, Trinity Church Rd. should be curtailed to the north of the hydro corridor. Rural areas NEED to be preserved.

Contact Information (Optional)

Name: Mr. & Mrs. Robert Win Smith

Address: 561 Trinity Church Rd.
RR # 2 Hannon, ON.

Phone Number: 905-692-3101

Email: rws29@sympatico.ca

Would you like to be added to our ROPA 9 Lands mailing list?

[ ] YES [ ] NO

To fulfill Environmental Assessment Act requirements, we will maintain your comments on file for use during this Study and may include them in Study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments received will become part of the public record. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
June Too

From: Nathalie Baudais
Sent: Monday, June 05, 2006 2:05 PM
To: June Too
Subject: FW: Damaged Truck/Families at risk

Hi June,

Can you please print this comment and include it in the appendix for the ROPA 9 Master Plan with names blacked out and include a copy in the public consultation binder too.

Thanks,
Nathalie

From: Liza Sheppard
Sent: Monday, June 05, 2006 2:02 PM
To: Nathalie Baudais
Subject: FW: Damaged Truck/Families at risk

From: [mailto][mailto]
Sent: Monday, June 05, 2006 10:39 AM
To: editor@stoneycreeknews.com;  
Dalton.McGuinty@premier.gov.on.ca;  
jrogers@canstar.com;  
dmitchell@hamilton.ca;  
dwastell@canstar.com;  
jmoosop.mpp@liberal.ola.org;  
klkianni@hamilton.ca;  
tryan@hamilton.ca;  
lreinhold@canstar.com;  
lsheppard@itransconsulting.com;  
pbruckler@hamilton.ca;  
rbaclue@itransconsulting.com;  

Subject: Damaged Truck/Families at risk

I am reporting an incident on behalf of [redacted] of Second Road West. His e-mail is currently in need of repair as his 2003 Ford Ranger is. As all of us, [redacted] has been vocal towards the speeders and traffic violators on our street. In return, his almost new vehicle was severely damaged. He can not even drive it. The windshield was smashed and the entire paint job was dented and damaged with nails. As you know, this happened to me 2 years ago and to [redacted] Second Road West(3 times). These ignorant s.o.b.'s feel they have the right to abuse our road. They don't have the spine to step out of their cars and deal with us but they feel brave at 3:00am in the morning when we are sleeping.

Phil, I am scared for my children's safety. I watch my children like a hawk but they are children, they are not always attached to my hip. I am thankful for the lines at the stops but we are in desperate need
of some real concrete and immediate solutions. Phil we have taken matters into our own hands far too long.

In the past I have been told that if I am not part of the solution I am part of the problem. We have since been heavily involved in the solution and it has gotten us damaged vehicles and egged home. (Have you ever tried to get egg out of brick?) Just ask of Second Road West sold his third car because he could not afford to park it on the street any longer. It was damaged many times.

Perhaps we should look at our property taxes. The issues that we are facing (Traffic, theft, vandalism) are those of another property bracket.

Where can I get a "Property tax reconsideration form"? I have asked for one of these many many times.

5 years of living hell Phil. What would you do? How would you deal with what we deal with? I think it will take a tragedy to get something done. I really hope I never witness something like that.

Mike

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted], "Lee-Morrison, Christine" <cleemorr@hamilton.ca>, "Dilanni, Larry" <kdhanni@hamilton.ca>, "Kirchnopf, Gary" <skirchkn@hamilton.ca>
CC: [redacted]

Subject: Re: Trucks traffic on Second Rd W
Date: Sun, 4 Jun 2006 13:11:06 -0400

HI Phil

All of Saturday big trucks continued to travel up and down our street. Traffic is unbelievable. My son was telling me that when he had to back out with his car he was waiting 5 minutes to even think about backing out, and I am NOT exadurating.

I was certain that there was to be 4 lanes on Rymal rd between Highway 20 and Trinity Church Road but if you look at the intersection on Rymal and Whiteoar there's only one lane each way. This has created a lot traffic. Why is the city spending money on surveys if they don't do anything with the information they get. Why is the city not respecting the recommendations from iTrans. I wonder if they respect closing our street.

Regards

----- Original Message -----
From: Bruckler, Phil
To: [redacted], "Lee-Morrison, Christine" ; Dilanni, Larry ; Kirchnopf, Gary
Cc: [redacted]

Subject: RE: Trucks traffic on Second Rd W

Hi,

I fully concur with your comments. Clearly Second Road is not a truck route and therefore only local destinations would be permitted.

6/6/2006
By forwarding this to Gary Kirchhoft, I will have him provide you with the regulations related to truck traffic and arrange for enforcement to address your concern.

Please contact me if I can be of further assistance.

Phil

Phil Bruckler
Councillor, Ward 9
Heritage Stoney Creek
Phone: 546-2703
Fax: 540-5183

-----Original Message-----
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Thursday, May 04, 2006 4:26 PM
To: Bruckler, Phil; Lee-Morrison, Christine; DiIanni, Larry
Cc: [Redacted]

Subject: Trucks traffic on Second Rd W

Hi Phil,

I am hoping that you can give me some information. Do you know the specifics about by-laws for trucks in the city of Hamilton? If not, who can I speak to?

I am noticing more and more truck traffic using Second Rd West as a thoroughfare. I realize that there is construction being done in the neighbourhood and for this reason, there will be some truck traffic on our street. I have witnessed, however, many other larger vehicles using our street to get through to Fynmal Road. Even the dump trucks carrying away excavated land and others delivering shingles, soil etc in the area could use only the southern portion of Second Rd, however, many are traveling the much narrower northern part of the road toward Highland. I can live with the temporary truck traffic during construction, however, I think something needs to be done about other, non-local trucks using Second Rd West. I am sure you can appreciate my concern. Not only are we experiencing high volumes of personal vehicles using Second Rd as a direct link between Highland and Fynmal Road, speeding and disobeying stop signs, but now we are also being subject to large, noisy trucks using a very small, narrow street that is populated with parked cars, lack of sidewalks and children playing outside. The addition of these larger vehicles causes very impatient motorists in their passenger vehicles to take chances constantly passing too closely to parked vehicles, passing on the opposite side of the road and ignoring the requests of local citizens. Please help me deal with this situation. I would like more information about commercial traffic on local roads. With the warmer weather and more children playing outside, I am deathly afraid of an accident. We need to deal with this situation immediately. We need to deal with it before something tragic happens.

Sincerely,

[Redacted]
Nathalie Baudais

From: Liza Sheppard
Sent: Monday, May 29, 2006 11:22 AM
To: Nathalie Baudais

Subject: FW: Large Vehicles on Second Road/Phase One

From: [redacted]
Sent: Monday, May 29, 2006 11:12 AM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]

Subject: Re: Large Vehicles on Second Road/Phase One

Phil,

I agree with Mike completely. Yesterday morning (approx. 9:30 am), while I was taking a walk with my daughter, two "Pacific Western" buses travelled down our road within approximately 2 minutes of one another. I did catch the bus number of one of them which I believe was 1183. I can't understand why they are using our road and where they are coming from but, as Mike stated, they barely fit down the narrow section of our road and are becomingly more intolerable to us as it is happening on a more frequent basis.

Further, on Saturday morning, Lou and I caught more than 5 cars in a matter of 2 minutes go directly through the stop sign situated at the front of our home. Phil, as you can imagine, our frustrations are mounting as we are trying to be patient with the City and all the bureaucracy involved with closing our road however, the violations are happening blatantly in front of us and there is nothing we can do about it. Trying to catch a license plate is impossible, and to tell you the truth, my husband and I tend to yell at the motorists about their violation and we end up getting cursed at. Something, we don't want happening in front of our 3 year old.

Notwithstanding the violators, the amount of volume of vehicles accessing our road is incredible. The addition of Wal Mart obviously hasn't helped our cause but, the volume is even quite excessive at times when Wal Mart is closed. I can't imagine how crazy it will continue to be once the residents of Summit Par move in. Each morning, I have to allow at least 6-8 cars go by before I can even leave my driveway...that seems pretty excessive for a narrow residential road.

Phil, are hands are tied at the moment and as Mike stated, we are all looking forward to an update on Phase 1 of our road closure. We would like all of our families to have the ability to enjoy a wonderful summer on a safe street. Right now, we are from this reality.

Kind Regards,

[signature]

5/29/2006
Hello Phil. I was wondering if you could tell me why those huge greyhound buses are up and down Second Road West. They can barely fit. They give off large amounts of black smoke. I would imagine they should be using 53 and 20. Should there be a sign letting motorists know that their vehicle is illegal on our very narrow residential side street? Also, is there any word on the possible speed limit to 40km/h. We are a school pick up and drop off zone. Any word on phase one? The amount of traffic and noise is out of hand.

Thanks.
Hi,

I am sure you and are enjoying parenthood. Look forward to seeing your new daughter when I walk by some time soon.

On the other matters:
- the work order for line painting to create stronger awareness of the stops has been issued, I will let you know when that is to be scheduled. Hopefully soon.
- regarding the waste truck drivers socializing in that area, I’ll forward your concern to our manager, Blair Smith, who will follow-up to ensure it is not an ongoing thing.
- Regarding the walkway to the Park and Gesteone school, I’ll review with staff as to who the walk is to be accessed from the west side of Second St. It is important that this be resolved until such time as the street is closed.
- Police presence: I know Duncan Moulloch and other officers are activity in the area. By way of this e-mail I’ll ask that he respond to more recent surveillance of Second Rd.

I’ll get back to you and other interested Second Road residents when I have information on those matters.
Sincerely,
Phil

Phil Bruckler
Councillor, Ward 9
Heritage Stoney Creek
Phone: 546-2703
Fax: 540-5183

-----Original Message-----
From: Nathalie Baudais
Sent: Tuesday, May 23, 2006 1:53 PM
To: Liza Sheppard
Subject: FW: Second Road West
Hello Phil! I hope all is well. I am sending this e-mail regarding my
concerns. Since I have been home for some time now (basically since
January) I have noticed a dramatic increase in traffic on our street —
both
during the day and night. As well, during my time at home I did a count
(free of charge). On average, 1 out of 2 cars are either either
speeding
and/or running the stop signs. This worries me Phil. It is difficult
enough trying to get out of my driveway or cross the street — and now
that I
have a newborn in the car that could potentially receive the impact of a
careless driver — the thought sickens my stomach.

Since the last public meeting, I was under the assumption that there was
going to be some change on Second Road West sooner than later. Police
presence has yet to be seen and the white stop bar on the pavement has not
yet been painted (as Mr. Pente mentioned in his e-mail as well). I do not
understand the logic in painting only white lines on Highland Road and
Gatestone and not on Second Road and connecting streets. Wouldn't it be
more cost effective if the City paid workers only once to do a job
instead
of waisting our tax dollars for repeat visits?

As well, I would like to bring to your attention that for the past 2
weeks,
city trucks have been "meeting" on the corner of Second Road West and
Hillzott during the day. I believe the trucks are for the green bin
pick
up. This "socialization break" makes it difficult for traffic to get
around them and is increasingly dangerous to pedestrians — especially since
failing
to stop at the stop sign at this intersection and speeding are a concern
as
well.

Also, I have also noticed work is being done on the walkway leading to
Gatestone elementary. Will the city be paving soon? Maybe to save our
precious tax dollars, when the City pours the walkway and curbs leading to
the school, the City can also close our road with the walkway! Just a
thought.

[Signature]

and I would appreciate action taking place in regard to the City
and
Trans resolutions. Summer is approaching, school will be out soon ... we
would like everyone on our street to have a safe summer!

Thank you and talk to you soon.
Phil

We all agree with the proposal of reducing the speed limit to 40kms/h. It needs to be posted and enforced. (The key component) Having said this, the speed limit can 5kms/h, if it is not enforced it will not matter. The community of Second Road West needs to see rather than just hear results and reactions form your part. What is happening here is we are being send the clear message. The message is that we need to cause noise in order to get something done. We all know the residents of Second Road have no problem with that, but, is it necessary? That takes time away from our families. We already pay our taxes. I also feel that our property taxes are much too high. We live on a dangerous high volume road. We need to get a Tax Reconsideration Application. Until the road is as it was planned, we should not pay the taxes for it. Could you tell me where to get one please. I am sure that if we do not see some results soon,(End of May) we will be forced to, once again, take matters into our own hands. We have been dealing with these issues for five years. We are sick and tired of being sick and tired.

Phil, help us enjoy our first safe summer on Second Road West.

5/23/2006
Our fundamental concerns however, remain the same:
- Traffic volumes using Second Road are continually increasing
- throughout the day and night hours with the peak periods literally out
  of control.
- Speeding and running of stop signs has intensified at an alarming
  rate.
- Within numerous community and advisory meetings the mention of police
  presence was to be seen, no constables to date.
- A recommendation was put forth regarding a white stop bar on the
  pavement, and although, it was a recommendation all were in favour this
  would be a simple, cost effective step until closure took place.
- Nothing to date.
- We have also attempted to take down license plate’s and send them in
  but this has become increasingly difficult. There is no way someone can
  take the plate number down of either a car who was speeding and went
  through the stop sign or of a car who just plainly ran the stop. You
  literally have to stand at the curb to accomplish this feat.
- We as a community have taken a proactive approach and as all will agree
  have tried to work with the City and Ittrans to try and come up with a
  resolution which everyone could agree on.
- Please feel free to share your comments.
- Best regards,
-
Hi,
Away for weekend. Will follow up on timing of interim improvements such as line painting etc., which was recommended, when I get back. Will also check with police.
Phil

-----Original Message-----
From: pbrucker@cityofhamilton.ca
To: brucker@cityofhamilton.ca; Lee-Morrison, Christin; Brucker, Phil
CC: rbcacquie@itransconsulting.com, lsheppard@itransconsulting.com

Sent: Thu May 18 17:39:31 2006
Subject: Second Road West

Good afternoon to all,

I let me begin by saying that I understand we are still within a process and although the recommendation to have Second Road closed was put forward from Itans it will take some time for this to come to fruition.

Our fundamental concerns however, remain the same:
-Traffic volumes using Second Road are continually increasing throughout the day and night hours with the peak periods literally out of control.

-Speeding and running of stop signs has intensified at an alarming rate.

-Within numerous community and advisory meetings the mention of police presence was to be seen, no constables to date.

-A recommendation was put forth regarding a white stop bar on the pavement, and although it was a recommendation all were in favour this would be a simple, cost effective step until closure took place.
Nothing to date.

We have also attempted to take down license plate's and send them in but this has become increasingly difficult. There is no way someone can take the plate number down of either a car who was speeding and went through the stop sign or of a car who just plainly ran the stop. You literally have to stand at the curb to accomplish this feat.

We as a community have taken a proactive approach and as all will agree have tried to work with the City and Trans to try and come up with a resolution which everyone could agree on.

Please feel free to share your comments.
Best regards,
Trinity PIC #1
March 27, 06 Minutes...

As requested, attached are the draft minutes of the Trinity Neighbourhood Plan Review Public Meeting held on March 27, 2006. These notes are currently being reviewed by staff for completeness, and I am glad to provide you with a draft copy. Several references are made to citizen comments about keeping Second Road West open, especially in the notes of the discussion groups attached after the minutes.

Please feel free to contact me directly with any comments you may have about these minutes or the Trinity Neighbourhood plan review. The final minutes and a summary of all comments received are being prepared, and will be made available on the project web site at www.hamilton.ca/trinity. Thank you.

Vanessa Grupe, Senior Planner
Community Planning & Design Section
Planning & Economic Development Department City of Hamilton
Phone: 905-546-2424 Ext. 1283

-----Original Message-----
From: Lee-Morrison, Christine
Sent: Thursday, April 27, 2006 10:32 AM
To: 'Bruckler, Phil; 'Liza Sheppard'; Grupe, Vanessa; 'Nathalie Baudais'
Subject: RE: ROPA 9

Dear,

Again, thank you for bringing your concerns and comments forward to the City. I trust our telephone conversation clarified stakeholder committee membership, the purpose of public meetings held this January and March and timing of the Special Policy Area C newsletter. By copy of this e-mail to Vanessa Grupe, I am requesting that she send the record of the March Trinity Neighbourhood meeting to you directly. Please feel free to call or e-mail if you have any further questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager, Environmental Planning
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
320-77 James St. N.
Hamilton, Ontario, L8R 2K3
tel: 905-546-2424 extension 6390
fax: 905-546-4425
-----Original Message-----
From: [mailto.
Sent: Thursday, April 27, 2006 1:05 AM
To: Lee-Morrison, Christine
Cc: Bruckler, Phil; 'Liza Sheppard'; Grupe, Vanessa; 'Nathalie Baudais'
Subject: RE: ROPA 9

Christine,

Thank you for your prompt reply. But I need to disagree with you regarding the Stakeholder Members they all appear to be members of council, City employees and staff from ITtrans. As a ratepayers and Hamiltonian, I would like to think that I am a Stakeholder regarding this matter and therefore feel that these meeting should not be held behind closed doors.

As for what you said about a second public meeting, I was at the last one and we where all told that "we are not here to talk about roads tonight" So if I missed a meeting where we talked about road alternatives please inform me of when it was. Also I noticed that on the web site you have placed the Newsletter for the month of April. You have a paragraph that says "Your input" I have spoken to a few neighbors and they have not received this news letter yet either. Could you please tell me when I and my neighbor might expect to receive this?

I have reviewed the minutes of the meeting and the comments that you have mentioned and was wondering where the comments regarding actually closing Second Rd where and the opposition that was voiced by at least 10 people at the meeting.

I look forward to discussing this matter with you in more detail and perhaps with Mr. Bruckler.

Thanks again for your time

-----Original Message-----
From: Lee-Morrison, Christine [mailto:clemurr@hamilton.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, April 26, 2006 12:55 PM
To: 
Cc: Bruckler, knil; Liza Sheppard; Nathalie Baudais; Grupe, Vanessa
Subject: RE: ROPA 9

Dear

Thank you for your interest in this project. The Stakeholder Committee was formed at the commencement of the Ryval Road Planning Area Class EA Master Plan study, to (1) provide the Project Team with an understanding of the public issues, (2) provide comments and concerns related to road
and water/waste water servicing, and (3) provide feedback on alternative solutions and their impacts, so that these issues can be considered throughout the study process, particularly in preparation for the public meetings. So the role of the Stakeholders Group is to provide a community perspective on issues, planning processes and solutions, which the general public has been involved with at the public meetings.

The Committee is comprised of residents from the community, other property owners, developers, and Councillors Bruckler (Ward 9) and Mitchell (Ward 11). These focus group meetings are unfortunately not public meetings. However, all information is presented to the public at the public meetings.

The focus of the upcoming meeting is to review the transportation Alternatives and Evaluation for the Special Policy Area C lands. There will be a second public meeting to discuss the Trinity Collector alignment in the Fall. Your name will be placed on the mailing list and you will be kept informed as public meetings are scheduled. Also, for your information, I understand that the Planning Department will be forming an Advisory Committee for the Trinity Neighbourhood Land Use Review and you may contact Vanessa Grupe (e-mail address above) if you are interested in sitting on the Trinity Neighbourhood Land Use Review Committee.

I trust this provides clarification on the matter. Please call me if you have questions.

Sincerely,

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager, Environmental Planning
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
320-77 James St. N.
Hamilton, Ontario, L8R 2K3
tel: 905-546-2424 extension 6390
fax: 905-546-4435
cleemorr@hamilton.ca

-----Original Message-----
From: mailto:
Sent: Tuesday, April 25, 2006 11:11 PM
To: Lee-Morrison, Christine
Cc: Bruckler, Phil
Subject: ROPA 9

Christine,

I am a resident of Richdale Drive. I was at the meeting on January 26 2006. I was under the impression that the neighbors would be included in the discussions and decision making regarding the roads and construction in the area. I have just noticed on the web site that you are having a meeting regarding "ROP A 9 Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2" I was wondering why the people that live in the area are not being included in this meeting.

I will be forwarding this information to all the neighbors in my immediate area and would hope that this meeting is open to the public!!

Please forward any communications regarding this matter as soon as possible.

Thanks in Advance
TRINITY NEIGHBOURHOOD LAND USE REVIEW

DRAFT MINUTES OF PUBLIC FORUM - MONDAY MARCH 27, 2006

6:00 p.m. – 8:30 p.m. Winterberry Heights Church

There were present:
Approximately 60 residents / citizens
Councillor Phil Bruckler, Ward 9
Councillor Dave Mitchell, Ward 10
Staff of the City Planning Dept., Public Works Dept., Hamilton Conservation
Authority and other interested parties.

1. Open House – Review of Displays
Displays were available for public viewing illustrating the purpose and status of
the land use review and the related transportation studies.

2. Public Meeting – Welcome and Meeting Purpose – Vanessa Grupe
Presentations began at 6:30 p.m. Vanessa Grupe of the City Planning
Department welcomed all to the public meeting. Purpose of the meeting was to:
- provide an overview of the Planning Department’s land use review;
- hear a presentation from the Conservation Authority regarding the Karst;
- summarize related transportation studies in the area;
- enable residents to do a visioning exercise on types of development and
density they would like to see in the area.

3. Councillor’s Remarks – Councillor Phil Bruckler
Councillor Phil Bruckler welcomed residents to the meeting. He noted the
tremendous opportunity presented by the Karst features. He also noted that
input from residents and the public is very important in these studies for Trinity.

4. Neighbourhood Plan Review Overview – Vanessa Grupe
An overview was provided of the land use review:
- Study area boundaries are Second Rd. W., Rymal Rd., Highland Rd. and
  the extension of Trinity Church Rd.
- Existing approved land use plan was prepared in early 1990’s for the
  entire Heritage Green secondary plan area, which includes Trinity
- This plan provided for a range of housing types, from low to medium density, also commercial, schools, parks.
- Karst area, the boundaries of which have recently been confirmed, takes up about half the interior of the Trinity neighbourhood.
- Therefore need to revise this land use plan, due to the Karst area, which eliminates the mid-block collector road originally proposed to connect Gatestone at Second Rd. W. to Winterberry Dr. at Highland Rd.
- The Rymal Road Secondary Plan for ROPA 9 lands to the south of Rymal Rd. identifies the development pattern for these lands; Development in Trinity must be integrated with plans for the ROPA 9 lands.
- A preliminary site analysis has been prepared for Trinity, to identify areas of opportunity and constraint, views, to help guide the land use review.

Transportation issues were also discussed by Vanessa Grupe, with assistance from Christine Lee-Morrison:
- Transportation studies are underway by City Public Works Dept. for the ROPA 9 lands, which includes a Class EA (Environmental Assessment).
- Development in Trinity will be affected by proposed closure of 2 roads:
  o Second Rd. W., about halfway between Highland and Rymal, and
  o Upper Mount Albion Rd., just north of Rymal.
- These road closures were included in the approved Secondary Plan for the area, and are therefore committed to by the City.
- A new north-south road will be built as an extension of Trinity Church Rd., exact location of which is to be determined (Trinity Church Collector EA).
- This public meeting is not intended to discuss these road projects in detail or as a primary focus. However, it is recognized that these Public Works roads projects affect the Trinity areas and future land use plan.
- A new collector road is to be built through the Trinity Neighbourhood, to the east and possibly to the north of the Karst area. This is needed to provide an alternative to Second Rd. W., which will be closed. Several options have been identified for the location of the collector road, by Public Works staff, and these are being evaluated.
- A public meeting was held on January 26 2006 to obtain input on the Trinity Neighbourhood Traffic Study.

Public Consultation
This is a very important part of the land use review process, and all City studies. Public input will be enabled by means such as public meetings, comment sheets, project web sites, and newsletters to provide status reports on projects.

5. Hamilton Conservation Authority and Karst – Bruce Duncan
Bruce Duncan, GM / CAO of the Hamilton Conservation Authority (HCA), provided a presentation on the Karst features and the HCA’s role:
- The extent of the Karst area was shown by means of a map.
- Photos were used to illustrate some of the Karst features, including underground caves, streams, etc., showing their size and extent.
- This is a major Environmentally Significant Area (ESA) in the province
- The Karst lands are in the process of being transferred from the Province to the HCA at a cost of $2.
- The HCA will manage the area and provide amenities such as trails, an interpretive centre, parking area, tours, and educational events.
- The specifics of these amenities are being defined. Some examples from other areas were shown for the purpose of illustration.
- There was a brief question and answer session about the HCA role, as well as the planning process and the road projects.

6. **Questions; Introductions to Discussion Groups – Vanessa**
The format for this public forum will include small discussion groups, to enable residents to do visioning about land use types and densities they prefer in Trinity.

7. **Small Discussion Groups – See Discussion Questions**
The participants formed 3 small discussion groups, each with a facilitator and a recorder(s). The attached discussion questions formed the basis for sharing of ideas and concerns. The groups met for about 45 minutes, and translated their comments into written and map form.

8. **Reporting Back to Large Group**
The attached is a summary of the discussion from each of the small groups.

9. **Next Steps and Adjournment**
The comments from this meeting, including written and verbal, will be compiled. Residents were invited to take comment sheets home with them to complete and submit during the next two weeks. Residents are also invited to express their interest in participating on a citizen advisory committee.

All present were thanked for attending and participating by Councillor Bruckler and Planning staff. Meeting results and updates will be posted at the project website at [www.hamilton.ca/trinity](http://www.hamilton.ca/trinity). Another further public meeting will be held once staff have prepared alternative land use concepts, for public input. The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.
TRINITY NEIGHBOURHOOD LAND USE REVIEW

Discussion Questions for Public Forum - March 27, 2006

The City is preparing a plan for future development in the Trinity area. As part of this process, it is important for City staff to hear from local residents and property owners about what form of development you feel would be most appropriate for this area.

Please use the questions below as a starting point for discussion. Feel free to use the maps provided to sketch your group’s concepts. Also please have your group’s recorder note written comments to explain your ideas. The separate comment sheets can be used to provide any further comments, this evening or over the next two weeks.

1. Land Uses
   - What future uses do you feel are most suitable for the Trinity area?
   - Housing types - single family / semis / quads, townhouses, low / high apartments
   - Forms of commercial might include corner stores, small or medium size plazas
   - Other uses could be parks, school, church sites, etc.

2. Residential Densities
   - What types of residential densities do you feel are appropriate for these areas?
   - This could be based on housing form, lot size, units per acre, etc.

3. Commercial Areas
   - Do you feel there is a need for commercial i.e. stores in the area?
   - How much and what type of commercial would you prefer to see here - such as small or medium size plazas, corner variety stores or strip commercial?
   - Where would these best be located, such as along which roads?

4. Building Heights
   - What should be the maximum height for buildings in each part of this area?
   - In terms of how many storeys are appropriate?
   - Should there be medium / higher residential densities in some areas, such as along arterial roads, along the collector road, or elsewhere?

5. Mixed Use
   - Is mixed use (commercial and residential together) appropriate in this area?
   - What about allowing professional offices in existing homes along Rymal Road?
   - This might include doctors and dentists.

6. Design Themes
   - What is special / memorable / unique about this area’s past and present?
   - What types of landmark features could be used as themes for the area?
   - Any suggestions for street names based on historic land owners or residents?

7. Other
   - What other comments do you have about future development in this area?
   - What do you feel is appropriate for the internal local road pattern?

Reporting Back to Large Group
Trinity Neighbourhood Land Use Review
Blue Group - Summary of Discussions - March 27, 2006 Forum

Between Upper Mount Albion Road & Second Road West
- Most residents would like to keep the neighbourhood low density with linked townhomes kept to a minimum.
- Preserve the wooded area and SWM pond at Richdale Drive. Concerns were raised about its future given that preferred road alignment goes through the woodlot area.
- Do not want any commercial facilities in their neighbourhood. Would prefer to keep all commercial south of Rymal Road. There was some acceptance of professional offices i.e. doctor, dental, legal along Rymal Road.
- Generally, do not want mixed use in this area.
- There is a perception that schools are needed in this neighbourhood particularly Catholic secondary.
- Residents would like to see a neighbourhood park with a splash pad and rubberized surface.
- Link the various parks, proposed and existing with a comprehensive trail system.

Karst Area
- Integrate all Karst features into the park including those not identified in the core or feeder areas i.e. Nexus Spring, Olmsted Spring, Olmsted Cave.
- Do not develop the properties south of the identified Karst boundary and include them in the conservation park.
- Maintain the open space character of the Karst feature.

West of Upper Mount Albion Road
- Residents not as concerned about the land use in this area.
- Receptive to higher density housing, commercial and mixed-use.
- No strip malls.
- Higher density buildings at intersections served by transit.
- Neighbourhood parks connected to the city trail system desirable.

Design Themes
- Neighbourhood theme and street names relating to the Karst would be appropriate such as:
  2. Pottruff Cave Court
  3. Watercress Sink Street
  4. Willow Spring Road
  5. Nexus Cave Crescent
Trinity Neighbourhood Land Use Review
Green Group - Summary of Discussions - March 27, 2006 Forum

1. Land Uses
   - What future uses do you feel are most suitable for the Trinity area?
     - Conservation land
     - Green Space (Open Space)
       - Housing types - single family/semis/quads, townhouses, low/high apartments
     - Single Family (Low Density)
       - Forms of commercial might include corner stores, small or medium size plazas
     - No need for more commercial (enough services available in the area)
       - Other uses could be parks, school, church sites, etc.
     - Passive Recreational (Soccer fields)
     - Parkette
     - No need for any new schools or churches

2. Residential Densities
   - What types of residential densities do you feel are appropriate for these areas?
     - Low Density Residential (less actual development, more land/space)
   - This could be based on housing form, lot size, units per acre, etc.
     - Estate housing backing onto Karst lands

3. Commercial Areas
   - Do you feel there is a need for commercial i.e. stores in the area?
     - No need for any additional commercial development in the area (no lack in any services)
   - How much and what type of commercial would you prefer to see here - such as
     small or medium size plazas, corner variety stores or strip commercial?
     - No need for any form of commercial types
   - Where would these best be located, such as along which roads?
     - Along Rymal Road where development already exists (not in Trinity Neighbourhood)

4. Building Heights
   - What should be the maximum height for buildings in each part of this area?
     - 2 storeys
   - In terms of how many storeys are appropriate?
     - 2 storeys (The higher the storeys permitted the more chance the development will be higher)
   - Should there be medium/higher residential densities in some areas, such as along arterial roads, along the collector road, or elsewhere?
     - No
5. Mixed Use
- Is mixed use (commercial and residential together) is appropriate in this area?
  - *Mixed feelings about this use, some agreed that if a butcher wants a shop below and residence above that could be appropriate. But others think that there is no need for any forms of commercial whether its mixed use or not.*
- What about allowing professional offices in existing homes along Rymal Road?
  - *Yes, professional offices, especially doctors is in great need in this area.*
  - This might include doctors and dentists.
  - Medical clinic for families (especially children)

6. Design Themes
- What is special / memorable / unique about this area’s past and present?
  - *Pathways that start beyond First Street West (Gatestone Rd. area) and continue over to Second Street into the Storm Water Pond.*
- What types of landmark features could be used as themes for the area?
  - *None mentioned*
- Any suggestions for street names based on historic land owners or residents?
  - *None mentioned*

7. Other
- What other comments do you have about future development in this area?
  - *Fencing is needed around the cave to stop children from entering into them, especially those caves outside of HCA lands (unprotected caves)*
  - *Continue linkages from pathways from First and Second Street into the Karst and Trinity Neighbourhood*
- What do you feel is appropriate for the internal local road pattern?
  - *No one mentioned specifically whether the local road pattern was appropriate or not, but some residents did have a concern as to where the location currently is on the conceptual mapping. Since it goes right over the rear of one resident’s property*
Trinity Neighbourhood Land Use Review
Red Group - Summary of Discussions - March 27, 2006 Forum

**New Collector Road Through Trinity Neighbourhood**
- Concerns regarding the construction of this road.
- Need for alternative roads in north-south direction – concerns regarding road capacity available to serve regular traffic and any potential emergency situations such as when roads are blocked by accidents
- Some residents felt the proposed new road might pass over other caves and sinkholes which are not included in designated Karst area, may sink.

**Closure of Second Road West**
- Many residents prefer to keep this road open, not build a new road.
- Other residents felt this road must be closed as was intended in City plans
  - They note that many children play on Second Road West.

**Land Use Types and Densities**
- Some residents prefer no new development on lands south-east of Karst – keep this area as open space
- However, cost to the City or Cons. Auth. of retaining these lands as open space is prohibitive – may be up to $200,000 per acre for residential land
- Low density residential preferable – no more than 3 storeys in height.

**Additional Public Comments**
- Prefer no new development
- Add to extent of Karst boundary, to include more lands in no-build zone
- Need to maintain park in behind Richdale
- New collector road should go straight north from Rymal Road
- Do not close Second Road West, but add another new road.
- This will provide two roads to handle (anticipated) traffic volumes
- Commercial – no more commercial lands – they generate too much traffic
- Residential - no apartment buildings
- Parkland include a water pad / splash pads
- There is (considered to be) insufficient parkland for Stoney Creek Mountain
- Mail out notices for next meeting based on names provided on sign-in sheet
Dear [Name],

As per your request, please find attached copies of Summaries of Public Information Centres No. 1 and 2. This information has also been posted to the project web site: www.hamilton.ca/rop9.

<<ROP9-PIC-2-Summary.pdf>>

<<ROP9-PIC-1-Summary.pdf>>

Please call me if you have any questions.

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager, Environmental Planning
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
320-77 James St. N.
Hamilton, Ontario, L8R 2K3
tel: 905-546-2424 extension 6390
fax: 905-546-4435
cleemorr@hamilton.ca
Nathalie Baudais

From: Lee-Morrison, Christine [cleemorr@hamilton.ca]
Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2006 10:15 AM
To: Isheppard@itransconsulting.com; NBaudais@itransconsulting.com
Cc: Ryan, Leanne; Grupe, Vanessa; Philip, Mohan
Subject: FW: ROPA 9

Liza, Nathalie

FYI

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager, Environmental Planning
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
320-77 James St. N.
Hamilton, Ontario, L8R 2K3
tel: 905-546-2424 extension 6390
fax: 905-546-4435
cleemorr@hamilton.ca

-----Original Message-----
From: 
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2006 6:54 PM
To: Lee-Morrison, Christine
Subject: Re: ROPA 9

Lee-Morrison:
I was at the meeting, (Trinity development) and the feeling was overwhelming against a new road: as follows: why build a new road to close down two others. See my info forwarded to Vanessa Grupe.
Always remember any study can bring out any conclusions (case in point) the same traffic department lowered the speed limit on Mount Albion road from 50km to 40km (back in 1990) that was also based on study data (at the time).
The decision was overturned and the limit was raised again back to 50km: when everyone realized what a mistake it was.
How about as a compromise:
1. Build the trinity church rd extension
2. wait for the Red-Hill valley to be completed
3. re-study traffic problems under the long term conditions.
Please do not make another mistake like the politically motivated 50km-40km speed limit change: one of the most misinformed decisions ever.: Building yet another road to satisfy a few unhappy people on First rd, would be in the top ten for sure.
Thanks very much for your information

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Lee-Morrison, Christine
Dear [Name],

Further to your recent submission of comments regarding this study, the following additional information is provided by our study team.

As presented at the public meeting held on January 26th, we have conducted an extensive review of key roadways within the Trinity Neighbourhood, including 2nd Road West, Upper Mount Albion Road, Gatestone Drive, Whitedeer Road and Highbury Drive. We looked at the roadway designations/ function (e.g., local road, collector road), the posted speed limit, pavement width, presence of sidewalks, setback distances of homes from the roadway, and the existing traffic demand versus the appropriate capacity (the volume of traffic the roadway was designed to carry). The review explicitly considered the nature of the road, including the presence of schools and pedestrian activity. We also looked at the collision history for the roadways, and speed survey data available for 2nd Road West, and for Upper Mount Albion Road.

Key findings of this review, as presented at the meeting, are as follows:

- Traffic volumes on 2nd Road West, north of Gatestone Drive are above levels associated with the road class (local road) and design.
- Traffic volumes on Upper Mount Albion Road are above levels associated with the road class (local road), the rolling vertical geometry, and a very narrow pavement width.
- Travel speeds are an issue on Upper Mount Albion Road, and high end speeds are being experienced on 2nd Road West.
- Collision rates are typical for the road functions.

Also, as shown in Schedule A3 of the former City of Stoney Creek Official Plan, a collector road connecting Gatestone Drive and Winterberry Drive is planned. This planned collector road provides important future north-south connection between Rymal Road and Highland Road within the Trinity Neighbourhood. Upper Mount Albion Road and Second Road West were both planned to be closed as part of the Trinity Neighbourhood Plan adopted by former City of Stoney Creek Council in the early 1990's. The City of Hamilton has recently initiated the Trinity Neighbourhood Land Use Review Study to update and prepare a future land use plan for the Trinity Neighbourhood. This will be conducted in recognition of the intended closure of Second Road West and of Upper Mount Albion Road, and construction of a new collector road to allow access through the neighbourhood. The collector road alignment study (currently underway) will be coordinated with the Trinity Neighbourhood Land Use Review Study.

Based on the results of the study conducted prior to the January 26th Public Meeting, we confirmed the need for closure of Second Road West, and of Upper Mount Albion Road. We recommended that the closure of Second Road West be implemented in coordination with construction of the planned new collector road in the Trinity Neighbourhood. We also recommended that the closure of Upper Mount Albion Road be implemented in coordination with construction of a planned new arterial road link between Rymal Road and Stone Church Road / Redhill Expressway. A study for this new arterial road is currently underway.

We are also working closely with the Hamilton Conservation Authority to ensure that a proposed new collector road within the Trinity Neighbourhood, will not adversely impact the Karst. The collector road alignment will have to avoid the Karst core area, which results in an alignment shift to the east compared to the original alignment shown in Schedule A3 of the former City of Stoney Creek Official Plan. A preferred alignment for the new collector road will be determined under a separate study which is currently underway. One of the key objectives

in determining a preferred alignment will be to minimize impacts on not only the Karst and other environmental features, but also on existing residents.

We have added your name to our study mailing list and will ensure that you receive any future Notices and invitations to public meetings. Please feel free to contact me if you have any further questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager, Environmental Planning
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
320-77 James St. N.
Hamilton, Ontario, L8R 2K3
tel: 905-546-2424 extension 6390
fax: 905-546-4435
clemorr@hamilton.ca

---Original Message---
From: Lee-Morrison, Christine
Sent: Friday, March 24, 2006 4:43 PM
To:
Cc: Grupe, Vanessa; Liza Sheppard; Nathalie Baudais
Subject: FW: ROP A 9

Dear

Thank you for submitting your comments on this study. As discussed, I have forwarded your e-mail to our project consultants who are carefully reviewing and considering all comments and concerns received. Also, for your information, attached is a copy of the Notice for the public meeting occurring March 27.

Sincerely,

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager, Environmental Planning
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
320-77 James St. N.
Hamilton, Ontario, L8R 2K3
tel: 905-546-2424 extension 6390
fax: 905-546-4435
clemorr@hamilton.ca

---Original Message---
From:
Sent: Friday, March 10, 2006 7:49 PM
To: Lee-Morrison, Christine
Subject: ROP A 9

Hello Christine;
I live in the "Summit Park" area. Drive to and from work( Lower Stony Creek. previously lived on Gatestone Drive. (4 years) and in the general area for the past 20 years.

As a tax payer & resident I feel I have some relevant opinions and information to offer.
I'm sure you are aware of the background material so I will not qualify my statements. If you need clarification please ask.

1. The studied volumes (2nd rd West) will change after the North-South Redhill expressway is completed. I suspect less after.

2. The ANSI area has been promoted as a "park" by area builders. To build any roads in the area (your option 2, 3, or 4) would be ecologically irresponsible. I get the point. To bypass 2nd road West. However this would be a short term solution only, to a none existing problem. The majority of the time 2nd road has very little traffic, but very heavy at to and from work times.

3. Building the Trinity Church/Rymal RD.- Stone Church connection is the best solution and will remove a majority of the through traffic from 2nd road West.

4. Building a "bypass" around 2nd road through a designated conservation area- ANSI to satisfy a few complainers (who live on 2nd road) is a waste of money and will only invite further traffic to the Gatestone area. Once the Rymal-Stonechurch road is built the majority of the 2nd Road through traffic will be gone.

5. When the north-South valley expressway is done a huge amount of traffic will be removed from the Mount Albion/Mud & Winterberry route, and relocated to the Pritohard or Upper Mount Albion route. There is a huge bottle-neck temporarily created during the construction of the Red-Hill valley, which will be moved West after its done.

6. Closing upper Mount Albion ? Why? It's a road and has been for decades. Same logic applies as for 2nd road West.
I have driven theses all of these roads for many years in all seasons. I have walked all of the trails. I have biked the roads.

I can offer any further details you like.

Call
or e-mail

Thanks

<< File: Trinity PIC #1 March 27 06 Public Notice.doc >>
PUBLIC NOTICE
TRINITY NEIGHBOURHOOD LAND USE REVIEW

The City of Hamilton Planning and Economic Development Department have initiated a study to prepare a future land use plan for the Trinity Neighbourhood. This is the area bounded by Highland Road, Second Road West, Rymal Road East, and the proposed extension of Trinity Church Road, as indicated on the attached map. This area is located within the Heritage Green Secondary Plan and the West Mountain Planning Area.

A land use plan was originally prepared for the Trinity Neighbourhood in the early 1990's, and adopted by former Stoney Creek Council. This plan identified the location of an internal collector road, schools, parks and housing areas of various densities.

During the late 1990's, the Eramosa Karst was discovered within the Trinity neighbourhood. This series of underground caves, sinking streams and related features include several features which are provincially significant. The boundary of this Area of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI) has been confirmed following detailed studies, and is shown on the attached map.

Most of the Karst area will be retained in a natural state, and residential development will not be permitted. These lands, which are largely owned by the Ontario Realty Corporation, are in the process of being transferred to the Hamilton Conservation Authority. This natural area will be managed by the Conservation Authority, with trails and an interpretive centre.

The form of development for the remaining lands in the Trinity Neighbourhood must be decided. The original neighbourhood plan is no longer valid, as the Karst area restricts the development of the collector road and the interior lands. A new land use plan must be prepared to guide development of this area. Future plans must also recognize the intended closure of Second Road West and Upper Mount Albion Road, and the construction of the Trinity Church Road extension. The interior collector road must be located accordingly to allow access through the neighbourhood. The Public Works Department is studying traffic access, and has held previous public meetings on these matters for the Rymal Road Planning Area Study (ROPA 9).

Public participation is an important part of the City's process for developing future land use plans. Input from residents, land owners and other interested parties are important in determining these future plans. Accordingly, citizens are invited to attend a Public Information Centre regarding the Trinity Neighbourhood Plan Review, to be held:

Date:       Monday, March 27, 2006
Time:      6:00 p.m. – 8:30 p.m., with Presentations at 6:30 pm.
Location: Winterberry Heights Church
           300 Winterberry Dr. (at Paramount Dr.) Stoney Creek

The purpose of the Public Information Centre is to outline the land use study process, and to enable input from citizens on their preferred vision for the area, and the form and character of development. There will be information displays, brief presentations from staff, and participation through small discussion groups to enable input.
The next steps will include the preparation of alternative land use options, to be integrated with options for the location of the collector road. These land use options will be evaluated and a final plan recommended for approval by City Council by fall of 2006. A further public meeting will be held prior to Council adoption.

You are invited to attend the Public Information Centre on March 27 to provide your comments on the type of development which you would like to see occur in this area. You are also able to provide comments by various other means including email, phone, fax, and postal mail to the address noted below.

Please see the project web site for the study, which is found on the City web site at http://www.myhamilton.ca/myhamilton/CommunityPlanning/SecondaryPlans/index.htm to obtain further details, contact information and comment sheets. Please contact staff if you wish to be placed on the mailing list for this study. Thank you for your interest in this project.

For questions and inquiries, please contact:

Vanessa Grupe, Senior Planner
Community Planning & Design Section
Planning & Economic Development Department
City of Hamilton
Mailing Address: 71 Main St. W.
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5
Phone: 905-546-2424 Ext. 1263
Fax: 905-543-7260
Email: vgrupe@hamilton.ca
Nathalie Baudals

From: Lee-Morrison, Christine [cleemorr@hamilton.ca]
Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2006 10:11 AM
To: Cecchetti, Lynne; Grupe, Vanessa; Isheppard@transconsulting.com; Philip, Mohan;
JMosher@transconsulting.com; NBaudais@transconsulting.com
Cc: RE: Rymal Road Planning Area Class EA

Dear

In reply to your recent e-mail inquiry, the following information is provided.

1) The lands in the former City of Hamilton are west of the approximate location of the proposed Trinity Church Road corridor extension. They are located within the East Mountain Industrial Business Park, which includes various types of restricted light industrial and commercial designations. The former City of Hamilton portion of your family’s lands at 66 Highland Road are split into two equal portions each in a different zoning district. The western portion, closest to the Hydro corridor, is designated "Restricted Industrial (M-14 and M-15)." The portion just east of this, up to the former Hamilton boundary, is designated "Restricted Industrial - Commercial (M-12 & M-13)." Planning staff would be glad to provide a map and details to illustrate.

The M categories refer to zoning by-law districts and definitions, and there are many permitted uses within each category. The by-law includes a table and text which explains these in detail. The M-14 and M-15 zones permit light industrial uses as well as commercial. The M-11 and M-12 zones permit a range of commercial, wholesale, public and office uses, and only a couple of industrial uses.

2) Planning staff can provide you with a map to illustrate these designations. For the lands bounded by Highland, the LINC, Pritchard and the former Hamilton boundary, the western portion is presently designated "Restricted Industrial (M-14 & M-15)" in the East Mountain Industrial Business Park approved plan. A Utilities (Hydro) corridor runs north-south through this area. The eastern third is "Restricted Industrial - Commercial (M-11 and M-12)."

For lands in the former City of Stoney Creek, between Paramount and Highland, west of Upper Mount Albion, lands are presently designated "Service Commercial" for the western third. The central third is Neighbourhood Park in the south, and Medium High Density Residential in the north. The eastern third is Medium High Density Residential. These designations are all contained in the approved Heritage Green Secondary Plan, which is under review in this area. Due to the identification of the Karst boundary, the Trinity Neighbourhood portion of this Secondary plan is under review. North of Paramount Drive in this area is the Special Policy C area, which is designated for mixed commercial and residential land uses.

3) The future designation of the eastern part of your lands is presently Service Commercial, under the above-noted Stoney Creek plans approved in the early 1990’s. Yes, it is possible that this designation will change within the Trinity Neighbourhood land use review, depending on input from staff, property owners and the general public. Planning staff are targeting to have land use options for public review by June of this year. It is anticipated that a final land use plan will be taken to Planning Committee and City Council by fall of this year for approval, if all issues can be resolved.

4) As discussed in an earlier e-mail, the City is intending to finalize the Rymal Road Planning Area Class EA Master Plan this spring. The Master Plan would establish the need for the new road link between Rymal Road and Stone Church Road as one of the solutions required for the Rymal Road Planning Area. Once the Rymal Road Planning Area Master Plan is complete, the City will commence with the next level of study required to evaluate the design concepts (road alignments) for the new road and that a further Public Information Centre (PIC) will be held during this study to present and discuss corridor options. This PIC has been tentatively scheduled for the last week of June, 2006. Once the exact date
and times are determined a notice will be sent people on our mailing list and published in the Spectator. Your name has been placed on our study mailing list and you will be advised of any upcoming meetings.

We would be glad to speak with you or meet if needed to explain the land use designations further. Planning staff will forward copies of the relevant portions of these plans under separate cover. Should you have any questions regarding the land use designations, please contact:

Vanessa Gruepe, Senior Planner
Community Planning & Design Section
Planning & Economic Development Department City of Hamilton
Phone: 905-546-2424 Ext. 1263

Please feel free to contact me with any further questions on the Class EA studies, or any general inquiries you may have.

Sincerely,

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager, Environmental Planning Capital Planning and Implementation Public Works Department City of Hamilton
320-77 James St. N.
Hamilton, Ontario, L8R 2K3
Tel: 905-546-2424 extension 6390
Fax: 905-546-4435
cleemorr@hamilton.ca

---Original Message---
From:
Sent: Saturday, April 01, 2000 2:36 PM
To: Lee-Morrison, Christine
Cc: Cecchetti, Lynne; Gruepe, Vanessa; lshappard@transconsulting.com; NEaudais@transconsulting.com; Bruckler, Phil; Philip, Mohan
Subject: RE: Rymal Road Planning Area Class EA

Dear Ms. Lee-Morrison,

Thank you for the information that you provided regarding land and road development in our neighbourhood. My husband and I appreciated your knowledgeable and thoughtful responses to our queries at last Monday's meeting.

In your e-mail response to my initial questions, you indicated "the existing land uses between Pritchard Road and Upper Mount Albion Road, and between Highland Road and Rymal Road are agricultural and residential. The City of Stoney Creek Official Plan (April 2001 consolidation) designates the lands as service commercial. The future designations will be reviewed by the City as development in the area proceeds." While we understand that the land and road development in the area is currently under review, we hope that you can clarify a few points.

1) Not all of the land between Pritchard and Upper Mount Albion and between Highland and Rymal was part of the former City of Stoney Creek. Some of the
land, including our property at 60 Highland, was part of The City of Hamilton. What are the current and proposed future designations or Hamilton portion of the land?

2) What are the current and future designations for the lands bounded by Paramount/ The L.I.N.C. and Highland, and by Pritchard and Upper Mount Albion (both the former Stoney Creek and Hamilton sections)?

3) Assuming that the future designation of any of the lands surrounding our property is anticipated to be service commercial, as proposed by the Stoney Creek Official Plan, is it possible that this future designation will change? At what point in the review process will the designation be finalized?

4) At what point will public input regarding the exact route of the arterial road begin? What sort of timeframe is anticipated before construction on the arterial road actually begins?

Sincerely,
Thank you for your reply.

It would appear that you have done some due diligence in this issue. Your email illustrated a lot of points.

I have written emails like yours in reply to concerned citizens, so I took the liberty of reading between the lines and took a look at what was really there, not much, apart from a few surveys.

As is the case with most controversial issues, common sense usually prevails, and I hope in this instance this holds true, because this new winding road through the fields and woodlot as your solution to the problem is certainly laughable.

Look forward to discussing the issue further.

---Original Message---
From: I Morison, Christine
To: L. Sheppard; M. Bacquié; P. Mohan; R. Leanne; V. Grupe; V. Crottenberg-Walker; N. Baudais
Cc: M. Phillip
Sent: Mon, Apr 10 16:44:53 2006
Subject: RE: Proposed Road issue

Dear,

Thank you for your interest in this study.

As presented at the public meeting held on January 26th, we have conducted an extensive review of key roadways within the Trinity Neighbourhood, including 2nd Road West, Upper Mount Albion Road, Gatestone Drive, Whitedeer Road and Highbury Drive. We looked at the roadway designations / function (e.g., local road, collector road), the posted speed limit, pavement width, presence of sidewalks, setback distances of homes from the roadway, and the existing traffic demand versus the appropriate capacity (the volume of traffic the roadway was designed to carry). The study explicitly considered the nature of the road, including the presence of schools and pedestrian activity. We also looked at the collision history for the roadways, and speed survey data available for 2nd Road West, and for Upper Mount Albion Road.

Key findings of this review, as presented at the January 26th meeting, are as follows:

* Traffic volumes on 2nd Road West, north of Gatestone Drive are above levels associated with the road class (local road) and design.
* Traffic volumes on Upper Mount Albion Road are above levels associated with the road class (local road), the rolling vertical geometry, and a very narrow pavement width.
* Traffic speeds is an issue on Upper Mount Albion Road, and high end speeds are being experienced on 2nd Road West.
* Collision rates are typical for the road functions.

To: Christine Lee-Moore
   Senior Project Manager
   Regional Road Planning Area
   (Roga & Lands)

From: [Local resident]

Re: Alternatives Being Discussed
with regard to Trinity Church Rd.
Alignments.

Phone:

Address:
Ms. Lee-Morrison:

First, my apologies for the lateness of this response to your presentation to the public residing in the Trinity neighbourhood on Jan. 26/06.

Of the seven listed Alternatives given on the Trinity Church Conceptual Alignments Map, dated Jan. 2006, almost every resident of this road and members of the Trinity Church Rd. Citizen’s Committee agree that only Alternative 2 or a combination of Alternatives 2 + 2a or 2 + 2b would resolve and alleviate our concerns. Not only would it accomplish that, but it would also circumvent the problems of the congregation of Trinity Church located immediately at the intersection of Trinity Church and Rymal Rd. and its accompanying cemetery. These choices would additionally maintain the safety of churchgoers who must park their cars in the church parking lot opposite the church and then cross Trinity Church Rd. to enter the church to attend services and/or banquet and wedding events etc.

Alternatives 2 + 2a and/or 2b would not only avoid the above complications, but would also more rapidly aid in opening up the core of the industrial park to the west where the development is desirable.

Thus, if the concerns of the Trinity community are respected, as we believe the Alternatives we have cited do achieve, then Hamilton’s future as it evolves, will do so more successfully and expeditiously.

Sincerely,
Hello Phil. How are you?

As you know we are very pleased with everything that was done for the residents of Second Road West. Your office with that of ITtrans is to be thanked. Unfortunately, I have some negative feedback. The conditions on Second Road West are at an all-time low. The Wal-Mart, car dealership, Fortinos, etc are bringing many unfamiliar rushed motorists. They are ignoring speed limits and stop signs. This may sound like that same old story but it is far from that. The majority of the problem before was from local residents. The problem now is that on top of the ignorance displayed by the local residents we now have many, many new faces traveling our streets. They must be unaware of the issues we have dealt with, or perhaps I am being silly in believing that if they did they would slow down and stop. Phil, the issue is different now. It is much more severe. There is much more volume. In all due respect, the numbers presented in the past in regard to the amount of speeding and the speeds that are actually traveled are very unrealistic. I am not saying that the tests performed are always unreliable but in this instance they are. What I am asking is that we speed up the closure. I believe that there was a "Phase 1" purposed at the last meet. I feel that it is vital that the phase one be implemented immediately. There is a resident that has a "Disabled Person" sign. It is being completely ignored. As a matter of fact, the last major collision would have taken that sign out. The nice weather is around the corner. Our family wants to have our first enjoyable spring/summer in our neighborhood. Phil, please deal with this severe issue at your earliest convenience.

Regards, The
Ray Bacquie, P.Eng, AVS.
Vice President
iTRANS Consulting Inc.
100 York Boulevard, Suite 300
Richmond Hill, ON L4B 1J8
Phone: 905-882-4100 Ext. 5227
Direct: 905-695-5227
Fax: 905-882-1557
E-mail: r bacquie@itransconsulting.com
www.itransconsulting.com

----- Original Message ----- 

From: Ray Bacquie
Sent: Monday, March 20, 2006 9:39 AM
To: cleemorr@hamilton.ca; ldianni@hamilton.ca; lryan@hamilton.ca; pbruckler@hamilton.ca
Cc:  

Subject: Re: Look forward to the meeting...

Hi,

Thanks for once again keeping the Second Rd. W. closure in the forefront. I am particularly eager to attend the upcoming meeting regarding the plan and vision for the Trinity Neighbourhood. For anyone who missed it in the Stoney Creek News a few weeks ago, the information meeting will be held on Monday, March 27, 6-8:30pm at the Salvation Army Church on Winterberry Drive. Like yourselves, Mike and Luis, I am hoping that some progress has been made towards the new north/south collector road that will link Highland and Rymal. I would also like to see some of the interim measures put into place, but I share your conviction that these 'bandaid' measures won't rescue us from the high volume/speed concerns on our road, which are getting progressively worse.

See you at the meeting.

----- Original Message ----- 

From:
To: <cleemorr@hamilton.ca>; <ldianni@hamilton.ca>; <lryan@hamilton.ca>
Cc:
Hello all,

As absolutely correct in his statements which go back to our original concerns. The trend has been set and we have been going through this for 5 years now. A glimpse of warm weather and sunshine and the vehicular chaos intensifies on Second Road.

To further complicate things and provide validation to our concerns; Walmart, Fortinos and A&H have created new volumes on our street as we have anticipated they would all along. Summit Park will be going into their heaviest months of closing dates, they are on the final stages of their 2nd Phase with another Phase still to follow. The commercial developments will also be breaking ground shortly, for what I'm sure are to be fall openings in time for the holiday season. This will all lead to increased volumes on our street as we have seen thus far.

At the last meeting which Itrans put forth their recommendation to the residents and city officials they outlined a 3-5 year time line which would potentially be placed into 3 phases. Immediate areas for improvement, we the residents were not in favour of but in the attempt of securing our families safety and working toward controlling the volume and speed we all agreed needed to be done.

To date, no white lines have been marked on the road approaching the stop signs as suggested. Larger stop signs were to be placed nothing to date. I particularly find this ridiculous considering if motorists are not speeding they will see the current ones, but I'm a team player and at this point willing to try anything.

Phill, have any new developments taken place? Has the time line of 3-5 years been firmer up/ reduced? Any realistic chance that the time line can be reduced? In this 3-5 year plan, can the trail system/ walkway be put in across Second Road at the front end of the time line rather than the back-end?

As we have seen drivers adjust to the quickest route, if Second Road is not an option anymore they will also adjust. Considering all that has gone on over the past 5 years I don't think this is much to ask.

Best regards,

3/18/2006 6:12:11
PM
Hello Phil. How are you?

As you know we are very pleased with everything that was done for the
residents of Second Road West. Your office with that of ITRANS is to be thanked. Unfortunately, I have some negative feedback. The conditions on Second Road West are at an all-time low. The Wal-Mart, car dealerships, Fortinos, etc. are bringing many unfamiliar rushed motorists. They are ignoring speed limits and stop signs. This may sound like that same old story but it is far from that. The majority of the problem before was from local residents. The problem now is that on top of the ignorance displayed by the local residents we now have many, many new faces traveling our streets. They must be unaware of the issues we have dealt with, or perhaps I am being silly in believing that if they did they would slow down and stop. Phil, the issue is different now.

It is much more severe. There is much more volume. In all due respect, the numbers presented in the past in regard to the amount of speeding and the speeds that are actually traveled are very unrealistic. I am not saying that the tests performed are always unreliable but in this instance they are. What I am asking is that we speed up the closure. I believe that there was a "Phase 1" purpose.
at the last meet. I feel that it is vital that the phase one be implemented immediately. There is a resident that has a "Disabled Person" sign. It is being completely ignored. As a matter of fact, the last major collision would have taken that sign out. The nice weather is around the corner. Our family wants to have our first enjoyable spring/summer in our neighborhood. Phil, please deal with this severe issue at your earliest convenience.

Regards,
Your fax was received. Thank you for your interest in this project. All comments received will be carefully reviewed and considered. Also, could you please relay the following information to your husband, Mr. [redacted]:

The City is aware of the need to coordinate the Rymal Road Planning Area Class EA (north of Rymal) and the North Glenbrook Business Park Class EA study (south of Rymal). As you know, the Rymal Road Planning Area study has presented the need for a new road link from Stone Church Road / Red Hill Creek Expressway ramps to Rymal Road. However, please note that, as illustrated at the meeting, the potential alignment for this road is yet to be determined. It is recognized that the studies for the areas north and south of Rymal must be coordinated.

Therefore, a further study, the Trinity Church Corridor Environmental Assessment for Phases 3 and 4 will follow to identify and evaluate alternative road alignments and design concepts. Further public consultation will take place. Your name and address have been added to the mailing list and you will be advised of future notices.

Sincerely,

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager, Environmental Planning
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
320-77 James St. N.
Hamilton, Ontario, L8R 2K3
tel: 905-548-2424 extension 6390
fax: 905-548-4435
cleemor@hamilton.ca
I have just faxed a questionnaire from my husband. Since it is legal form, I am not sure if it came through properly. Also I had to fax the front page then the back so the pages may have been split up. Can you please let me know if you received the fax successfully?
Dear [Name]

Thank you for raising your concerns about traffic issues in your community. We have been listening to the Community and will endeavour to meet the needs of the community.

As presented at the public meeting held on January 26th, we have conducted an extensive review of key roadways within the Trinity Neighbourhood, including 2nd Road West, Upper Mount Albion Road, Gatestone Drive, Whiteneder Road and Highbury Drive. We looked at the roadway designations / function (e.g. local road, collector road), the posted speed limit, pavement width, presence of sidewalks, setback distances of homes from the roadway, and the existing traffic demand versus the appropriate capacity (the volume of traffic the roadway was designed to carry). The review explicitly considered the nature of the road, including the presence of schools and pedestrian activity. We also looked at the collision history for the roadways, and speed survey data available for 2nd Road West, and for Upper Mount Albion Road.

Key finding of this review, as presented at the meeting, are as follows:

- Traffic volumes on 2nd Road West, north of Gatestone Drive are above levels associated with the road class (local road) and design.
- Traffic volumes on Upper Mount Albion Road are above levels associated with the road class (local road), the rolling vertical geometry, and a very narrow pavement width.
- The road class and design of Gatestone Drive, Highbury Drive and Whiteneder Road (collector roads, with wide pavement width) is appropriate for the daily volumes experienced.
- Travel speeds is an issue on Upper Mount Albion Road, and high end speeds are being experienced on 2nd Road West
- Collision rates are typical for the road functions.

We also looked at future traffic conditions, and noted that there is also a potential that future development of the ROPA 9 lands will exacerbate the existing traffic conditions on roadways within the Trinity Neighbourhood. As a result, we concluded that solutions are necessary to address the traffic conditions we identified.

In recognition that the operation of the roadway system should relate to residents' activities, we conducted a detailed evaluation of a number of options to address the identified issues. These options included: (1) Keeping the road network as is today, (2) Enhanced traffic control (for example, additional signage and pavement markings), (3) New road connections, and (4) Road closures. The evaluation included a number of factors, including potential impacts on
area residents, and on schools (specifically Gatestone Elementary, and St. Mark's Elementary), with any of the four options in place.

The results of this evaluation showed that a combination of solutions is required to address the Trinity Neighbourhood traffic issues. We therefore recommended implementation of the preferred solutions in 2 phases. The first phase would provide Option 2 measures (enhanced traffic control) on 2nd Road West, and on Upper Mount Albion Road. The second phase would include a combination of Options 3 (new road connections) and 4 (road closures). The recommendation is therefore that closure of 2nd Road West is warranted, but that this should occur in combination with a new road connection between Rymal Road and Highland Road (west of 2nd Road West). As such, closure of 2nd Road West would not occur until such time that another roadway option is available for traffic between Rymal Road and Highland Road. This will address your concern of redirecting traffic into a school community where hundreds of children walk to school every day.

The information presented at the January 26th, 2006 Public Meeting is available for review on the City's website at www.hamilton.ca/ropae9. We will be happy to discuss this matter with you further.

In response to your request for a copy of the minutes from the public meetings, we can provide you with a copy when a summary of the meeting has been finalized (expected by early next week). We allocated until February 15, 2006 for public comments, and will be summarizing all of the comments in the document.

If you require further assistance please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager, Environmental Planning
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
320-77 James St. N.
Hamilton, Ontario, L8R 2K3
tel: 905-546-2424 extension 6390
fax: 905-546-4435
cleemorr@hamilton.ca
Nathalie Baudais

From: Ray Bacquie
Sent: Friday, February 24, 2006 9:50 AM
To: Nathalie Baudais; Liza Sheppard
Subject: 2nd Road West Closure

From: [Redacted]
To: rbacquie@transconsulting.com
CC: Bruckler, Phil
Subject: Re: FW: 2nd Road West Closure

Gentlemen,
I am following up from my e-mail on February 14. I am anxious to review the Minutes and have not received them thus far. At your earliest convenience, is it all possible to e-mail them to me.

Thank you :) 

On 5:16:34 am 02/14/06 <[Redacted]> wrote:
> Dear R. Bacquie,
> 
> I am assuming that by now you have read the message forwarded to you by Councillor Bruckler. Please understand that my intentions is not based on the following:
> 
> However, petitions should not necessarily be a numbers game about the many vs. 30; but rather, about what is the safest decision for all residents based on all pertinent information.
> 
> My sole concern is redirected traffic into a school community whereby hundreds of children walk to school every day. Closing off 2nd Road West at Fairhaven absolutely makes no sense to anyone in this area I am talking to and it puts a greater number of children at risk.
> 
> I am interested in receiving Minutes from the public meetings if that is all possible. I will do my research as Councillor Bruckler suggests, and then I will advise if I will go ahead with a petition.
> 
> Thanks.
> 
> On 8:10:14 pm 02/07/06 "Bruckler, Phil" <pbruckler@hamilton.ca> wrote:
> 
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Bruckler, Phil
> Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 12:10 PM
Good morning,

I do appreciate your concern. It is for this same concern that I put forward the recommendation to make the current Environmental Assessment review as comprehensive and as technically based on all available traffic engineering and planning data as possible.

I can further say that the 1989 Stoney Creek Plan was based on full build out populations and commercial zoned areas, not statistics of that day. It was on the basis of that information that all developments proceeded. The current study was to review that data in light of present day development. As you may know the population for Heritage Green will, in all likelihood, decrease as approximately 200 acres have been taken out of the Trinity Neighbourhood due to the Karst natural features; land which is being turned over to the Conservation Authority.

I certainly agree that we need to be vigilant and put all possible controls in the school zones at Gatestone and St.Marks, from no stopping, to reduced 40kms, to enforcement. I will copy our traffic staff to ensure that ALL possible safety measures have or WILL BE implemented.

If you were to take up a petition, now would be the time before the report is being finalized. However, petitions should not necessarily be a numbers game about the many vs. 30; but rather, about what is the safest decision for all residents based on all pertinent information. Not sure if you attended any of the public information meetings, but perhaps before you consider the petition route, I suggest you contact the consultant for the project, Ray Bacque, Vice President of iTRANS Consulting Inc., at 1-905-882-4100 ex.5227 and city staff member, Christine Lee Morrison at (905)540-6390 for specifics relative to your concern.

Or feel free to call me any time to discuss this further. I hope this may help you to understand the process and address some of your concerns. Regards,

Phil

Phil Bruckler
Councillor, Ward 9
Heritage Stoney Creek
Phone: 546-2703
Fax: 540-5183

-----Original Message-----
From: [mailto:*redacted*]
Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 10:05 AM
To: Bruckler, Phil
Subject: Re: 2nd Road West Closure

Good Morning Councillor,

Thank you for taking the time to reply. I understand that there was a "former city of Stoney Creek's in 1989 approved neighbourhood plan"; however, that was almost twenty years ago and developments change. And in
Stoney Creek's case, surely the housing and commercial market has
sky-rocketed.

With two elementary schools, Gatestone & St. Marks (right in the
heart of
where the traffic will be detoured), I don't think it makes sense
and at the cost with school children in the area.

Suggestion: would it not make sense to use enforced signage i.e.
Speeding
School Zone - with maximum fines etc.

If it is prudent, I can start a petition and collect signatures.
Parents
in the area will be affected and will gladly sign the petition. We
are talking about 30 residents vs. a whole neighbourhood.

Please advise.

On 2:56:54 am 02/06/06 "Bruckler, Phil" <pbruckler@hamilton.ca>
wrote: Good evening.
I can understand your concern as it is one which I also raised.
However, the recommendation being made by the consultant and
staff is not as a result of pressure by the residents but
reaffirmation of the former city of Stoney Creek's in 1989
approved neighbourhood plan. Based on the former city's
approved Plan, Second Road was designed with a narrow width of
a local road and is carrying almost twice its design capacity.
Safety of all our streets is a big concern for me and for this
reason I requested that the area of review be expanded for the
Environmental Assessment which included a detailed analysis of
our road network. I would be pleased to discuss this with
further if you wish to call me. Phil
-----Original Message-----
From: 
To: Bruckler, Phil
Sent: Sat Feb 04 21:47:52 2006
Subject: 2nd Road West Closure

Dear Councillor Bruckler,

We are residents of Willowridge Way, just east of 2nd Road West.
Reading the article "Looks like residents will get their wish"
in the Stoney Creek News surely has left concern in this
household. We have three children who attend school in this
community. Surely the "30" residents who have plotted to close
2nd Road West have not considered the ramifications of doing
so. That is, the traffic flow will be forced to detour into
the side streets whereby the local schools will be congested
with traffic. This will surely cause havoc and at worst
risking our school children walking to school.

In my opinion, the smartest thing to do is to put a traffic
light at Fairhaven - wouldn't it be a cost-efficient solution
as well? Also, one of the signs placed on 2nd Road last summer was that it was not safe for the children to play on the street. Well surely, children should not be playing in the streets - and the local park is being built where children should safely play.

Shutting down 2nd Road West is not a solution...
Thank you very much for having the meeting at the Salvation Army site to update the community on future plans for this area. I have a few questions before I send my comments sheet in.

1) Could I have a graphic of the now decided Karst lands?
2) Could you please send the graphic of the proposed route to bypass Second Rd. W.? and where Second Rd. would be cul-de-sacced?
3) Also, with that, how would the new roadway be configured and signed?
   - Would the city be wanting to divert most traffic from Highland onto this new roadway or would it be a "T" junction?
   - What would happen to the lands between the proposed cut off on Second (Fairhaven?) south to Rymal.

Thank you
January 27, 2006

Christine Lee-Morrison  
Senior Project Manager  
Capital Planning and Implementation  
Public Works Department  
City of Hamilton  
320-77 James St. N  
Hamilton Ontario  
L8R 2K3

Dear Ms. Lee-Morrison,  

After attending the public meeting regarding the "Trinity Neighbourhood Study" on January 25 2006, I have some grave concerns regarding the construction of a new arterial route from Stone Church Road to Rymal Road. My mother, Marilyn Hills, has owned the property at 60 Highland Road for almost 40 years. The maps provided at the meeting indicate that the new arterial, option one or two, will be built directly beside our property.

Mr. Ray Bacquie of iTrans Consulting indicated that the details of the final route would be decided within the next six to eight months with property acquisition occurring in the subsequent six to eight months. However, he was unable to answer my queries regarding the size of the arterial (two lane, four lane, divided) or the potential development of the lands in the area (residential, commercial, industrial.)

Though vague discussion of a possible new road in this area has occurred periodically over the years, we were shocked at the designation of this road as arterial and the seemingly short timeline for planning and implementation. Since we have a large financial and emotional investment in 60 Highland, we are concerned about the impact of all of these variables on our property, property value, and quality of life.

Thus, it is imperative that we be informed of any and all factors and decisions related to this section of the project. Any information or avenues of information that you could provide at this time would be greatly appreciated. We eagerly await your reply.

Sincerely,

cc: Liza Shppard, Phil Bruckler

MSN® Calendar keeps you organized and takes the effort out of scheduling get-togethers.  
http://join.msn.com/?pgmarket=en-ca&page=byoa/prem&xAPID=1994&DI=1034
Dear Liza and Christine:

As a resident of the area bounded by Mud St., Rymal Rd., Dartnall Rd. and Upper Centennial, I have great concerns, as do many of my neighbours, about the traffic flow which is about to clog up the arteries of our small community. We have lived here, on Bywood Crescent, for 27 years and have seen many changes, from the three small distinct areas known as phase 1, 2 and 3 to a sprawling metropolis of new homes and neighbourhoods. Some of the older areas such as Upper Mount Albion Rd. and Second Road West have issues regarding excess traffic. First Road W. got a lucky break having direct access to Rymal Rd. cut off, Second Road W. wasn’t as lucky, however most of the homes on that street are new and they sought homes knowing that they were going to be subject to traffic, but at least the city widened the road properly. Unfortunately, the residents on Upper Mount Albion didn’t ask for all the extra traffic and the city never widened their road to help the situation. We can’t cut off all the access routes to Rymal, for the residents north of Highland Road, but the city planners can surely divert enormous amounts of new incoming traffic away from these “local access only” roads.

There are no direct north/south routes through our neighbourhoods to facilitate traffic looking for a quick access from the Linc or from the soon to be completed Red Hill Expressway to Rymal Road and the new development area along that route. Drivers will not “GO AROUND” to Dartnall or U. Centennial. They already cut through in huge numbers. This will only get worse.

In doing so, they are driving past three elementary schools, Janet Lee, Gatestone and St. Mark, subjecting these children to increasing amounts of traffic that could be otherwise avoided by having the Trinity Church Road extension completed to coincide with the completion of the Red Hill Expressway. It’s the only way to get the traffic to flow directly from the Linc directly to the Rymal Road development area with little or no impact on the surrounding areas, it also diverts the traffic away from the children in the 3 elementary schools. It doesn’t make sense to “plan” the completion on the Trinity Church Rd. extension until the year 2011.

I implore you to take this proposal back to city planning committee and have this issue resolved as soon as possible, especially if the Red Hill Expressway is to be completed ahead of schedule. If the road is being built anyway, please do it now to save the patience and tempers of the residents and probably at least one child, if not more, from being hurt from the onslaught of traffic which is about to bear down on these “back streets”.

Sincerely,
Hey folks, Best wishes to all for a fantastic year ahead! 2006 will be a pivotal year for all on Second Rd. W. We remain hopeful that the road will be closed, delivering the safer, vibrant neighbourhood we all know will thrive once the right decision is made. We look forward to biking and rollerblading with you, our neighbours, on our street and on the network of pathways that will one day connect us all. We look forward to hockey and basketball in our driveways, and kids actually playing in our front yards! Like Luis, we anxiously await the details of the upcoming January meeting. See you all there.
Hello all, I trust everyone had a safe and happy holiday season. I am eagerly anticipating the upcoming meeting which was originally scheduled for December '05 but was pushed out to January '06. Any confirmation as to a date, time or place as of yet?

Just to provide an update cars are still speeding, running stops and volumes continuously increasing as was highlighted especially throughout the holiday week.

As was suggested to us, to ease off on the e-mails, signage and parked cars on the road which we have done up to this point but please make no mistake that we are all still very concerned about what the outcome will be as it pertains to Second Road.

Best regards,
They were taken by [redacted] on a Bruce Trail association hike. February 2003.


---

Hi Luis,

> Sorry I didn't notice your request from your email when we spoke today. I have to fly up to Sudbury tomorrow and won't be able to attend. I will be interested if there is anything further from what we discussed.

> Thanks

> Ray Bacque, P.Eng, AVS.

> Vice President

> ITTRANS Consulting Inc.

> 100 York Boulevard, Suite 300

> Richmond Hill, ON L4B 1J8

> Phone: 905-882-4100 Ext. 5227

> Direct: 905-695-5227

> Fax: 905-882-1557

> E-mail: rbacque@itransconsulting.com

> www.itransconsulting.com

11/30/2005
>-----Original Message-----
>From: [name] [mailto:[email address]]
>Sent: Tuesday, November 29, 2005 10:47 AM
>To: [name]
>Subject: Re: FW: caves
>
>This is an absolute joke as far as I am concerned. The City has
>re-nagged on it's original plans for this, give me a break. We, honest
>tax paying citizens have put effort into trying to come up with
>solutions to these 3 little caves.
>
>Ray, I am begging you for another hour of your time and I know it's
>short notice but can you visit with us and Phil Bruckler on Wednesday
>November 29th @ 7 pm? Phil has already confirmed his attendance. We
>have discovered some new findings through Mr. DeSantis which I'm sure
>you will find very interesting.
>
>Please call me at your earliest convenience so we can discuss.
>
>
>>> [redacted] 11/29/2005
>>10:39:35 AM >>>
>
>Ray, I have some info re the caves. or I will call you
>
>From: [name] [mailto:[email address]]
>To: [name]
>Subject: caves
>Date: Sun, 27 Nov 2005 21:02:59 -0500
>
Ray, I will definitely keep you posted as to anything which may come out of tomorrow’s meeting. I certainly plan on bringing this new information to light.

Thank you again for your valuable time and insight into our matter.
As always Best regards,

Ray Bacquie, P.Eng, AVS.
Vice President
ITRANS Consulting Inc.
100 York Boulevard, Suite 300
Richmond Hill, ON L4B 1J8

Phone: 905-882-4100 Ext. 5227
Direct: 905-695-5227
Fax: 905-882-1557
E-mail: rbacquie@itransconsulting.com
www.itransconsulting.com

-----Original Message-----
From: (mailto: )
Sent: Tuesday, November 29, 2005 10:47 AM
To: Liza Sheppard; Ray Bacquie
Subject: Re: FW: caves
This is an absolute joke as far as I am concerned. The City has re-nagged on it's original plans for this, give me a break. We, honest tax paying citizens have put effort into trying to come up with solutions to these 3 little caves.

Ray, I am begging you for another hour of your time and I know it's short notice but can you visit with us and Phil Brucklow on Wednesday November 29th @ 7 pm? Phil has already confirmed his attendance. We have discovered some new findings through Mr. DeSantis which I'm sure you will find very interesting.

Please call me at your earliest convenience so we can discuss.

>>> "**********" ********** 11/29/2005
10:39:15 AM >>>

Ray. I have some info re the caves. Do or I will call you Mike

From: **********<**********
To: **********
Subject: caves
Date: Sun, 27 Nov 2005 21:02:59 -0500
Good afternoon,

I am responding to your email on behalf of Ed Switenky.

As you have noted, the Trinity Neighbourhood Plan for the lands bounded by Second Road West, Highland Road, west of Upper Mount Albion Road and Rymal Road did include a closure of Second Road West at Fairhaven Drive. The road would be physically closed (we consider it a diversion rather than a closure) to through traffic but would provide access for the existing residents, future residents on the westerly extensions of Fairhaven Drive and Richdale Drive, and other proposed roads on the west side of Second Road West. The neighbourhood plan also included the westerly extension of Gatestone Drive to Highland Road (a critical roadway connection), several new local roadways, schools, parks and the permanent closure (cul-de-sac) of Upper Mount Albion Road just north of Rymal Road. However, once the environmental issues related to the karsts were brought to the forefront, development was halted and the proposed neighbourhood could not proceed until the karst boundaries were confirmed and the lands transferred to Conservation Authority jurisdiction.

The boundaries of the karst lands have now been determined, and as was expected, the limits are significant enough to require a revision to the neighbourhood plan. The purpose of revising the plan is to determine in part where and what density of development can occur and how new roads will be configured around the karsts. The City, through the Community Planning and Design Section, will in the very near future be embarking on the initial data gathering stage of that study. Traffic staff will be involved in that process.

The City has also initiated the Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process to assess the transportation, water and sewage needs for the Rymal Road Planning Area south of Rymal Road between Trinity Church Road and RR 56. That developing area will require infrastructure improvements, and therefore the effect that traffic from that area could have on existing roadways such as Second Road West, Upper Mount Albion and Rymal Road, and possible mitigations, will be considered. The contact person for this project is Christine Lee-Morrison at cleemorr@hamilton.ca

You have requested volumes, capacity and road widths and I provide these as follows:
- from engineering drawings for the Shadyglen Subdivision.....Second Road West from Gatestone Drive northerly has 8 m of pavement and a 20 m road allowance width. From Gatestone Road southerly to Rymal Road the pavement is 9.25 m wide and the road allowance width is 26 m. Gatestone Drive from Second Road West to Highland Road is 9.25 m wide with a 26 m road allowance width.

- staff have undertaken traffic counts on Second Road West and in a 24 hour period the northbound and southbound volumes combined total 2,200 vehicles in September 2005. The
24 hour volumes on Gatestone Drive closer to Highland Road total 4,380 vehicles in a study conducted this month.

- City staff expect a local roadway to carry approximately 1,000 vehicles per day (total of both directions). A collector roadway can carry 5,000 to 8,000 vehicles per day.

Please give me a call if you wish to discuss this data, or for specific information on the Rymal Road Planning Area EA study please send Christine an email. Thank you,

Leanne

Leanne Ryan
Traffic Technologist
Traffic Engineering & Operations
Public Works Department
905-546-2424 ext. 5925
fax: 905-540-5926

3/15/2006
It has to close. The road simply can’t hold more traffic. If nothing else, it needs less.
> > > Councillor, Ward 9
> > > Heritage Stoney Creek
> > > Phone: 546-2703
> > > Fax: 540-5163
> > >
> > >
> > > Original Message——
> > > From: [mailto: ______________________]
> > > Sent: Tuesday, November 22, 2005 10:04 PM
> > > To: rbacque@transconsulting.com; Bruckler, Phil; Dianni, Larry
> > > CC: ______________________
> > > Subject: RE: Second Rd. W Closure
> > >
> > >
> > > Dear Mr. Bacque, Mayor Dianni, Mr. Bruckler
> > >
> > > Having followed this debate closely over the last few weeks as well as the rhetoric, sign vandalism and high emotions, I just wanted to add my 2 cents worth. I live behind the Desantis model home on Shadetree Cres. When my wife, and children moved here from Waterdown 4 years ago, we were "promised" by our builder that Second Rd. W. would be closed as First Road already is. We were shown the plans and did our homework on this huge investment. In fact, we recently added a pool to our property
> > > As we planned on being here for quite a while.
> > > My three children (ages from 6, 10 and 11) walk to Gatestone School across Second Road twice a day. On numerous occasions, they have had close calls crossing Second Rd. at the stop sign as many drivers find that stopping on Second is "optional" as enforcement is not possible on a regular basis. On Monday of this week, a car completely ran the stop sign, having made eye contact with my children and narrowly missed my 6 year old daughter in Grade 1. This is not related to John Northey's
> > > e-mail as that incident happened Friday. Two close calls within 2 school days is not acceptable. Unfortunately, my children and wife were too preoccupied with saving their own lives and consoling their baby sister to get a license plate or description of the vehicle other than it was a green car.
> > > Currently my children, along with many others from my street and the neighbouring Fairhaven and Richdale, attend Gatestone as "out of catchment" walkers. It is my understanding as a parent in the community and discussions with the principal that the current catchment for Gatestone may come up for review this year to formally include these three streets. It makes no economic, pragmatic or justifiable sense to make Second Rd. a through road to Rymal. The road is too narrow, the houses too close to the street and the children too precious to allow it to continue to be a dragstrip. Especially as small children have to use this street to access the two elementary schools as walkers, not to mention the many school bus stops currently on Second Rd. Many High School Students walk to Steliffe Secondary School and back too.
> > > I have asked Mr. Switchen from the Planning Department for Second Road's current capacity and usage as well as information as to road widths and related capacities back on October 11, 2005 and have yet to receive a reply. It has been a month!!! Why, when there are streets that can easily be engineered to handle large volumes of traffic (e.g. Whitleer and Gatestone or better yet, Upper Mount Albion) do we need to continue to have this discussion. They were and/ or be easily planned,
> > > and engineered for this greater capacity.
> > > Please help protect my children and all my neighbours' children. Close Second Rd. W. and put the extra traffic onto roads that can be designed for the volume.
> > >
> > > Please do not hesitate to contact me for any further clarification or information.
> > >
> > > Sincerely
> > >
Christine, Liza and Ray.

I just wanted to thank you guys for taking the time to come to my home and community to speak with us in person. I realize you are all very busy. Your honesty and integrity on the subject is very much appreciated. Whatever the decision, (But we want Second Road West closed) you are always welcome to my home for coffee and tea.

Thanks,
Fyi....

-----Original Message-----
From: Liza Sheppard
Sent: Friday, November 25, 2005 5:53 PM
To: ' '; rbacquie@itansconsulting.com; cleemorr@hamilton.ca
Cc: [redacted]; pbruckler@cityofhamilton.ca; [redacted]; [redacted];
Subject: RE: Nov. 23

Hello [redacted],

It was our pleasure meeting with you, [redacted] and [redacted] on Wednesday. In response to your question about the traffic volumes on Second Road West, the volumes were recorded in September of this year.

Regards,
Liza

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted] [mailto:[redacted]]
Sent: Thursday, November 24, 2005 2:00 PM
To: rbacquie@itansconsulting.com; Liza Sheppard; cleemorr@hamilton.ca
Cc: [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted];
Subject: RE: Nov. 23

Hello Ray, Liza and Christine,

I just wanted to send out a quick note to thank you for meeting with us yesterday. I felt that it was a positive discussion and I truly appreciated all of your patience when listening to our concerns and ideas.

Ray, as we discussed please look into the points we brought up:

1. Please check the date on the volume measurement test that is being used as the basis for volume predictions on Second Rd. If it is older than six months I would like to request that another test is taken. Please check to ensure that the measuring devices will be left for 24 hours as you described.

2. Please ensure that all of the documentation that is being presented shows that Second Rd. is a local road. I know the most southern portion is a collector road but I want to make sure that everyone understands that there is no way a street 28 feet wide can handle 8000 cars a day.

I also wanted to make sure that all of you understand that since the natural location (as we discussed) to close Second Road is directly in front of my home that I have no issue with losing property to accommodate the "bulbs" that the city requires when closing a road.

Basically, one bulb (the southern one) could be built in front of my house (please note that there is just a field across the street from my home) and not affect any other residents. The northern bulb could easily be built encompassing the Bell easement land (directly beside my home) and would also not affect any other residents current property. The pedestrian crossing would fit right between the two bulbs ensuring safety for anyone
trying to cross Second Rd.

Regards,

[Signature]

> Enabling businesses to succeed through innovative solutions.
> Visit our website at [URL]
>
> This message, including any attachments, is intended only for the use
> of
> the individual(s) to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is
> privileged/confidential. Any other distribution, copying or disclosure is strictly
> prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient or have received this message in error,
> please notify us immediately by reply e-mail and permanently delete this message including
> any attachments, without reading it or making a copy. Thank you.
>
> Ce message (y compris ses fichiers joints) est transmis pour l'usage
> exclusif de la ou des personnes à qui il est destiné et peut contenir des renseignements
> confidentiels ou protégés. Il est strictement interdit d'en faire toute autre
> distribution, copie ou divulgation. Si vous n'êtes pas le destinataire visé ou que vous
> avez reçu ce message par erreur, veuillez nous en aviser immédiatement en répondant à ce
> courriel et le détruire (y compris ses fichiers joints) de façon définitive sans le lire
> ou en faire de copie.

Merci.
Hi [Name] and [Name],

I went down to old Stoney Creek City Hall yesterday to do some investigating for our cause only to find out that the Engineering portion of the Planning Department has move to Hamilton City Hall. I wasn't able to find all the answers I was looking for, however, I was able to get copies of 2 other planning maps. One is from December 2000, and the other is from March of 2005. They indicate that "Neighborhood Park" and "Off Street Bikeway and/or Walkway" cross Second Road West at the Bell Easement, obviously representing a closure of Second Road West at that point. If you would like to get copies of these maps please let me know. Hopefully these will help us in our attempt to convince the decision makers that Second Road West NEEDS TO BE CLOSED. This is not just because the current residents of Second Road West and surrounding area wish to provide AND be provided with a safe and secure neighborhood in which to raise their families and enjoy the company of neighbors and friends. This is because the past and present engineers and staff of the Planning Department determined that closing Second Road West was necessary to produce a desirable and safe residential neighborhood that are ever so important to great cities like our own. To promises kept, and expectations fulfilled.

[Name]

From: [Name]  
Date: 2005/11/21 Mon PM 07:35:27 EST  
To: [Name]  
Subject: Re: Maps Needed  

Hi [Name],  
I do have a full size copy of the neighborhood plan issued by the city planning department, as well as the full marketing package the Desantis provided for potential buyers for Phase 1. However I have not yet been able to locate either of them. I am continuing to look for them and will let you know as soon as I find them.  

From: [Name]  
Date: 2005/11/21 Mon PM 12:02:20 EST  
To: [Name]  
Subject: Maps Needed  

Hi [Name],  
This is [Name] and [Name] — [Name]. At the meeting at [Name] house a few weeks back you informed me that you had
Please photocopy these maps. I work at a school so I have access to photostating large pieces of paper. I could either borrow them for a day or you can come to my school (Assumption - just past Centennial - east side - on Rycol if you do not wish for me to take them overnight).

I would greatly appreciate it. Please get back to us and
Thank you for taking time out of your day to discuss some of our issues as they pertain to Second Road West.

Best regards,
Hey guys. and I took some measurements. Gatestone is 32 plus feet, Upper Mt Albion has the potential to be over 41 feet, and get this, Whitdeer and Highbury are almost 50 feet. By the way Second Road West is 28 feet.

I realize that for a brief time, Gatestone school is jammed in the morning but the opening of the path will alleviate some of that. Many will walk. I know that for a fact. During the down times it is dead. Traffic does not even need to go as far as the school during those peak times. Highbury is very wide.

But the best option is to leave Upper Mount Albion open. It can be widened to over 41 feet. It is a direct and natural link to Summit Park and the future commercial development. It is already a 60km/h zone. It has restaurants, large commercial mechanics shops, variety stores and their houses are much further back than ours. Most of that street is bush not homes as Second Road West. We have a group home with many children living there (CAS). It makes perfect sense to use Upper Mount Albion along with Pritchard, Whitdeer, Highbury and Gatestone. Second Road West is too narrow, the homes are too close to the road as is, there is only one sidewalk, it is not a commercial road, and it is definitely not a collector road. Remember, there is also Paramount linking up to Upper Mount Albion that can get the traffic to the Linc. Close Second Road West. Things will flow naturally that way. Summit Park will use Upper Mount Albion (A natural route) The 53 traffic will use 20 and Upper Mount Albion, when need be, to get to the already existing and future commercial developments. Gatestone, Whitdeer, and Highbury will also serve the purpose. This way, our promise is fulfilled and the vast majority is happy and safe. I am confident that when Second Road West is closed, the traffic will be forced to use all the other avenues equally. No one street will suffer like we would. If Second Road were to remain open, they would all use Second Road West as the favoured and unnecessary short cut. Our families would suffer as safety would be a concern every day. We were told the road would be closed.

Do the right thing, close Second Road West as promised.
Subject: RE: Everyday tribulations of Second Rd residents

I noticed that you had to spend over an hour to clean off that egg. It was on the windows, embedded in the brick. That is awful. You should be spending that time in a more desirable fashion. I agree, we have taken the appropriate steps needed to resolve our issue. We have had to target our homes over the past 4 years in order to get things done. But will it be worth it? I certainly hope so. I noticed that when residents complained about parking bylaws and the home made sign bylaws, things were resolved rather quickly, but when people blatantly brake the laws day after day after day... those people are rewarded with warnings. What would if we were to discipline our children this way? They would continue to repeat that undesired behaviour. In fact, the behaviour escalates. These are proven and studied facts. They directly apply to adults also. We need to continue our crusade and not feel intimidated. If we do not receive the support promised by the city or the enforcement warranted by police in this area, we will need to govern ourselves and protect our families and home. Is that fair? ABSOLUTELY NOT!!!

Phil, Ray Close Second Road West before things get out of hand.

From: [redacted]
Sent: Sunday, November 20, 2005 12:04 PM
To: [redacted]
CC:

11/24/2005
On Saturday November 19, 2005 we were appalled to find the front of our house covered with raw eggs. We were the only house on Second Rd W to be egged and we were the only house on the street to have our homemade sign supporting road closure on our front lawn. We can only assume that our house was targeted with the eggs because of our support of road closure. I know we are making assumptions, however, with recent events this is a valid and logical assumption. Upon speaking to our neighbours on the weekend, we found out that over the past few months, other homes had been targeted with raw eggs as well. Our home being targeted should not surprise us. Our conscious effort to promote road safety is also upsetting to some vehicles that travel through our neighbourhood. We have experienced hostile driving, vulgar language and vehicles passing us to the left as we obey the speed limit while driving down our street and make complete and legal stops at all stop signs. Apparently obeying laws and promoting safety is only the concern of some drivers!

All of this is very upsetting to us as well as our neighbours. We have made a conscious, logical, thought out attempt to promote the closure of Second Rd W. We have used all the appropriate avenues available to us. We have made city officials and those involved in the decision making process aware of our concerns, we have brought up valid and logical alternatives, we have used the email address provided to us by the police to notify them of traffic violations. We as residents of Second Rd W have done everything appropriately and ethically. We have not resorted to childish, inappropriate and destructive measures. For this reason, egging of our home is very upsetting.

We just wanted to give you another idea of the situations that we as residents have had to deal with. Let's solve these problems and proceed with the logical solution. Close Second Rd W quickly!!!

Sincerely: [Redacted]
Hello Mr. Colby Constant.

I understand that you were on our street (Second Road West) this past Friday evening telling people to remove the signs that were placed on our lawns. Would it be possible to have the name of the individual complaining? We would like to explain to them what we are trying to accomplish. I would also like to know what the complaint is. I have a sign. It was down when you passed by as it was knocked down by somebody. (Is that against the law?) Probably by the same people that are egging our homes. (Is that against the law?) Have you ever tried to clean frozen egg off your brick? Is there a by-law against vandalizing a home?, driving 80kms in a 50km (should be 40km) zone?, blowing three stop signs on one street? Is the message of safety for our children a problem for some? Is keeping a promise too much to ask for some people? What exactly is the problem? We are trying to get people to slow down and to stop breaking the law. We are proactive in our fight. We have been begging for support in our issues. Thousands of e-mails, hundreds of phone calls and nothing. These people make one call and you jump. I guarantee you that the people complaining are the ones that love using Second Road West as a short cut. They are probably the people that have received a letter as we track all violations and submit them to the police. Was this person brave enough to leave a name?

Close Second Road West

11/24/2005
Hello,

I do not think it will come down to that. I feel confident that the road will be closed as in the 1989-present plans. We have made intelligent suggestions. It is evident that Second Road West is not the road that can solve the traffic problems. I feel confident in Phil Bruckler and after speaking to Ray Bacque feel even more confident that they see what we see. They are educated people that are educated on our situation.

I am sorry that your house was egged for no reason. I agree that you were targeted as a result of your unwavering support of closure of Second Road West. I just wish that we will succeed in making Mr. Bacque and the mayor and others realize that we will continue to fight for second road closure no matter what results.

I hope mayor Dianni reads this email from you and realizes that you have been targeted and it was unjustified. I know you and Dan and the rest of us will not give up the fight to close Second road as promised by the city.

I witnessed people flying down Second Road today as most of the signs came down. This street is not meant to be a "highway" like most drivers are treating it.

Second road must be closed. There are many other alternatives that have been brought forward already (ex: Upper Mount Albion). If only we could get these people to listen and see the obvious alternatives, they would close the second road.

Again, I am sorry that this happened to such a nice family with two beautiful small children.
On Saturday November 19, 2005 we were appalled to find the front of our house covered with raw eggs. We were the only house on Second Rd W to be egged and we were the only house on the street to have our homemade sign supporting road closure on our front lawn. We can only assume that our house was targeted with the eggs because of our support of road closure. I know we are making assumptions, however, with recent events this is a valid and logical assumption. Upon speaking to our neighbours on the weekend, we found out that over the past few months, other homes had been targeted with raw eggs as well. Our home being targeted should not surprise us. Our conscious effort to promote road safety is also upsetting to some vehicles that travel through our neighbourhood. We have experienced hostile driving, vulgar language and vehicles passing us to the left as we obey the speed limit while driving down our street and make complete and legal stops at all stop signs. Apparently obeying laws and promoting safety is only the concern of some drivers!

All of this is very upsetting to us as well as our neighbours. We have made a conscious, logical, thought out attempt to promote the closure of Second Rd W. We have used all the appropriate avenues available to us. We have made city officials and those involved in the decision making process aware of our concerns, we have brought up valid and logical alternatives, we have used the email address provided to us by the police to notify them of traffic violations. We as residents of Second Rd W have done everything appropriately and ethically. We have not resorted to childish, inappropriate and destructive measures. For this reason, egging of our home is very upsetting.

We just wanted to give you another idea of the situations that we as residents have had to deal with. Let’s solve these problems and proceed with the logical solution. Close Second Rd W quickly!!!

Sincerely
Nathalie Baudais

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Sunday, November 20, 2005 6:03 PM
To: [Redacted]

Subject: RE: Upper Mount Albion Needs To Stay Open

what you are saying makes perfect sense.

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Sunday, November 20, 2005 12:37 PM
To: [Redacted]

Subject: Upper Mount Albion Needs To Stay Open

Ray, Phil.

According to a community meeting last Wed. November 16th, 2005, we were informed that across form Janet Lee School, in the vicinity of Paramount, Winterberry and the Linc, there is going to be a rather large commercial development; a Canadian Tire, a Home Depot, a movie theatre, etc. Now that we were made aware of what is going to happen in the above mentioned area, I am completely flabbergasted that there was a real consideration ever given to closing Upper Mount Albion. How could this ever be seriously considered? In taking a slow drive down Upper Mount Albion, I realized a few things. Upper Mount Albion links the Summit Park residents directly to this new commercial development avoiding Second Road West as a route. It would also eliminate the people from the commercial development (across from Janet Lee) taking Second Road West as a route up to the 53 commercial development. I could not believe my ears when three Second Road West representatives attended this meeting only to

11/24/2005
report back that the officials in charge of traffic control did not know that there was going to be a Wal-Mart on Hwy53. If the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing, then Second Road West is in big trouble, as it is the preferred short cut for people using the surrounding amenities. Upper Mount Albion is already a commercial environment. There are people with large structures doing mechanical commercial work, there are variety stores and restaurants. It is obviously zoned for this type of traffic. The homes are also set back much further from the street in comparison to Second Road West. Upper Mount Albion road is even favourable for expansion. For the above mentioned reasons, Upper Mount Albion is naturally the road to keep open. Even if for some unfathomable reason Second Road West were to remain open, why would Upper Mount Albion close? This would definitely add fuel to the fire. Also please remember that Whitdear leading to Highbury and Highland is something that needs to be considered as the road is far more superior in structure to accommodate large amounts of traffic. Even with parking on both sides of the road, this route can handle five times the amount of traffic than Second Road West could with no parking at all. Yes, I agree that the double sided parking on Second Road West is a hazard, but we do need parking on one side of the road. Gatetestone is also a very wide street.

It is very bothersome and unsettling that the residents of Second Road West are the ones exposing these unbelievably obvious alternatives that make complete sense. It makes me wonder what the true reasons are as to why Second Road West is having so much trouble for such a simple and obvious solution.

Close Second Road West
Nathalie Baudais

From: Nathalie.Baudais@hamilton.ca
Sent: Friday, November 18, 2005 1:57 PM
To: Nathalie.Baudais@hamilton.ca; Nathalie.Baudais@hamilton.ca; Liza.Sheppard@hamilton.ca
Cc: Nathalie.Baudais@hamilton.ca; Nathalie.Baudais@hamilton.ca; Liza.Sheppard@hamilton.ca
Subject: RE: Meet at

Good point. I am attaching the text from an e-mail I received back in October, which indicates the path/walkway to the school will be under construction soon, and paving completed in the spring. The path is a 'hot topic' among parents accompanying children to the school. There are a large number of families who currently drive to school daily, who will use the path once it is available. It's important to note that, for the most part of each day, Gatestone has more than adequate passage for vehicles, and pedestrians have no issues, with sidewalks on both sides. The only time traffic and parking issues arise is when school begins in the morning, and again at dismissal time. Traffic will certainly be minimized at these times once the path is usable.

-----Original Message-----
From: Moore, Gary [SMTP:gmoore@hamilton.ca]
Sent: October 24, 2005 4:16 PM
To: Gacchetti, Lynne; Bruckler, Phil; Parisotto, Jerry
Cc: Nathalie.Baudais@hamilton.ca; Nathalie.Baudais@hamilton.ca; Liza.Sheppard@hamilton.ca
Subject: RE: park & walkways adjacent to Gatestone school

Hi, the contract has been awarded and the preconstruction meeting was held with the contractor last week. The contract calls for the contractor to complete the installation of walkways to finished granular this year (paving in the spring) as well as the facilities and lighting for the ice rink area (grading, water supply, etc). The remainder of the park facilities and landscaping will be completed by early summer next year (2006). Hope this helps.

If you have any other questions regarding the contractor progress or work schedule, please contact Mr. Jerry Parisotto Manager of Construction.

Gary Moore
Manager of Design
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department
Ext 2382

-----Original Message-----
From: Nathalie.Baudais@hamilton.ca
Sent: November 18, 2005 9:53 AM
To: 'Ray Bacque'; pbruckler@hamilton.ca
Cc: Nathalie.Baudais@hamilton.ca; Liza.Sheppard@hamilton.ca
Subject: RE: Meet at

Hello Mr. Bacque,

When you are assessing the conditions in front of Gatestone School please note the following:

The school situation is exactly like the Second Rd. situation just on a smaller scale. They built the school and opened it without finishing all of the access routes to get to the school. There is a future walking/bicycle path that runs from Second all the way to the school. There are access points to the path from Eringate for all of the people in the southwestern portion of the subdivision to use to get to the school.
When the city finishes the path the traffic will be greatly diminished (currently my wife as well as all of our neighbours, including the ones behind us on Eringate, Willowridge, Woodbank etc. drive our kids to school).

From my house on Second it is a four minute walk to the school along the path, however the path is currently extremely muddy and because of the safety concerns in trying to walk the long way around (which would include walking on Second Rd.) we are all driving. In the early fall when the ground was hard and we could walk on the path there was easily 100 people using the path every morning.

Once the path is completed, and the school puts a gate in the south eastern part of the fence at the back of the school, (I understand the school is currently looking at quotes) they will see a huge decrease in volume as everyone west of Gatestone will use the short cuts and enter the school from the rear.

Basically, what the school did was build a chain link fence all the way around the school with only one gate at the back. Residents living in the northwestern portion of the subdivision can use the gate (the path for them is also not finished and is currently very muddy). Obviously this leads to funneling the entire school (people driving, walking, riding their bikes, school buses etc.) through the front entrance on Gatestone. It is hard to explain in writing but you will understand once you see it. Please make sure that you walk to the back of the school to get a better understanding.

I think it was one of your colleagues who said "people are going to take the path of least resistance". Well, currently when it comes to the school there is only one choice for the residents and that is through the front of the property. When they finish the paths and put in the gate there will be a huge difference compared to today.

I am trusting that you will look at the big picture and envision what will happen in the future when making your decision. The city will finish the paths, the school will put in a gate and any current conditions at the school will be solved.

The situation on Second Road is not as bright, if you don’t close this road, it will be a road in constant chaos. There will be more vehicles than the road can handle and with the new path and park and more children than ever on the road. Obviously, not a good mix!

The safety of the neighborhood children must be the most important factor in your decision.

Please, close Second Road.

Regards,

[Signature]

Enabling businesses to succeed through innovative solutions.
Visit our website at [Website URL]

This message, including any attachments, is intended only for the use of the individual(s) to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged/confidential. Any other distribution, copying or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient or have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply e-mail and permanently delete this message including any attachments, without reading it or making a copy. Thank you.

Ce message (y compris ses fichiers joints) est transmis pour l'usage exclusif de la ou des personnes a qui il est destine et peut contenir des renseignements confidentiels ou proteges. Il est strictement interdit d'en faire toute autre distribution, copie ou divulgation. Si vous n'etes pas le destinataire vise ou que vous avez recu ce message par
Hello

I am sorry I have not been able to get in touch with you by phone since I spoke to Melena. I have been tied up in the evenings, and did not want to call too late. I will be in Sudbury on November 30th, so I won't be able to meet with you that day. Evenings next week are also difficult for me due to family commitments. However I am hoping to get out to the neighbourhood again next week early around 8:00 or 8:30 to catch the morning rush hour and observe conditions in front of the school on Gatestone. If you are available, perhaps join me and we can talk then. When I sort out a date I will let you know.

Thanks

Ray

Ray Bacquie, P.Eng, AVS.
Vice President
iTRANS Consulting Inc.
100 York Boulevard, Suite 300
Richmond Hill, ON L4B 1J8

Phone: 905-882-4100 Ext. 5227
Direct: 905-695-5227
Fax: 905-882-1557

E-mail: rbacquie@itransconsulting.com
<mailto:rbacquie@itransconsulting.com>
www.itransconsulting.com
Wed the 30th would be better for me. Around 7:00pm. I think for also.

How bout you?

Phil, Can you see if Ray can come also?

-----

From: "Bruckler, Phil" <pbruckler@hamilton.ca>
To: <header>
CC: <rbaquie@itransconsulting.com>
Subject: RE: Meet at
Date: Wed, 16 Nov 2005 15:18:34 -0500

Phil would be more than happy to attend a meeting at your house. I assume you are looking for an evening meeting so your neighbours can attend? His evenings get pretty filled up but right now I have the 21st and 22nd (Mon & Tuesday) next week and the 30th (Wednesday) the following week. Hope one of these will work with your group.

-----Original Message-----
From: <header>
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2005 10:57 AM
To: rbaquie@itransconsulting.com; Bruckler, Phil
Cc: Hamiltonbackclinic@yahoo.ca;
Subject: Meet at

Hello Ray, Phil. How are you?

Would you guys be interested in meeting at my home to discuss this matter. We could have myself and a couple others representing the entire group. We understand if this is not possible as you are both very busy but I feel it would be a great opportunity to sit down with some positive and constructive solutions. What do you think?

Call me or e-mail me if you wish to discuss this 905-560-8740

Thanks

<< File: ATID0000.htm >>
This is true. I agree

Hello Mr. Bacque,

When you are assessing the conditions in front of Gatestone School please note the following:

The school situation is exactly like the Second Rd. situation just on a smaller scale. They built the school and opened it without finishing all of the access routes to get to the school. There is a future walking/bicycle path that runs from Second all the way to the school. There are access points to the path from Eringate for all of the people in the southwestern portion of the subdivision to use to get to the school.

When the city finishes the path the traffic will be greatly diminished (currently my wife as well as all of our neighbours, including the ones behind us on Eringate, Willowridge, Woodbank etc. drive our kids to school). From my house on Second it is a four minute walk to the school along the path, however the path is currently extremely muddy and because of the safety concerns in trying to walk the long way around (which would include walking on Second Rd.) we are all driving. In the early fall when the ground was hard and we could walk on the path there was easily 100 people using the path every morning.

Once the path is completed, and the school puts a gate in the southeastern part of the fence at the back of the school, I understand the school is currently looking at quotes) they will see a huge decrease in volume as everyone west of Gatestone will use the short cuts and enter the school from the rear.

Basically, what the school did was build a chain link fence all the way around the school with only one gate at the back. Residents living in the northwestern portion of the subdivision can use the gate (the path for them is also not finished and is currently very muddy). Obviously this leads to funneling the entire school (people driving, walking, riding their bikes, school buses etc.) through the front entrance on Gatestone. It is hard to explain in writing but you will understand once you see it. Please make sure that you walk to the back of the school to get a better understanding.

I think it was one of your colleagues who said "people are going to take the path of least resistance". Well, currently when it comes to the school there is only one choice for the residents and that is through the front of the property. When they finish the paths and put in the gate there will be a huge difference compared to today.

I am trusting that you will look at the big picture and envision what will happen in the future when making your decision. The city will finish the paths, the school will put in a gate and any current conditions at the school will be solved.

The situation on Second Road is not as bright, if you don't close this road, it will be a road in constant chaos. There will be more vehicles than the road can handle and with the new path and park and more children than ever on the road. Obviously, not a good mix!

The safety of the neighborhood children must be the most important factor in your decision.
Please, close Second Road.

Regards,

Enabling businesses to succeed through innovative solutions.
Visit our website at: [Website URL]

This message, including any attachments, is intended only for the use of the individual(s) to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged/confidential. Any other distribution, copying or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient or have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply e-mail and permanently delete this message including any attachments, without reading it or making a copy. Thank you.
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-----Original Message-----
From: Ray Bacquie [mailto:rbacquie@itransconsulting.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2005 10:56 PM
To: [Redacted] pbruckler@hamilton.ca
Cc: [Redacted] Nathalie Baudais; Liza Sheppard
Subject: RE: Meet at

Hello [Redacted]

I am sorry I have not been able to get in touch with you by phone since I spoke to Melena. I have been tied up in the evenings, and did not want to call too late. I will be in Sudbury on November 30th, so I won't be able to meet with you that day. Evenings next week are also difficult for me due to family commitments. However I am hoping to get out to the neighbourhood again next week early around 8:00 or 8:30 to catch the morning rush hour and observe conditions in front of the school on Galesone. If you are available, perhaps join me and we can talk then. When I sort out a date I will let you know.

Thanks

Ray

Ray Bacquie, P.Eng, AVS.
Vice President
iTRANS Consulting Inc.
100 York Boulevard, Suite 300
Richmond Hill, ON L4B 1J8
Ray Bacque, P.Eng, AVS.
Vice President
iTRANS Consulting Inc.
100 York Boulevard, Suite 300
Richmond Hill, ON L4B 1J8

Phone: 905-882-4100 Ext. 5227
Direct: 905-695-5227
Fax: 905-882-1557
E-mail: rbacque@itransconsulting.com
www.itransconsulting.com

-----Original Message-----
From: [mailto: ]
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2005 1:08 PM
To: 
Cc: 

Subject: RE: The Status of Second Rd W

excellent point regarding Pritchard Road.

>>> < 11/17/2005 11:08:15 AM >>>
Good morning all,

I also agree that Upper Mount Albion is definitely an adequate road to
handle the north/south traffic. Again, it has the capacity for installation of sidewalks
on both sides and is sparsely populated. I am positive that the commercial businesses on
that road will also be delighted that the road stay opened for ease of customers.
Further, it

directly links to one of the main entrances to Summit Park and therefore seems to be the
logical choice with respect to ease of traffic flow.

Also, I never heard Pritchard Road in any of these discussions. Would
this road not also be a logical choice for north/south traffic? Again,
sparsely populated, the majority of the road is occupied by commercial
development and runs from Rymal Road to Paramount Drive. I am sure the
commercial developments on Pritchard Road as well as the new Leons store would not protest
the extra traffic that the commercial and residential
developments on Rymal Road will bring. This road also provides easy access to the Linc
via Dartnall Road. It would also alleviate the traffic from Winterberry Drive (from which
I understand the residents are really concerned with).

Again, another more logical choice than utilizing Second Road West. A
road that can not handle the traffic it is already receiving and further, a road that was
to have traffic diverted as per City Plans (whether it be City of Hamilton or City of
Stoney Creek Plans – Are we not all the City of Hamilton now and therefore, these are all
now City of Hamilton issues/plans?)

Best Regards
The

11/17/2005 10:14 AM
To
rbacquie@itransconsulting.com,
pbruckler@hamilton.ca, cleemorr@hamilton.ca, eswitenik@hamilton.ca
cc

Subject
RE: The Status of Second Rd W

Upper Mt Albion is more suitable
From: 
To: "rbacquie@itransconsulting.com", "idianni@hamilton.ca"
"rbacquie@itransconsulting.com", "idianni@hamilton.ca"
"pbruckler@hamilton.ca"
"pbruckler@hamilton.ca"
"cleemorr@hamilton.ca" "cleemorr@hamilton.ca", "eswitenik@hamilton.ca"

"eswitenik@hamilton.ca"
CC: "Leona Garabedian", "Local Council Support Staff"
Subject: RE: The Status of Second Rd W
Date: Tue, 15 Nov 2005 13:52:16 -0500

> Good points With respect to Upper Mount Albion being a more
> suitable North/South thoroughfare...it also runs North all the way to Paramount!! This
> means traffic from the Linc, after scooting up Winterberry, could turn right at Paramount
> (westbound) to quickly reach

Upper Mount Albion for easy North/South access to Summit Park, and all
destinations on and South of Rymal. This would alleviate traffic flowing by Janet Lee
School, and traffic on Highland Rd., which has already been identified as a concern.
> To me, it just makes sense!

>-----Original Message-----
>From: [SMTP]
>Sent: November 15, 2005 11:46 AM
>To: rbaucue@itransconsulting.com; ldianni@hamilton.ca;
pbruckler@hamilton.ca; cleemorr@hamilton.ca; eswitenik@hamilton.ca
>Cc:

>Subject: The Status of Second Rd W
>
>Mr. Bacque,
>
> In response to your email, I am confused with respect to a few of
>your observations. I am very confused as to why Gatestone Drive and
>Highland Rd need to be assessed whether or not they can handle
/redirected
>traffic. According to the original "Trinity Neighbourhood Plan",
>before
>the
>'sudden' discovery of the karsta lands, Gatestone was supposed to be
>the
>route between Rymal Rd and Highland road anyway. If it were built
>with that
>intention at that time, how could its function and capability be
>different
>now?
>
> In your email, you speak of function and design of a road. Highland
>Rd and Gatestone Drive are built to function as a commuter road. They

are
>wider than other residential roads and they have sidewalks on both
>sides
>of
>the street. Second Rd West was not designed and cannot function as a
>commuter road regardless if there is no other North South connection
>between
>Rymal Rd and Highland Rd. Other solutions must be possible. Traffic

will
>have to be redirected elsewhere.
Upper Mount Albion is the perfect solution. Presently there are very few houses on Upper Mount Albion Rd. The road could easily be made wider, sidewalks could be installed on both sides and residents could receive City water and sewers. It could very easily be developed to meet the needs and would ultimately let its design function as a North South connection. Upper Mount Albion is presently designated as a truck route, which further supports the idea of it being a good solution for north/south traffic.

The approximate 3200 homes being built south of Rymal road at the end of Upper Mount Albion, as well as all other vehicles using the commercial developments in that area could very easily use Upper Mount Albion as their local connection to other residential areas, but they could also use the expansion of Trinity Church to reach the Red Hill Expressway. With the expansion of Trinity Church, combined with the improvement of Upper Mount Albion, residents of the area would have perfect access both locally and to the expressway.

It is beyond my comprehension why consultants and the City of Hamilton are now looking into traffic patterns and solutions to traffic problems. Opening of the commercial development on Rymal Rd before traffic concerns are addressed is very disturbing to me. Rymal Rd will be disastrous. Rymal Rd itself at this time is too narrow to accommodate the traffic that will be brought by the opening of Walmart. The amount of vehicles hoping to avoid the congestion that will be brought from those entering and leaving Walmart will look for the easiest route out. Unfortunately Second Rd W will be their choice. A road which was designed to function as a local road will be forced to handle these large amounts of traffic. This will create a dangerous situation of not only those residents who live there, but for all using it as a thoroughfare. Let's keep all of our roads safe. Close Second Rd W and redirect traffic to other locations which were designed with safety in mind.

We need to find a solution quickly. Walmart will be opening shortly. We cannot waste time. We need to stop major problems before they arise. The safety of Hamilton's residents depends on it.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
This e-mail is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed (the
"addressee") and may contain confidential and/or privileged material.
Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use that a person other
than the addressee makes of this communication is prohibited and any reliance or decisions
made based on it, are the responsibility of such
person. We accept no responsibility for any loss or damages suffered by
any person other than the addressee as a result of decisions made or actions taken based
on this communication or otherwise. If you received
this in error, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of this
e-mail. <br>

Ce courriel est strictement reserve a l'usage de la personne a qui il est adresse (le
destinataire). Il peut contenir de l'information privilegiee et confidentielle. L'examen,
la reexpedition et la diffusion de ce message par une personne autre que son destinataire
est interdite. Nous declinons toute responsabilite a l'egard des pertes ou des dommages
subis par une
personne autre que le destinataire par suite de decisions ou de mesures
fondee sur le contenu de cette communication ou autrement. Si vous avez recu ce courriel
par erreur, veuillez communiquer avec son expediteur et en detruire toutes les copies.
Hello everyone,

After our street meeting on Friday we took a drive over to Upper Mt. Albion Road to try and get a good "sense" of what that street was like. I was pretty shocked to count only 13 houses on each side of the road (and two of them are for sale). As earlier mentioned the speed limit is already posted at 60kph and I had forgotten that there is a pizza restaurant and variety store on the north end of Upper Mt. Albion. You can imagine what will happen to their businesses if their road is closed. I am sure the owners would welcome the increased traffic to help them improve their business.

Just to review the facts, we have been told that there needs to be an alternate north/south route from Rymal to Highland to handle the new increased volume.

Second Road, a highly populated residential street backing onto a huge park and school.

Upper Mt. Albion, sparsely populated road with existing businesses and an already posted 60 kph speed limit. Not to mention, lots of room to upgrade the road.

If the decision is between these two roads it is pretty clear which one should be closed.

Close Second Road.

Regards,
I agree. There are many other options.
Thanks [redacted] This is why we felt it would remain a residential street.

> The average width of Second Rd between Highland and Gatestone is 28 ft 3 inches.
> The average width of Second Rd between Gatestone and Rymal is 32 ft 8 inches.
> Gatestone Drive just off of Second Rd is 32 ft 8 inches.
> Hillcroft Rd. just off of Second Rd is 28 ft 3 inches. (which would suggest to me, that the north end of Second is a residential rd just like Hillcroft)
Hello Ray. Can a street that is only 28 feet be a collector road? Is there not a minimum requirement for that much traffic? We can barely handle 800 a day.

Thanks,
From: Ray Bacquie
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2005 10:31 PM
To: Nathalie Baudais; Liza Sheppard
Subject: FW: Phil, When?

From: [mailto: [mailto:]
Sent: Saturday, November 12, 2005 11:13 AM
To: [mailto:]
Subject: Phil, When?

Hello Phil. Did you receive my voice mail? Will we know at the December meeting what our fate is? I really hope that we will get answers. Would you not agree that it is a fair request???
Nathalie Baudais

From: Ray Bacque
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2005 10:31 PM
To: Nathalie Baudais; Liza Sheppard
Subject: FW: [Redacted]

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Saturday, November 12, 2005 11:20 AM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: [Redacted]

Dear [Redacted],

By now you must be fully aware of what has been happening on Second Road West over the past 4 years. What is your view on this matter? Can we count on your support? We were told that our road would be closed. We purchased our home with trust of integrity.

Respectfully, [Redacted]
I agree.

I have not received the plate # of that black jeep that speeds down our residential street? It was racing at about 80kms or more today. I fear what will come when 8000 of those come down our residential street.
In response to your email, I am confused with respect to a few of your observations. I am very confused as to why Gatestone Drive and Highland Rd need to be assessed whether or not they can handle redirected traffic. According to the original "Trinity Neighbourhood Plan", before the 'sudden' discovery of the karsts lands, Gatestone was supposed to be the route between Rymal Rd and Highland Road anyway. If it were built with that intention at that time, how could its function and capability be different now?

In your email, you speak of function and design of a road. Highland Rd and Gatestone Drive are built to function as a commuter road. They are wider than other residential roads and they have sidewalks on both sides of the street. Second Rd West was not designed and cannot function as a commuter road regardless if there is no other North South connection between Rymal Rd and Highland Rd. Other solutions must be possible. Traffic will have to be redirected elsewhere.

Upper Mount Albion is the perfect solution. Presently there are very few houses on Upper Mount Albion Rd. The road could easily be made wider, sidewalks could be installed on both sides and residents could receive City water and sewers. It could very easily be developed to meet the needs and would ultimately let its design function as a North South connection. Upper Mount Albion is presently designated as a truck route, which further supports the idea of it being a good solution for north/south traffic.

The approximate 3200 homes being built south of Rymal road at the end of Upper Mount Albion, as well as all other vehicles using the commercial developments in that area could very easily use Upper Mount Albion as their local connection to other residential areas, but they could also use the expansion of Trinity Church to reach the Red Hill Expressway. With the expansion of Trinity Church, combined with the improvement of Upper Mount Albion, residents of the area would have perfect access both locally and to the expressway.

It is beyond my comprehension why consultants and the City of Hamilton are now looking into traffic patterns and solutions to traffic problems. Opening of the commercial development on Rymal Rd before traffic concerns are addressed is very disturbing to me. Rymal Rd will be disastrous. Rymal Rd itself at this time is too narrow to accommodate the traffic that will be brought by the opening of Walmart. The amount of vehicles hoping to avoid the congestion that will be brought from those entering and leaving Walmart will look for the easiest route out. Unfortunately Second Rd W will be their choice. A road which was designed to function as a local road will be forced to handle these large amounts of traffic. This will create a dangerous situation of not only those residents who live there, but for all using it as a thoroughfare. Lets keep all of our roads safe. Close Second Rd W and redirect traffic to other locations which were designed with safety in mind.

We need to find a solution quickly. Walmart will be opening shortly. We cannot waste time. We need to stop major problems before they arise. The safety of Hamilton's residents depends on it.

Sincerely

[Signature]

11/16/2005
Dear Mr. DiIanni,

How are you? As you know we have been working diligently for over four years now to close Second Road West. Please assist us in resolving this matter quickly as we are understandably out of patience. Ms. Mossop has forwarded a letter to your office in support of our cause. Would you also kindly support us in the form of a letter addressed to whomever can help us best.

Thank you,

[Signature]
Mr. Bacque. How are you?

Have you had the opportunity to drive through our survey yet? If so I'm sure you will understand our determination to resolve our cause immediately. Please remember that we were directed into this survey with the clear understanding that local traffic would be all that we would need to deal with. I believe that your options are ample. There are many many streets that can and should be used as a collector. Second Road West will not serve you well for this purpose. Our options are limited. The city either does what they promised or we have to move. Who will compensate us for our losses?

Best Regards,
Hello, We have been submitting license plate numbers. What exactly happens with those submissions? Does it help our cause at all or are we just wasting our time? What else are we to do to make our street safe?

Respectfully,
Ray Bacquie, P.Eng, AVS.
Vice President
iTRANS Consulting Inc.
100 York Boulevard, Suite 300
Richmond Hill, ON L4B 1J6

Phone: 905-882-4100 Ext. 5227
Direct: 905-695-5227
Fax: 905-882-1557
E-mail: rbacquie@itransconsulting.com
www.itransconsulting.com

-----Original Message-----
From:  
Sent: Monday, November 07, 2005 1:36 PM
To:  
cc:  
Subject: pictures

All,
Attached are some photo's which depict and I over the weekend trying to record some license plates who in our opinion were either speeding, rolling the stop or just driving through it altogether.

Unfortunately for us the veests may have given us away as they slowed down, however, and I cannot stay outside for 24 hrs, 7 days a week. Something which we were continually noticing while we were out...
there is the amount of traffic using Second Road West as their north-south corridor. This of course was of no surprise to us rather just confirmation that once the residential and commercial developments are complete the problem will only multiply itself.

As I understand Itrans Consulting is claiming they have done a study on our street but I ask that they physically come down and see the traffic pattern prior to making their recommendations to the City's Planners.

Regards,
Nathalie Baudais

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2005 11:08 AM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]

Subject: RE: The Status of Second Rd W

Good morning all,

I also agree that Upper Mount Albion is definitely an adequate road to handle the north/south traffic. Again, it has the capacity for installation of sidewalks on both sides and is sparsely populated. I am positive that the commercial businesses on that road will also be delighted that the road stay opened for ease of customers. Further, it directly links to one of the main entrances to Summit Park and therefore seems to be the logical choice with respect to ease of traffic flow.

Also, I never heard Pritchard Road in any of these discussions. Would this road not also be a logical choice for north/south traffic? Again, sparsely populated, the majority of the road is occupied by commercial development and runs from Rymal Road to Paramount Drive. I am sure the commercial developments on Pritchard Road as well as the new Leons store would not protest the extra traffic that the commercial and residential developments on Rymal Road will bring. This road also provides easy access to the Linc via Dartmall Road. It would also alleviate the traffic from Winterberry Drive (from which I understand the residents are really concerned with).

Again, another more logical choice than utilizing Second Road West. A road that can not handle the traffic it is already receiving and further, a road that was to have traffic diverted as per City Plans (whether it be City of Hamilton or City of Stoney Creek Plans - Are we not all the City of Hamilton now and therefore, these are all now City of Hamilton issues/plans?)

Best Regards
[Redacted]

[Redacted]

11/17/2005 10:14 AM

To: mbaquie@transconsulting.com, idillarin@halton.ca, pbnackler@hamilton.ca,
cleemorr@hamilton.ca, eswitenik@hamilton.ca

Cc: [Redacted]

Subject RE: The Status of Second Rd W
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Upper Mt Albion is more suitable

Subject: RE: The Status of Second Rd W
Date: Tue, 15 Nov 2005 13:52:16 -0500

> Good points. With respect to Upper Mount Albion being a more suitable North/South thoroughfare...it also runs North all the way to Paramount! This means traffic from the Linc, after scooting up Winterberry, could turn right at Paramount (westbound) to quickly reach Upper Mount Albion for easy North/South access to Summit Park, and all destinations on and South of Rymal. This would alleviate traffic flowing by Janet Lee School, and traffic on Highland Rd., which has already been identified as a concern.

> To me, it just makes sense!

> Original Message:

> From: 
> Sent: November 15, 2005 11:46 AM
> To: 

> Subject: The Status of Second Rd W

> Mr. Bacque,

> In response to your email, I am confused with respect to a few of
> your observations. I am very confused as to why Gatestone Drive and
> Highland Rd need to be assessed whether or not they can handle redirected
> traffic. According to the original "Trinity Neighbourhood Plan", before the
> "sudden" discovery of the karst's lands, Gatestone was supposed to be the
> route between Rymal Rd and Highland road anyway. If it were built with that
> intention at that time, how could its function and capability be different
> now?

> In your email, you speak of function and design of a road. Highland
> Rd and Gatestone Drive are built to function as a commuter road. They are
> wider than other residential roads and they have sidewalks on both sides of
> the street. Second Rd West was not designed and cannot function as a
> commuter road regardless if there is no other North South connection between
> Rymal Rd and Highland Rd. Other solutions must be possible. Traffic will
> have to be redirected elsewhere.

> Upper Mount Albion is the perfect solution. Presently there are
> very few houses on Upper Mount Albion Rd. The road could easily be made
> wider, sidewalks could be installed on both sides and residents could
> receive City water and sewers. It could very easily be developed to meet
> the needs and would ultimately let its design function as a North South
> connector. Upper Mount Albion is presently designated as a truck route,
> which further supports the idea of it being a good solution for North/South
> traffic.

> The approximate 3200 homes being built south of Rymal road at the
> end of Upper Mount Albion, as well as all other vehicles using the
> commercial developments in that area could very easily use Upper Mount
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Albian as their local connection to other residential areas, but they could also use the expansion of Trinity Church to reach the Red Hill Expressway. With the expansion of Trinity Church, combined with the improvement of Upper Mount Albion, residents of the area would have perfect access both locally and to the expressway.

It is beyond my comprehension why consultants and the City of Hamilton are now looking into traffic patterns and solutions to traffic problems. Opening of the commercial development on Rymal Rd before traffic concerns are addressed is very disturbing to me. Rymal Rd will be disastrous. Rymal Rd itself at this time is too narrow to accommodate the traffic that will be brought by the opening of Walmart. The amount of vehicles hoping to avoid the congestion that will be brought from those entering and leaving Walmart will look for the easiest route out. Unfortunately Second Rd W will be their choice. A road which was designed to function as a local road will be forced to handle these large amounts of traffic. This will create a dangerous situation of not only those residents who live there, but for all using it as a thoroughfare. Let’s keep all of our roads safe. Close Second Rd W and redirect traffic to other locations which were designed with safety in mind.

We need to find a solution quickly. Walmart will be opening shortly. We cannot waste time. We need to stop major problems before they arise. The safety of Hamilton’s residents depends on it.

Sincerely,

<< File: ATT00000.htm >>

This e-mail is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed (the "addressee") and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use that a person other than the addressee makes of this communication is prohibited and any reliance or decisions made based on it, are the responsibility of such person. We accept no responsibility for any loss or damages suffered by any person other than the addressee as a result of decisions made or actions taken based on this communication or otherwise. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of this e-mail.

Ce courriel est strictement reserve a l’usage de la personne a qui il est adresse (le destinataire). Il peut contenir de l’information privilegiee et confidentielle. L’examen, la reexpedition et la diffusion de ce message par une personne autre que son destinataire est interdite. Nous declinons toute responsabilite a l’egard des pertes ou des dommages subis par une personne autre que le destinataire par suite de decisions ou de mesures fondees sur le contenu de cette communication ou autrement. Si vous avez reçu ce courriel par erreur, veuillez le communiquer avec son expediteur et en detruire toutes les copies.
Ray Bacque, P.Eng, AVS.
Vice President
iTRANS Consulting Inc.
100 York Boulevard, Suite 300
Richmond Hill, ON L4B 1J8

Phone: 905-882-4100 Ext. 5227
Direct: 905-695-5227
Fax: 905-882-1557
E-mail: rbacque@itranconsulting.com
www.itranconsulting.com

-----Original Message-----
From: jdshepard@concentric.net
Sent: Tuesday, November 15, 2005 10:06 PM
To: rbacque@itranconsulting.com; pbruckler@hamilton.ca
Cc: N. Baudais

Subject: Ray Bacque

Mr. Bacque,

How are you? I would like to begin by thanking you for calling us back so quickly and for being so very helpful. It is clear that you have your plate full with all of the activity that is surrounding our area. We are glad to hear that your knowledge of our area is ample. For this reason we feel confident that you will understand the dilemma that we find ourselves in of having purchased our homes under this premises. We have been very diligent and pro-active in working towards the options that should be put forth. There is no secret that one of the options that we don’t want to see materialized is that of Second Road West remaining open. Perhaps there are some people that have jumped on our coat-tails and have opposed us. Please keep in mind that our family and many others have been consistently working at our cause for many years. It is important to us that you realize that the people in opposition at this time are simply responding to the signs and the media exposure that we ourselves have created. These people were quick to jump at the type of our activity; we however, waited patiently before going public with our cause. We are not unreasonable people, we are pro-active and willing to work together on this. Ray, we are dealing with many sensible options. When looking at our community, starting from Hwy 20, Whiteoer, Gatestone (linking to Highbury and Highland), Upper Mount Albion, and the opening of Trinity Church Road are all much, much better and safer solutions (not
alternatives). In other words there are plenty of avenues that will handle large amounts
of traffic. When you close Second Road West traffic will be dispersed evenly among the
other avenues. If you don't, they will all come down Second Road West and that will prove
to be catastrophic. In doing some research on the city's web page, as of 9:00pm on Nov
15, 2005, it clearly indicates Gatesstone joining up to the new Winterberry to Paramount.
Therefore, houses are still being sold under this pretense. Also, the Nursing Home on
Highland was built on Karst land, perhaps another small exception could be made to make a
road through the area with minimal disturbance to the karst. Ray, the bottom line is that
we purchased our homes with the understanding of having to deal with a few hundred cars a
day in our area. Our road, and our residents for that matter, cannot safely handle 8,000
cars a day. As we speak, with a thousand cars a day we are having immense issues and
great frustrations. In your attempt to take everything into consideration please take
into consideration one further point, we are dealing with hard working people, with
families with mortgages and bills to pay who feel strongly that they were misled and lied
to.

Respectfully,
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Good points. With respect to Upper Mount Albion being a more suitable North/South thoroughfare...it also runs North all the way to Paramount!! This means traffic from the Line, after scooting up Winterberry, could turn right at Paramount (westbound) to quickly reach Upper Mount Albion for easy North/South access to Summit Park, and all destinations on and South of Rymal. This would alleviate traffic flowing by Janet Lee School, and traffic on Highland Rd., which has already been identified as a concern.
To me, it just makes sense!

-----Original Message-----
From: Ray Bacquie
Sent: Tuesday, November 15, 2005 1:52 PM
To: rbacquie@itransconsulting.com; ldiianni@hamilton.ca; pbruckler@hamilton.ca; cleemorr@hamilton.ca; eswitenik@hamilton.ca
Cc:
Subject: RE: The Status of Second Rd W
In response to your email, I am confused with respect to a few of your observations. I am very confused as to why Gatestone Drive and Highland Rd need to be assessed whether or not they can handle redirected traffic. According to the original "Trinity Neighbourhood Plan", before the 'sudden' discovery of the karsts lands, Gatestone was supposed to be the route between Rymal Rd and Highland Road anyway. If it were built with that intention at that time, how could its function and capability be different now?

In your email, you speak of function and design of a road. Highland Rd and Gatestone Drive are built to function as a commuter road. They are wider than other residential roads and they have sidewalks on both sides of the street. Second Rd West was not designed and cannot function as a commuter road regardless if there is no other North South connection between Rymal Rd and Highland Rd. Other solutions must be possible. Traffic will have to be redirected elsewhere.

Upper Mount Albion is the perfect solution. Presently there are very few houses on Upper Mount Albion Rd. The road could easily be made wider, sidewalks could be installed on both sides and residents could receive City water and sewers. It could very easily be developed to meet the needs and would ultimately let its design function as a North South connection. Upper Mount Albion is presently designated as a truck route, which further supports the idea of it being a good solution for north/south traffic.

The approximately 3200 homes being built south of Rymal road at the end of Upper Mount Albion, as well as all other vehicles using the commercial developments in that area could very easily use Upper Mount Albion as their local connection to other residential areas, but they could also use the expansion of Trinity Church to reach the Red Hill Expressway. With the expansion of Trinity Church, combined with the improvement of Upper Mount Albion, residents of the area would have perfect access both locally and to the expressway.

It is beyond my comprehension why consultants and the City of Hamilton are now looking into traffic patterns and solutions to traffic problems. Opening of the commercial development on Rymal Rd before traffic concerns are addressed is very disturbing to me. Rymal Rd will be disastrous. Rymal Rd itself at this time is too narrow to accommodate the traffic that will be brought by the opening of Walart. The amount of vehicles hoping to avoid the congestion that will be brought from those entering and leaving Walart will look for the easiest route out. Unfortunately Second Rd W will be their choice. A road which was designed to function as a local road will be forced to handle these large amounts of traffic. This will create a dangerous situation of not only those residents who live there, but for all using it as a thoroughfare. Let's keep all of our roads safe. Close Second Rd W and redirect traffic to other locations which were designed with safety in mind.

We need to find a solution quickly. Walart will be opening shortly. We cannot waste time. We need to stop major problems before they arise. The safety of Hamilton's residents depends on it.

Sincerely

<< File: ATT00000.htm >>
Great question. Why not build the road that was to go through the karst?

Hi Phill

How are you today?

Everytime I drive on Highland Rd. and look at the Nursing Home, I always have a question in mind. I wonder how the owner of that nursing home obtained a building permit to build the nursing home on the core of the Karsts. That area from 2000 was forbidden to have any sort of construction on it. HOW DID THIS HAPPEN? Even Aldo DeSantis had to stop building houses in that area. The nursing home was built in 2002-2003

Can you provide some sort of answers for us?
Hey guys. This message is not getting to Ray. Can somebody else try?

If the ORC's transfer of ANSI land makes the Winterberry extension impossible, why not look at Upper Mount Albion as a suitable alternate? Certainly, it is more suitable than Second Rd. W. It is a sparsely populated street, with houses set far back from the road. It is not part of a network of sidestreets in a family neighbourhood, like Second Rd. W. Is. Instead, Upper Mount Albion stands alone, providing a straight, unencumbered North/South route, providing direct access for residents of the 3000+ Summit Park homes. Upgrading and widening Upper Mount Albion and adding sidewalks on both sides would be feasible - where it is not feasible on Second Rd. W. Also, residents of Upper Mount Albion still receive their Hydro via overhead wires running to poles on their homes and the homes are still on septic systems. Since modern services (underground hydro & city sewers) are required anyway, it would be logical to upgrade and widen the road as necessary, and add sidewalks at the same time.

Also, if re-directing traffic to Highland Rd. is a concern, then utilizing Upper Mount Albion instead of Second Rd. W. would divert traffic away from the troublesome Highland/Glenhollow corner. From Winterberry, it is a very short jaunt to the West along Highland to reach Upper Mount Albion. To travel East to Second Rd. W. is more than double the distance along Highland, a road already identified by the police and in the newspaper as a "trouble spot for traffic and speeding."
> We can only hope the folks making the decisions listen to our very practical concerns. Second Rd. W. should be closed, and if the planned 4-lane Trinity Church extension will not provide sufficient North/South access, then Upper Mount Albion should be utilized as an alternate or additional route.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> ----Original Message----
>
> From: [redacted]
> Sent: November 8, 2005 3:47 PM
> To: 'rbacque@transconsulting.com'
> Cc: [redacted]; 'mcrossop.mpp@liberal.on.ca'; [redacted]; 'lidianni@hamilton.ca'; 'pbruckler@hamilton.ca'; 'cmcculloch@hamiltonpolice.on.ca'; 'jryan@hamilton.ca'; 'lswitenk@hamilton.ca'; 'cmcculloch@hamiltonpolice.on.ca'; [redacted]
> Subject: RE: ROPA 9 Master Plan EA and the status of Second Road
>
> Hello Mr. Bacque,
>
> Unfortunately, I have been away on business and I have not had an opportunity to respond to your e-mail until now. There are several statements that you have made that I would like to see clarified.
>
> The first issue is that you have confirmed that Second Road is a collector (capacity 8000 cars a day) road, south of Gatestone Drive. Do realize that this portion of the road encompasses maybe 1/10th of the length of the entire street?
>
> You wrote about your mandate relating specifically to the ROPA 9 and Special Policy Area "C" lands. If you take a look at your map you will see the quickest route from one area to the other is along Winterberry, Highland and Second Road. Winterberry and Highland are very wide roads that can accommodate four car widths at any one time. Second Road, especially the northern portion, cannot handle three car widths at the same time (as you have seen from the pictures forwarded to you previously, the motorists who try it have crashed their vehicles). There is no room to widen this northern portion of Second Road because the houses have been built so close to the road already.
>
> You have asked some questions in the second portion of your e-mail that I am having difficulty understanding? My first thought is why are you looking into these questions now when they have already started the construction of the ROPA project? Talk about putting the wagon in front of the horse. All of these questions should have been addressed at the outset of this project not when the stores are only months away from opening. Regardless of that point, you have written that you need a "sense" about how the volumes on Second compare with adjacent streets or similar roads in the city. I am hoping that you have truly read all of the e-mails we have sent you and I believe that alone should give you some kind of "sense" of what is happening.
>
> As for your question about dispensing traffic and what adjacent roads could handle the north/south traffic, why are you not looking at Upper Mt. Albion Road? That road is sparsely populated already has a posted speed limit of 60 kph and the houses that are there are set way back from the street. The city could upgrade that street and make it a four lane road with sidewalks on both sides. Although, I am not an engineer I can't understand why your group would even be contemplating bringing more commuting traffic into the subdivisions (Second Rd.) when you have a street (Upper Mt. Albion) with minimal residents that would be more than an adequate solution for your north/south problem.
>
> Your second question in regards to redirecting traffic to Gatestone and Highland? I am baffled? Those streets were designed/built to accommodate that re-directed traffic. The original plan called for Winterberry to hook
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> up directly with Gatestone which hooks up with Highland. What has changed
> that would not allow them to be able to handle the traffic now?
> >
> > You wrote about conflicts at more sensitive traffic/pedestrian locations.
> > They are building a huge park complete with children's play area, splash pad
> > and outdoor ice rink approximately 200 meters east of Second Road. The path
> > (Bell easement) that runs just south of Fairhaven on Second will most likely
> > be one of the major entrances to the area. What will be more sensitive than
> > all these kids heading in and out of the park?
> > >
> > I am not sure why you brought up Whistledear in your next question? Whistledear
> > is a short street that ends at Highbury. In my opinion this street is a non
> > issue. It is not the path of least resistance and instead would have most
> > commuters lost in the middle of the survey if they took it.
> > >
> > Mr. Bacque, I understand that there are political and monetary factors
> > involved in your decision, however, the biggest factor should be safety and
> > we the families that live on this road cannot emphasize enough how dangerous
> > it is on this road. If something is not done prior to the opening of those
> > stores I am very fearful of what might happen. There is so much volume
> > already and I have personally witnessed too many near misses between
> > kids/cars/trucks/buses to count.
> > >
> > You need to close this road.
> > >
> > I look forward to your reply.
> > >
> > Regards,
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > Enabling businesses to succeed through innovative solutions.
> > Visit our website at
> > >
> > This message, including any attachments, is intended only for the
> > use of the individual (s) to which it is addressed and may contain
> > information that is privileged/confidential. Any other distribution,
> > copying or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended
> > recipient or have received this message in error, please notify us
> > immediately by reply e-mail and permanently delete this message including
> > any attachments, without reading it or making a copy. Thank you.
> > >
> > Ce message (y compris ses fichiers joints) est transmis pour l'usage
> > exclusif de la ou des personnes a qui il est destine et peut contenir des
> > renseignements confidentiels ou proteges. Il est strictement interdit d'en
> > faire toute autre distribution, copie ou divulgation. Si vous n'etes pas le
> > destinataire vise ou que vous avez reçu ce message par erreur, veuillez nous
> > en aviser immédiatement en repondant a ce courriel et le detruire (y compris
> > ses fichiers joints) de façon definitive sans le lire ou en faire de copie.
> > Merci.
> > >
> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: Ray Bacque [mailto:rbacque@iltransconsulting.com]
> > Sent: Sunday, October 30, 2005 5:57 PM
> > To:
> > CC:
> >
Subject: ROPA 9 Master Plan EA and the status of Second Road

Hello,

I fully understand the sensitivity and your sense of urgency in addressing the issue of traffic volumes, operations, and safety on Second Road. We understand that the members of the community that have been emailing want Second Road closed. I would like to reassure you that we are reviewing the emails from the community to identify specific operational issues that we need to consider. What we have seen to date include concerns that specifically relate to:

- High volumes relative to the Capacity of Second Road
- Lack of compliance with traffic controls (i.e., vehicles running the stop sign)
- Speeding
- Safety and ease of driveway access/egress
- Accommodation and safety of pedestrians and cyclists
- Effects of ROPA 9 development (residential and commercial) on traffic volumes

* Official Plan designation of Second Road West
* School bus pick up

At the public meeting held October 3rd, we heard similar concerns from the community during the question and answer period and in one-on-one discussions with you and your neighbours. We confirm that Second Road is a collector road south of Gatestone Drive. However, as noted at the meeting, we are looking further into the need and implications of a closure to Second Road. Our review is within the context of the need for transportation network changes (including the need for road closures) as a result of the release of any further development of the ROPA 9 and Special Policy Area 'C' lands. Our mandate relates specifically to the ROPA 9 and Special Policy Area 'C' lands.

The ROPA 9 (and Special Policy Area 'C') Master Plan study must consider all potential implications of changes in the transportation infrastructure. We must have a sense for the following:

- How do the traffic volumes on Second Road compare to adjacent streets?
- How do the traffic volumes on Second Road compare to other similar roads in the City?
- Is it appropriate to disperse the traffic to the road network including Second Road or can adjacent roads handle any redirected traffic?
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> Will a closure of Second Road north of Gatestone Drive result in
> redirecting traffic to Gatestone Drive to Highland Road? Can Gatestone Drive
> handle this traffic given its function and design? Will redirected traffic
> create conflicts at more sensitive traffic/pedestrian generators or
> locations with poor road geometry?
> 
> Will a closure of Second Road at Rymal Road result in a redirection
> of traffic to adjacent local roads via Whiteoak Road? Can Whiteoak handle
> additional traffic given its function and design? Will redirected traffic
> create conflicts at more sensitive traffic/pedestrian generators or
> locations with poor road geometry?
> 
> Will the closure of Second Road allow for acceptable access to
> future services south of Rymal Road? Does it allow for adequate community
> connectivity north and south of Rymal Road? How would the closure of Second
> Road affect emergency services (fire and ambulance)?
> 
> It may be possible that other members of the community will have an interest
> in these questions, hence we are working toward answering them. Ultimately
> we will have to have recommended plan that balances the needs of the whole
> community. The ultimate recommended plan must also recognize the reality
> that the impact of the Karst lands includes the delay or deletion of
> alternative collector roads that would have accommodated north-south traffic
> as an alternative to Second Road. Our analysis must consider the possibility
> that no other north-south link will be provided between Pritchard Road and
> Upper Centennial.
> 
> City staff and the consultant team will be meeting shortly to discuss the
> issues raised above. We will be in touch with the community when we have
> answers to these questions. We all look forward to continuing to work with
> the community.
> 
> Regards
> 
> Ray
> 
> Ray Bacque, P.Eng, AVS.
> 
> Vice President
> 
> ITRANS Consulting Inc.
> 
> 100 York Boulevard, Suite 300
> 
> Richmond Hill, ON L4B 1J6
> 
> Phone: 905-882-4100 Ext. 5227
> 
> Direct: 905-695-5227
> 
> Fax: 905-882-1557
> 
> E-mail: rbacque@itransconsulting.com
> <mailto:rbacque@itransconsulting.com>
> www.itransconsulting.com
> 
> >
> >
> >
> >
> From: 
> Sent: Sunday, October 30, 2005 2:15 PM
> To: 
> Isheppard@itransconsulting.com; 
> Nbaudais@itransconsulting.com; 
> Jondone@gmail.com; 
> Mr. Bacquie
> 
> Subject: Mr. Bacquie??
> 
> Mr. Bacquie
> 
> As you are aware we have been dealing with some very serious issues on
> Second Road West in Stoney Creek for over four years. We need Second Road
> West closed as promised. We have respectfully forwarded you all of our
> e-mails; however, we have had no response from you thus far. Your input is
> necessary in order for our issue to be resolved quickly. We look forward to
> hearing from you at your very earliest convenience.
> 
> Second Road West Residents
> 
> << File: AT700001.htm >>
Hello. How are you? Any word on that application form for the re-evaluation of our property taxes? I'm sure the taxes that are withdrawn at this point include a peaceful and safe environment.

Thanks,
Nathalie Baudais

From: [redacted]
Sent: Sunday, November 13, 2005 10:44 AM
To: [redacted]

Subject: Ray—Let’s work together

Hello Ray. I was just wondering if you received my voice mail. Please give me a call if you wish to discuss this matter in detail. If you are in town, I am willing to personally show you what we are dealing with in regards to traffic issues, but more importantly the width of the streets around us. If you come and see for yourself, I am very confident that you will side with us. I am sure we have stated this before, but if all else was equal there is one factor that would make this a no brainer; we were told the road would be closed. Having said this, everything else is not equal. Surrounding roads are twice the width. Highland, Gatestone, Highbury and Whitedeer have their own turning lanes. Yes, that is correct, their own turning lanes. On the other hand, we can barely turn. Our entire street is 28 feet in width. I will get back to you with the exact measurement of those other future collector roads. Ray, Second Road West is not the road that will do the job you want it to. That is why I purchased my home here.

Please call me if you would like to work together on this matter that is very important to me, my family and my community.

Respectfully, [redacted]
Hello

Obviously people that live on Gatestone will oppose the closure. They do not want more traffic on their street even though they are the ones causing most of the disruption on our street at this time. What bothers me is that this would not even be an issue if the road was closed as it was to be in the plans. It is their problem if they did not do their homework. If they in fact did do their planning, as we did, they would see that things were going according to city plans. The only reason why they feel they can put their 2 cents in is because of all the signs and newspaper coverage we have generated. But what else were we to do? It was obvious that closure was out of the picture. i.e. a collector road of 8000 a day. The message was clear as day that we were not being heard. I feel that it is important that those people complaining understand that they really have no right. We were told our road would be closed. They were not promised anything of the sort. With all due respect, their argument is undeniably weak. Take a look at the width of the road. My question to them is ...What did you expect? What we expected was road closure. Why? because that is what we were told. Phil, I cannot express how much it bothers me that people from surrounding area have the audacity to oppose the closure. That is simply inconsiderate. I trust that their suggestions are being put into perspective. We have been waiting for 4 years. Again, the attention that we were forced to bring to ourselves is the only reason why these people have spoken up, otherwise they would have accepted what was planned by the city. Phil, we need to resolve this issue very very soon. Our families are in limbo and that is simply not fair. Closing Second Road West would not harm any other surrounding streets. They are built for any increased volume. Please remember, we bought our homes with the trust and integrity of a promise.

Please Close Second Road West!
From: [Redacted]
To: [Redacted]
CC: [Redacted]
Subject: clarification please, Phil
Date: Thu, 10 Nov 2005 11:32:47 -0500

> Hello,
> I agree with you completely that iTrans may not understand the gravity of the situation on our street. I read with great interest your suggestion that, "It may be strategic to give the EA process time to wind down."
>
> I would like some clarification here please....
> In early December we anticipate another public meeting, at which time Mr. Bercue will indicate the substance of his recommendations. If his final recommendation to the City suggests that the planned Second Rd. W., road closure should not be honoured, then what are our options?
> Can the Mayor and our elected Councillors, in conjunction with City Planning Department staff, decide to reject all or part of iTrans recommendations? Can you and your colleagues decide, for example, that leaving Upper Mount Albion open - instead of our street - would be a preferable alternative because:
> 1) both roads are predominantly built for local access...meaning both would require upgrades to handle the increased traffic anticipated due to commercial & housing developments
> 2) for upgrading purposes, Upper Mount Albion is a logical choice because the street could easily be widened, and sidewalks added since homes are set far back from the road, unlike our homes which are situated much closer to the street
> 3) Upper Mount Albion is sparsely populated, compared to our street which is home to far greater numbers of families, children and even a CAS home (these children have already seen enough risk and danger in their lives - let's keep them safe on our street)
> 4) our street is in the middle of a busy, vibrant neighbourhood, with many side-streets and even a pathway/bikeway providing access to the brand new elementary school, and neighbourhood park with playground, compared to Upper Mount Albion which provides the same North/South access, but does not impact any side-streets (meaning increased traffic would be far less a danger there)
> 5) many of the homes on Upper Mount Albion pre-date the 1989 Plan (and again, there are far fewer homes), unlike the vast majority of homes on our street, which were built recently with the planned road closure as a major factor
>
> It would be great if our mayor, and our elected Councillors would stand together and do what is right (upholding the road closure that was promised to so many on our street). Could this still happen, regardless of what the iTrans recommendations are? Please educate me as to whether the recommendations of the EA process are binding and irreversible.
> I appreciate your insight into this matter, Phil.
>
>Sincerely,

>P.S. I am still hopeful that, based on our insight and many submissions, the iTrans recommendations will support the planned road closure for Second Rd. W.
>
>-----Original Message-----
>From: [Redacted]
>Sent: November 10, 2005 8:29 AM
>To: [Redacted]
>CC: [Redacted]
>Subject: Re: second road west
>
>Hi [Redacted] thank you for your prompt response.
>Understandably you would get opposition to closure, unfortunately those opposed are the drivers who in my opinion use Second as an alternate,
>I'm sure.
>
The trend is very clear as you have witnessed while we've been in casual conversations out in front of our homes throughout the summer months. The Eingate development including the homes in and around Gatestone continually use Second as an alternate to Gatestone. As you can well attest there are significant differences between the 2 streets which we have continually tried to convey to you, the city of hamilton and now iTrans.
>
>Those opposed are just looking at it as their quickest route either in the morning or afternoon. These are the same residents however who speed and roll the stops, it's not in front of their homes so why should they care. Maybe my next course of action is to follow one who is speeding and then spend 2 hours speedign in front of his home to see how much they like it.
> Phil, I understand we are into the EA process but so are they with the
> Walmart construction and Multi-Area Development. It will be open soon
> and I'm not entirely convinced that Ittrans understands the impact this
> will have.
> 
> Best regards,
> 
> >>> "Bruckler, Phil" <pbruckler@hamilton.ca> 11/10/2005 12:59:18 AM
> >>>>
> Things are busy all around. To your credit you have certainly raised
> the profile of your concern. It will get heightened consider as part of
> the ongoing process of which you are a part of. The next meeting which
> has not been set will be held in early Dec and you will be notified.
> You should know that I have received several calls from area residents
> strongly opposed to the closure. It may be strategic to give the EA
> process time to wind down.
> 
> Phil
> 
> -----Original Message-----
> From: [removed]
> To: Bruckler, Phil <pbruckler@hamilton.ca>
> CC: [removed]
> Subject: second road west
> 
> Hi Phil, how is it going?
> Just wondering where we stand with the consulting firm. Have they
> submitted any recommendations as of yet?
> As you can see we are still experiencing problems with speeding, stops
> and overall volume. It unfortunately has become a daily occurrence
> and
> at least my families frustrations are at an all time high. Mike was
> correct in his earlier email today that the novelty of the signage has
> definitely worn off. I feel we have been very proactive in bringing
> the
> issue forward and raising the awareness on the street. I'm sure that
> some individuals will and have openly criticized the approach we used
> such as homemade signs, rented signs, media outlets, e-mail, petitions
> and questionnaires. We feel we had remained patient over the last 4
> years and as it was brought forth to us this would be the time for
> input.
> 
> Please feel free to either contact me over the phone or via email,
> I'll
> also leave my home # if you wish to call through the evening.
>

11/14/2005
Mr. Bacque. How are you?

Have you had the opportunity to drive through our survey yet? If so I'm sure you will understand our determination to resolve our cause immediately. Please remember that we were directed into this survey with the clear understanding that local traffic would be all that we would need to deal with. I believe that your options are ample. There are many many streets that can and should be used as a collector. Second Road West will not serve you well for this purpose. Our options are limited. The city either does what they promised or we have to move. Who will compensate us for out losses?

Best Regards,
Hello

We have been submitting license plate numbers. What exactly happens with those submissions? Does it help our cause at all or are we just wasting our time? What else are we to do to make our street safe?

Respectfully,
Nathalie Baudais

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2005 10:56 AM
To: Nathalie Baudais; Ray Bacquie; Liza Sheppard; lidianni@hamilton.ca; pbruckler@hamilton.ca; cleemorr@hamilton.ca
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Second Road West - Now I have to deal with profanity from motorists

Just remember to consider the source. There are many ignorant people that do not understand because they are not going through what we are going through. We were promised/told closure and we will not relent until we get what we deserve and paid for.

From: Nathalie Baudais@transconsulting.com, Ray Bacquie@transconsulting.com, Liza Sheppard<br>sheppard@transconsulting.com>, lidianni@hamilton.ca, pbruckler@hamilton.ca, cleemorr@hamilton.ca
CC: [Redacted]
Subject: Second Road West - Now I have to deal with profanity from motorists
Date: Wed, 2 Nov 2005 10:01:06 -0500

Hello All,

As you are all probably aware, we, as residents of Second Road West have taken much time and money from our pockets to put up signs (including rented one) on our lawns to voice our concern with not only the excessive traffic on our road but motorists who are continuously speeding and not adhering to stop signs. We all decided that yes, these signs will be taking away from the time, money and effort we all put in upkeeping the appearance of our front lawns, but, what other alternative do we have at this time? We seem to be getting no where with respect to receiving "concrete unpolitical answers" from our City representatives and the consulting firm and therefore, we can only rely on our efforts in knowing that we did everything we could possibly do with respect to getting the road closure we all expected when deciding to reside in this neighbourhood.

2/15/2006
Now, not only do I have to continuously pay close attention to watch out for hundreds of cars darting by and the good chance that they will not stop at the stop sign located in the front of my home, but, now I have to deal with the profanity coming from motorists and pedestrians on why are we "fighting" (their word) such a battle. I do assure you that their comments are not so eloquently put - they come with quite the aggressive tone and with much profanity.

At times, I am with my two year old daughter when this occurs. On Monday as I am getting my home ready for the children tick or treating, I get a pedestrian walking by and says - in a very aggressive tone - "Why are you all putting up signs, complaining and trying to get articles in the paper and not concerned with the parking of vehicles on this stretch of the road. It is getting out of hand" - My response, "Well, we have no other choice but to try and slow down and detour traffic from using our road than to park our vehicles on the road. It is the only thing we can humanly do at this time." She than gives me another comment to which I felt I should not have to deal with and I came into my home. This by the way came from a woman, who lives on a quiet street, does not have any children to worry about, but, continuously uses our side of the sidewalk (as sidewalks are very scarce in our area) to walk her dogs. I was completely offended and upset with her comments and right way thought - if our road was closed, as was shown on City plans, we wouldn't have to park on the road, and I wouldn't have had to listen to her rude comments. If I wanted to deal with this harassment and profanity, I could have purchased a much cheaper home in a more lower class neighbourhood in the city and be paying much lower property taxes.

This has not been the only occasion, many of us neighbours have discussed this as we deal with motorists yelling profanity out of their car windows due to our parking of vehicles and our signs.

My point - We would not have to resort to these measures, and deal with these horrible experiences if the road was closed as depicted on City Plans. Since this play on words of "promised" and "so called closures" has been thrown in our faces by some City staff members, I won't use it. "Per City Plans" is what I will say.

Bottom line - It is becoming increasingly more difficult to justify residing on this road - the cons are far outweighing the pros. Our only heartbeat is that our children have become very close with one another and we as neighbours have become very close indeed with our recent effort to see our road closed. We will be the ones greatly effected by this as City constituents and the consultants just go about their day without any of this phasing them.

Thank you.
John, that is an excellent point. I agree.

Hi Ray,

My name is ___________ and I am a resident of ___________. I would like to respond to some of the comments in your email. Obviously you have a concern for the function and design of a road. In fact, you specifically mention the function and design of Gatestone, Highland, Whitedeer, and Second Road West. I am certain that you are aware that the first three streets mentioned are MUCH wider than Second Road. In the case of Gatestone, it can accommodate 4 car widths; Highland and Whitedeer can accommodate 5 widths. Second Road West can barely accommodate the width of 3 cars. Obviously its DESIGN cannot allow it to FUNCTION as a route between Rymal and Highland.

You also mention the Karsk lands and how its geography could block its ability to build a road that could handle north/south traffic. I submit to you that the "man-made" geography of Second Road West blocks its ability to handle north/south traffic. The street is too narrow; the houses are too close to the road. If you can't "force" a road through the Karsk, you certainly can't force traffic through on Second Road West. Accidents will happen; people will be hurt!

Please! Do the right thing and close this road.

Sincerely,
Sent: Sunday, October 30, 2005 12:56 PM
Subject: ROPA 9 Master Plan EA and the status of Second Road

Hello Mr. Borrelli,

I fully understand the sensitivity and your sense of urgency in addressing the issue of traffic volumes, operations, and safety on Second Road. We understand that the members of the community that have been emailing want Second Road closed. I would like to reassure you that we are reviewing the emails from the community to identify specific operational issues that we need to consider. What we have seen to date include concerns that specifically relate to:

- High volumes relative to the Capacity of Second Road
- Lack of compliance with traffic controls (i.e. vehicles running the stop sign)
- Speeding
- Safety and ease of driveway access/egress
- Accommodation and safety of pedestrians and cyclists
- Effects of ROPA 9 development (residential and commercial) on traffic volumes
- Official Plan designation of Second Road West
- School bus pick up

At the public meeting held October 3rd, we heard similar concerns from the community during the question and answer period and in one-on-one discussions with you and your neighbours. We confirm that Second Road is a collector road south of Gatestone Drive. However, as noted at the meeting, we are looking further into the need and implications of a closure to Second Road. Our review is within the context of the need for transportation network changes (including the need for road closures) as a result of the release of any further development of the ROPA 9 and Special Policy Area 'C' lands. Our mandate relates specifically to the ROPA 9 and Special Policy Area 'C' lands.

The ROPA 9 (and Special Policy Area 'C') Master Plan study must consider all potential implications of changes in the transportation infrastructure. We must have a sense for the following:

- How do the traffic volumes on Second Road compare to adjacent streets? How do the traffic volumes on Second Road compare to other similar roads in the City? Is it more appropriate to disperse the traffic to the road network including Second Road or can adjacent roads handle any redirected traffic?
- Will a closure of Second Road north of Gatestone Drive result in redirecting traffic to Gatestone Drive to Highland Road? Can Gatestone Drive handle this traffic given its function and design? Will redirected traffic create conflicts at more sensitive traffic / pedestrian generators or locations with poor road geometry?
- Will a closure of Second Road at Rymal Road result in a redirection of traffic to adjacent local roads via Whitdeeer Road? Can Whitdeeer handle additional traffic given its function and design? Will redirected traffic create conflicts at more sensitive traffic / pedestrian generators or locations with poor road...
geometry?

Will the closure of Second Road allow for acceptable access to future services south of Rymal Road? Does it allow for adequate community connectivity north and south of Rymal Road? How would the closure of Second Road affect emergency services (fire and ambulance)?

It may be possible that other members of the community will have an interest in these questions, hence we are working toward answering them. Ultimately we will have to have recommended plan that balances the needs of the whole community. The ultimate recommended plan must also recognize the reality that the impact of the Karst lands includes the delay or deletion of alternative collector roads that would have accommodated north-south traffic as an alternative to Second Road. Our analysis must consider the possibility that no other north-south link will be provided between Pritchard Road and Upper Centennial.

City staff and the consultant team will be meeting shortly to discuss the issues raised above. We will be in touch with the community when we have answers to these questions. We all look forward to continuing to work with the community.

Regards

Ray

Ray Bacquie, P.Eng, AVS.
Vice President
iTRANS Consulting Inc.
100 York Boulevard, Suite 300
Richmond Hill, ON L4B 1J8

Phone: 905-882-4100 Ext. 5227
Direct: 905-695-5227
Fax: 905-882-1557
E-mail: rbacquie@itransconsulting.com
www.itransconsulting.com

From:
Sent: Sunday, October 30, 2005 2:15 PM
To:
hamiltonbackhome@yahoo.ca; arturmaiz@hotmail.com; astogiannes@cogeco.ca; cleemorre@hamilton.ca;
cladinhorobis@hotmail.com; ddleneac@cogeco.ca; danester@sympatico.ca; dmitche@hamilton.ca;
dvorticchio@hamiltoncans.com; eswitenk@hamilton.ca; htanguay@hamilton.ca; info@deanallison.ca;
jmossop.mpp@liberal.ola.org; joelle.pattison@sympatico.ca; joebisciglie@hotmail.com;
john.diklich@camc.ge.com; john_northey@sympatico.ca; jvenneri@wrs.on.ca; mkrysztowiak@sympatico.ca;
ldianni@hamilton.ca; lcrockett@hamilton.ca; lryan@hamilton.ca; leeaustin@sympatico.ca;
lmuraca@ngco.com; lsheppard@itransconsulting.com; lponte@namasco.com;
mgraham@grahamrestorations.com; gemfimario@yahoo.ca; bellamia99@hotmail.com; mcinelli1@cogeco.ca;
mhell@cogeco.ca; nbaudais@itransconsulting.com; nilogarbar@yahoo.ca; ppalmieri1@cogeco.ca;
pbruckler@hamilton.ca; rbacquie@itransconsulting.com; rbacquie@hamilton.ca; rick.muraca@camc.ge.com;
fatboysskinny@hotmail.com; sandy.m.ponte@ca.pwc.com; sdolenac@cogeco.ca; sdolenac@cogeco.ca;
smarczak@cogeco.ca; tomask51@hotmail.com; cleishman@hamiltonpolice.on.ca;
dmcullough@hamiltonpolice.on.ca; wayne.rockel@hwdsb.on.ca
Subject: Mr. Bacquie?

Mr. Bacquie

As you are aware we have been dealing with some very serious issues on Second Road West in Stony Creek for over four years. We need Second Road West closed as promised. We have respectfully forwarded you all of our e-mails; however, we have had no response from you thus far. Your input is necessary in order for our issue to be resolved quickly. We look forward to
Hello Ray,

Thank you for your response. It is my understanding that looking at a grid of our survey, the quickest way from point A to point B in this case would be Second Road West. However, Ray when you add real people with real children, real safety concerns, promises and ultimately loss of money, the issue becomes larger than a map. Perhaps it is in the best interest of your company’s reputation and the safety of our community, that you take a drive in our survey. Ray you must understand that when we purchased our homes, we were purchasing a quiet neighbourhood. It was obvious that regardless of all our efforts in the past four years, the closure was being thrown under the carpet with shallow excuses. With all due respect, your suggestion of having to consider the rest of the survey before adhering to the original plan and promise is bothersome. In my opinion, you need to first address the largest issue which is the promised closure of our Road, and then worry about the rest. Gatestone, Highland and Highbury are roads that are two times the width of Second Road West. If you do your homework as we did when purchasing your home, you will know that these Roads are meant to take large capacity. By no means does Second Road West fit under this category. In regards to the karst, they were there much before the 1989 Heritage Green Plan, why all of a sudden the big issue? As a matter of fact, when the walkway is placed where it was promised, it will in fact beautify our community and enhance the prestige of the karst. We feel strongly that you should indeed consider the following facts: Second Road West is physically not the road to be a collector road, and the integrity of the argument is very weak as we paid large amounts of dollars for our homes, and are paying large amounts in property tax. Let’s face it, we were “promised” or “told”, whatever you want to call it, that we would deal with local traffic only.

We plead with you to close Second Road West

Respectfully

11/7/2005
Hi Ray,

My name is [redacted] and I am a resident of Second Road West. I would like to respond to some of the comments in your email. Obviously you have a concern for the function and design of a road. In fact, you specifically mention the function and design of Gatestone, Highland, Whitedeer, and Second Road West. I am certain that you are aware that the first three streets mentioned are MUCH wider than Second Road. In the case of Gatestone, it can accommodate 4 car widths; Highland and Whitedeer can accommodate 5 widths. Second Road West can barely accommodate the width of 3 cars. Obviously its DESIGN cannot allow it to FUNCTION as a route between Rymal and Highland.

You also mention the Karsk lands and how its geography could block its ability to build a road that could handle north/south traffic. I submit to you that the "man-made" geography of Second Road West blocks its ability to handle north/south traffic. The street is too narrow; the houses are too close to the road. If you can't "force" a road through the Karsk, you certainly can't force traffic through on Second Road West. Accidents will happen; people will be hurt!

Please! Do the right thing and close this road.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Hi – I have attached a copy of the letter I sent to the Mayor on behalf of the residents on Second Road West.

Hopefully this will help.

Regards,

[Redacted]
November 1, 2005

Mayor Larry DiIanni
City of Hamilton
71 Main St. W.
Hamilton, ON  L8P 4Y5

Dear Mayor DiIanni:

Recently I have received numerous e-mails from constituents lobbying for the closure of Second Road West.

Although this is not a provincial issue and I have no role in any changes, I have assured the residents of Second Road West that I would relay to you the importance of their concerns regarding the road closure.

I understand their urgency in addressing the issue of traffic volumes and the lack of compliance with traffic rules, such as speeding and running stop signs, to ensure safety for their children in the neighbourhood.

I know you have taken their concerns seriously and will move swiftly to resolve the issue.

Best regards,

Jennifer Mossop, MPP
Stoney Creek
Subject: RE: Second Road West - Now I have to deal with profanity from motorists

Just remember to consider the source. There are many ignorant people that do not understand because they are not going through what we are going through. We were promised/told closure and we will not relent until we get what we deserve and paid for.
Nathalie Baudais

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2005 10:01 AM
To: NBaudais@1transconsulting.com; rbacque@1transconsulting.com; Liza Sheppard; Idianni@hamilton.ca; pbruckler@hamilton.ca; cleemorr@hamilton.ca
Cc: [redacted]

Subject: Second Road West - Now I have to deal with profanity from motorists

Hello All,

As you are all probably aware, we, as residents of Second Road West have taken much time and money from our pockets to put up signs (including rented one) on our lawns to voice our concern with not only the excessive traffic on our road but motorists who are continuously speeding and not adhering to stop signs. We all decided that yes, these signs will be taking away from the time, money and effort we all put in upkeeping the appearance of our front lawns, but, what other alternative do we have at this time? We seem to be getting no where with respect to receiving "concrete unpolitical answers" from our City representatives and the consulting firm and therefore, we can only rely on our efforts in knowing that we did everything we could possibly do with respect to getting the road closure we all expected when deciding to reside in this neighbourhood.

Now, not only do I have to continuously pay close attention to watch out for hundreds of cars darting by and the good chance that they will not stop at the stop sign located in the front of my home, but, now I have to deal with the profanity coming from motorists and pedestrians on why are we "fighting" (their word) such a battle. I do assure you that their comments are not so eloquently put - they come with quite the aggressive tone and with much profanity. At times, I am with my two year old daughter when this occurs. On Monday as I am getting my home ready for the children tick or treating, I get a pedestrian walking by and says - in a very aggressive tone - "Why are you all putting up signs, complaining and trying to get articles in the paper and not concerned with the parking of vehicles on this stretch of the road. It is getting out of hand" - My response, "Well, we have no other choice but to try and slow down and detour traffic from using our road than to park our vehicles on the road. It is the only thing we can humanly do at this time." She than gives me another comment to which I felt I should not have to deal with and I came into my home. This by the way came from a woman, who lives on a quiet street, does not have any children to worry about, but, continuously uses our side of the sidewalk (as sidewalks are very scarce in our area) to walk her dogs. I was completely offended and upset with her comments and right away thought - If our road was closed, as was shown on City plans, we wouldn't have to park on the road, and I wouldn't have had to listen to her rude comments. If I wanted to deal with this harassment and profanity, I could have purchased a much cheaper home in a more lower class neighbourhood in the city and be paying much lower property taxes.

This has not been the only occasion, many of us neighbours have discussed this as we deal with motorists yelling profanity out of their car windows due to our parking of vehicles and our signs.

My point - We would not have to resort to these measures, and deal with these horrible experiences if the road was closed as depicted on City Plans. Since this play on words of "promised" and "so called closures" has been thrown in our faces by some City staff members, I won't use it. "Per City Plans" is what I will say.

Bottom line - It is becoming increasingly more difficult to justify residing on this road - the cons are far outweighing...
the pros. Our only heartbreak is that our children have become very close with one another and we as neighbors have become very close indeed with our recent effort to see our road closed. We will be the ones greatly effected by this as City constituents and the consultants just go about their day without any of this phasing them.

Thank you.

This e-mail is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed (the "addressee") and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use that a person other than the addressee makes of this communication is prohibited and any reliance or decisions made based on it, are the responsibility of such person. We accept no responsibility for any loss or damages suffered by any person other than the addressee as a result of decisions made or actions taken based on this communication or otherwise. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of this e-mail.

Ce courriel est strictement réservé à l'usage de la personne à qui il est adressé (le destinataire). Il peut contenir de l'information privilégiée et confidentielle. L'examen, la reexpédion et la diffusion de ce message par une personne autre que son destinataire est interdit. Nous déclinons toute responsabilité à l'égard des pertes ou des dommages subis par une personne autre que le destinataire par suite de décisions ou de mesures fondues sur le contenu de cette communication ou autrement. Si vous avez reçu ce courriel par erreur, veuillez communiquer avec son expéditeur et en détruire toutes les copies.

11/2/2005
Dear [Name],

Please contact me if you need further information. I have written some of my thoughts on your question. I will start by saying that when I was looking for somewhere to purchase my home, I pictured looking out of my window and safely watching my children playing street hockey. Local neighbours would drive by, slow down and wave, and the parents would bring out hot chocolate. This is one of the reasons why I purchased my home. I was looking for a quiet, peaceful neighbourhood; that was my first priority. Unfortunately, we are nowhere close to that, in fact, we are the complete opposite. My children play nowhere near the front of my property. We built our home with the intention of making this our first and last home. With this in mind, we extended ourselves to do things that would make this our dream home. My wife and I are really upset because instead of planning for our children's future, we get to look forward to having our finances absorbed by moving costs which include, real estate and lawyer fees, land transfer tax, and the countless miscellaneous monies that will be spent in moving. Furthermore, much time has to be spent when looking to move. As it is, much of our time is spent policing our own community; for example, recording and submitting vehicle license plates, yelling at speeders to stop and slow down (which targets our homes and families), and having to deal with profane responses which are heard by our children. I understand that police are very busy and cannot always be parked on Second Road West, but when they are present a zero tolerance should be in effect. Police warnings do not suffice, they only reinforce the behaviour. We are also spending time and money to make and rent signs to bring attention to our grave situation. Residents are forced to double park in order to slow traffic down, which in turn decreases safety for children on the street. At this time, I feel that words are being played with. Statements such as "told" not "promised", "lead to believe" not "promised" are some examples. In my opinion, we almost need to forget about what was said or done in the past. The reality lies in the fact that we are having major issues with only a few hundred cars a day; 8,000 would be absurd, or even 3-4,000.

You ask why I am considering moving? Increased speeding, increased stopping violations, increased pollution and fumes, increased collisions to moving and parked vehicles, and God forbid personal injury or death. I also feel that taxes are being collected as if it were a residential community, not one that would supposedly accommodate 8,000 people a day.

Thank you,

[Name]

---

From: [Name]  
To: [Name]  
Subject: RE: Thank you  
Date: Mon, 31 Oct 2005 16:43:42 -0500  

You can call me at [Phone] or [Phone]  
Tomorrow, I can be reached at the second number in the a.m., the first in the afternoon. If it has to be in the evening, you can call me at [Phone].

11/2/2005
Thanks,

---

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2005 2:32 PM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Thank you

Not a problem. I am home after 6:30pm. Tonight I will be in and out as the kids will want to go out for some candy. Give me a try though. If not I can call you. What are the #s that I can call you at.

---

From: [Redacted]
To: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Thank you
Date: Mon, 31 Oct 2005 14:09:19 -0500

Hi [Redacted]

I noticed in your letter to Jennifer, you mentioned you are considering selling your home.

Would I be able to ask you a few questions about your experience? Let me know when I can call you, today or tomorrow.

Thanks,

---

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Friday, October 14, 2005 12:15 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Thank you

I agree with you. You are a talented writer and did justice to our cause. Great Job! Thanks

From: [Redacted]

11/2/2005
To: <editor@stoneycreeknews.com>

Subject: Thank you

Date: Fri, 14 Oct 2005 09:02:18 -0400

Thank you for dedicating your time to our concerns. I just finished reading the article and am very pleased.

We the looking forward to working with you in the near future.

>
Hello. We were just wondering if you sent the letter to the city of Hamilton on behalf of the residents of Second Road West, Stoney Creek ON. We feel that the letter would help our cause. As you know, we have made little progress and our frustration and disappointment is growing at an alarming rate. I am personally considering selling the home that I took so much pride in building. I have two very young children and feel very angry that any money that I would put aside for their education would be absorbed by real estate, land transfer costs, lawyer fees, renting of movers etc. This is far more than a group of residents angry at speeders and drivers that will not stop at a stop sign. We were told/promised that Second Road West would be closed. We feel betrayed! I'm sure that anyone in our situation would feel the same way. We are honest and very hard working people, we pay our taxes, and feel we deserve answers and closure.

Respectfully,
Hello How are you?

I also feel that we are in the dark. The efforts that we have displayed have been time consuming and yet we have no idea as to our status. We can not wait until January. Where are we with all of this?

Thanks,
Your comments and input are appreciated and are an important part of the Class EA process. The Ryalm Road Planning Area project team has received a large number of e-mail submissions regarding Second Road West as well as other submissions related to this study. Although we are not able to reply to each e-mail individually as they come in, every e-mail is considered a submission to the Ryalm Road Planning Area Class EA study and will be reviewed and considered during the EA evaluation. We are also receiving completed comment sheets that were handed out at the Public Information Centre (PIC) last week (comments were requested by October 21). Once we have an opportunity to review all submissions, written responses will be prepared and sent to all the individuals who submitted comments including those who submitted e-mails. The results of the public input received will be summarized for the next Stakeholder Committee Meeting and PIC tentatively scheduled for December.

Sincerely,

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager, Environmental Planning
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
320-77 James St. N.
Hamilton, Ontario, L8R 2K3
tel: 905-546-2424 extension 6390
fax: 905-546-4435
cleemorr@hamilton.ca

-----Original Message-----
From: [mailto:]
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2005 4:21 PM
To: Lee-Morrison, Christine; Switenky, Ed; DiIanni, Larry; Ryan, Leanne; Bruckler, Phil; rbacquie@itranconsulting.com; jmossop.mpp@liberal.ola.org
Cc:
Subject: Second Road West

All of you are well informed about our issues to date regarding our road and closure. Unlike other residents in the Hamilton area we are not pushing for something that is out of the question, the road and homes were built with closure planned.

City of Hamilton plans depict closure and all who are involved purchased their homes under that premise. We unfortunately are not speaking of a $2 or $3000 investment, this was our life savings put into the biggest single purchase we may ever make.

Frustrations are growing by the day and can you honestly blame us.
I am yet to receive a response from Mr. Bacquie regarding his comment of 8000 vehicles at the last meeting. I feel we as taxpayers should be entitled to an answer on this topic.

If Mr. Bacquie is once again unavailable for comment can someone else provide me with an answer to the question.
Like [redacted] who was almost hit by a passing vehicle, and [redacted] who almost lost her sideview mirror, I have been frightened to death by the aggressive drivers on our street. If you don't live on Second Rd. W., you'll have a hard time believing this...my neighbours will understand completely.

On four separate occasions I narrowly escaped a 'T-bone' collision while trying to pull into my driveway. In each case, I was travelling South on Second Rd. W., towards my home. At the Fairhaven intersection I always come to a full stop, and put on my left turn indicator...to give the cars approaching or behind me plenty of warning that I intend to turn left into my driveway (which is the first one South, about 150 feet from the intersection).

The danger has come from 4 idiots (sorry, no other word will do!) following behind me, who sped away from the Fairhaven stop sign (or didn't stop at all) and tried to pass me from behind, on the left, before I could turn into my driveway. Normally, I wouldn't expect a driver to veer into the oncoming lane and pass me on the left, when I am clearly slowing down - signalling to turn left. The first time it happened, I truly almost hit the car. I knew he was behind me at the stop sign. I knew he saw my left turn signal as I slowly approached my driveway. I had no idea he would be passing me on the left as I turned into my driveway. At the last split second I saw him in my sideview mirror, and hit my brakes. Also, I would have been charged in that near accident, because I was the one turning left. The same situation, being passed from behind on the left while preparing to turn left into my own driveway, has happened on 3 additional occasions. None of these were such 'close calls', because I now always watch the car behind, anticipating that they may try to pass on the left.

And we have only lived here for 3 years. The plan to close Second Rd. W., (shown to me by city planning department staff prior to our purchase) was a big part of our decision to relocate here. We
Nathalie Baudais

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2005 5:37 PM
To: cleemorr@hamilton.ca; eswitenk@hamilton.ca; ldianni@hamilton.ca; lryan@hamilton.ca; pbruckler@hamilton.ca; Ray Bacquie; jmossop.mpp@liberal.ola.org
Cc: [Redacted]

Subject: RE: Second Road West

We need to demand a response. I feel that it is a slap in the face. I also feel that we need to get our closure very very soon. We can not wait until December. It has been four years. Why so long??
Closure is the only option as far as I'm concerned. I personally will not entertain any other suggestions. We should get a property tax rebate. Why are we paying these kind of taxes? It is very busy road.

From: [Redacted]
To: <cleemorr@hamilton.ca>, <eswitenk@hamilton.ca>, <ldianni@hamilton.ca>, <lryan@hamilton.ca>, <pbruckler@hamilton.ca>, <rbacquie@transconsulting.com>, <jmossop.mpp@liberal.ola.org>
Cc: [Redacted]

Subject: Second Road West
Date: Tue, 25 Oct 2005 16:20:43 -0400

Dear all,

> All of you are well informed about our issues to date regarding our road
> and closure. Unlike other residents in the Hamilton area we are not
> pushing for something that is out of the question, the road and homes
> were built with closure planned.
>
> City of Hamilton plans deplct closure and all who are involved
> purchased their homes under that premise. We unfortunately are not
> speaking of a $2 or $3000 investment, this was our life savings put into
> the biggest single purchase we may ever make.
>
> Frustrations are growing by the day and can you honestly blame us.
>
> I am yet to receive a response from Mr. Bacquie regarding his comment
> of 8000 vehicles at the last meeting. I feel we as taxpayers should be
> entitled to an answer on this topic.
>
> If Mr. Bacquie is once again unavailable for comment can someone else
> provide me with an answer to the question,

3/15/2006
Lee-Morrison, Christine

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2005 1:45 PM
To: Lee-Morrison, Christine; Ryan, Leanne; rbaque@transconsulting.com; cleishman@hamiltonpolice.on.ca; dmcculloch@hamiltonpolice.on.ca; Bruckler, Phil; Dilanni, Larry; jmossop.mpp@liberal.ola.org
Cc: [Redacted]

Subject: Re: RE: Second Rd W closure

It's good to hear you escaped that dangerous situation. It sounds like this is what it will take to get something done. I have had a vehicle damaged. The car that hit me did not stick around. At the time insurance co were on their rampage. I had to pay out of my own pocket. With 2 children, it really hurt. $1500. The vehicle was never the same. The hood would not sit properly, the paint is peeling etc. I don't think it matters to anybody else but it does anger me. I purchased my home knowing that it would be closed. We must have Second Road West closed as told/promised.

From: [Redacted]
To: Lee-Morrison, Christine; Ryan, Leanne; rbaque@transconsulting.com, cleishman@hamiltonpolice.on.ca, dmcculloch@hamiltonpolice.on.ca, pbuckler@hamilton.ca, ldilanni@hamilton.ca, jmossop.mpp@liberal.ola.org
Cc: [Redacted]

Subject: Re: RE: Second Rd W closure
Date: Tue, 25 Oct 2005 13:17:52 -0400

> During the weekend I was working on building my home and witnessed cars repeatedly speeding down Second Road West. I was appalled at the speeds these people were driving at so I stopped working and just watched and almost all the cars that went from hwy 53 to highland road failed to stop at the Fairhaven stop sign at around 6:00pm.
> THE WORST PART- I went to my truck to leave and I opened my door to get in, my brother in law yelled watch out as I was nearly hit by a car with my door partially opened, missed me by about a foot, scared the hell out of me. My brother in law was terrified.
> Please ,Please close Second road West. If my door was fully open I would have been killed by that speeder.

> >

> > I am so upset now that I will put up signs as large as possible on any piece of open land that I can find, if this road is not closed. If I break the law in doing so, I will accept my punishment. I WAS NEARLY KILLED BECAUSE NO ONE WILL DO WHAT THEY PROMISED AND CLOSE SECOND ROAD.

> >>

> >> From:
> >> Date: 2005/10/25 Tue PM 12:57:05 EST
> >> To: [Redacted]
> >> Cleishman@hamilton.ca, ryan@hamilton.ca, rbaque@transconsulting.com, cleishman@hamiltonpolice.on.ca, dmcculloch@hamiltonpolice.on.ca, pbuckler@hamilton.ca, ldilanni@hamilton.ca, jmossop.mpp@liberal.ola.org
> >> CC: [Redacted]
The other night as I was returning home, just as the sun was setting and it was pouring rain. I patiently waited to make a right turn into my driveway. I was taking my time, because there was oncoming traffic and there were cars parked on the road around my driveway. With poor visibility because of the dark and the rain, I thought I would be extra careful as I maneuvered around the parked cars. Unfortunately the vehicle approaching me did not feel the same way. Apparently as this vehicle traveled southbound up Second Rd W, they were in a very big hurry. Rather than letting me turn into my driveway safely, they felt the need to squeeze between me and the parked car, almost taking my side view mirror with them. I would love to know where exactly they were going in such a hurry.

Second Rd West is not a wide street, yet vehicles constantly attempt to speed through tight spots, impatiently weaving between traffic and parked cars. This has got to stop. Second Rd was not meant at a thoroughfare. It was not meant as the quickest and most direct route between Rymal Rd and Highland. Yet this is what it has become.

This problem can be fixed by keeping with the original plan to CLOSE SECOND RD W!!!
the only solution is to close Second Road West as told/promised.
Subject: Second Road West

Date: Mon, 24 Oct 2005 16:09:51 -0400

Well unfortunately drivers even under adverse conditions as we experienced over the weekend with all the rain still will not slow down or obey the traffic stops.

Although some drivers appear to be local if you spend enough time outside you definitely notice the trend. They come and use Second Road as their thoroughfare.

This is extremely disappointing and frustrating from our perspective considering this situation would not exist if the closure would have taken place as we were told.

Fair????????????????

I feel that things are starting to go back to the "same old". They slowed down at first but the novelty is wearing off.
Lee-Morrison, Christine

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2005 4:36 PM
To: NBaudais@itransconsulting.com; nbacquie@itransconsulting.com; Liza Sheppard; Dilanni, Larry; Bruckler, Phil; Lee-Morrison, Christine; Caccometti, Lynne; Ryan, Leanne
Cc: [Redacted]

Subject: Second Road West - NOT Intended as Collector Road

For those who have not read the latest article we have sought from the local media, I have attached a link below. We thank Ms. Leanne Ryan for her time and comments. Unfortunately, Mr. Bacquie was not available for comment for the second week in a row. We definitely seek out his remarks with respect to his repeated comment that Second Rd. West can handle 8000 cars a day.

To reiterate, City officials along with sales staff of Multi-Area Developments advised that the road would be closed. The proof is in the pudding - City Plans Show Road Closure. We ask that you keep to the plan and close the road. Our road is too narrow to accommodate high volumes of traffic. We can't even fit sidewalks on both sides of the road.

As my husband, stated, even with the high winds and rain we dealt with this weekend and today, we repeatedly dealt with high volumes of traffic and cars zipping through the stops sign all weekend. I was out on my driveway at 12:00 today putting my 2 year old daughter in her car seat, and had two cars in a matter of 2 minutes go through the stop sign in front of my home. Further, I had to allow 6 cars coming from the south direction of Second Rd. by before I could pull out of my driveway. This was at 12:00 on a Monday afternoon - with NO Walmart and Summit Park - once these developments go up, how many minutes will I have to add onto my day just to get out of my house?? This is ridiculous. If I wanted a busy street I would have moved onto Highland Road or Paramount. There should be no comparison....

Stoney Creek News Article - 10/21/05

Regards

[Redacted]
Lee-Morrison, Christine

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2005 7:51 PM
To: Lee-Morrison, Christine; Ryan, Leanne; rbacque@ittransconsulting.com; cleishman@hamiltonpolice.on.ca; dmcculloch@hamiltonpolice.on.ca; Brucker, Phil; Dilanni, Larry; jmossop.mpp@liberal.ola.org
Cc: [Redacted]

Subject: RE: FW: Second Rd W.

Al, I drove down Gatestone the other day. There is more than enough room for double parking and 2 way traffic. I stress more than enough room, Second Road West...not even close!

From: [Redacted]
To: cleishman@hamiltonpolice.on.ca, ryan@hamilton.ca, rbacque@ittransconsulting.com, dmcculloch@hamiltonpolice.on.ca, pbrucker@hamilton.ca, kdlanni@hamilton.ca, jmossop.mpp@liberal.ola.org
Cc: [Redacted]

Subject: RE: FW: Second Rd W.
Date: Mon, 24 Oct 2005 17:44:23 -0400

Hello everyone,

Last Friday, I decided I would walk up to my mailbox which is located at the south end of the street (there are no sidewalks on either side of the street so you are forced to walk on the shoulder of the road). I decided I would count the number of vehicles driving on the street on my way. As I was walking to the mailbox I was passed by 8 cars/trucks headed north and 11 cars/trucks, 2 dump trucks and 1 cement mixer headed south. On my way back home I was passed by 9 cars/trucks heading north and 13 cars/trucks and 1 bus heading south. The volume on this road is out of control and it is some kind of luck that no one (especially a child) has not been hurt or killed walking/riding down this street. When the big vehicles are coming down or two cars are passing each other going in opposite directions there is no where for people to go because the road is so narrow. I am guessing that we live on the busiest "local" road in the entire city (if not the busiest certainly the most dangerous).

I understand there is concern about closing Second Road because of volume flows, traffic patterns etc. My suggestion is that if Gatestone was designed for this volume of traffic, why not start using it? Gatestone currently connects Highland to the southern portion of Second Rd. Let's at least use that portion of the cities plan as it will take the pressure off Second Road which wasn't built to handle this volume. Safety should always come first.

I can't stress enough how dangerous this road is. You need to close it (the sooner it's closed, the safer everyone is going to be).
Enabling businesses to succeed through innovative solutions.
Visit our website at [redacted]

This message, including any attachments, is intended only for the use of the individual(s) to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged/confidential. Any other distribution, copying or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient or have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply e-mail and permanently delete this message including any attachments, without reading it or making a copy. Thank you.

Ce message (y compris ses fichiers joints) est transmis pour l'usage exclusif de la ou des personnes à qui il est destiné et peut contenir des renseignements confidentiels ou protégés. Il est strictement interdit d'en faire toute autre distribution, copie ou divulgation. Si vous n'êtes pas le destinataire visé ou que vous avez reçu ce message par erreur, veuillez nous en aviser immédiatement en répondant à ce courriel et le détruire (y compris ses fichiers joints) de façon définitive sans le lire ou en faire de copie. Merci.
Lee-Morrison, Christine

From: Mossop_Jennifer-MPP [mossop.mpp@liberal.ola.org]
Sent: Friday, October 21, 2005 3:16 PM
To: Morrison, Christine; cmwander@hamilton.ca; Mossop_Jennifer-MPP; idianni@hamilton.ca; Dilanni, Larry; Cecchetti, Lynne; Ryan, Leanne; lshepperd@itransconsulting.com; 

Subject: RE: We need your help!

Hi everyone,

I have been following this issue, along with all of you, thanks to being cc’d on your email exchanges. This is a municipal issue and as such I have no role or opportunity for any real input or to make any changes in this matter, at all. I think you have all been doing an excellent job of keeping your local council and media aware of this issue. However, if you think it would be of assistance, I am happy to send a formal letter to City Council to let them know that I have been made aware of these concerns, and that it is an issue of great importance to my constituents in this neighbourhood.

Thank you, again, for keeping me in the loop on this issue, and I trust you will be able to work with the city to find a satisfactory solution.

All the best,

Jennifer Mossop, MPP
Stoney Creek

---

From: 
Sent: October 18, 2005 10:18 PM
To: cmwander@hamilton.ca; cladinorobis@hotmail.com; Mossop_Jennifer-MPP; 
Cecchetti, Lynne; lryan@hamilton.ca; 
idianni@hamilton.ca; 
lshepperd@itransconsulting.com; 
N Baudais@itransconsulting.com; 
pbruckler@hamilton.ca; rbacque@itransconsulting.com;

Subject: We need your help!

Dear Mr. Dilanni and Ms. Mossop.

As you are aware we have been dealing with serious issues on Second Road West in Stoney Creek for
over four years. We need Second Road West closed as promised. We have respectfully forwarded both of you all of our e-mails; however, we have had no response or support from you thus far. We feel your input is necessary in order for our issue to be resolved quickly. We look forward to hearing from you at your very earliest convenience.

Respectfully,
Mr. Bacque,

I understand Mr. Bacque you have been out of the office. We the concerned residents of Second Road West in Stoney Creek have been trying to obtain some answers regarding the statement you made at the Environmental Assessment Mtg.

As you were going through your presentation and throughout the question and answer period with the local residents, you made a statement that Second Road can handle up to 8000 vehicles. This as you have noticed has not gone over very well with the residents, we feel that it is not only inaccurate but unreasonable for the some of the following reasons.

1. The City of Hamilton engineered the road to be closed as it is apparent due to the width of the road.
2. There has been open space which remains open south of Fairhaven Drive where the walkway was to come across the road.
3. Residents were continually informed and provided with City plans which clearly depict closure.
4. Stop signs were never put on Second Road West until the closure delays started to take place. Usually with street signs, stop signs also go up unless of course a road will not become a corridor, which it wasn't supposed to be.
5. Local developers were using closure as a selling feature, as they were informed by city planners.
6. The setback of all the homes (23' from sidewalk) is consistent with a low volume street. Shadetrees Cres. which is the street directly behind Second Road has a greater setback (30') and that is a crescent with only local traffic, not a road which apparently can handle 8000 vehicles.

Unfortunately I the pure optimist have been patiently awaiting a response from you affirming that indeed the statement was incorrect. At this point however, I'm not sure how to react whether I should be upset that you haven't replied at all, or to continue to doubt the validity of the study which was apparently conducted by your firm, Itrans. Further to this, we were informed to become involved because community feedback was critical to the study as you and your associates continued to affirm throughout the meeting.

I look forward to speaking to either you or Mr. Morrison regarding this matter in the near future.
Ce courriel est strictement reserve a l'usage de la personne a qui il est adresse (le destinataire). Il peut contenir de l'information privilegiee et confidentielle. L'examen, la reexpedition et la diffusion de ce message par une personne autre que son destinataire est interdite. Nous declinons toute responsabilite a l'egard des pertes ou des dommages subis par une personne autre que le destinataire par suite de decisions ou de mesures fondees sur le contenu de cette communication ou autrement. Si vous avez reçu ce courriel par erreur, veuillez communiquer avec son expéditeur et en détruire toutes les copies.
Hello All,

Attached you will find the Family's completed questionnaire with respect to the ROPA 9 Lands Master Plan. We have taken the time to complete this and hope that all evaluators/assessors will now complete their due diligence by respecting our comments and suggestions.

Kind Regards

10/21/2005
excellent job with tracking the violators. Unfortunately, we have to continuously take matters into our own hands, and have to continuously take even more time away from being with our families in order to get our point across to Itrans and the City that our road is not equipped for this flow of traffic. This is what you happened to track down in approximately a 30 minute time span and the numbers you could have come up with if you had had the time to spend the entire afternoon there would be ridiculous. I tried taking plate numbers down this past Sunday evening and had no luck as motorists were just going through too quickly.

This is what we are saying loud and clear to everyone involved; whether it be consultants, politicians, police - whatever, our road is continuously being bombarded with excessive motorists. Motorists we should not have to be taking license plates down for because - We Were Promised Road Closure by Multi-Area and most importantly via City plans. These motorists should not have through access to our road - We should not have to put up with this anylonger. Enough is enough!

We all understand the process - the political red tape, the assessments, the consultants that the City has to pay thousands of dollars for so that they can come back and tell the taxpayers that we had qualified/educated engineers decide that Second Rd. can handle this traffic - But, We are definitely not expecting this answer. I don't understand how the City has the capacity to negate plans that were printed and voluntarily given to residents. In my line of work this is called "Unacceptable behaviour". And, if I were to do that to our clients - I would be fired! - Unfortunately, for us taxpayers - that outcome is not so easy. We have to continuously listen to the regurgitated answer that the assessment is currently ongoing and that we have take a comprehensive look at all neighbourhoods. These neighbourhoods were not promised road closure and did not purchase their homes under these false pretensions. There is no comparison.

Respectfully, [Redacted]

[Redacted] Family
Residents on Second Rd. W. see daily the results of hurried drivers using our street as a 'short-cut'. They speed. They fly through the STOP signs. The number of "rolling stops" (I'm being generous here), is unthinkable, but I'm not even going to try to list those.

Here's a list of some who completely ran the Stop sign @ Fairhaven yesterday, and I was actually able to get license plate #s for:

11:25am - 47Z391 Travelling south on Second Rd. W., actually accelerated through the intersection @ Fairhaven (despite the STOP sign, and numerous homemade signs on residents' lawns urging 'slow down', 'stop', 'kids play here' etc). This 2-tone car, predominantly burgundy or red in colour was travelling at approx. 80km through the intersection, and continued to accelerate Southbound toward Rymal Rd. I happened to be unbuckling my 3 year old from her car seat as this car raced faster by my driveway, and I managed a clear look at the license plate.

There were 2 additional vehicles that sped through the Fairhaven intersection around 12:20pm, at high rates of speed, but I was unable to view the license plate #s. Angry to have missed their plate #s, I quickly fed my daughter lunch and returned to the window at 12:40 with my binoculars (OK, this sounds funny...but the situation is getting desperate).

12:43pm - 2715MF A blue Cogeco service van, travelling North on Second Rd. W., slowed to approx. 15-20km as it passed through the intersection @ Fairhaven.

12:52pm - LEAF51 A silver car travelling North on Second Rd. W., slowed a little bit, to perhaps 30km as it passed through the intersection @ Fairhaven. I watched it do exactly the same thing up the road as it passed through the intersection @ Hillcroft.

1:09pm - 426YXL A white van travelling North on Second Rd. W., slowed to approx. 15-20km as it passed through the intersection @ Fairhaven.

I wish I had more time to spend at the window...certainly there would be more plate #s to report. It's important for all the right people to have this information because Second Rd. W. can not tolerate higher volumes of commuters abusing our street as a fast short-cut to where they're going. We can't tolerate the number doing it right now. Second Rd. W. must have a road closure in place before the commercial developments on Rymal all open their doors, and before the masses of commuters take possession of their homes South of Rymal. Our road was not designed to be a North-South short-cut for those in a hurry.

Sincerely,
From: Unknown E-mail Address
Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2005 8:39 PM
To: Lee-Morrison, Christine
Cc: Unknown Employee, Michael Bonson, Chuck Bonson, Dilanni, Larry
Subject: Rymal Road Area (ROPAN 9 Lands) Master Plan - Comments

1. This meeting of October 3rd was more for city workers and staff, not for general public. For us, we should have been told how this development will affect our lives and neighbourhood. My son and myself think that this discussion is too late. Aldo DeSantis is in the process of building 3200 new homes. Al Frisina is building a Wal-mart. A car dealership is already operating. Now, a Maple Leaf factory is planning to be built.

2. Follow the presentation, my son and myself asked the itrans rep. what businesses are planning to be built. His answer was that he himself didn't know. How can some who doesn't know what types of businesses are being built conclude that there should be 4 lanes on Rymal Rd extending from Hwy 20 to Trinity Church Rd. Based on the types of businesses being built we believe that 4 lanes should be extended to Upper James. Furthermore, my son believes that the view is one way so to speak. When these business are built, people from Upper James, Upper Wentforth, Upper Gage, and Garth will be taking Rymal. Should we not think ahead and accommodate them too? What's more, if the experts believe that Second Rd can accommodate 8000 cars per day (roughly 340/per hour) then anything is possible.

With regards to extending Trinity Church Rd the Link the discussion is about 6 years too late because in the Winterberry area 2 bridges have been built, which to this day not 1 car has driven over it, connect the Link to Trinity Church Rd.

3. We don't have any comments for questions 4, 5 because experts have decide pipe sizes, numbers of people to accommodate, what to do with pump stations. We don't know the problems that are occurring in the Binbrook subdivision.

4. With regards to question 6, Displays were outdated since the new plans weren't presented in the maps so people were confused.

Contact Information:

[Redacted]

Thank You
We purchased our home on Second Rd W almost four years ago. Having two young children, location was definitely one of the most important factors in making our decision. We were assured repeatedly by people at the City of Hamilton that Second Rd West was going to be closed to through traffic sometime in the future. We were given maps of the "trinity neighbourhood plan" outlining the area to be closed. Anyone looking at or taking a drive down Second Rd W can see plain as day, that the road was not built to accommodate large amounts of traffic. The road is very narrow and has partial sidewalks on only one side of the street. We were convinced that the city would indeed close the road eventually. Based on its characteristics, it could not possibly be left as a throughway between Rymal Rd and Highland. That is what we thought. We are now very angry and sad at the same time, that we were naïve enough to believe that the City would keep its promise.

We truly do not understand how the City of Hamilton or the consulting firm Ittrans could possibly believe that Second Rd W can accommodate 8000 cars a day and be considered a commuter road. Anyone driving down Second Rd can see that it was not constructed the same way that other thoroughfares such as Highland Rd and Gatestone were developed.

Highland is indeed one of the major connections between Centennial Parkway and Winterberry Drive and all the communities within that area. The residents that purchase their homes on Highland must realize the traffic that their road is equipped to handle. The road is wide enough for parking as well as through traffic, there are sidewalks on both sides of the street and houses are set significantly further back from the road than most other subdivisions. Gatestone, similarly is also wide, with sidewalks on both sides, longer driveways and boulevards setting the houses significantly back from traffic. If Second Rd W were considered a commuter road between Highland and Rymal Rd, would it not have been built the same way? Instead, we have a very narrow road, partial sidewalks on only one side of the street, and houses that were built significantly closer to the road than those on Highland and Gatestone. When developing the land on Second Rd W, the city could have constructed the road as wide as it wished. There was no development on the west side of the street between Highland and Rymal. Why did the city not make Second Rd W as wide as Highland, if it is expected to tie all the communities to the new industrial developments on Rymal Rd? It is incomprehensible to my family how anyone could think that Second Rd W is equipped to handle the amount of traffic that we are already experiencing, let alone the traffic that will develop once the industrial development is complete on Rymal Rd.

When developing Second Rd W, the city was aware that it would one day be closed to through traffic. Did they suddenly forget? If the intention was not to close the road, why did they not build it to accommodate the large amounts of traffic? Were they greedy, did they want to sell as much land to the developers as possible? Did they change their mind about closing the road? Did they not think ahead to the traffic that the new industrial
developments would bring to this area? Regardless of the reasons that Second Rd W was built the way it was, we as residents demand that the city keep its promise.

We demand that Second Rd W be closed as promised, so that we can raise our children in the safe environment that we were lead to believe we would have.
Dear [Redacted],

Your comments and input are appreciated and are an important part of the Class EA process. The Rymal Road Planning Area project team has received a large number of e-mail submissions regarding Second Road West as well as other submissions related to this study. Although we are not able to reply to each e-mail individually as they come in, every e-mail is considered a submission to the Rymal Road Planning Area Class EA study and will be reviewed and considered during the EA evaluation. We are also receiving completed comment sheets that were handed out at the Public Information Centre (PIC) last week (comments were requested by October 21). After the October 21 comment deadline, written responses will be prepared and sent to all the individuals who submitted comments including those who submitted e-mails. The results of the public input received will be summarized for the next Stakeholder Committee Meeting and PIC tentatively scheduled for December.

Sincerely,

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager, Environmental Planning
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
320-77 James St. N.
Hamilton, Ontario, L6R 2K3
tel: 905-546-2424 extension 6390
fax: 905-546-4435
dleemorr@hamilton.ca

-----Original Message-----
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2005 10:18 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: We need your help!
Dear Mr. DiIanni and Ms. Mossop,

As you are aware we have been dealing with serious issues on Second Road West in Stoney Creek for over four years. We need Second Road West closed as promised. We have respectfully forwarded both of you all of our e-mails; however, we have had no response or support from you thus far. We feel your input is necessary in order for our issue to be resolved quickly. We look forward to hearing from you at your very earliest convenience.

Respectfully,
Lee-Morrison, Christine

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2005 2:39 PM
To: Bruckler, Phil; N.Baudais@ittransconsulting.com; rbacquie@ittransconsulting.com; Liza Sheppard; Lee-Morrison, Christine; Ryan, Leanne; Dilanni, Larry; jmoosop.mpp@liberal.ola.org; ven Berkel, Chris; Cecchetti, Lynne
Cc: [Redacted]

Subject: Fw: Second Road West - News Article in the Paper

Good afternoon,

In the chance that each of you may have missed the featured article in last week’s edition of the Stoney Creek News, I have attached it here for your reference. We thank Mr. Bruckler for being available for comment.

We assure you that we have been spending countless hours to defend our reasoning that Second Rd. should be closed, as was promised. We have diligently been creating the signs which are now located on our lawns, speaking to representatives of the media and looking at other alternatives to help our cause. This has taken much time out of our days with our families however, it is a choice we are willing to take as we foresee closure being the only resolution.

If seeing our initiative move forward means taking time away now from playing with our children we are determined to do that. This is the only way we can assure ourselves that are children will be raised in a safe and quiet community. We obviously can not rely on our City constituents nor Ittrans to do so.

Again we await your contact and hope for your time whereby we can all have an informed discussion.

As stated previously, our daily accounts and details of motorist occurrences on our street can only bring more value to your engineered calculations and assessments. We ask that you take the time to listen to our comments and possibly take the time to speak to us verbally. We would all be willing to speak to any of you regarding this very important issue.

We all look forward to your reply and your citizen informed review.

Article
http://www.stoneycreeknews.com/NASApp/cs/ContentServer?pagename=brabant/Layout/Article&c=Article&cid=1129283717459&call_pageid=1071061598532&col:

picture
Kind Regards

This e-mail is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed (the "addressee") and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use that a person other than the addressee makes of this communication is prohibited and any reliance or decisions made based on it, are the responsibility of such person. We accept no responsibility for any loss or damages suffered by any person other than the addressee as a result of decisions made or actions taken based on this communication or otherwise. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of this e-mail.

Ce courriel est strictement reserve a l'usage de la personne a qui il est adresse (le destinataire). Il peut contenir de l'information privee e et confidentielle. L'examen, la reexpedition et la diffusion de ce message par une personne autre que son destinataire est interdite. Nous declinons toute responsabilite a l'egard des pertes ou des dommages subis par une personne autre que le destinataire par suite de decisions ou de mesures fondees sur le contenu de cette communication ou autrement. Si vous avez reçu ce courriel par erreur, veuillez communiquer avec son expediteur et en detruire toutes les copies.
Hello guys. In talking to some residents, here are some suggestions to keep up the heat. Please respond and let us know what you think:

1. Involving a lawyer. Does anybody have any recommendations?
2. Getting the petition signed by all and mail one a day for 30 days
3. More signs. "Close Second Road West"
4. Record plate #’s and frwd them to police
5. Continues e-mail, add to others copy and frwd
6. Frwd our SC clip in the paper to the Spec, Scott etc
7. Renting a large sign "Close Second Road West" etc
8. Scott Urquhart?
9. Driving very slow and taking our time at stops to make our statement.
10. Set up 2 spots where we sit and take plate #’s down.

Did I miss any?
Let us know. Thanks
Hey guys. Sounds like the e-mails (Along with the signs) are also working. As you know Phil suggests that they are all looked at. I think we should continue to flood. It is and will continue to work. Even a few lines is better than nothing.
Thank you for your response.
The confusion was brought forth by Mr. Ray Bacquie at the Environmental Assessment Mtg last week as he stated both in the open Q&A period and in the informal conversations after the presentation that Second Road West was equipped to be a "collector road"

Regards,

Councillor Bruckler:

As you know we have received a large number of e-mail submissions regarding Second Road West. Although we are not able to reply to each e-mail individually as they come in, every e-mail is considered a submission to the Rymal Road Planning Area Class EA study and will be reviewed and considered during the EA evaluation. We are also receiving completed comment sheets that were handed out at the Public Information Centre (PIC) last week. Comments were requested by October 21. After the October 21 comment deadline, written responses will be prepared and sent to all the individuals who submitted comments including those who submitted e-mails. The results of the public input received will be summarized for the next Stakeholder Committee Meeting and PIC tentatively scheduled for December.

With respect to the designation of Second Road West (e.g. collector vs. local), I have received some information from our Traffic Staff on this designation. There may have been some confusion between a section of the road designated as collector and sections designated as local. I have asked our consultant to review the designation. This matter will be clarified in all written responses to individuals who made submissions.

Please call me if you have any questions.

Christine Lee-Morrison, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager, Environmental Planning
Capital Planning and Implementation
Public Works Department
-----Original Message-----
From: Bruckler, Phil
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2005 12:53 PM
To: Lee-Morrison, Christine
Cc: 
Subject: FW: Second Road West

This is correct.
We need clarification on this comment:
While it may have acted as a collector by virtue of location, clearly,
it not capable of fulfilling this function within the urban context and
similar to First Road W., Stoney Creek determined that it be closed.

Phil

Phil Bruckler
Councillor, Ward 9
Heritage Stoney Creek
Phono: 546-2703
Fax: 546-5183

-----Original Message-----
From: mailto:
Sent: Friday, October 07, 2005 11:50 PM
To: Lee-Morrison, Christine; Dilanni, Larry; Ryan, Leanne; Bruckler, Phil; dacullincho@hamiltonpolice.on.ca; r bacquie@transconsulting.com; jmosso.mp 8@liberal.ola.org
Cc: 
Subject: Second Road West

At Monday's Environmental Assessment Public Information Forum, I heard
repeatedly from Mr. Ray Bacquie that Second Road West was collector
road.

How can Second Road become a collector road or be deemed a collector
road almost overnight? It was planned, surveyed, engineered and
constructed to be closed. We have obtained plans which support and
prove this along with the simple truth that the road is indeed narrow.

How does a street which was planned for closure all of sudden become
equipped to deal with constant flows of traffic and be deemed
"collector"?

Looking forward to hearing from you,
Nathalie Baudais

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2005 6:19 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Second Road West

Hello All,

I have been following the emails and was wondering if anyone has gone public with this.

I know that Roy Green from the 900 chml morning show frequently discusses city matters with Larry Dianni live.

If you can convince him to help, he would be your best advocate.

Here is his email: roygreen@900chml.com

Remember, less than 1% of listeners call into any talk radio show. If all of you call and email the show, I'm sure he would help.

Do You Yahoo!?  
Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around
http://mail.yahoo.com

10/12/2005
I agree. When Wal-mart opens it will be awful out here. There will be no choice but to close it. Perhaps we should protest and close it ourselves.

Ms. Baudais,

I assure you that the comments/suggestions you have received and will continue to receive from us, the concerned residents, is that our monitoring of motorists driving at excessive speeds and failing to adhere to stop signs has become progressively harder for us to tolerate. We have continuously been bombarded with new excuses and bureaucratic red tape by our local city constituents with respect to our road closure. I hope you realize that this has been a four year ordeal for most of us.

Now, with all do respect to you and your firm, it is even more difficult for us to understand the City's rationale behind the hiring of your firm to provide an analysis/review of the traffic problems as it be with our road. There is nothing further to analyze...When they open that Wal-Mart we are going to be way over the limit with respect to our road's capacity for traffic. Motorists will be using our road as a short cut to the Linc. We will have all of the East Mountain and Upper Stoney
Creek
using our road as a short cut to get to the new shopping plazas. It
seems quite simple to us that our road is not engineered to take this brunt
of traffic. As stated in numerous emails by various residents, the
road widens towards the south portion of Second Road (near Gatestone) and
obviously previous professional engineers determined that only this portion
of the road was equipped to handle this magnitude of traffic - thus the
widening of the road. Therefore I ask - Why are wasting our hard
earned tax dollars reinventing the wheel??

We ask that you please respect all our
comments/suggestions. We may not be engineers but, we are all educated
professionals who understand the system. We live this ordeal every
day and have access to numerous facts/stories which no engineered calculations
could give more value to. We ask that you take the time to listen
to our comments and possibly take the time to speak to us verbally. We
would all be willing to speak to your firm on an individual or group basis.

We all look forward to your reply and your *citizen informed*
review.

Kind Regards

--- Forwarded by Sandy

Nathalie Baudais <N.Baudais@transconsulting.com>

To: 
cc: rbacque@transconsulting.com, Liz Sheppard <lsheppard@transconsulting.com>, pbrouder@cityofHamilton.ca, cleecher@hamilton.ca, lkoehl@hamilton.ca, tdiamm@hamilton.ca, liyan@hamilton.ca, jmoses@moseslegal.org

Subject: RE: Second Road West

Hello Mr. Ponte,
Mr. Bacque will be back in the office on Friday morning.

We are still considering public input on this issue and are receptive to the comments that have been received to date.

We will provide further information on our review as soon as possible.

Regards,
Nathalie

Nathalie Baudais,
EIT, PE
Transportation Planner
iTRANS Consulting Inc.
100 York Boulevard,
Suite 300
Richmond Hill, ON
LAB 118
Ph. (905) 882-4160
ext 5282
Fax. (905) 882-1557
nbaudais@itransconsulting.com

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted] <[redacted]>
Date: Tue, 11 Oct 2005 14:15:18
To: [redacted], [redacted], [redacted], [redacted], [redacted], [redacted], [redacted]
Cc: [redacted], [redacted], [redacted], [redacted]

[Email text]

[Email signature]
Subject: Second Road West

Attached are photos of our street. We have put up signs to try and calm traffic ourselves, they all have proactive messages on them. Ultimately the street was supposed to be closed and we are still expecting nothing short of this.

We all as residents pay upwards of $4000 a year on property taxes spend additional money on the appearance of our homes, put our vehicles on the road and have to put out these signs to try and control the traffic.

This could all have been averted if the city just went ahead and closed the road as was originally planned.

I have asked Mr. Bacque on the "Collector Road" comment and am yet to receive an answer and Mr. Bruckler has asked Ms Morrison the same question to which no answer has been given.
This e-mail is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed (the "addressee") and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use that a person other than the addressee makes of this communication is prohibited and any reliance or decisions made based on it, are the responsibility of such person. We accept no responsibility for any loss or damages suffered by any person other than the addressee as a result of decisions made or actions taken based on this communication or otherwise. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of this e-mail.

Ce courriel est strictement reserve a l'usage de la personne a qui il est adresse (le destinataire). Il peut contenir de l'information privilegiee et confidentielle. L'examen, la reexpedition et la diffusion de ce message par une personne autre que son destinataire est interdite. Nous declinons toute responsabilite a l'egard des pertes ou des dommages subis par une personne autre que le destinataire par suite de decisions ou de mesures fondees sur le contenu de cette communication ou autrement. Si vous avez reçu ce courriel par error, veuillez communiquer avec son expediteur et en detruire toutes les copies.
Hi All,
We also purchased on Second Rd. West with the understanding that it would be closed. I now have 3 kids under the age of 12 and with Halloween approaching, I am reminded of a situation a couple of years ago. My middle son was going out on Halloween for the first time and as we got to the second house up the street from us, a silver Reliant went screaming up the road doing at least 80km. My son freaked out and hasn’t been back out for Halloween since. All this talk about volume and capacity is important, but it will only take one car going in excess of 80km for a severe tragedy to occur. It’s our kid’s LIVES we are talking about. This road IS NOT DESIGNED for traffic between Rymal and Highland!

----- Original Message ----- 
From: [redacted] <[redacted]> 
To: [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted] 
Cc: [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, October 12, 2005 1:12 PM
Subject: My Storey :Second road West Road Closure

> In the summer of 2004 my brother in-law told me he was planning on severing
> his property on Second Road and asked if I was interested in purchasing
> the
> lot when severed. The first thing that came to my mind was the road
> closure
> at Fairhaven where a walkway would go across the road. I had seen it a
> year
> earlier in the Desantis model home main area survey drawing table. The
> Desantis people told me that the walking path would close off Second Road
to
> prevent high volume traffic from going between Highland road and Hwy 53.
> >
> > So just before agreeing to buy the lot from my brother in law I went to
> City
> > Hall in the summer of 2004 and spoke with Paul Moore, who told me he was a
Planner for the area and he showed me a map which showed closure with a
twalkway going across Second Road at Fairhaven and he gave me a copy of the
map for the area. I asked him specifically if Second Road would be closed
and he said "yes", and something to the effect that the road is too narrow
handle high traffic flow and that Winterberry Drive was going to join onto
Gatestone Drive cutting across Second Road west, which would handle the
traffic flow. Paul Moore told me that Gatestone Drive was a wider road and
it would take the traffic coming from Winterberry Drive.
We went ahead (my wife Kathy and myself) getting our dream home designed
as
my brother in law who is building beside us currently. We broke ground
a
couple of months ago at 52 Second Road. We are still under construction
and
now I heard that the road closure may not happen. This is unbelievable!! We
finally thought we had found the perfect piece of property to build our
Dream home and now we hear it is deemed a "collector road", for a street
this narrow you might as well say "highway" because at the rate of speed the
traffic is currently travelling at and the volume, it can be branded no other
way.
My wife and three children are heart-broken. We were lied to and that is
unacceptable. How could we let our kids play near the front of the house
with crazy drivers flying down the road on a constant basis. My best friend
who happens to live on Second Road told me that 4 parked cars have been hit
by drivers who claimed they "misjudged" the width of the street and thought
they could get by. Those 4 parked cars could easily have been 4 small
children on their bikes or skateboards.
You people must listen and CLOSE Second Road, one day a life may depend on
your final decision.
Hello everyone,

I would like to see the data that is being used for them to state that our road is not near capacity. At the last city meeting I was informed by Mr. Bacque that a local road (which Second Road is) can handle 1000 cars a day. Over a 24 hour period you are looking at approximately 42 cars per hour. I would be willing to bet that averaged over a week we are at or really close to that level.

As stated in the e-mail, traffic will follow the path of least resistance which unfortunately for us is currently Second Rd. West. Think about it, if you are taking the Linc from Hamilton heading east you have six stoplights if you go along Mud and up Centennial to the development area, however, if you go up Winterberry, down Highland and up Second you only have 1 stop light and 5 stop signs to get to the commercial area. It is pretty easy to figure out the path of least resistance. If the city and the police are truly concerned about stopping excessive speeding on our streets, especially Highland Road as I read in the paper, then Second Road West must be closed to eliminate this "short-cut" that will exacerbate an already dangerous situation.

The commercial development has already started construction on Rymal Road with nothing done to address the road issues as yet. When they open that Wal-Mart we are going to be way over the limit. Not only will we have all of the people from Binbrook, Smithville etc. using our road as a short cut to the Linc we will have all of the East Mountain and Upper Stoney Creek using our road as a short cut to get to the new shopping plazas.

I would also like to ask the city to bring their measuring devices back to our street and this time leave them between Gatestone and Fairhaven. It would be great if they could leave them there for an entire week. I guarantee the number of cars and the speed they are traveling will get our point across. Note... if they are willing to do this please let us know so that we can take all of the signs off of our lawns and they can get some true measurements.

My last point would be for the city to realize who the people are that are sending out all of these e-mails. We are professional people whose houses have been assessed for over 300K. Actually, last week I received an assessment notice stating that my property value has increased 18%, I have not seen my new tax bill but I am betting it has increased substantially.

So please understand that we are not complaining for any other reason than to ensure the safety of all of the children and residents that live on our street. We want what was planned/promised to us when we bought these houses.
Hi

Speeding is a driver behavioural issue and speed enforcement is an activity conducted by the Police Department. It is my understanding that the police have been monitoring the speed when manpower/resources permits. As a result of a previous inquiry from Mike Morelli, Second has been placed on the September's Speed Watch list (conducted by the Police).

Traffic, like water, will follow the path of least resistance, however, none of the roads in this area are at or near capacity so I'm not sure what your looking for in terms of traffic capacity or traffic pattern information.

Please forward any future traffic related emails to our Department Head, Mr. Ed Switenky and he'll assign it to one of several technologists that report to him.

Thank you,

Operations & Maintenance Division
Public Works Department
Phone (905) 546-2424 x 5563
Fax: (905) 540-5926
---Original Message-----

From: [mailto:]
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2005 9:27 AM
To: pbruckler@cityofhamilton.ca; Lee-Morrison, Christine; DiFanni, Larry; Ryan, Leanne; rbacquie@ltransconsulting.com; jmossop.mpp@liberal.ola.org

Subject: RE: Second Road West Closure

es, we need future road closure and maybe you cannot help us with this matter. However, in your current capacity can you aid in speed control, traffic patterns, traffic capacity and speed monitoring?

If not pls advise as to who would be responsible in these areas.

---Original Message-----

"van Berkel, Chris" <cvanber@hamilton.ca> 10/11/2005 9:16:44 AM

Hello all: Please remove me from this email chain, I am not responsible for the future road closure matter. Thank you.

Chris van Berkel
Traffic Technologist
Operations & Maintenance Division
Public Works Department
Phone (905) 546-2424 x 5663
Fax: (905) 540-5926

---Original Message-----

From: [mailto:]
Sent: Sunday, October 09, 2005 9:29 PM
To: Lee-Morrison, Christine; Ryan, Leanne; rbacquie@ltransconsulting.com; cleishman@hamiltonpolice.on.ca; dmcculloch@hamiltonpolice.on.ca; pbruckler@cityofhamilton.ca; DiFanni, Larry; jmossop.mpp@liberal.ola.org; van Berkel, Chris

Subject: RE: Second Road West Closure
I have three young kids and my brother in law who is my neighbour has four. This is all about the safety of our children and a promise whether it was from the builder to the residents on the highland end of the street or from the city planning department (Paul Moore) and others to the people closer to Gatestone Drive, we were all lied to and that is inexcusable. This street must be closed and I agree with Michael that drastic measures must be taken for our children to have a safe future on Second Road West. There will (God forbid), I fear, come a day, that if the road is not closed one our children will be hurt by these speeders if not killed. I know what the answers will be, parking on one side of the street, more stop signs, slower speed limits. This doesn't work, just ask the people on Lake Avenue street. If something is not done and something tragic does occur the responsibility will be on those who wouldn't listen. Four parked cars have been hit on the street in the last couple of years because of it's width and the speed and rate of traffic. Those four parked cars could have easily been four small children playing.

I challenge all of our representatives to do the right thing and CLOSE Second Road West at some point for the sake of our kids and so far empty promises.

From: [mailto:____________________] Sent: Sunday, October 09, 2005 6:45 PM To: cleonmor@hamilton.ca; ryan@hamilton.ca; rbacquisetransconsulting.com; cleishman@hamiltonpolice.on.ca; dmccullioch@hamiltonpolice.on.ca; pruckler@cityofhamilton.ca; idoanni@hamilton.ca; jmossop.mpp@liberal.on.ca; cmvanber@hamilton.ca

Subject: RE: Second Road West Closure

I feel the same. I would not have purchased our home in this location had I known this is what we would have to deal with. With two young children it is not possible to just pick up and move. It is expensive and difficult. If I wanted this volume I would have purchased elsewhere. At least our property taxes would reflect the area. We
way
too much for this type of community. I feel that if nothing is
accomplished in the very near future we should rethink our
strategies
and take more drastic measures. After all we are talking about safety
of children here. Our property taxes need to be reviewed. We were
promised closure. Nothing else will suffice.

How do the rest of you feel?

Please copy all when responding

From: "[Redacted]"
To: <cleemorr@hamilton.ca>,
<lryan@hamilton.ca>, <rbacquie@transconsulting.com>,
<cleeishman@hamiltonpolice.on.ca>, <dmcculloch@hamiltonpolice.on.ca>,
<pbruckler@cityofhamilton.ca>, <ldilanni@hamilton.ca>,
<jmossp.mpp@liberal.ola.org>, <cmvanber@hamilton.ca>
CC: [Redacted]

Subject: Second Road West Closure
Date: Sun, 9 Oct 2005 16:46:59 -0400

> We purchased our home on Second Road West almost four years
ago. Having two
> young children, location was one of the most important
considerations when
> choosing our new home. After many telephone conversations
with
people
> working at the City of Hamilton, we decided to purchase our
dream home on
> Second Rd West. We made this very difficult decision based on
the
> information given to us by those at the city. We were assured
repeatedly
> that Second Rd West was scheduled to be closed. We were given
plans of the
> Trinity Church neighbourhood which illustrated where the
street
closure was
> to take place. Although we were not given a time line as to when
the
> closure would take place, we were assured that it would indeed
be closed.
>
> Purchasing our new home was one of the biggest decisions we
have ever had
> to make. We made that decision on the assumption that our
children would
> have a quiet and safe location to play and grow. Instead, we
have a very


busy street with many speeding cars. Our children are growing up in a location which requires them to only play in the backyard, because their parents feel it is unsafe for them to play in the front yard. We as well as our neighbours are very angry and disappointed at the way our neighbourhood has developed. Almost every other house on Second Rd West has small children which unfortunately are unable to play together because the are limited to playing in their backyards. Would so many families have purchased homes in this area unless they were confident that their children would have a safe place to play? No, they would have chosen to build their homes elsewhere.

We have joined with a number of other families on the street and are committed to fight for the street closure that we were promised. We are committed to our fight. We will not go away.

WE WANT SECOND RD WEST CLOSED!!
Hi Natalie, I realize that you are still considering public input however I still have the same question;

How is Second Road West able to perform the function of a "collector road" when it was built and engineered to be closed? Surely somebody in your company can answer this.

Regards,

---

>>> Nathalie Baudais <NBaudais@transconsulting.com> 10/11/2005 4:18:52 PM >>>
Hello

Mr. Bacquie will be back in the office on Friday morning.

We are still considering public input on this issue and are receptive to the comments that have been received to date.

We will provide further information on our review as soon as possible.

Regards,

Nathalie Baudais, EIT, PE
-----Original Message-----

From: [Redacted] <[Redacted]>
Date: Tue, 11 Oct 2005 14:15:18
To: [bruckler@cityofhamilton.ca>, <cleemorr@hamilton.ca>,
<leccchet@hamilton.ca>, <liyanni@hamilton.ca>, <lryan@hamilton.ca>,
<rbacquie@itransconsulting.com>, <jmossop.mpp@liberal.ola.org>
Cc: [Redacted], <[Redacted]>

Subject: Second Road West

Attached are photos of our street. We have put up signs to try and

calm
traffic ourselves, they all have proactive messages on them.
Ultimately
the street was supposed to be closed and we are still expecting
nothing
short of this.

We all as residents pay upwards of $4000 a year on property taxes
spend
additional money on the appearance of our homes, put our vehicles on
the
road and have to put out these signs to try and control the traffic.
This could all have been averted if the city just went ahead and
closed
he road as was originally planned.

I have asked Mr. Bacquie on the "Collector Road" comment and am yet to receive an answer and Mr. Bruckler has asked Ms Morrison the same question to which no answer has been given.
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2005 11:51 AM
To: van Berkel, Chris
Cc: [Redacted]

Subject: Re: Second Road West Closure

If this is the case, what is the supposed capacity of Second Rd. W. and what is the current usage according to your department?

My concern is the street is only wide enough to support local residential use and not be an "arterial road" as intended at the meeting. In addition, as Second Road was to be "cul-de-sacced" as per the original plans, houses were built very close to the roadway.

"van Berkel, Chris" <cmvanber@hamilton.ca> on Tuesday, October 11, 2005 at 10:00 AM -0500 wrote:
Traffic, like water, will follow the path of least resistance, however, none of the roads in this area are at or near capacity so I'm not sure what your looking for in terms of traffic capacity or traffic pattern information??
Lee-Morrison, Christine

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Monday, October 10, 2005 1:30 PM
To: [Redacted]; Lee-Morrison, Christine; Ryan, Leanne; rbacque@hamilton.ca; cleishman@hamiltonpolice.on.ca; pbuckler@cityofhamilton.ca; lidlanni@hamilton.ca; jnossop.mpp@liberal.on.ca; cmvander@hamilton.ca
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: City staff also showed me the Promised Closure

As you know, the residents have placed signs around our street. There are people actually speeding and waving just to throw it in our face. The issue here is that they feel it is a joke. And why not? Everytime there is a police car here nothing is done. It has been a joke to these people for four years. It is not a joke to us though. We live it every day. It is slap in the face. We are being bullied by people using Second Road and ignored by the City of Hamilton. Perhaps we should hold property tax payment. We have received answers that simply delay things. We can not allow this to happen anymore. The winter is coming. It will be a mess out here. The time has come to hold the city to their promise.

Good Luck,

From: [Redacted]
To: [Redacted]; "cmvander@hamilton.ca" <cmvander@hamilton.ca>, "ryan@hamilton.ca" <ryan@hamilton.ca>, "rbacque@hamilton.ca" <rbacque@hamilton.ca>, "cleishman@hamiltonpolice.on.ca" <cleishman@hamiltonpolice.on.ca>, "pbuckler@cityofhamilton.ca" <pbuckler@cityofhamilton.ca>, "lidlanni@hamilton.ca" <lidlanni@hamilton.ca>, "jnossop.mpp@liberal.on.ca" <jnossop.mpp@liberal.on.ca>, "cmvander@hamilton.ca"
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: City staff also showed me the Promised Closure
Date: Mon, 10 Oct 2005 12:45:59 -0400

Much like your experience, my husband and I also made our decision to purchase our home at 68 Second Road West, based largely upon the planned road closure. We did not build this home (built in 1987), but purchased it in 2002. In July 2002 we were considering buying this house, and were told by the owners that a walkway, leading to a park and school would be built on the north side of our property. I visited the city hall planning department to confirm plans for this grassy corridor beside the home, and the large open field behind. I was shown a very large Heritage Green Neighborhood Plan, and the city staffer specifically pointed out the walkway, neighbourhood park and elementary school designated on the plan [to date, Gatestone Elementary has opened its doors, and public meetings have promised construction of Eringate Park in the near future]. I was thrilled when the city staffer showed me that the "parkland" and "off street bikeway/walkway" indicators stretched across Second Road West...thus indicating the walkway would intersect the street, providing a road closure at the mid-point between Highland and Rymal Road (see the attached jpeg
image). With full confidence in this confirmation provided by our city planning department, we purchased this home anticipating the road would be closed in the future. Just like you, we want to see this long-planned road closure honoured. A previous e-mail from Sandy Ponte indicated that the sales staff at Multi-Area Developments also marketed the planned road closure as one of the great selling features, enticing many families to buy a DeSantis home on Second Road West. We were all promised a neighbourhood with much reduced traffic and speed - which the road closure would certainly deliver. Like you, I demand that promised be kept, and this road closure be honoured.

----Original Message-----
From: [SNIP]
Sent: October 9, 2005 1:02 PM
To: desmori@hamilton.ca; lryan@hamilton.ca; rbaquic@hamilton.ca; ccleishman@hamiltonpolice.on.ca; pbruckder@cityofhamilton.ca; kdianna@hamilton.ca; jmossop.mpp@liberal.ola.org; cmvander@hamilton.ca
Cc: [SNIP]

Subject: Second Road West: Promised Closure

My name is [SNIP] and I am currently building a home between Fairhaven and Gatesone Drive on Second road west. The home is in early construction.

My brother in-law is also building a home next to mine (number 50 and 52). Last year before I decided to build on Second road west I did my homework and went to the city planning department where I was shown the area plan that included second road west. The reason for this was that I have three small children and and my brother in-law has four and I wanted to build on a street with little traffic. I was shown a plan by the head planner for the area (Paul Moore) where second road was to be cut off from traffic at two locations, one was a walking path going through the street at Fairhaven and the other was Winterberry drive joining onto Gatesone drive, where there would be no turning option onto the North side of Second Road. I was assured that the plan that I was looking at would be implemented.

I am in total disbelief that this will not or may not happen. I work on this home daily and I can't believe the speed at which the cars come down the street as it is, with total disregard for the children and the stop signs at Fairhaven. I would estimate the average speed on the street to be 70 to 80 kilometers per hour before Fairhaven where the stop signs are usually ignored. In the evenings people often walk up and down the street and I have witnessed many a near miss by cars flying by. I just keep telling myself, I can't wait till they close this street down.

I was lied to and I am very upset to hear what is happening. When we take the children to see the homes under construction we park on both sides of the street to try and slow the traffic down while our kids are there, but this doesn't work. The ONLY way to stop the traffic is to close the street off at one point.

Has anyone from planning been to the area, all they have to do is stand there and see for themselves. Our children's lives are at stake here.

Did the city not take into account the safety of the children in the home that was purchased for problem children between Gatesone and Fairhaven? I often see these kids playing outside where there are no sidewalks. This street will become a death trap for our kids if no action is taken.

Please feel free to contact me and add me to your contact lists:

[SNIP]
Great idea. I say we should start either taking down 1. peoples plate numbers, or 2 start taking counts of how many cars we have to allow before we can move out of our spot, (doing it each time we leave and add up the total number of cars.) Statistics and numbers are great tools to use.

I also see this happen on a daily basis. I think it is important that we record the license plate of the vehicle and call or e-mail the police.
Subject: RE: Second Road West Closure

Date: Sun, 09 Oct 2005 19:56:51 -0400

All though I do not pay property taxes I still live here and my parents pay the property taxes and I'm with the rest of you.

Something has to be done! Just yesterday I was pulling out to go out. I was lucky that I looked in my rear view mirror. A white van had turned onto second road from Highland and was passing through.

When the van got infront of my house had, had he been less then a mere 2-3 inches more to the right he would have hit my truck just like the incident that occured a week ago. Something has to be done! I DO NOT want to end up going to Mcmaster Hospital instead of my classes at Mcmaster because people can't find an alternate way to go from Point A to Point B, and 2 At least have the common sense to slow down in a congested area rather than goin 60 km/h. If there is anything I can do to help please let me know. Close this road.

From: lryan@hamilton.ca
To: rbaqueie@transconsulting.com, cleishman@hamiltonpolice.on.ca, dmcculloch@hamiltonpolice.on.ca, phrucler@cityofhamilton.ca, ldianni@hamilton.ca, jmossop.mpp@liberal.ola.org, cmvanber@hamilton.ca

I feel the same. I would not have purchased our home in this location had I known this is what we would have to deal with. With two young children it is not possible to just pick up and move. It is expensive and difficult. If I wanted this volume I would have purchased elsewhere. At least our property taxes would reflect the area. We pay way too much for this type of community. I feel that if nothing is put in accomplished in the very near future we should rethink our strategies and take more drastic measures. After all we are talking about safety of children here. Our property taxes need to be reviewed. We were promised closure. Nothing else will suffice.

How do the rest of you feel?

Please copy all when responding
Subject: Second Road West Closure

Date: Sun, 9 Oct 2005 16:46:59 -0400

We purchased our home on Second Road West almost four years ago. Having two young children, location was one of the most important considerations when choosing our new home. After many telephone conversations with people

working at the City of Hamilton, we decided to purchase our dream home on Second Rd West. We made this very difficult decision based on the information given to us by those at the city. We were assured repeatedly

that Second Rd

was scheduled to be closed. We were given plans of the Trinity Church neighbourhood which illustrated where the street closure was
to take place. Although we were not given a time line as to when the closure would take place, we were assured that it would indeed be closed.

Purchasing our new home was one of the biggest decisions we have ever had
to make. We made that decision on the assumption that our children would have a quiet and safe location to play and grow. Instead, we have a very busy street with many speeding cars. Our children are growing up in a location which requires them to only play in the backyard, because their parents feel it is unsafe for them to play in the front yard. We as well as our neighbours are very angry and disappointed at the way our neighbourhood has developed. Almost every other house on Second Rd West has small children which unfortunately are unable to play together because the area limited to playing in their backyards. Would so many families have purchased homes in this area unless they were confident that
their children
would have a safe place to play? No, they would have chosen to
build their
homes elsewhere.

We have joined
with a number of other families on the street and
are
committed to fight for the street closure that we were
promised. We are
committed to our fight. We will not go away.
WE WANT SECOND RD WEST CLOSED!!
From: Lee-Morrison, Christine; Ryan, Leanne; rbacque@transconsulting.com; cleishman@hamiltonpolice.on.ca; dmculloch@hamiltonpolice.on.ca; pbuckler@cityofhamilton.ca; Dilanni, Larry; jmossop.mpp@liberal.ola.org; van Berkel, Chris
Sent: Sunday, October 09, 2005 9:29 PM
To: Lee-Morrison, Christine; Ryan, Leanne; rbacque@transconsulting.com; cleishman@hamiltonpolice.on.ca; dmculloch@hamiltonpolice.on.ca; pbuckler@cityofhamilton.ca; Dilanni, Larry; jmossop.mpp@liberal.ola.org; van Berkel, Chris
Cc: No CC
Subject: RE: Second Road West Closure

I have three young kids and my brother in law who is my neighbour has four. This is all about the safety of our children and a promise whether it was from the builder to the residents on the highland end of the street or from the city planning department(Paul Moore) and others to the people closer to Gately Drive, we were all lied to and that is inexcusable. This street must be closed and I agree with _____ that drastic measures must be taken for our children to have a safe future on Second Road West. There will (God forbid), I fear, come a day, that if the road is not closed one our children will be hurt by these speeders if not killed. I know what the answers will be, parking on one side of the street, more stop signs, slower speed limits. This doesn’t work, just ask the people on Lake Avenue street. If something is not done and something tragic does occur the responsibility will be on those who wouldn’t listen. Four parked cars have been hit on the street in the last couple of years because of it’s width and the speed and rate of traffic. Those four parked cars could have easily been four small children playing. I challenge all of our representatives to do the right thing and CLOSE Second Road West at some point for the sake of our kids and so far empty promises.

From:_____
Sent: Sunday, October 09, 2005 6:45 PM
To: Lee-Morrison, Christine; Ryan, Leanne; rbacque@transconsulting.com; cleishman@hamiltonpolice.on.ca; dmculloch@hamiltonpolice.on.ca; pbuckler@cityofhamilton.ca; dilanni@hamilton.ca; jmossop.mpp@liberal.ola.org; cmvanber@hamilton.ca
Cc: No CC
Subject: RE: Second Road West Closure

I feel the same. I would not have purchased our home in this location had I known this is what we would have to deal with. With two young children it is not possible to just pick up and move. It is expensive and difficult. If I wanted this volume I would have purchased elsewhere. At least our property taxes would reflect the area. We pay way too much for this type of community. I feel that if nothing is put in accomplished in the very near future we should rethink our strategies and take more drastic measures. After all we are talking about safety of children here. Our property taxes need to be reviewed. We were promised closure. Nothing else will suffice.
How do the rest of you feel?

Please copy all when responding.

From: [Redacted]
To: [Redacted]
CC: [Redacted]
Subject: Second Road West Closure
Date: Sun, 9 Oct 2005 16:46:59 -0400

We purchased our home on Second Road West almost four years ago. Having two young children, location was one of the most important considerations when choosing our new home. After many telephone conversations with people working at the City of Hamilton, we decided to purchase our dream home on Second Rd West. We made this very difficult decision based on the information given to us by those at the city. We were assured repeatedly that Second Rd West was scheduled to be closed. We were given plans of the Trinity Church neighbourhood which illustrated where the street closure was to take place. Although we were not given a time line as to when the closure would take place, we were assured that it would indeed be closed.

Purchasing our new home was one of the biggest decisions we have every had to make. We made that decision on the assumption that our children would have a quiet and safe location to play and grow. Instead, we have a very busy street with many speeding cars. Our children are growing up in a location which requires them to only play in the backyard, because their parents feel it is unsafe for them to play in the front yard. We as well as our neighbours are very angry and disappointed at the way our neighbourhood has developed. Almost every other house on Second Rd West has small children which unfortunately are unable to play together because the are limited to playing in their backyards. Would so many families have purchased homes in this area unless they were confident that their children would have a safe place to play? No, they would have chosen to build their homes elsewhere.

We have joined with a number of other families on the street and are committed to fight for the street closure that we were promised. We are committed to our fight. We will not go away.

WE WANT SECOND RD WEST CLOSED!!
Nathalie Baudais

From: Dilanni, Larry [LDilanni@hamilton.ca]
Sent: Saturday, October 08, 2005 8:34 AM
To: Lee-Morrison, Christine; Ryan, Leanne; Bruckler, Phil; dmcculloch@hamiltonpolice.on.ca; Ray Bacquie; jmossop.mpp@liberal.ola.org
Cc: Sent from a Handheld Device

Subject: Re: Second Road West

Please keep me informed on this question. Thx.

Sent from a Handheld Device

----Original Message----

From:
To: Lee-Morrison, Christine <clemorr@hamilton.ca>; Dilanni, Larry <LDilanni@hamilton.ca>; Ryan, Leanne <ryan@hamilton.ca>; Bruckler, Phil <bruckler@hamilton.ca>; dmcculloch@hamiltonpolice.on.ca <dmcculloch@hamiltonpolice.on.ca>; rbacquie@transconsulting.com <rbacquie@transconsulting.com>; jmossop.mpp@liberal.ola.org <jmossop.mpp@liberal.ola.org>
Cc:

Sent: Fri Oct 07 23:49:56 2005
Subject: Second Road West

At Monday's Environmental Assessment Public Information Forum, I heard repeatedly from Mr. Ray Bacquie that Second Road West was collector road.

How can Second Road become a collector road or be deemed a collector road almost overnight? It was planned, surveyed, engineered and constructed to be closed. We have obtained plans which support and prove this along with the simple truth that the road is indeed narrow.

How does a street which was planned for closure all of sudden become equipped to deal with constant flows of traffic and be deemed "collector"?

Looking forward to hearing from you,

3/15/2006
Subject: RE: Second Road West

Phil. You said that the average speed was 51kms. Where were the speed detectors placed? I was told that they were placed between the stop signs. I don't think the detectors can detect the running stops. I can see why the speed did not reflect reality. Can we place them closer to the walkway? Also, Lake Ave has the 40km zone. They have no schools there. We have school pick-ups. Can we look at that again as an immediate and temporary solution?

The car accident that occurred last week was one of many. That one was reported to the police because the person actually stayed to give his information. There were many others that did not. We paid out of our own pockets. Have you seen insurance rates in the last 5 years? What choice did we have.

I am sick and tired of being sick and tired.

We can live with losing a vehicle but we cannot live with losing a child over this. We were promised closure. I don't care if the people speeding are from our community. As far as I'm concerned many of them should not even have access to Second Road West. It should be closed.

The car accident that occurred last week was one of many. That one was reported to the police because the person actually stayed to give his information. There were many others that did not. We paid out of our own pockets. Have you seen insurance rates in the last 5 years? What choice did we have.

I am sick and tired of being sick and tired.

We can live with losing a vehicle but we cannot live with losing a child over this. We were promised closure. I don't care if the people speeding are from our community. As far as I'm concerned many of them should not even have access to Second Road West. It should be closed.

The car accident that occurred last week was one of many. That one was reported to the police because the person actually stayed to give his information. There were many others that did not. We paid out of our own pockets. Have you seen insurance rates in the last 5 years? What choice did we have.

I am sick and tired of being sick and tired.

We can live with losing a vehicle but we cannot live with losing a child over this. We were promised closure. I don't care if the people speeding are from our community. As far as I'm concerned many of them should not even have access to Second Road West. It should be closed.
Subject: Second Road West
Date: Fri, 07 Oct 2005 23:49:56 -0400

> At Monday's Environmental Assessment Public Information Forum, I heard
> repeatedly from Mr. Ray Bacquie that Second Road West was collector
> road.
> 
> How can Second Road become a collector road or be deemed a collector
> road almost overnight? It was planned, surveyed, engineered and
> constructed to be closed. We have obtained plans which support and
> prove this along with the simple truth that the road is indeed narrow.
>
> How does a street which was planned for closure all of sudden become
> equipped to deal with constant flows of traffic and be deemed
> "collector"?
>
> Looking forward to hearing from you,
>
> [Signature]
Hello Larry. Welcome to our fight. Hope you can help us.

Please keep me informed on this question. Thx.

Sent from a handheld device
Sent: Fri Oct 07 23:49:56 2005  
Subject: Second Road West

At Monday's Environmental Assessment Public Information Forum, I heard repeatedly from Mr. Ray Bacque that Second Road West was collector road.

How can Second Road become a collector road or be deemed a collector road almost overnight? It was planned, surveyed, engineered and constructed to be closed. We have obtained plans which support and prove this along with the simple truth that the road is indeed narrow.

How does a street which was planned for closure all of sudden become equipped to deal with constant flows of traffic and be deemed "collector"?

Looking forward to hearing from you,
Lee-Morrison, Christine

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Friday, October 07, 2005 11:20 AM
To: Lee-Morrison, Christine
Cc: isheppard@itransconsulting.com
Subject: Public meeting

Christine with regards to the public meeting at the Salvation Army Church on October 3rd 2005.

Subject: Rymal Road planning Area (ROPA 9Lands)

I feel that this is a good thing that the city is finally looking into improving this area. We are the owners of two properties in the Portside Drive area and welcome these improvement.

A question that I had for Christine Hill was, who will be responsible for installing and paying for the main sewer and water services for those of use on Portside Drive.

A big concern of ours is that this area has always had a problem with collecting runoff water from rain or melting snow and as new development is being allowed in this corner we are seeing this problem increase. The water that is being generated or collected in this area can not escape fast enough, we would greatly appreciate it if this is taken into consideration when highway 56 is being worked on.

Thank you,

[Signature]

"This e-mail and any attachments may contain confidential and privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail, do not use the information, delete this e-mail and destroy any copies. Any dissemination of use of this information by a person other than the intended recipient is unauthorized and may be illegal. Unless otherwise stated, opinions expressed in this e-mail are those of the author and are not necessarily endorsed by the author's employer. If you are authorized to use this information, please keep it confidential and use it only for its intended purpose."
From: LESMYERS@ROYALLEPAGE.CA [mailto:LESMYERS@ROYALLEPAGE.CA]
Sent: Monday, May 02, 2005 1:41 PM
To: mfazio@hamilton.ca
Cc: lsheppard@transconsulting.com
Subject: Rymal road environmental

This is in regards to the environmental assessment being done in the rymal and trinity church area.
As you know there are kursts, caves and underground streams all through this area.
There are protected lands on the north side of rymal due to these kursts. Thus has been caused by a huge underground lake in the white church road area. This lake runs north underground till it comes out of the escarpment in various places.

I hope people don't think that these kursts and caves just jumped from white church to rymal. These kursts and caves are probably all through these areas. You don't think that the developer is going to tell you when he finds one and hold up his projects and money. They didn't tell you when they found them on the Stoney Creek mtn till they got caught. There are a few homes that are sinking and have problems due to these hidden and undisclosed kursts and caves.

The farmer that used to do the area said that he witnessed more then once a blasting that went down instead of up. He also told us of different areas that he thought maybe burial sites etc as he has found small artifacts and things over the years but that no one listens to him. They think he just wants to keep the land to lease for his farm.

They have now carved a huge chunk out of the ground as there is a big drop from where the land used to be to their level now. They are already above the ground level for the existing homes in the area. Where will the water go but into these peoples backyards and homes.

I hope you can use this little bit of info.
Thank you
From: Liza Sheppard
Sent: Tuesday, March 08, 2005 3:51 PM
To: Nathalie Baudais
Subject: FW: Rymal Road Master Plan

From: [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, March 08, 2005 10:01 AM
To: mfazio@hamilton.ca
Cc: lsheppard@transconsulting.com
Subject: Rymal Road Master Plan

Re: Notice of Study Commencement, Rymal Road Planning Area Master Plan, Class Environmental Assessment

As per the notice published on March 4, 2005, I would like to be added to the study mailing list. I am a land owner in the study area.

3/8/2005
Nathalie Baudais

From: Liza Sheppard
Sent: Tuesday, January 18, 2005 3:35 PM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Rymal Road EA

Hi [Redacted],

I have forwarded your e-mail to the City. They are maintaining the mailing list for the project.

Regards,
Liza

---

From: [Redacted]  
Sent: Tuesday, January 18, 2005 3:23 PM  
To: lsheppard@transconsulting.com  
Cc: [Redacted]  
Subject: Rymal Road EA  

Hi Liza, please could you please add [Redacted] and I to the circulation list for the Rymal Road EA. Email is fine in lieu of mailings if possible.

Thanks

---

5/2/2005
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PART I- THE PREAMBLE

1. TITLE

This Amendment shall be known as AMENDMENT NO. 36 TO THE OFFICIAL PLAN OF THE TOWNSHIP OF GLANBROOK, being an amendment to “The Official Plan of the Township of Glenbrook”.

2. COMPONENTS OF THIS AMENDMENT

Only that part of this document entitled “PART II – THE OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT” and “PART III – THE SECONDARY PLAN” comprising the attached explanatory text and maps designated as Schedule A - amendments to Schedule A - Land Use Plan of the existing Township Official Plan, Schedule E - amendments to Schedule E - Road Network Plan, Schedule F - amendments to Schedule F - Special Housing Policy Areas and Schedule I - Rymal Road Planning Area Secondary Plan Land Use Plan, constitute Amendment No. ____ to the Official Plan of the Township of Glenbrook.

“PART I - THE PREAMBLE” does not constitute part of this Amendment.

3. PURPOSE OF THIS AMENDMENT

The purpose of this Amendment is to establish detailed policies and a land use plan to guide the future development in the Rymal Road Planning Area. This Amendment contains development principles, objectives and policies for the Rymal Road Planning Area, and addresses land use, infrastructure and servicing issues, transportation matters, environment and implementation. The Amendment establishes a generalized land use and collector road pattern for the Rymal Road Planning Area.

4. LOCATION OF THIS AMENDMENT

The lands subject to this Amendment are located south of Rymal Road East; east of Trinity Church Road; north of the hydro corridor; and west of Swayze Road and Regional Road No. 56. In total, the amendment area is comprised of approximately 190 hectares (470 acres). Schedule A attached hereto and forming part of this Amendment identifies the location of the lands affected by this Amendment.
5. **BASIS OF THIS AMENDMENT**

On June 20, 2000, Council of the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth adopted Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 9, which affects the area of this amendment. The purpose of Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 9 was to:

- adjust the Urban boundary on Map No. 1, Regional Development Pattern, to include the lands bounded by Trinity Church Road, Rymal Road East, Swayze Road and the Ontario Hydro corridor within the Township of Glanbrook;
- redesignate the subject lands on Map. No. 1 from “Rural Area” to “Urban”;
- remove the “Prime Agricultural Lands” designation for the subject lands on Map No. 2, Agricultural Lands & Niagara Escarpment Plan Area; and,
- require the approval of a Secondary Plan to the Township of Glanbrook Official Plan prior to the development of Urban uses on these lands.

Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 9 also contains a requirement for a Master Servicing and Drainage Plan to be prepared and approved in a coordinated manner with the Secondary Plan. Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 9 further provides that the approval of the Secondary Plan not proceed until comprehensive transportation studies have been completed and approved to determine off-site road improvements required to accommodate the full development of these lands.

The Ontario Municipal Board modified and approved Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 9 on September 18, 2001.

This Secondary Plan is therefore prepared in accordance with the direction provided in Section C.3.1.2.10, C.3.1.2.11 and C.3.1.2.12 of the Regional Official Plan, as amended by Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 9. The Rymal Road Secondary Plan provides more detailed policies and information to refine and amplify the Official Plan policies to facilitate the appropriate development of the Rymal Road Planning Area. This Official Plan amendment incorporates the entire Rymal Road Secondary Plan into the Township Official Plan.
PART II - THE OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT

1. INTRODUCTION

The whole of this part of the document entitled “PART II - THE OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT” which consists of the following text and attached maps which amend Schedule A - Land Use Plan, Schedule E - Road Network Plan and Schedule F - Special Housing Policy Areas constitutes the amendments to the Official Plan of the former Township of Glanbrook. Part III - The Secondary Plan and Schedule I - The Rymal Road Secondary Plan Land Use Plan will also form part of the Official Plan of the former Township of Glanbrook. Together Part II and Part III constitute Amendment No. 36 to the Official Plan of the former Township of Glanbrook.

2. OFFICIAL PLAN SCHEDULE CHANGES

2.1 Schedule A - Land Use Plan of the Township of Glanbrook Official Plan is hereby amended as follows:

2.1.1 By specifically identifying the lands within the Rymal Road Planning Area as being within the ‘Urban Area’ and designated as ‘Residential’ and ‘General Commercial’.

2.1.2 By specifically identifying the lands within the Rymal Road Planning Area as being subject to ‘Official Plan Amendment No. 36’ The Rymal Road Secondary Plan’.

2.1.3 By deleting reference to ‘OPA No. 9’, ‘OPA No. 22’ and ‘OPA No. 32’.

2.2 Schedule E - Road Network Plan of the Township of Glanbrook Official Plan is hereby amended by adding the collector road network within the Rymal Road Secondary Plan.

2.3 Schedule F - Special Housing Policy Areas of the Township of Glanbrook Official Plan is hereby amended by identifying the lands within the Rymal Road Planning Area as a ‘New Community’.

2.4 A new schedule, Schedule I - Rymal Road Secondary Plan Land Use Plan is hereby added to the Township of Glanbrook Official Plan.
3. **TEXT CHANGES**

The text of the Official Plan of the Township of Glenbrook is hereby amended as follows:

3.1 The Urban Area policy B.2 is amended by adding the following as a new paragraph between the current fourth and fifth paragraphs within policy B.2 as follows:

“The Rymal Road Planning Area is intended to be the fourth significant location for urban residential and commercial development in the Township. Located south of the Heritage Green Community, as identified in the former City of Stoney Creek Official Plan, the area will develop with a mix of housing forms and densities and will contain retail, personal service and community uses, intended to serve the Rymal Road Planning Area and surrounding area.

3.2 A new Clause G.4.7 is added to SECTION G: IMPLEMENTATION as follows:

“G.4.7 The policies of the Secondary Plans provide greater detail but do not supersede all other policies of the Official Plan, and as such, should be read in conjunction with the policies of the Official Plan. Where there is a conflict between the Official Plan and a Secondary Plan, the policies of the Secondary Plan shall prevail.”

3.3 Section A.2.4 is hereby amended as follows:

“To encourage the major portion of the residential development in the Township to locate in Urban Settlement Areas on the basis of full municipal services. These areas include the Binbrook Urban Settlement Area, the Mount Hope Urban Settlement Area, the land designated Residential on Twenty Road and the Rymal Road Secondary Plan Area. Some residential development will be permitted in the Binbrook Urban Settlement Area prior to the provision of full municipal services thereto. Limited Residential development will be permitted in the Rural Area, including, the Woodburn Rural Settlement Area, Rural Residential Estate development and severances, in accordance with the policies of this Plan and the Regional Official Plan.

3.4 Section A.3.1 is hereby amended by changing the population goal from “13,500 persons for the Township of Glenbrook by the year 2011” to “23,000 persons for the Township of Glenbrook by the year 2021”.

3.5 Section B.1.1.14.2 is hereby deleted.

3.6 Section B.2.1.10 is hereby amended by adding the following words to the second paragraph after the words “hazard lands”:

“and public stormwater management areas.”
3.7 Section F.1.1 is hereby amended as follows:

“It is the intent of this Plan that full municipal services, including municipal water and sanitary sewers, be provided to the Urban Areas of the Township, including, the
Binbrook and Mount Hope Urban Settlement Areas, the Residential lands on Twenty
Road, the North Glanbrook and Airport Industrial-Business Parks, the Rymal Road
Secondary Plan Area and the lands designated Airport-Related Commercial adjacent
to Highway No. 6 directly to the south of the former City of Hamilton/Township of
Glanbrook Municipal boundary, as designated on Schedule “A” – Land Use Plan.

3.8 Section H.1.1 is hereby amended by adding the following words after “Road Network
Plan:

“and the boundaries between the land use designations shown on Schedule I -
Rymal Road Secondary Plan Land Use Plan,”

3.8 A new Section **B.3 - RYMAL ROAD SECONDARY PLAN** shall be added as set out in
Part III of this Amendment.
PART III - THE SECONDARY PLAN

B.3 RYMAL ROAD SECONDARY PLAN

B.3.1 DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES AND OBJECTIVES

The Rymal Road Secondary Plan is based on the strategies of Vision 2020, the Official Plan policies of the former Township of Glanbrook and former Region of Hamilton-Wentworth and the land use planning policies of the Province of Ontario. The following principles set out the premise for development and redevelopment within the Rymal Road Planning Area.

B.3.1.1 Development shall be based on a compact urban form which promotes a sense of community, encourages a mixing of uses, establishes a vibrant neighbourhood setting, encourages pedestrian travel and other alternative modes of movement and creates residential densities which support transit.

The objectives associated with this principle are:

a) To provide and encourage ease of pedestrian accessibility between residential neighbourhoods, commercial areas and other land uses.

b) To develop a pedestrian and bicycle network, using features such as Parkland areas, school yards, utility corridors, stormwater management areas and where appropriate, local streets.

c) To provide for a maximum walking distance of generally 400 metres to neighbourhood parks.

d) To ensure that 90% of the residential units are within approximately 400 metres of a potential transit stop.

e) To encourage a mixing of dwelling types and densities throughout the secondary plan area.

f) To encourage the provision of commercial and higher intensity residential uses in corridors along Rymal Road to serve the community and to support public transit.

g) To encourage commercial areas to develop with a range of commercial, service and community uses appropriate to their function and to intensify over time into mixed use areas.

h) To encourage multi-use institutional and community facilities.
B.3.1.2 The system of streets within the Secondary Plan area shall provide for not only the efficient movement of vehicle traffic but also contribute to the public realm through a land use pattern that encourages walking, creates pedestrian oriented development and streetscapes, links the components of the community and provides the infrastructure for alternative modes of transportation. The mid-block east-west collector extending the length of the study area will also function as a pedestrian and bicycle oriented spine of the community linking all significant land uses within the community.

The objectives associated with this principle are:

a) To create a grid system of collector and local roads and discourage cul-de-sacs.

b) To develop walkable neighbourhoods through a grid system of streets, short blocks, street oriented development, a safe and attractive public realm and pedestrian scaled streets.

c) To consider appropriate alternative development standards for all types of development, streets and servicing and to utilize a range of policy and regulatory instruments to implement alternative standards to the extent possible.

d) To provide a transportation network that accommodates and promotes pedestrian and bicycle movement in a safe and convenient manner and that supports public transit.

e) To provide, where possible, separate pedestrian and cycling networks along public streets and through public parkland.

f) To employ traffic calming measures on collector roads in order to reduce traffic speeds and makes the streets conducive to pedestrian and bicycle travel.

g) To orientate all schools and the majority of parks along the main collector road spine of the community and to ensure that all commercial areas within the Plan Area are either directly or indirectly connected to the collector road spine through intersecting collector and arterial roads.

h) To orientate streets to promote energy conservation.

B.3.1.3 Development within the Rymal Road Secondary Plan will integrate with the Heritage Green community to the north, promote compatibility with the existing and designated industrial areas to the east and west, be sensitive to the rural character to the south, and create a gateway to the City.
The objectives associated with this principle are:

a) To create a transition of uses and densities along the southern boundary of the Planning Area adjacent to the rural area, and to provide for view corridors from public streets into the rural landscape south of the Rymal Road Planning Area.

b) To ensure land use compatibility between nearby existing and planned industrial uses through the distribution of land uses including transitional uses and distance separations.

c) To establish a system of open space trails and linkages on the lands within the hydro corridor which form the southern boundary of the Planning Area and to permit community gardens within the hydro corridor.

d) To establish a hierarchy of commercial areas which complements the existing and designated commercial areas and commercial hierarchy within the Heritage Green community and which together serves the needs of the residents within the Rymal Road and Heritage Green Secondary Plan Areas and surrounding areas in an integrated manner.

e) To incorporate elements into the design of the community and the design of key gateway locations along Highway 56, Fletcher Road, Trinity Church Road and Rymal Road to reinforce the area as a gateway to the City.

B.3.1.4 A broad range of housing forms and types will be provided which can accommodate households of various ages, incomes, lifestyles and family structure. These housing forms are encouraged to be mixed throughout the Secondary Plan Area.

The objectives associated with this principle are:

a) To encourage innovative and varied housing types, densities and designs utilizing a combination of regulatory and incentive-based policy tools as appropriate.

b) To provide the opportunity for life style residential development and to encourage ‘aging in place’ where different housing forms accommodate life cycle changes.

c) To provide a variety of housing types and designs at a range of prices, in order to provide the opportunity for affordable residential units.

B.3.1.5 Development shall reflect the Vision 2020 principles of environmental sustainability and recognize the fundamental importance of healthy ecosystems. As such, natural environmental systems shall be protected, enhanced and sustained, and the interaction of human systems and ecosystems shall be managed to provide for the well-being of the ecosystem over the long term.
The objectives associated with this principle are:

a) To maintain or enhance the predevelopment surface water quality and quantity, in accordance with municipal and conservation authority standards in order to protect and enhance downstream fisheries and off-site Karst features and functions.

b) To employ naturalized forms of storm water management, which minimize stormwater run-off, and reduce the need for and size of storm water management ponds.

c) To respect and maintain the existing drainage boundaries within the Rymal Road Planning Area.

d) To maintain the quantity and improve the quality of water flowing north into Stewart and Phoenix Creeks so as to maintain and not impact the Karst features and functions associated with those creeks.

e) To ensure through appropriate studies and mitigation measures that public safety is not compromised by building and infrastructure construction within the vicinity of Karst features within the Rymal Road Planning Area.

B.3.1.6 All municipal services, including transportation infrastructure, required to service the Rymal Road Secondary Plan area or specific phases of development of the Secondary Plan Area are to have received all necessary approvals including financial commitment, and all sanitary, water and stormwater management facilities are to be in place and operative prior to or coincident with the development of the land or development of specific phases of the land.

The objectives associated with this principle are:

a) To provide full municipal services, including sanitary sewers, a piped water supply and appropriate storm water management facilities.

b) To phase development according to the capacity of municipal services and transportation infrastructure relied upon by the Rymal Road Secondary Plan area.

B.3.1.7 Costs for the applicable portion of growth related infrastructure and service improvements required to service development within the Secondary Plan area including roads, sanitary, storm and water services shall be paid for by development. To implement this principle and to ensure that such infrastructure is available in a timely manner:

a) Council will update the Municipal Development Charges By-law to include all improvements required by the development. Until such time as Council updates the
Municipal Development Charges By-law, it may consider area specific development charges;

b) In addition to development charges referred to in B.3.1.7 a, Council may also employ:
   i) front-ending agreements, development charge credit agreements and prepayment of development charge agreements under the Development Charges Act;
   ii) public/private partnerships;
   iii) conditions of subdivision approval;
   iv) creation of one foot reserves;
   v) cost sharing agreements or best effort agreements to recover costs from benefiting landowners;
   vi) any of the above singly or in combination with any others; or
   vii) any other mechanism Council considers appropriate in the circumstances.

B.3.1.8 The Secondary Plan area is to be developed within the context of a set of urban design principles and objectives. The following urban design principles set out general criteria for the development of both the public realm and private lands to create an attractive, safe and pedestrian friendly environment.

a) To support the other Development Principles and Objectives for a community designed on the basis of compact urban form.

b) Develop an interconnected system of public and private streets including the development of an east-west central spine through the community and integration with the existing surrounding land use and development pattern.

c) Design the internal network of streets within the community to facilitate pedestrian movement and linkage to the broader pedestrian system. Where appropriate, internal collector streets will incorporate design measures to accommodate public transit service while discouraging the infiltration of regional traffic into the community.

d) Promote attractive streetscapes, social interaction, transit usage and safety through the relationship of buildings to the streets.

e) Develop a pedestrian-friendly and pedestrian-oriented community through the layout of streets, configuration of lots and the siting and configuration of buildings that will address the following streetscape design principles and objectives:

   i) Provide ease of pedestrian access and enjoyment of public streets and other outdoor spaces through a consistent level of streetscape design, incorporating such elements as appropriate planting, lighting and signage.
ii) Encourage pedestrian connectivity throughout the community, building on the central spine as the main east-west connecting element of the community through the appropriate placement of public walkways and bike paths.

iii) Provide community focal points through the location of gathering places along the central spine including schools and parks.

iv) Reinforce the importance of public and institutional buildings in the community and enhance their role through design, location and orientation.

v) Promote the safety and security for all persons in public places including streets, parks and amenity areas through the design and siting of building, entrances, walkways, amenity and parking areas to provide visibility and opportunities for informal surveillance.

vi) Design service and parking facilities to minimize disruption to the safety of pedestrian movement and the attractiveness of development adjacent to the public realm.

vii) Reinforce the relationship of buildings to the street by avoiding where possible reverse lotting adjacent to public streets.

viii) Promote the relationship of buildings to streets through the arrangement of buildings on lots, setbacks to the street, the placement of parking and garages, and the use of specific architectural treatment where the side façade of a building abuts a street, with a view to creating a street presence.

f) Design commercial developments in terms of scale, bulk, design and siting to be compatible with the adjacent residential areas and to minimize impacts on adjacent uses.

B.3.2 LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

B.3.2.1 General

a. The Rymal Road Secondary Plan Area is planned to accommodate an ultimate population of approximately 9,700 persons.

b. The approximate area of land within each land use designation is shown in Appendix 1: Land Use Analysis. This Table also provides the estimated number of dwelling units within each residential land use designation and the estimated population.
B.3.2.2 Residential Designations

Residential development in the Rymal Road Planning Area will have a compact urban form. Lands designated ‘Residential’ shall be developed in accordance with Schedule I - Rymal Road Secondary Plan Land Use Plan and the following policies:

B.3.2.2.1 General Policies for all Residential Designations

a. Housing opportunities shall be responsive to a variety of housing needs in order to make housing accessible to a range of persons. Council is committed to encouraging a variety of housing opportunities suitable to a wide range of housing needs through a variety of tenure options, housing prices and housing forms including innovative housing ideas.

b. Adult lifestyle development is permitted within each residential designation provided it is contained in a housing form permitted by the respective designation and provided that:

i) The predominant use of these lands shall be for residential dwellings. Other accessory uses may be permitted including recreational uses, local commercial uses, storage facilities, and administration and sales office(s), which are designed to exclusively serve the needs of the residents of the adult lifestyle community and are compatible with the residential development.

ii) The provision of open space areas within the adult lifestyle developments through the clustering of the residential units shall be encouraged, as well as other innovative site planning designs which satisfy the policies of this Plan and the regulations of the implementing Zoning By-law.

iii) These areas shall be zoned on a site-specific basis in the implementing Zoning By-law. The site specific zoning shall identify specific permitted uses and establish regulations which may include such matters as minimum setback distances; maximum building heights; separation distances between separate and/or blocks of dwelling units; minimum landscaping and buffering requirements; on-site recreational and commercial uses; minimum parking and open space requirements; and other matters deemed necessary by Council.

iv) All development within these areas is subject to Site Plan Control pursuant to Section 41 of the Planning Act and Section G.8 of the Official Plan.

v) Such adult lifestyle development shall be limited to the lands west of Fletcher Road.

c. Notwithstanding Section B.2.1.2 of the Glanbrook Official Plan, commercial development will not be permitted in the Residential Designations of the Rymal Road Secondary Plan except for local commercial uses in conjunction with adult lifestyle developments.
d. Council shall encourage the provision of housing for persons with special housing needs. As such, group homes, residential care facilities, and nursing homes shall be permitted in all residential designations and subject to specific provisions of the Zoning By-law. The size and scale of such facilities shall be similar to and oriented to the built form permitted in each designation. In the low density residential designation, these facilities shall be permitted in converted dwellings or in a similar built form on lots up to 0.4 ha.

e. Small scale Institutional uses, such as private schools, churches, day nurseries and other related community and institutional uses, shall be permitted in all residential designations on lots up to 0.4 ha. without an amendment to this Plan, subject to appropriate zoning by-law amendments and Site Plan control approvals.

f. The mitigation of the protrusion of garages shall be encouraged to foster streets as interactive outdoor space for pedestrians. The implementing Zoning By-law shall contain provisions restricting the extent of garage protrusions.

g. Direct access to individual dwelling units along Arterial Roads shall not be permitted except for infill development or other similar situations where the City has determined that no other alternative access options are available.

h. Direct access to individual street townhouse units along Collector Roads shall be discouraged and the use of common access or rear lane arrangements will be encouraged.

i. Reverse frontage lotting patterns shall be discouraged and may only be permitted in short reaches or where the owner satisfies the City that no other alternative development form or street patterns are feasible. The use of long reaches of acoustical walls adjacent to Arterial Roads shall also be discouraged.

j. Ninety per cent of all residential units shall be within approximately a 400 metre walking distance from a public transit stop.

**B.3.2.2 Low Density Residential**

a. Low Density Residential uses shall consist primarily of single detached dwellings, semi-detached and duplex dwellings. Street related townhouse dwellings and other low rise multi-residential units may also be permitted.

b. The net residential density of Low Density Residential development shall be from 14 to 35 units per net residential hectare (approximately 5.7 to 14 units per net acre). The net residential density may be averaged over each plan of subdivision within the designation.
c. Street related townhouses and other low rise multi-residential housing forms shall be encouraged to locate adjacent to or in the nearby vicinity of the collector roads within the Secondary Plan Area.

d. Notwithstanding B.3.2.2.2 b., street related townhouses will be permitted up to a maximum density of 45 units per net residential hectare (18 units per net acre), provided the units are integrated with other housing forms on the street and do not exceed 15 units in any one cluster.

e. The implementing zoning by-law shall create the flexibility to encourage a mix of housing forms in the low density residential designation.

f. A variety of housing elevations shall be encouraged within each residential block to provide an interesting streetscape. In this regard, the zoning by-law may contain standards controlling the repetition of front building elevations.

B.3.2.2.3 Low-Medium Density Residential

a. Low-Medium Density Residential areas shall permit low rise (up to 3 storeys) single detached dwellings, multiple attached dwelling unit types including street and block townhouse dwellings, and/or other forms of multiple dwellings such as semi-detached, duplexes, triplexes, stacked townhouses and low rise apartment buildings. Mixing of unit types shall be encouraged, and the implementing zoning by-law may contain provisions to allow for a mixing of units.

b. Retirement homes and long term care facilities are also permitted provided they are contained within a building form permitted in B.3.2.2.3 a. above.

c. The density range for Low-Medium Density Residential areas shall be from 24 to 50 units per net residential hectare (approximately 9.7 to 20 units per net acre). The net residential density may be averaged over each plan of subdivision within the designation.

d. Multiple-residential housing forms shall be encouraged to locate adjacent to or in the nearby vicinity of the arterial and collector roads within and adjacent to the Secondary Plan Area.

e. A variety of housing elevations shall be encouraged within each residential block to provide an interesting streetscape. Where town housing is proposed, a mix of long and short townhouse blocks on public and private streets is encouraged to provide variety to the streetscape. The massing of long townhouse blocks can be broken down so that a single monotonous elevation is not created. The zoning by-law may contain standards controlling this circumstance.
B.3.2.4 Medium Density Residential

a. Medium Density Residential uses shall be comprised predominantly of a variety of low rise (up to 4 storeys) multiple attached dwelling unit types including street and block townhouse dwellings, and other forms of multiple dwellings such as semi-detached, duplexes, triplexes, stacked townhouses and low rise apartment buildings.

b. Retirement homes and long term care facilities are also permitted provided they are contained within a building form permitted in B.3.2.4 a. above.

c. The density range for Medium Density Residential areas shall be from 35 to 70 units per net residential hectare (approximately 14 to 28 units per net acre). The net residential density may be averaged over each plan of subdivision within the designation.

d. In locating new Medium Density Residential areas, consideration shall be given to the following criteria:

i. location adjacent to arterial roads and other public transit routes;

ii. where Medium Density Residential uses are proposed to be located adjacent to Low Density Residential, consideration shall be given to the appropriate integration of built form to enhance compatibility.

e. Where town housing is proposed, a mix of long and short townhouse blocks on public and private streets is encouraged to provide variety to the streetscape. The massing of long townhouse blocks can be broken down so that a single monotonous elevation is not created. The zoning by-law may contain standards controlling this circumstance.

B.3.2.5 Medium-High Density Residential

a. Medium-High Density Residential areas may permit apartments, townhouses, stacked townhouse dwellings and other forms of multiple attached dwellings as a single form or mixed form development in a mid-rise housing form (up to 9 storeys).

b. Retirement homes and long term care facilities are also permitted provided they are contained within a building form permitted in B.3.2.5 a. above.

c. The minimum density for Medium-High Density Residential areas shall be 60 units per net residential hectare (approximately 24 units per net acre). The maximum density shall be set out in the implementing Zoning By-law.

d. Medium-High Density Residential areas shall be generally located on the periphery of the Residential Area or in areas abutting commercial development, Arterial or Collector Roads.
e. Where Medium-High Density Residential areas are proposed to be located adjacent to Low and Medium Density Residential uses, consideration shall be given to the appropriate integration of built form to enhance compatibility. This may be accomplished through architectural massing, lot setbacks, height, setbacks of upper floors, scale, density, buffering and landscaping.

B.3.2.3 Institutional Designation

a. The lands designated ‘Institutional’ on Schedule I - Rymal Road Secondary Plan Land Use Plan shall permit schools, day care centres, churches, nursing homes, residential care facilities, community facilities, government services and other similar institutional uses.

b. Certain Institutional sites shown on Schedule I are labelled as public and separate elementary (PES and SES) and secondary school (SS) sites. These represent the general location and size of elementary and secondary school sites, as requested by the Hamilton-Wentworth Roman Catholic Separate School Board and the Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board. These labels can change without an amendment to this Plan.

c. All schools shall be located adjacent to designated Parkland areas to provide opportunities to share facilities.

d. Council encourages the development of schools in a joint campus setting as well as the development of multiple use buildings for joint school use and joint school - community facility use.

e. The specific size of each designated school site shall be determined prior to approval of the draft plan of subdivision in which each school site is located. The need for a particular school site shall also be confirmed prior to draft plan approval, and the timing for which the site is reserved will also be established at that time.

f. Should any or all of the designated school sites not be required, such lands may be used for the following purposes without the requirement for an Official Plan Amendment:
   i) Uses permitted in the Low Density Residential designation;
   ii) Uses permitted in the Low-Medium Density Residential designation; and/or
   iii) Other Institutional uses.

g. Institutional buildings should be designed as neighbourhood focal points, which create a distinctive community identity and sense of place and serve as landmarks for orientation and local identity.

h. At the time of subdivision approval, school sites may be zoned for both institutional purposes and low density and /or low-medium density residential purposes.
B.3.2.4 Parkland Designation

a. Land designated ‘Parkland’ shall constitute neighbourhood level parks and be used for active and passive parkland purposes to provide a variety of recreational opportunities for the residents of the Rymal Road Planning Area. Permitted uses shall include active recreational uses such as sports fields and playgrounds as well as passive recreational open space areas and trails. The specific facilities provided in each park shall be determined by the Community Services Department.

b. Neighbourhood parks shall be located no more than 800 metres apart and all residential uses within the Secondary Plan Area shall generally be located within a 400 metre distance (5 minute walk) of a park.

c. Parkland is encouraged to be located adjacent to and in conjunction with schools sites and where possible with stormwater management ponds, however, neither of these latter sites shall be considered to satisfy any parkland dedication requirements.

d. Neighbourhood parks are intended to be square or rectangular in shape, have a significant street frontage and be a minimum of 1.9 hectares in size. However, to provide flexibility in design at Draft Plan of Subdivision, the specific location, size and shape of the neighbourhood parks may vary subject to the approval of the City. Any major size or shape change or relocation of a Neighbourhood Park will require an amendment to this Plan.

e. A pedestrian and bicycle trail network shall be established to link parks with adjacent residential areas. The pedestrian and bicycle trail network shall also link with Collector Roads extending north of Rymal Road so as to provide the opportunity to link with the proposed trail network in the Heritage Green Community. It is intended that the network will use public streets, sidewalks and public open space lands. The network shall be identified through the Streetscape Manual in B.3.5.2. and more specifically delineated during the processing of subsequent plans of subdivision.

f. In co-operation with the respective utility companies, the City shall establish a pedestrian and bicycle trail network along the Hydro corridor that forms the southern boundary of the Rymal Road Secondary Plan Area.

B.3.2.5 Commercial Designations

The Rymal Road Secondary Plan provides for four Commercial designations including General Commercial areas to serve the more occasional shopping needs of surrounding residential areas; Neighbourhood Commercial areas to serve the weekly and daily needs of residential neighbourhoods; Local Commercial areas to serve the convenience needs of the nearby residents and the pass-by travelling public; and Service Commercial (Recreational) areas which provide private and public recreational uses, banquet facilities, restaurants, service commercial uses and offices.
B.3.2.5.1 General Commercial

a. Lands designated General Commercial are intended for commercial development which has land extensive requirements such as a larger free standing buildings with a single user, group of buildings or multiple tenant shopping centres. This designated area is intended to primarily serve the more occasional commercial needs of the surrounding residential areas and shall be 11.7 ha (29 acres).

b. Permitted uses include a full range of retail, and service commercial, personal and business services, offices and medical centres, entertainment facilities, and restaurants excluding supermarkets. The particular range and size of uses shall be determined through a market impact study. Medium-high density residential uses may also be permitted in a co-ordinated development format.

c. Prior to approval of any implementing zoning by-law amendment for a General Commercial site, a market impact study (including consumer surveys) shall be undertaken to demonstrate that the proposed use will not adversely impact the planned function of any existing or designated commercial areas. The market impact study shall identify appropriate uses, timing and minimum floor sizes for individual stores in order to avoid adverse impact on the planned function of any existing or designated commercial areas. The City shall retain an outside peer review consultant at the proponent’s expense to peer review the proponent’s market impact study.

d. General Commercial areas shall be developed in a co-ordinated and comprehensive manner. Access points shall be limited and regard shall be given to the sharing of access points, adequate internal traffic circulation, and adequate off-street parking, loading and manoeuvring facilities.

e. Open storage of goods and materials shall not be permitted except in special cases (e.g., garden centre, hardware store), subject to Council’s approval and implementing Zoning By-law regulations.

f. Loading and unloading areas shall be located so as to minimize adverse effects to adjacent residential areas and shall be screened from view.

g. Landscaping shall form an integral part of all developments and screening and/or buffering shall be provided between commercial and other sensitive adjacent land uses.

h. All high intensity outdoor lighting shall be oriented away from residential areas and streets.
B.3.2.5.2 Neighbourhood Commercial

a. Lands designated Neighbourhood Commercial are intended to provide the daily and weekly shopping amenities for the surrounding residential areas. These areas shall generally not exceed 4.6 ha (11.4 ac).

b. Permitted uses shall include a range of retail stores including a supermarket (but excluding a department store) as well as service commercial uses, restaurants, and community and institutional uses. Medium-high density residential uses may also be permitted in a co-ordinated development format.

c. A Neighbourhood Commercial designation shall have a maximum gross leaseable floor area of 11,000 square metres. Prior to approval of any implementing zoning by-law amendment for a neighbourhood commercial site, a market impact study shall be undertaken to demonstrate that the proposed use will not adversely impact the planned function of any existing or designated commercial areas.

d. Sections B.3.2.5.1 (d) to (h) inclusive also apply to the development of Neighbourhood Commercial areas.

B.3.2.5.3 Local Commercial

a. Lands designated Local Commercial are intended to provide the convenience shopping amenities for the surrounding residents as well as to the pass-by travelling public.

b. Permitted uses shall include a limited range of convenience retail, personal services professional offices and restaurant uses.

c. The maximum gross leaseable floor area of any individual commercial establishment shall be 500 sq. m. and the maximum gross leaseable floor area of any group of Local Commercial uses shall be 1,500 sq. m.

d. Sections B.3.2.5.1 (d) to (h) inclusive also apply to the development of Local Commercial areas.

e. Notwithstanding Section B.2.2.5.2 b & c, the Local Commercial area at the south west corner of Rymal Road and Second Road, which was previously approved through Official Plan Amendments 9, 22 and 32, shall have a maximum site area of 1.6 hectares with no maximum floor area and be permitted to contain the following additional uses:

i. Farm equipment sales, rental and service,

ii. Farm supply establishments,

iii. Garden centres;

iv. Farm produce markets,

v. Antique and gift shops,

vi. Restaurant with a maximum seating capacity of 30 persons,
vi. Refreshment stand,

vii. Wholly enclosed veterinary service establishment,

viii. Pet store,

ix. Pet food store,

x. Seasonal theme establishment, and

xi. Buildings, structures and uses accessory to the above-noted permitted uses.

B.3.2.5.4 Service (Recreational) Commercial

a. Lands designated Service (Recreational) Commercial are intended to provide more specialized and limited commercial uses such as office, banquet facilities, restaurants and recreational uses. Retail stores, except for ancillary convenience retail, shall not be permitted.

b. Sections B.3.2.5.1 (d) to (h) inclusive also apply to the development of Service (Recreational) Commercial areas.

B.3.2.6 Stormwater Management Area Designation

a. Lands designated as Stormwater Management areas on Schedule I shall be used primarily for stormwater drainage purposes such as stormwater drainage channels and ponds to control stormwater quantity and improve stormwater quality, as well as compatible trail or passive recreational purposes in accordance with the following policies. Stormwater management is an important component of urban development. These facilities improve the quality of urban stormwater that flows off city streets and driveways into the storm sewer systems, and controls the quantity of the stormwater flows to pre-development levels.

b. The design of the Stormwater management facilities shall comply with the requirements of the municipality pursuant to the approved Master Servicing and Drainage Plan for the Rymal Road Planning Area, the adopted standards of the City of Hamilton, the policies of this Plan and the requirements of the applicable Conservation Authorities, the Ministry of Environment, and the Ministry of Natural Resources.

c. Stormwater management facilities should be designed in consultation with a qualified landscape architect, and where possible, incorporate a naturalized design to achieve a park-like setting, with appropriate trees, shrubs, meadow grasses and wildflowers, as well as incorporate trail or passive recreational uses.

d. Lands required for stormwater management facilities shown on Schedule I shall be dedicated to the municipality.

e. The City may consider the establishment of interim stormwater management facilities on a temporary basis within the Rymal Road Planning Area, notwithstanding the underlying land use designation for the lands, provided the
interim facilities do not preclude or prejudice future development on the basis of the land use designations shown on Schedule I.

f. Changes to the areas designated Stormwater Management areas may be made without an amendment to this Plan, based on more detailed information and analysis, subject to an amendment to the Master Servicing and Drainage Plan and the approval of the City and pertinent agencies.

g. Where possible, stormwater management facilities should be combined with other open space uses such as Parkland areas.

B.3.3 ENVIRONMENT

The pre-development landscape within the Rymal Road Planning Area consists largely of cultivated farmland bisected by intermittent streams. The area is located at the headwaters for a number of streams and is divided into two watersheds, the Red Hill Creek and Twenty Creek. The central portion of the study area drains north into the Stewart and Phoenix Creeks. Within the Heritage Green community, these creeks have created a Karst landscape consisting of sinkholes and caves. The area associated with these Karst features including the upstream watershed has been proposed as an Area of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI). Despite this proposal, development within the respective watersheds within the Rymal Road Secondary Plan can occur provided that the quality and quantity of surface water draining from the Secondary Plan area in a post-development condition does not impact the downstream karst process or features. The western portion of the study area drains to the Hannon Creek. The intermittent streams associated with the headwaters of the Hannon Creek have created Karst features in this portion of the Rymal Road Planning Area. These Karst landscapes represent the most significant natural features on and adjacent to the Rymal Road Planning Area. The eastern portion of the Planning Area drains east to Sinkhole Creek a tributary of Twenty Creek.

a. The water quality draining north into the Stewart and Phoenix Creeks shall be improved principally with respect to sediment load through naturalized stormwater management techniques both during and following construction.

b. The water quantity draining north into the Stewart and Phoenix Creeks shall maintain the pre-development regime in accordance with applicable municipal stormwater management policies of the City of Hamilton, and flows should go to both Stewart and Phoenix Creek at approximately the same proportion as currently exists.

c. Stormwater management ponds shall be clay-lined to prevent loss of surface flow to Stewart and Phoenix Creeks.

d. The Karst features located within the Rymal Road Planning Area and associated with Hannon Creek shall be closed out. Storm water management systems shall be designed, by the applicant, prior to approval of draft plans of subdivision, to re-
route surface water that drains into these Karst features so that it drains into the Hannon Creek watershed west of Trinity Church Road.

e. The water quantity draining west into Hannon Creek shall maintain the pre-development levels in accordance with applicable municipal stormwater management policies of the City of Hamilton.

f. Geotechnical studies shall be completed, by the applicant prior to approval of draft plans of subdivision, to identify the location of Karst features which could affect the construction of buildings, roads, services and utilities and recommend appropriate construction techniques and other mitigative measures to protect public health and safety.

g. A sedimentation and erosion control plan shall be submitted at detailed engineering prior to registration of plans of subdivision which addresses how sedimentation will be controlled during construction stages.

B.3.4 INFRASTRUCTURE

It is the intent of Council to ensure that the Rymal Road Planning Area develops on the basis of full municipal services, including sanitary sewers and a piped municipal water supply, in accordance with the following policies:

a. The City and pertinent private sector interests shall work in a co-operative and proactive manner in order to provide the appropriate sanitary sewage services and municipal water supply to the Rymal Road Planning Area in a manner that is both environmentally and fiscally sound.

b. The provision of municipal sanitary sewers and watermains shall comply with the requirements of the City pursuant to the approved Master Servicing and Drainage Plan for the Rymal Road Planning Area.

c. It is intended that a portion of the Planning Area will be serviced by a required sanitary sewer pumping station and a water booster station both located in and/or adjacent to the south-easterly portion of the Planning Area. The exact locations of the sanitary sewer pumping station and/or water booster station shall be determined at the final design stage. In this regard, any portion of the Planning Area may be used for the sanitary sewer pumping station and/or water booster station.

d. Existing residential dwellings are encouraged to connect to municipal piped water and sanitary sewers as services are extended.

e) Any existing wells which are abandoned must be plugged in accordance with Ontario Regulation 903/90 (wells) as further amended. Any existing septic/holding tanks, which are abandoned, must be pumped out by a MOE licensed sewage hauler and the tank collapsed or filled in with clean soil material.
B.3.5 TRANSPORTATION

It is the intent of Council to provide a safe and efficient transportation system, which includes bike paths, on and off-street walking trails, transit linkages and a road network for the Rymal Road Planning Area, in accordance with Schedule I - Rymal Road Secondary Plan Land Use Plan and the following policies:

B.3.5.1 General Policies

Schedule I identifies an internal public road system and road hierarchy for the Planning Area. The road hierarchy consists of Arterial, Collector and Local Roads, although Local Roads are not shown on Schedule I.

a. All new roads within the Planning Area shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the Standard Drawings for Urban Roads contained within the adopted standards of the City of Hamilton. The City may consider alternative Development Standards where, in the opinion of the City, they are appropriate and do not compromise public safety or the efficiency of the transportation network or the ability to locate the required services.

b. As a condition of development or redevelopment approval, all lands required for new internal public roads, road widenings for existing public roads, traffic calming measures and/or day-lighting triangles shall be dedicated free of charge and free of all encumbrances to the satisfaction of the City, except where the City’s development charge policy provides otherwise.

c. The applicable portion of growth related costs related to the design and construction of all new public roads and the appropriate upgrading of the adjacent existing public roads required as result of development of Rymal Road Planning Area shall be paid for by development, and shall be subject to the financing provisions of Section B.3.1.7 of this Plan and the cost sharing provisions of Section B.3.7.4.

d. In some areas, and for some development, such as street townhouses along Collector Roads, access to development serviced by rear lanes or front lanes may be appropriate and encouraged in order to contribute to an improved streetscape and urban character, but such rear lanes or front lanes may remain in private ownership.

e. On-street parking may be permitted on Collector and Local Roads as specified in this plan or for additional parking permission at the discretion of the City of Hamilton.

f. The use of cul-de-sac in the road pattern shall be discouraged and may only be permitted where the owner satisfies the City that no other alternative development form or street patterns are feasible.
B.3.5.2 Streetscape

Streetscape is a key element of a successful public realm. The road is the principal interface between built form and the public realm and as such plays a dominant role in determining the character of any given neighbourhood. The elements that shape the streetscape include adjacent architectural design, the relationship of buildings to the street, yards and boulevards, roads, sidewalks, planting of trees, fences and utilities. Streetscape policies are intended to guide the planning and design of public roadways including the spaces extending across the road.

a. A comprehensive Streetscape Manual shall be prepared, by the landowners to the satisfaction of the City, for the overall Rymal Road Planning Area. The Streetscape Manual shall reflect the streetscape principles and objectives in Section B.3.1 of this Plan. The Streetscape Manual shall address the following:

i. the function, design and treatment of road types (i.e. sidewalks and crosswalks, landscaping/boulevard plantings, intersection treatments, on-street parking, signage, street lighting and utility wires, etc.);

ii. a continuous bicycle trail system and appropriate means to accommodate the system on arterial and collector roads;

iii. a continuous pedestrian trail system, including public sidewalks;

iv. requirements for the mobility impaired, such as safety features, treatments at bus stops, standards for the placement of street furniture, sidewalk maintenance and design, including curb cuts so as to provide a continuous barrier free path to transit services;

v. requirements for boulevard tree planting including spacing and canopy density;

vi. the design of special entry points or gateway features where collector roads intersect with perimeter arterial roads; and

vi. the design of traffic calming features along the collector roads.

b. The design of all streetscape elements must be consistent with the Streetscape Manual so that the roads are cohesive and attractive places for pedestrians and persons travelling through them. Where the City agrees to initiate alternative development standards at draft plan of subdivision approval, the Streetscape Manual shall be updated to reflect this standard.

c. Major intersections should be pedestrian oriented providing connection to public walkways. Boulevard tree planting should be closely spaced.
d. Minor intersections should continue to feature landscape treatment through road street tree selection with an increased density of boulevard tree planting.

e. The streetscape appearance of Arterial and Collector Roads shall be enhanced by encouraging buildings to present their main building facades to these roads and to enhance their treatment to avoid the appearance of blank building walls and service entrances.

B.3.5.3 Arterial Roads

a. Rymal Road and Regional Road 56 have a designated right-of-way width of approximately 36 metres.

b. Trinity Church Road, south of Rymal Road, has a designated right-of-way width of 36 metres. Trinity Church Road shall be realigned at Rymal Road to align with the Trinity Church Road extension north of Rymal Road. To accommodate this realignment or to provide for additional turning lanes, merging lanes or other measures required to align with the Trinity Church Road extension north of Rymal Road, additional road widening may be required at the intersection with Rymal Road. Notwithstanding Section 3.5.1 (b), if additional lands beyond the designated 36 metre right-of-way width are required, they will be paid for by the City.

c. Notwithstanding Policy E.2.1.3 b (ii) of the Glenbrook Official Plan, reverse lot frontage development shall not be permitted along arterial roads except as provided for in Section B.3.2.2.1 k of this Plan.

d. Notwithstanding Policy E.2.2.5 (a) of the Glenbrook Official Plan, the required road widening will be taken equally from both sides of Trinity Church Road where it bounds the Rymal Road Secondary Plan Area.

B.3.5.4 Collector Roads

a. The right-of-way width of the Collector Roads shall be 26 metres, but may be up to 30 metres to accommodate traffic calming mechanisms or streetscape features identified in the Streetscape Manual.

b. The City shall require a sufficient right-of-way be dedicated to ensure the possible long term future extension of Second Road West south through the hydro corridor, the alignment of which shall be co-ordinated with Hydro-One Networks or its successor company. In the interim, this public right-of-way shall be used as a pedestrian and bicycle access.

c. Bicycle facilities shall be included within Collector Road right-of-ways.

d. The central east-west collector road shall contain a maximum of 2 through lanes, provide for on-street parking on at least one side, and incorporate traffic calming features.
e. Appropriate traffic calming features shall be incorporated into the collector roadway system at locations determined by the City of Hamilton and constructed to the satisfaction of the City at the sole expense of the landowner.

B.3.5.5 Local Roads

A Local Road is an internal local street that is inter-linked to the neighbourhood network.

a. As set out in Section 3.4.1 b, alternative development standards and road widths may be considered. The details regarding appropriate rights-of-way widths shall be addressed prior to draft plan of subdivision approval.

b. On-street parking shall be permitted on one (1) side of the road.

c. The alignment of a possible extension of Swayze Road shall be determined prior to the approval of any draft plan of subdivision for the adjacent lands.

B.3.5.6 Sidewalks and Bicycle Paths

Sidewalks are places for pedestrian movement, children’s play and neighbours’ socializing. Sidewalks encourage walking as urban transportation, walking to transit and walking for pleasure. Sidewalks improve the liveability of a community, enhance safety and are vital to seniors and the disabled.

a. The Streetscape Manual, as required in Section B.3.5.2 a, shall identify the location of sidewalks, their widths and design elements within the Rymal Road Planning Area.

b. Sidewalks should be provided on both sides of arterial and collector roads and one side of local roads or as set out in a new City of Hamilton sidewalk policy.

c. The width of public pedestrian walkways to parks and the hydro corridor shall be of sufficient width to accommodate utilities, provide adequate visibility from the street and promote public safety, and shall be determined prior to draft plan approval.

d. A continuous bicycle trail system shall be identified as part of the Streetscape Manual in Section B.3.5.2. The bicycle trail system shall include both on-street and off-street routes linking the parks and community facilities. Off-street routes will use public open space lands including school sites and a potential route along the hydro corridor.
B.3.5.7 Public Transportation

Good transit service is an asset to all communities. The ability to support public transit is largely dependent upon the density and arrangement of land uses as well as the design of the streetscape and the relationship of adjacent buildings to the street.

a. Council shall ensure the design of the Rymal Road Planning Area including the location of higher density land uses and the streetscape design will provide for the ability to accommodate future public transportation at an early stage in the development of the community and the long term potential for higher order transit such as express bus service along the arterial roads.

b. Neighbourhood design should minimize pedestrian walking distance to transit service. Within the Rymal Road Planning Area, 90% of all residential dwellings shall be within approximately 400 metres of a potential transit stop.

c. The transit system must be integrated into the community design and be a key component of community focal points including commercial areas.

B.3.6 UTILITIES

a. A hydro corridor abuts the southern boundary of the Rymal Road Planning Area. The City shall work in consultation with Hydro One or its successor company in order to establish pedestrian/ bicycle path/trail linkages along this corridor and a continuous east-west pedestrian linkage for the Planning Area.

b. Improvements within this corridor shall be subject to the approval of Hydro One or its successor company.

c. Grading and drainage of lands within and/or adjacent to this corridor shall be designed to ensure there are no adverse impacts on these lands and shall have regard for comments from the appropriate agencies.

d. Wiring for electrical power distribution, telephones, cable television and any similar systems shall be located underground except along existing arterial roads.

B.3.7 IMPLEMENTATION

B.3.7.1 Urban Design Guidelines

Comprehensive urban design guidelines shall be prepared for the entire Rymal Road Planning. The principles and objectives in Section B.3.1 along with other policies of this Plan provide an overall guiding framework for the preparation of urban design guidelines. The Urban Design guidelines shall be consistent with this framework and shall be prepared by the landowners to the satisfaction of the City. These guidelines may be prepared either on a single comprehensive basis for the entire Secondary Plan Area or on a sub-area basis prior to the approval of any development applications for
Draft Plan Approval or amendments to the Zoning By-law to implement this Plan within the respective area or sub-area. Sub-areas are those blocks of lands separated by the north-south collector roads.

B.3.7.2 Phasing of Development

Development within Rymal Road Planning Area shall be phased according to the capacity of the infrastructure serving the Rymal Road Planning Area and relied on by the future residents of the area. Development may also be phased to avoid potential land use conflicts.

B.3.7.2.1 Transportation Phasing

a. The full development of the Rymal Road Secondary Plan Area will rely on the transportation capacity provided by the following road improvements:
   i) construction of the Red Hill Creek Expressway with four lanes plus an additional upbound truck lane,
   ii) widening of Rymal Road to four lanes plus turn lanes,
   iii) the extension of Trinity Church Road to the Lincoln Alexander Parkway, and
   iv) the construction of a new signalized collector road intersection with Regional Road 56 and the widening of Regional Road 56 to four lanes from Rymal Road to the new collector road intersection.

b. Until such time as the following matters have been addressed for each of these road improvements, full development of the Rymal Road Secondary Plan shall not be permitted:
   i) Environmental Assessment studies have been completed and approved,
   ii) The method of financing to undertake the required road improvements have been identified including provisions for changes to the applicable Development Charges By-law; and
   iii) The required road improvements have been included in the Capital Budget and/or Forecast where applicable, or financed through other mechanisms such as those identified in Section B.3.1.7.

c. Prior to the completion of any of the matters outlined in B.3.7.2.1 (b), the construction of 500 dwelling units, 19,000 square metres of General Commercial space and the other commercially designated sites shall be permitted within the Rymal Road Secondary Plan subject to localized studies as necessary to address access and egress from Rymal Road.

d. The construction of additional dwellings units beyond that permitted in B.3.7.2.1 (c) shall require either:
   i) the matters outlined in B.3.7.2.1 (b) have been addressed for one or more of the required road improvements in B.3.7.2.1 (a), or
ii) the submission and approval of a traffic impact study to address the need for and timing of any other required road improvements to improve transportation capacity south of and/or crossing the escarpment to accommodate such additional dwelling units, and compliance with the matters set out in B.3.7.2.1 (b) in respect of such improvements.

e. The construction of additional General Commercial space beyond that permitted in B.3.7.2.1(c) shall require either:

i) the matters outlined in B.3.7.2.1 (b) have been addressed for one or more of the required road improvements in B.3.7.2.1 (a), or

ii) the submission and approval of a traffic impact study to address the need for and timing of any other required road improvements to improve transportation capacity south of the escarpment to accommodate such additional General Commercial space, and compliance with the matters set out in B.3.7.2.1 (b) in respect of such improvements.

f. Once the matters outlined in B.3.7.2.1 (b) have been addressed for any one of the required road improvements in B.3.7.2.1 (a), the City may identify the amount of development permitted in subsequent phases without the necessity of further transportation studies.

B.3.7.3 Minimum Distance Separation Requirements

a. Minimum distance separation requirements shall be addressed prior to draft plan of subdivision approval.

B.3.7.4 Archaeological and Heritage Assessments

a. An archaeological assessment shall be undertaken by the landowners, prior to approval of draft plans of subdivision or zoning changes where a plan of subdivision is not required, to identify and refine areas of archaeological sensitivity and recommend appropriate mitigation measures (including further stages of work as required), land uses or design strategies.

b. A detailed built heritage and cultural heritage landscape assessment shall be undertaken by the landowners, prior to approval of draft plans of subdivision, to identify heritage buildings, structures and features of architectural, historical or cultural landscape interest and recommend appropriate measures, land-uses or design strategies that conserve, protect and maintain identified cultural heritage resources. It is acknowledged that the agricultural landscape will be altered by urban development. In spite of this, the cultural heritage landscape assessment may contain measures to recognize and interpret this former landscape through urban design elements, park design, street names and display panels or other media in public spaces.
B.3.7.5  Development Cost Sharing

Costs of local infrastructure and/or local service improvements within the Rymal Road Secondary Plan Area, which benefit more than one individual development, but which are not provided for under Section B.3.1.7, shall be equitably apportioned among landowners within the Rymal Road Secondary Plan area. Such costs may include, but are not limited to, the costs of community use lands and facilities, front-ended Secondary Plan component studies, other area-wide studies, schools and parks, and local infrastructure, facilities or works including roads, sanitary, water and stormwater facilities. To implement this policy, Council may employ:

a. Conditions of subdivision approval;
b. Creation of one-foot reserves;
c. Cost sharing agreements or best effort agreements to recover costs from benefiting landowners;
d. Any of the above singly or in combination with any others; or
e. Any other mechanism Council considers appropriate in the circumstances.
APPENDIX 1: LAND USE ANALYSIS

The approximate area of land within each land use designation is shown in the following table. This Table provides the estimated number of dwelling units within each residential land use designation and the estimated population. This table is only provided for general estimation purposes and variation to these figures is permitted, in accordance with the density policies of this Secondary Plan. Changes to this table are permitted without an amendment to this Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE DESIGNATION</th>
<th>APPROXIMATE GROSS AREA</th>
<th>NO. OF UNITS</th>
<th>ESTIMATED POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HECTARES</td>
<td>ACRES</td>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESIDENTIAL:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>124.8</td>
<td>1110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Medium Density</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-High Density</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Residential</strong></td>
<td>121.2</td>
<td>299.4</td>
<td>3590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parkland</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>4.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Commercial</strong></td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Commercial</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Commercial</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service (Recreational)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Commercial</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stormwater Management</strong></td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>4.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collector Roads</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>5.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>188.8</td>
<td>466.5</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) was contracted by iTRANS Consulting Inc., Richmond Hill, on behalf of the City of Hamilton to conduct a Stage 1 archaeological assessment. The project will include an inventory of the following potential improvements:

- widening of Rymal Road from Regional Road 56 to Trinity Church Road,
- extension of Trinity Church Road from Rymal Road to Lincoln Alexander Parkway,
- intersection realignment at Rymal Road and Trinity Church Road,
- widening of Regional Road 56 from Rymal Road to new Collector Road intersection, and
- a new signalized collector road intersection with Regional Road 56.

The proposed work is situated within the City of Stoney Creek, the City of Hamilton, and the Township of Glanbrook, Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth (Figure 1). The proposed improvements cover approximately 13 and may also include Special Area “C”, Schedule A3 Secondary Plan, West Mountain Planning District, Heritage Green Section, City of Stoney Creek Official Plan.

The assessment was conducted under the project direction of Mr. Robert Pihl, ASI, under an archaeological license (P057) issued to Mr. Pihl. All fieldwork was conducted by Ms. Deborah Pihl (R130), pursuant to the Ontario Heritage Act (2005).
The contract was awarded to ASI on February 4, 2005. Because permission to enter new properties had not been arranged, the field review was confined to existing rights-of-way (ROWs). This report presents the results of the Stage 1 background research and field review and makes several recommendations.

2.0 BACKGROUND RESEARCH

2.1 Previous archaeological research

In order that an inventory of archaeological resources could be compiled for the study corridor, three sources of information were consulted: the site record forms for registered sites housed at the Ontario Ministry of Culture; published and unpublished documentary sources; and the files of ASI.

In Ontario, information concerning archaeological sites is stored in the Ontario Archaeological Sites Database (O.A.S.D.) maintained by the Ontario Ministry of Culture. This database contains archaeological sites registered within the Borden system. Under the Borden system, Canada has been divided into grid blocks based on latitude and longitude. A Borden block is approximately 13 kilometres east to west, and approximately 18.5 kilometres north to south. Each Borden block is referenced by a four-letter designator, and sites within a block are numbered sequentially as they are found. The study corridor under review is located in the Borden Blocks AgGw and AhGw.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borden #</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site Affiliation</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Researcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AgGw-8</td>
<td>P. Fletcher</td>
<td>Early &amp; Late Archaic</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>MPA 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgGw-19</td>
<td>J. Swayze</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td>MPA 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-28</td>
<td>Soley I</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>Leslie 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-29</td>
<td>Soley II</td>
<td>Middle Archaic</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>Leslie, 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-30</td>
<td>Soley III</td>
<td>Archaic</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>Leslie 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-32</td>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>Early Archaic</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>Leslie 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AgGw-68</td>
<td>Late Paleoindian</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>Michael 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-69</td>
<td>unnamed</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>MPA 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-70</td>
<td>unnamed</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>MPA 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-71</td>
<td>unnamed</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>MPA 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-73</td>
<td>unnamed</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>MPA 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-74</td>
<td>unnamed</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>MPA 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-75</td>
<td>A. Swayze</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td>MPA 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-76</td>
<td>Victoria Inn</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>Tavern/Residence</td>
<td>Griffin-Short 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-82</td>
<td>Valley Park Stage 3-I</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>ASI 1991a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-83</td>
<td>Valley Park Stage 3-II</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>ASI 1991a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-90</td>
<td>Valley Park Stage 5-I</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>ASI 1991b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-91</td>
<td>Valley Park Stage 5-II</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>ASI 1991b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-92</td>
<td>Valley Park Stage 5-III</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>ASI 1991b,c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-93</td>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td>ASI 1991b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-94</td>
<td>Mount Albion Stage II</td>
<td>Late Archaic</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>ASI 1991d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-96</td>
<td>Pottruf</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td>ASI 1991d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-102</td>
<td>Heritage Green</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td>Griffin-Short 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-103</td>
<td>Heritage Green</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>Griffin-Short 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-104</td>
<td>Heritage Green</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>Griffin-Short 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-105</td>
<td>Heritage Green</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>Griffin-Short 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-106</td>
<td>Olmstead</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td>Griffin-Short 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-107</td>
<td>James Cook</td>
<td>Pre-Contact</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>MHC 1996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the O.A.S.D., numerous archaeological assessments have been conducted within and in the vicinity of the study corridor, and these have produced at least 55 archaeological sites within two kilometres of it. These sites reflect a lengthy occupation of the area from the Paleoindian Period (ca. 9,000-7,000 B.C.) to historic times (Table 1). Most of the pre-contact sites are small campsites or findspots, but the list includes one probable lithic workshop. The Euro-Canadian sites are usually farmsteads (or isolated middens), but one tavern and the community of Mount Albion Crossroads are also listed. While none of the registered sites are situated within or immediately adjacent to the study corridor, twelve are situated within Special Policy Area “C” (Leslie 1977; New Direction Archaeology 2003).

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Code</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Feature Type</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-108</td>
<td>Barbara Guy Long</td>
<td>Late Archaic</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>MHC 1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Davis</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-109</td>
<td>Reverend David Inglis</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>MHC 1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-110</td>
<td>Burning Bush</td>
<td>Early Iroquoian</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>MHC 1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-111</td>
<td>John Gage 1</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>MHC 1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-112</td>
<td>John Gage 2</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>MHC 1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-113</td>
<td>Jane Inglis 1</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>MHC 1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-114</td>
<td>Jane Inglis 2</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>MHC 1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-115</td>
<td>Robert Holbrook 1</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>MHC 1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-116</td>
<td>Robert Holbrook 2</td>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>MHC 1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-121</td>
<td>Mount Albion East</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Lithic workshop</td>
<td>ASI 1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-122</td>
<td>Mount Albion Crossroads</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>ASI 1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-123</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td>ASI 1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-125</td>
<td>Van Dusen 1</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td>ASI 1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-128</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td>ASI 1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-129</td>
<td>Van Dusen 2</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td>ASI 1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-131</td>
<td>Mount Albion West</td>
<td>Paleo-Indian</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>ASI 1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-134</td>
<td>Albion Mills</td>
<td>Late Woodland</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>ASI 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-140</td>
<td>Paramount</td>
<td>Early Archaic</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-152</td>
<td>Find 1</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>NDA 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-153</td>
<td>Find 2</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>NDA 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-154</td>
<td>Find 3</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>NDA 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-155</td>
<td>Find 4</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>Midden</td>
<td>NDA 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-156</td>
<td>Find 5</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>NDA 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-157</td>
<td>Find 7</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>NDA 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-158</td>
<td>Find 8</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>NDA 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-159</td>
<td>Find 9</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>NDA 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AhGw-160</td>
<td>Find 10</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>NDA 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 **Physiography and Assessment of Pre-contact Archaeological Potential**

The study corridor is situated atop the Niagara Escarpment within the Haldimand Clay Plain physiographic region of southern Ontario. At one time, Glacial Lake Warren covered this area and deposited clay over much of the underlying till (Chapman and Putnam 1984: 156-157). The loam and silt soils are generally well drained in the west portion of the corridor, with the exception of the low area north of the intersection of Trinity Church Road and Rymal Road. To the north of the low area the land rises sharply to a high point between Stone Church Road and Highland Road. To the east along Rymal Road, soils are imperfectly drained and there is little topographic relief (Presant et al 1965).
Potable water is the single most important resource necessary for any extended human occupation or settlement. Since water sources have remained relatively stable in south central Ontario after the Pleistocene era, proximity to water can be regarded as a useful index for the evaluation of archaeological site potential. Indeed, distance from water has been one of the most commonly used variables for predictive modeling of site location.

The Ontario Ministry of Culture Primer on Archaeology, Land Use Planning and Development in Ontario (1997: 12-13) stipulates that undisturbed lands within 300 metres of a primary water source, and undisturbed lands within 200 metres of a secondary water source, are considered to exhibit archaeological potential.

The study corridor is intersected by various tributaries of Sinkhole Creek and Red Hill Creek, and these watercourses and springs were probably important foci for pre-contact settlement. Aboriginal people would have been attracted to the rivers and creeks especially during the spring, by the abundance of fish, as well as by other important aquatic resources.

In addition, many of the streams feed through a complex of sinkholes and springs which occur as part of the Eramosa Karst Area of Natural and Scientific Interest (Buck et al 2002). The core of the karst area is intersected by the corridor between Upper Mount Albion Road and Fletcher Road, but the surrounding feeder area also exhibits karst features. For instance, springs are known to occur in the vicinity of Trinity Church Road: one south of the cemetery and another north of Rymal Road (MNR website). These aquatic features offer an additional attraction for prehistoric and historic activity in the area (ASI 2002).

Therefore, depending on the degree of previous land disturbance, it may be concluded that there is potential for the recovery of pre-contact archaeological remains within the study corridor.

2.2 Assessment of Historic Archaeological Potential: Summary Review of Historical Maps

Using the 1875 Illustrated historical atlas of the county of Wentworth, Ontario nineteenth century settlement patterns were reviewed to assess the potential for the presence of historical archaeological sites within the study corridor (Figure 2). The study corridor is located along the former boundaries between the townships of Saltfleet, Binbrook, Glanford and Binbrook. The village of Elfrida is the only historic hamlet in the vicinity.

A number of historic features are illustrated within or adjacent to the study corridor, including houses, orchards, a church and a mill. Table 2 presents a summary of property owners and historic features within or adjacent to the study corridor.

For the Euro-Canadian period, the majority of early nineteenth century farmsteads (ie. those which are arguably the most potentially significant resources and whose locations are rarely recorded on nineteenth century maps) are likely to be captured by the basic proximity to water model outlined above, since these occupations were subject to similar environmental constraints. An added factor, however, is the development of the network of concession roads through the course of the nineteenth century. These transportation routes frequently influenced the siting of farmsteads. Existing Rymal Road follows the original townline right-of-way between the townships of Saltfleet and Binbrook, with the exception of its intersection with Trinity Church Road. Trinity Church Road south of Rymal Road follows the original townline right-of-way between the Townships of Glanford and Binbrook. North of Rymal Road, Regional Road 56 (former County Road 20) follows the original right-of-way, but south of Rymal Road,
Table 2: Property owner(s) and historic Feature(s) Illustrated Within or adjacent to the Study Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Concession</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Illustrated Feature(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saltfleet</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>unnamed</td>
<td>residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Timothy Kennedy</td>
<td>residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>G. McGill</td>
<td>mill, residence, &amp; orchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Kinney</td>
<td>residence, orchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>hamlet of Elfrida residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Cline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Henry Cline</td>
<td>residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>John Cline</td>
<td>residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glanford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binbrook</td>
<td>1, Block 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>church, residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geo. Magill</td>
<td>residence, orchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, Block 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>J.B. Stewart</td>
<td>residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dav Wilson</td>
<td>residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, Block 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Richard Swayze</td>
<td>residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ira Stewart</td>
<td>residence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regional Road 56 does not follow the original ROW. Undisturbed lands within 100 metres of an early settlement road are considered to have potential for the presence of Euro-Canadian archaeological sites.
Therefore, dependent on the degree of previous land disturbance, it may be concluded that there is potential for the recovery of historic cultural material within the study corridor. Furthermore, it should be noted that not every feature of potential interest today would have been illustrated on the nineteenth century mapping.

2.3 Field Review

A field review of the study corridor (Figure 3) was conducted by Ms. Deborah Pihl, ASI, on March 13, 2005. The weather was cold and partly cloudy.

A rural right-of-way profile predominates along most of the roadways, with the exception of a few improved intersections. The extent of ROW disturbance varies from wide shoulders and pronounced ditches along Regional Road 56 to very minimal shoulders and variable ditching along Trinity Church Road. Disturbance generally extends to the top of the ditch. Thus, unless otherwise indicated, existing typical right-of-way is disturbed.

Extension of Trinity Church Road from Rymal Church Road to Lincoln Alexander Parkway

Between the Lincoln Alexander Parkway and Stone Church Road some grading for the interchange at Parkway has been done. Thus, these lands are at least partially disturbed (Plate 1).

Between Stone Church Road and Rymal Road, the land dramatically descends from the high ground north of Highland Road (Plate 2) to low, poorly drained soils south of Highland Road (Plate 3). Agricultural fields cover most of this section of the study corridor, with scattered residential properties along north sides of Highland Road (Plate 2) and Rymal Road (Plate 4).

Intersection Realignment at Rymal Road/Trinity Church Road

The existing rural right-of-way along Trinity Church Road includes narrow shoulders and little to moderate roadside ditch (Plate 5). Along the west side of the road are several residences, Trinity Church, and Trinity Church Cemetery. Grave locations within the cemetery are well-documented by church records, and none are near the chain link fence that marks the eastern property line of the cemetery (pers. comm. April 6, 2005, Tom Thurmon, Supervisor of Cemeteries, City of Hamilton). A waterline has been installed in the narrow right-of-way between these properties and the existing pavement. Thus, construction activities within the existing right-of-way will not impact the cemetery. However, the church is situated quite close to the existing pavement, and potential impact on that structure should be considered.

Agricultural fields, a small wet area associated with a stream course, a residence and a parking area, line the east side of the road (Plate 6). Given that there are two streams in the vicinity, the potential for pre-contact sites is high on the east side of Trinity Church Road.
Figure 3: Study Corridor and Special Area “C” – Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment.

Widening of Rymal Road from Trinity Church Road to Regional Road 56

In general, the south side of Rymal Road is lined by agricultural fields with a few scattered single-family residences and historic homesteads or farms (Plate 7). There are also several scattered areas of new commercial and residential development: residential development is being initiated opposite Upper Mount Albion Road (Plate 8) and on the southwest corner of the intersection with Fletcher Road (Plate 10), a mixed commercial area including a golf complex is situated opposite 2nd Road West (Plate 11) and more intensive commercial development between Swayze Road the Regional Road 56 (Plate 14).
The north side of Rymal Road is lined by a mix of residential properties (Plate 8), most of which are scattered single family properties with fields beyond and fields between. One cemetery, on the north side of the road opposite the intersection with Fletcher Road, is situated behind the associated church, and no construction impact is anticipated (personal communication, April 6, 2005, T. Thurmon). A small woodlot occurs east of 2nd Road West (Plate 13). East of the woods, subdivision and commercial development line the north side of the road to Regional Road 56.

At the intersection with Regional Road 56, the northwest and southwest corners have been disturbed by development (Plates 17 and 18), the southeast corner is a cultivated field, and the northeast corner may be disturbed. The Elfrida Methodist Church, now a restaurant (Plate 15), and a house on the southwest corner of the intersection with Swayze Road (Plate 14) are the only apparent remains of the former village of Elfrida.

**Widening of Regional Road 56 from Rymal Road to the New Collector Road intersection**

South of its intersection with Rymal Road, the typically disturbed ROW of Regional Road 56 is quite wide (Plates 16 and 17). Undisturbed cultivated fields lie adjacent to the east side of the Regional Road 56 and, south of the Swayze Road terminus, to the west as well. Lands between Regional Road 56 and Swayze Road have been disturbed by commercial development.

**New Collector Road between Rymal Rd (at 1st Road W) and Regional Road 56 (at Swayze Rd)**

At the southeastern end of the collector road, vegetation patterns indicate the possible location of an historic farmstead, and current land use of a strip of uncultivated lands to the west could not be determined. For most of its length, the collector road would extend across cultivated fields. One residence may be in the vicinity of the proposed intersection with Rymal Road (Plate 13).

**Special Area ‘C’**

The area includes lands on either side of Upper Mount Albion Road between the Lincoln Alexander Parkway and Stone Church Road. Single-family residences line both sides of Upper Mount Albion Road with the lands behind them in active cultivation. An archaeological survey of a section of the lands west of Upper Mount Albion Road was completed in 1977, and two sites were located (Leslie 1977).

A follow-up archaeological assessment of Special Area “C”, also known as the Heritage Greene Property, was conducted by New Directions Archaeology in 2003. A total of ten sites were discovered, and nine were registered with the Ministry of Culture (Table 1). All had pre-contact components, but none contained diagnostic artifacts that could yield information on cultural period or affiliation (NDA 2003). One site also had a Euro-Canadian component.

Based on the two archaeological studies, Special Area “C” has demonstrated archaeological site potential.
3.0 SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

ASI was contracted to conduct a Stage 1 archaeological resource assessment as part of the environmental assessment for the proposed ROPA-9 project including Special Area ‘C’ and improvements to sections of Rymal Road, Trinity Church Road, and Regional Road 56. It will also include construction of a connector road and an extension of Trinity Church Road. The project includes lands within the Cities of Stoney Creek and Hamilton and the Township of Glanbrook, in the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth.

The assessment was conducted under the project direction of Robert Pihl, ASI, under an archaeological license (P057) issued to Mr. Pihl. Background research has determined that 55 sites have been registered within two kilometres of the study corridor. Numerous streams intersect the study corridor, and in addition, the presence of springs in an area of karst features indicates that the area has potential for the identification of pre-contact sites. Local nineteenth century land use suggests that the study corridor has potential for the identification of historical archaeological sites as well.

Field review confirmed the lack of topographic relief over most of the eastern portion of that corridor that would make better-drained locations and springs more attractive. While most of the existing road ROWs are disturbed, development has been minimal and there is potential for sites on the adjacent agricultural lands. On the scattered residential properties, disturbance due to grading and landscaping is likely. A number of the structures indicated on the historic atlas mapping probably correspond to extant structures, and the presence of two cemeteries was also noted, although neither is expected to be impacted by proposed construction.

It is therefore recommended that:

1. Prior to any land-disturbing activities within the study corridor, Stage 2 archaeological field survey should be conducted in accordance with Ministry of Culture Stage 1-3 Archaeological Assessment Technical Guidelines, in order to identify any archaeological remains that may be present within undisturbed lands. This includes investigation of any and all lands beyond the limits of the existing disturbed ROW (consisting of the traveled lanes and shoulders, and extending to the toe of the fill slope, the top of the cut slope, or the outside edge of the drainage ditch, whichever is furthest from the centerline), that will be impacted, whether temporarily or permanently, by the project.

The above recommendations are subject to Ministry approval, and it is an offence to alter any archaeological site without Ministry of Culture concurrence. No grading or other activities that may result in the destruction or disturbance of an archaeological site are permitted until notice of MCL approval has been received.

2. Should deeply buried archaeological remains be found on the property during construction activities, the Heritage Operations Unit of the Ontario Ministry of Culture should be notified immediately.

3. In the event that human remains are encountered during construction, the proponent should immediately contact both the Ministry of Culture and the Registrar or Deputy Registrar of the Cemeteries Regulation Unit of the Ministry of Consumer and Business Services.
The documentation related to the archaeological assessment of the subject property shall be curated by Archaeological Services Inc. until such a time that arrangements for their ultimate transfer to Her Majesty the Queen in right of Ontario, or other public institution, can be made to the satisfaction of the project owner, the Ontario Ministry of Culture, and other legitimate interest groups.
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6.0 PHOTOGRAPHY

Plate 1: View to north from Stone Church Road, graded interchange area between road and Lincoln Alexander Parkway.

Plate 2: View to south from Stone Church Road, agricultural fields residential properties on north side of Highway Road in background.

Plate 3: View to west, agricultural fields in low area south of Highland Road West.

Plate 4: View to north from terminus of existing Trinity Church Road. Note hay fields beyond scattered residential properties.

Plate 5: View to north on Trinity Church Road. Note tertiary stream at dip in road, narrow shoulders, and proximity of cemetery and church to road. Another stream with spring on west of road is to

Plate 6: View to southwest from intersection of Trinity Church Road and Rymal Road. Disturbed parking lot in foreground and fields beyond.
Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment
Project ROPA-9 Highway Construction and Improvements Environmental Assessment,
City of Stoney Creek, City of Hamilton, and Township of Glanbrook,
Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth, Ontario

| Plate 7: View to east along Rymal Road, from east of Trinity Church Road intersection. Note fields and historic farmstead south of road, and residences lining north side of road. |
| Plate 8: View to east along Rymal Road, development on south side of road and scattered residences on north. |
| Plate 9: View to west along Rymal Road, single-family residences on north side of road. |
| Plate 10: View to east along Rymal Road, development on south side of road. Historic residence in background on southeast corner of Fletcher Road intersection. |
| Plate 11: View to west along Rymal Road, commercial development opposite 2nd Road West intersection. |
| Plate 12: View to north at intersection of Rymal Road and 2nd Road West. Subdivision on northeast corner and fields on northwest corner. |
Plate 13: View to west along Rymal Road, fields on south side of Rymal Road and subdivision on north. Proposed location of connector road at left. Woods in background.

Plate 14: View to east along Rymal Road at Swayze Road intersection. Historic house on southwest corner. Commercial development on both sides.

Plate 15: View to west along Rymal Road, historic adjacent to north side of road.

Plate 16: View to south of Regional Road 56 at location of proposed intersection with connector road. Note agricultural fields and spruce trees at right.

Plate 17: View to northeast along Regional Road 56. Note width of disturbed right-of-way south of intersection with Rymal Road. West side of road disturbed by commercial development and east side in agricultural fields.

Plate 18: View to southeast at intersection of Rymal Road and Regional Road 56. Field in background on southwest corner, northwest (foreground) and southwest corners are disturbed.
Appendix D.2

Cultural Heritage Assessment
(April 2005):
Unterman McPhail Associates
RYMAL ROAD SECONDARY PLAN
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT REPORT

Prepared by: Unterman McPhail Associates
Unterman McPhail Associates undertook a field survey of the study corridor for the Rymal Road ROPA Environmental Assessment including Special Area C on March 10, 2005. Tables 1 and 2 list the cultural landscapes (CHL) and built heritage features (BHF) of 40 years of age or older identified within or adjacent to the study corridor during the survey.

A number of residences identified as built heritage features and a farm complex of 40 years or older are located along Rymal Road East within the study area. The intersection of Trinity Church Road is sensitive to change.

The historical community of Elfrida was located on the township line between Binbrook and Saltfleet Townships, to the west of the intersection of the former Highways 20, 53 and 56. Originally known as Swayze’s Corners and then Clinesville, it was renamed Elfrida in 1865 when its post office was opened. Elfrida had two hotels, general store and Quance’s mill south of the settlement on Highway 20 in the middle-to-late 1800s. A Methodist church was built on the Saltfleet Township side of the township road in 1856 and rebuilt in 1881. An Orange Hall stood across the road opposite the church. It later became the head office for the Binbrook and Saltfleet Fire Insurance Company. Only the former church building and the residence located at No. 2109 Rymal Road East remain of the community.

The identified built heritage features and cultural heritage landscapes have not been assessed for heritage significance. A request will be submitted to the City of Hamilton asking for heritage and historical information for the study area.

Two buildings identified within the study area are listed in the Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 2: Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest, namely, No. 10 Trinity Church Road (Church) and No. 31 Trinity Church Road (Residence).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHL 1</td>
<td>Church and Cemetery</td>
<td>Rymal Road Community Church is set back from the Rymal Road. It is much altered and appears to be an older building incorporated into newer additions. The Free Methodist Cemetery, Stoney Creek, is located behind the church away from Rymal Road.</td>
<td>No. 1957 Rymal Road East, north side at Fletcher Road.</td>
<td>Local Interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 2</td>
<td>Roadscape</td>
<td>Local road, part of original township survey with a jog at Rymal Road.</td>
<td>Fletcher Road, north and south of Rymal Road East.</td>
<td>Local Interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 3</td>
<td>Church and Cemetery</td>
<td>Trinity United Church and Cemetery. Church is listed on <em>Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 2: Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest</em>.</td>
<td>No. 10 Trinity Church Road</td>
<td>Local Interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 4</td>
<td>Farm Complex</td>
<td>Includes a farmhouse, large barn and outbuildings. Farmhouse set close to Rymal Road East.</td>
<td>No. 1824 Rymal Road East, south side to east of Trinity Church Road.</td>
<td>Local Interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 5</td>
<td>Roadscape</td>
<td>Local, two lane paved road, Intersection at Rymal Road East includes Trinity Church and Cemetery and two residences (BHF 5 and 6).</td>
<td>Trinity Church Road, south of Rymal Road East.</td>
<td>Local Interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 6</td>
<td>Agricultural land</td>
<td>Fields and farm complexes interspersed with individual residences along Rymal Road East.</td>
<td>Along Rymal Road, north of Rymal road north of Trinity Church Road and Special Area C.</td>
<td>Local Interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Resource Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHF 1</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Former Elfrida Church built 1858, rebuilt 1881; dichromatic decorative brickwork, Gothic window openings. Now Zarconos Italian Eatery. Marks location of former hamlet of Elfrida.</td>
<td>[No. number visible] Rymal Road East, north side, across from No. 2205 (Stoney Creek).</td>
<td>Known as No. 2251 Rymal Road East Local Interest. Stoney Creek LACAC expressed an interest in designation in 1992 and again in 1996/97, but both the church trustees and the subsequent owners were not interested. LACAC did not object to either the rezoning or the renovations converting the structure to a restaurant in 1995.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHF 2</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Two storey early 20th century residence with garage, vacant. One of two remaining buildings associated with former community of Elfrida.</td>
<td>No. 2190 Rymal Road, south side at west of Swayze Road (Glanbrook).</td>
<td>Local Interest. Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment Report, prepared by Unterman McPhail Sept. 2003 for 100 Main Street East Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHF 3</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Early 20th C. vernacular Four-Square, two storey, brick residence with hip roof. Set close to Rymal Road East.</td>
<td>1970 Rymal Road East, south side, east of Fletcher Road (Glanbrook).</td>
<td>Local Interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHF 4</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Ca. 1920s/30s, vernacular Bungalow style, one and-a-half storey brick residence.</td>
<td>No. 1865 Rymal Road East, north side at Upper Mount Albion Road (Stoney Creek).</td>
<td>Local Interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHF 5</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Mid 20th C., one storey, vernacular brick residence. Possibly associated with Trinity Church.</td>
<td>No. 4 Trinity Church Road, west side, immediately south of Rymal Road East (Hamilton).</td>
<td>Local Interest. Residential property code, owned by Trinity United Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHF 6</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>19th C. vernacular residence. Listed in <em>Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 2: Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.</em></td>
<td>No. 31 Trinity Church Road, east side south of parking lot for Trinity Church (Glanbrook).</td>
<td>Local Interest. Listed in <em>Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 2.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

The City of Hamilton is conducting a Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment to investigate infrastructure improvements to service Rymal Road Planning Area, including all necessary transportation, water and wastewater (sewer) improvements. iTRANS Consulting Inc. is conducting the study on behalf of the City of Hamilton. LGL Limited, as a sub-consultant to iTRANS Consulting Inc., is providing natural heritage services. This Natural Heritage Existing Conditions Report documents the results of data collection and analysis and forms an appendix to the Environmental Study Report.

2.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS

The following discussion outlines the existing environmental conditions within the study area and identifies natural heritage areas and/or features of environmental sensitivity and/or significance.

2.1 Physiography and Soils

The study area lies within the Haldimand Clay Plain physiographic region, which is situated between the Niagara Escarpment and Lake Erie. In the vicinity of the Niagara Escarpment, this physiographic region is comprised of subdued moraines, with troughs comprised of lacustrine silt or clay. This topography was formed under water by the ice lobe that occupied the basin of Lake Ontario. While several streams direct drainage eastward in this region, many undrained depressions remain on higher ground (Chapman and Putnam 1984).
The soils within the study area are classified as Binbrook silt loam, Smithville silt loam, Chinguacousy silt loam, Oneida silt loam, Winona sandy loam, Toledo silt loam – shallow phase, and Toledo silty clay loam (Presant et al. 1965).

2.1.1 Binbrook silt loam

Binbrook silt loam is developed from silt loam over clay till. This soil type has a complex and very gently sloping topography. This soil type is imperfectly drained and often requires artificial drainage for more specialized agricultural uses. The silt and loam content make this soil susceptible to erosion; however, its topography limits its susceptibility. Binbrook silt loam is the dominant soil type in the study area, surrounding Rymal Road between Upper Mount Albion Road and Upper Centennial Parkway.

2.1.2 Smithville silt loam

Smithville silt loam is developed from silt loam over clay till. This soil type has a complex and gently sloping topography. This soil type is moderately well drained. The silt and loam content make this soil susceptible to erosion; however, its topography limits its susceptibility and drainage may be temporarily impeded in level areas. Smithville silt loam surrounds Rymal Road between Upper Mount Albion Road and Trinity Church Road. A small band of Smithville silt loam also crosses Rymal Road just west of Upper Centennial Parkway.

2.1.3 Chinguacousy silt loam

Chinguacousy silt loam is derived from clay loam till parent materials. This soil type has a complex and very gently sloping topography. This soil type is imperfectly drained and drainage improvements are typically required for certain agricultural crops. The silt and loam content make this soil susceptible to erosion; however, its topography limits its susceptibility. Chinguacousy silt loam is located to the north of Rymal Road, north of the current northern terminus of Trinity Church Road.

2.1.4 Oneida silt loam

Oneida silt loam is derived from clay loam till parent materials. This soil type has a complex and moderately to steeply sloping topography. This soil type is well drained. The silt and loam content, combined with the topography, make this soil type susceptible to erosion. Oneida silt loam is located to the south of Alexander Parkway, north of the current northern terminus of Trinity Church Road.

2.1.5 Winona sandy loam

Winona sandy loam is developed from sand over clay till. This soil type has a complex and very gently sloping topography. This soil type is imperfectly drained. The sand and loam content make this soil susceptible to erosion; however, its topography limits its susceptibility. Winona sandy loam is located to the south of Alexander Parkway, north of the current northern terminus of Trinity Church Road.

2.1.6 Toledo silty clay loam

Toledo silty clay loam is derived from lacustrine silty clay loam and silty clay parent materials. This soil type has a simple and level to very gently sloping topography. This soil type is poorly drained. The silt and loam content make this soil susceptible to erosion; however, its topography and clay content limit its susceptibility. A small band of Toledo silty clay loam crosses Rymal Road just west of Fletcher Road.

2.1.7 Toledo silt loam – shallow phase

Toledo silt loam – shallow phase soils are derived from lacustrine silty clay loam and silty clay parent materials. This soil type has a simple and level to very gently sloping topography. This soil type is poorly drained. The silt and loam content make this soil susceptible to erosion; however, its topography and clay
content limit its susceptibility. A small band of Toledo silt loam – shallow phase runs parallel to and north of Rymal Road, north of the current northern terminus of Trinity Church Road.

2.2 Fisheries and Aquatic Ecosystems

The study area is located in the Redhill Creek and Twenty Mile Creek watersheds. The location of watercourses within the study area is presented in Figure 2. The western portion of the study area lies within the Redhill Creek watershed and the Montgomery Creek, Hannon Creek and Upper Davis Creek subwatersheds and drains in a northwest direction. Approximately six road crossings of tributaries of Redhill Creek occur in the study area, including two tributaries of Hannon Creek, which cross Trinity Church Road (Crossings 1 and 2), three tributaries of Upper Davis Creek, which cross Rymal Road (Crossings 3, 4 and 5) and one tributary of Montgomery Creek, which crosses the proposed extension of Trinity Church Road (Crossing 6).

The eastern portion of the study area lies within the Twenty Mile Creek and the Sinkhole Creek subwatershed and drains in a southeast direction. Approximately three road crossings of Sinkhole Creek occur in the study area, including two crossings of Rymal Road (Crossings 7 and 8) and one crossing of Regional Road 56 (Crossing 9).

The majority of watercourses in the study area are intermittent and may provide seasonal functionality to receiving systems. One watercourse in the study area, the tributary of Sinkhole Creek at Regional Road 56, supports a warmwater fish community. The land usage surrounding these systems is predominantly agricultural and many of the intermittent tributaries are ploughed-through or have a very minor riparian vegetation belt.

The fish communities of Hannon Creek and Upper Davis Creek were sampled in 1995 and from 1997 to 2000 (ESG 2001a). In 1995 brook stickleback (*Culaea inconstans*) and goldfish (*Carassius auratus*) were captured in these watercourses, and from 1997 to 2000 brook stickleback were captured in these watercourses. No other species are recorded as present in either of these subwatersheds upstream of the escarpment. The fish community of Montgomery Creek was sampled in 1996 and it was found that the reach of Montgomery Creek above the escarpment does not provide fish habitat (Philips Planning and Engineering Limited 1997). The fish community of Sinkhole Creek was sampled in 2000 (ESG 2001a). In 2000 a total of seven species were captured in this watercourse within the study area, including brook stickleback, central mudminnow (*Umbra limi*), fathead minnow (*Pimephales promelas*), golden shiner (*Netemigonus crysoleucas*), largemouth bass (*Micropterus salmoides*), pumpkinseed (*Lepomis gibbosus*) and tadpole madtom (*Noturus gyrinus*).

LGL investigated fish habitat function in conjunction with electrofishing surveys (where sufficient flows would allow) to identify habitat type while providing a case for protection measures. Only one crossing supported an electrofishing survey, the tributary of Sinkole Creek at Regional Road 56. The watercourse habitat was characterized for a length of stream approximately 50 m upstream and 100 m downstream of the Regional Road 56 culvert. Due to the intermittent nature of watercourses in the study area, an overview of the habitat was conducted on all but one of the watercourse crossings. Detailed physical habitat features were surveyed in the tributary of Sinkhole Creek at Regional Road 56, which supports a fish community. Sufficient detail to enable mapping and identification of key habitat types is provided and the physical habitat attributes assessed included: (a) instream cover, (b) bank stability, (c) substrate characteristics, (d) stream dimensions, (e) barriers, (f) stream morphology, (g) terrain characteristics, (h) stream canopy cover, (i) stream gradient, (j) aquatic vegetation, (k) ground water seepage areas, and (l) general comments. A habitat map was produced in the field specific to the Regional Road 56 crossing. Photographic documentation was conducted for all the watercourses in the study area (Appendix A). A summary of fish habitat function is presented in Table 1.
## TABLE 1.
SUMMARY OF FISHERIES AND AQUATIC HABITAT CONDITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Watercourse Name</th>
<th>Type of Fishery</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tributary of Hannon Creek</td>
<td>Indirect fish habitat</td>
<td>• intermittent swale, dry during June 2005 field investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tributary of Hannon Creek</td>
<td>Indirect fish habitat</td>
<td>• intermittent swale, dry during June 2005 field investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• flows enter a catchment drain on the downstream (west) side of Trinity Church Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tributary of Upper Davis Creek</td>
<td>Indirect fish habitat</td>
<td>• potentially intermittent, poor channel definition through emergent vegetation (<em>Typha</em> sp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• stormwater management facility located upstream (south) of Rymal Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tributary of Upper Davis Creek</td>
<td>Indirect fish habitat</td>
<td>• intermittent swale through agricultural field, dry during June 2005 field investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tributary of Upper Davis Creek</td>
<td>Indirect fish habitat</td>
<td>• intermittent swale through agricultural field, dry during June 2005 field investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tributary of Montgomery Creek</td>
<td>Indirect fish habitat</td>
<td>• intermittent swale, dry during June 2005 field investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• approximately a 10 m riparian vegetation buffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tributary of Sinkhole Creek</td>
<td>Indirect fish habitat</td>
<td>• intermittent swale, dry during June 2005 field investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• woodlot riparian community upstream (north) of Rymal Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tritubary of Sinkhole Creek</td>
<td>Indirect fish habitat</td>
<td>• intermittent swale, dry during June 2005 field investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• stormwater management facility located upstream (north) of Rymal Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tribuary of Sinkhole Creek</td>
<td>Warmwater fish habitat</td>
<td>• warmwater fish community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• slow flowing with emergent and submergent vegetation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• high amounts of green algae indicating excessive nutrient inputs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.1 Tributary of Sinkhole Creek

The tributary of Sinkhole Creek flows from west to east across Regional Road 56. Upstream of the road crossing, baseflow widths and depths were generally 3.0 m and 0.30 m, respectively, while bankfull widths and depths were approximately 5 m and 0.4 m, respectively. It should be noted that upstream conditions appear to have been channelized and bermed in the past and this likely attributed to the light commercial/residential build-out associated with the Rymal Road/Regional Road 56 intersection. Downstream, flows were slow and impounded by detrital debris, emergent vegetation and reduced channel definition. Stream morphology was dominated by flat habitat (80-95%) with the remainder comprised of pools and runs. Substrate was comprised of fine sediments and supported dense growths of submergent vegetation, such as pondweeds (Potamogeton sp.). The abundance of vegetation provided ample habitat for fathead minnows, which prefer slow/standing flows and vegetative cover. High amounts of green algae were present within the system and may indicate excessive nutrient runoff from surrounding pasture lands. Overhanging grasses were growing heavily on the banks and may contribute to bank stability, shore cover, and spawning habitat for brook stickleback, a species preferring vegetative debris for nest building. During June 2005 field investigations both fathead minnows and brook stickleback were sampled within this watercourse.

2.2.2 Species at Risk

No fish species considered rare, threatened or endangered (R, T, E) were identified in the study area via secondary source information or as a result of the June 2005 field investigations.

2.3 Vegetation and Vegetation Communities

The geographical extent, composition, structure and function of vegetation communities were identified through air photo interpretation and field investigations. Air photos were interpreted to determine the limits and characteristics of vegetation communities. Field investigations of natural/semi-natural vegetation were conducted within the study area on June 2 and September 24, 2005 to ground truth the boundaries of vegetation communities and to conduct a botanical survey. A landscape/ornamental tree inventory of trees with a diameter at breast height (dbh) greater than 10 cm adjacent to Rymal Road, Trinity Church Road and Regional Road 20 was also conducted during field investigations.

Vegetation communities were classified according to the Ecological Land Classification for Southern Ontario: First Approximation and Its Application (Lee et al. 1998). The community was sampled using a plotless method for the purpose of determining general composition and structure of the vegetation. Vascular plant nomenclature follows Newmaster et al. (1998), with a few exceptions.

2.3.1 Vegetation Communities

Much of the vegetation within the study area is of anthropogenic origin, resulting from past and present agricultural and residential land use. Forage crops are the predominant agricultural crop in the study area. At the time of field investigations, several rural non-farm residential developments were underway in retired agricultural fields in the study area, confirming previous work performed by ESG (2001b).

Natural/semi-natural vegetation communities in the study area include a Fresh – Moist Oak – Sugar Maple Deciduous Forest (FOD9-1), a Cattail Mineral Shallow Marsh (MAS2-1), and a Pondweed Submerged Shallow Aquatic (SAS1-1) community. The FOD9-1 community is a small, mid-aged forest block dominated by sugar maple (Acer saccharum), red oak (Quercus rubra) and shagbark hickory (Carya ovata). The MAS2-1 community is a small community dominated by common cattail (Typha latifolia), which is associated with the tributary of Sinkhole Creek adjacent to Regional Road 56. The
SAS1-1 community is a small community dominated by pondweeds (Potamogeton sp.), which is associated with the tributary of Sinkhole Creek adjacent to Regional Road 56.

Cultural vegetation communities in the study area include Dry-Moist Old Field Meadows (CUM1-1) and Grey Dogwood Cultural Thickets (CUT1-4). CUM1-1 communities are dominated by grasses, such as brome (Bromus inermis), orchard grass (Dactylis glomerata) and Kentucky bluegrass (Poa pratensis), and herbaceous species such as wild carrot (Daucus carota), teasel (Dipsacus fullonum), tufted vetch (Vicia cracca) and goldenrods (Solidago sp.). CUT1-4 communities are dominated by shrubs such as grey dogwood (Cornus foemina), Tartarian honeysuckle (Lonicera tatarica) and common buckthorn (Rhamnus cathartica).

Vegetation communities within/adjacent to the study area are delineated in Figure 2 and described in Table 2.

### 2.3.2 Roadside Trees

A total of 35 trees/tree clusters are located along Rymal Road in the study area. The most common tree species include Siberian elm (Ulmus pumila), Norway maple (Acer platanoides) and silver maple (A. saccharinum) and the majority of species are non-native. Trees range in size from 10 cm to 120 cm dbh and all trees are over 8 m beyond the existing Rymal Road edge-of-pavement. A summary of these tree species is presented in Appendix B1.

A total of 10 trees/tree clusters are located along Regional Road 56 south of Rymal Road in the study area. The majority of these trees are Carolina poplars (Populus X canadensis). Trees range in size from 15 to 41 cm dbh and all trees are over 8 m beyond the existing Regional Road 56 edge-of-pavement. A summary of these tree species is presented in Appendix B1.

A total of 51 trees/tree clusters are located along Trinity Church Road south of Rymal Road in the study area. The most common tree species include hawthorns (Crataegus sp.) and honey locusts (Gleditsia tricanthos) and the majority of species are non-native. Trees range in size from 10 to 75 cm dbh and the majority of trees are over 8 m beyond the existing Trinity Church Road edge-of-pavement. A summary of these tree species is presented in Appendix B2.

### 2.3.3 Flora

To date, a total of 110 vascular plant taxa have been recorded within the study area. Fifty-three (53) taxa, 48 percent of the recorded flora, are considered introduced and non-native to Ontario. A list of vascular plants identified within the study area is presented in Table 3.

### 2.3.4 Species at Risk

Plant species status was reviewed for the City of Hamilton (Goodban 2003) and Ontario (NHIC 2005). No plant species considered rare, threatened or endangered (R,T,E) in Ontario or in the City of Hamilton were noted during field investigations.
## TABLE 2.
**SUMMARY OF ECOLOGICAL LAND CLASSIFICATION COMMUNITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELC Code</th>
<th>ELC Vegetation Community</th>
<th>Species Association</th>
<th>Community Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terrestrial – Natural/Semi-natural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOD</td>
<td>DECIDUOUS FOREST</td>
<td><strong>Canopy:</strong> Red oak (<em>Quercus rubra</em>) is found in the super canopy and it is co-dominant with shagbark hickory (<em>Carya ovata</em> var. <em>ovata</em>), with some silver maple (<em>Acer saccharinum</em>) and red ash (<em>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</em>). <strong>Understorey:</strong> Ironwood (<em>Ostrya virginiana</em>), American basswood (<em>Tilia americana</em>), and choke cherry (<em>Prunus virginiana</em> spp. <em>virginiana</em>). <strong>Ground Cover:</strong> May-apple (<em>Podophyllum peltatum</em>), and spotted touch-me-not (<em>Impatiens capensis</em>) with some wood anemone (<em>Anemone quinquefolia</em> var. <em>quinquefolia</em>).</td>
<td>Tree cover &gt; 60 % (FO). Deciduous trees &gt; 75 % of canopy cover (D). Red Oak is dominant over White Oak with some Sugar Maple (9-1). Sand, loam and clay soils that are well to poorly drained, in lower slope and bottomland positions (Fresh-Moist).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOD9-1</td>
<td>Fresh – Moist Oak – Sugar Maple Deciduous Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terrestrial - Cultural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUM</td>
<td>CULTURAL MEADOW</td>
<td><strong>Ground Cover:</strong> Awnless brome (<em>Bromus inermis</em> ssp. <em>inermis</em>), wild carrot (<em>Daucus carota</em>), goldenrod (<em>Solidago</em> sp.), and orchard grass (<em>Dactylis glomerata</em>).</td>
<td>Tree cover and shrub cover &lt; 25 % (CUM). This community can occur on a wide range of soil moisture regimes (Dry-Moist). Community resulting from, or maintained by, anthropogenic-based influences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUM1-1</td>
<td>Dry-Moist Old Field Meadow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2.
**Summary of Ecological Land Classification Communities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELC Code</th>
<th>ELC Vegetation Community</th>
<th>Species Association</th>
<th>Community Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>CULTURAL THICKET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAS</td>
<td>MINERAL SHALLOW MARSH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAS2-1</td>
<td>Cattail Mineral Shallow Marsh</td>
<td><strong>Ground Cover:</strong> Broad-leaved cattail (<em>Typha latifolia</em>) and narrow-leaved cattail (<em>Typha angustifolia</em>) are dominant.</td>
<td>Standing or flowing water for much of the growing season (MAS). Tree and shrub cover &lt; 25 percent. Mineral soil (as opposed to organic).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SHALLOW AQUATIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAS1-1</td>
<td>Pondweed Submerged Shallow Aquatic</td>
<td><strong>Ground Cover:</strong> Pondweed (<em>Potamogeton</em> sp.) are dominant.</td>
<td>Water up to 2 m in depth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>COSEWIC</td>
<td>OMNR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQUISETACEAE</strong></td>
<td><strong>HORSETAIL FAMILY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Equisetum arvense</em></td>
<td>field horsetail</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PINACEAE</strong></td>
<td><strong>PINE FAMILY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Picea abies</em></td>
<td>Norway spruce</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pinus strobus</em></td>
<td>eastern white pine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pinus sylvestris</em></td>
<td>Scotch pine</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RANUNCULACEAE</strong></td>
<td><strong>BUTTERCUP FAMILY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anemone quinquefolia var. quinquefolia</td>
<td>wood anemone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ranunculus acris</em></td>
<td>tall buttercup</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BERBERIDACEAE</strong></td>
<td><strong>BARBERRY FAMILY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podophyllum peltatum</td>
<td>may-apple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ULMACEAE</strong></td>
<td><strong>ELM FAMILY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulmus americana</td>
<td>white elm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ulmus pumila</em></td>
<td>Siberian elm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUGLANDACEAE</strong></td>
<td><strong>WALNUT FAMILY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Carya ovata var. ovata</em></td>
<td>shagbark hickory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAGACEAE</strong></td>
<td><strong>BEECH FAMILY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fagus grandifolia</td>
<td>American beech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus alba</td>
<td>white oak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus rubra</td>
<td>red oak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BETULACEAE</strong></td>
<td><strong>BIRCH FAMILY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpinus caroliniana</td>
<td>blue beech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 3. WORKING VASCULAR PLANT CHECKLIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>COSEWIC</th>
<th>OMNR</th>
<th>Local Status</th>
<th>Legal Status</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>ELC Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ostrya virginiana</td>
<td>ironwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Chenopodium album var. album</td>
<td>lamb's quarters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLYGONACEAE</td>
<td>SMARTWEED FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Rumex crispus</td>
<td>curly-leaf dock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUTTIFERAE</td>
<td>ST. JOHN’S-WORT FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Hypericum perforatum</td>
<td>common St. John's-wort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TILIACEAE</td>
<td>LINDEN FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Tilia americana</td>
<td>American basswood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALICACEAE</td>
<td>WILLOW FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Populus X canadensis</td>
<td>Carolina poplar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Salix fragilis</td>
<td>crack willow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Salix X sepulcralis</td>
<td>weeping willow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRASSICACEAE</td>
<td>MUSTARD FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Alliaria petiolata</td>
<td>garlic mustard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Barbarea vulgaris</td>
<td>yellow rocket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Hesperis matronalis</td>
<td>dame's rocket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Thlaspi arvense</td>
<td>field penny-cress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROSSULARIACEAE</td>
<td>GOOSEBERRY FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribes lacustre</td>
<td>swamp black currant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Ribes rubrum</td>
<td>red currant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSACEAE</td>
<td>ROSE FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Crataegus punctata</td>
<td>large-fruited thorn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crataegus sp.</td>
<td>hawthorn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3.
**WORKING VASCULAR PLANT CHECKLIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>COSEWIC</th>
<th>OMNR</th>
<th>Local Status</th>
<th>Legal Status</th>
<th>ELC Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Fragaria virginiana</em> ssp. virginiana</td>
<td>scarlet strawberry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Geum aleppicum</em></td>
<td>yellow avens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Malus baccata</em></td>
<td>Siberian crabapple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Malus pumila</em></td>
<td>common crabapple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Prunus avium</em></td>
<td>sweet cherry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Prunus cerasus</em></td>
<td>sour cherry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Prunus mahaleb</em></td>
<td>mahaleb cherry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Prunus serotina</em></td>
<td>black cherry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Prunus virginiana</em> ssp. virginiana</td>
<td>choke cherry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pyrus communis</em></td>
<td>common pear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rosa blanda</em></td>
<td>smooth rose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FABACEAE</strong></td>
<td><strong>PEA FAMILY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gleditsia triacanthos</em></td>
<td>honey locust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Medicago lupulina</em></td>
<td>black medick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Melilotus alba</em></td>
<td>white sweet-clover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vicia cracca</em></td>
<td>tufted vetch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LYTHRACEAE</strong></td>
<td><strong>LOOSESTRIFE FAMILY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lythrum salicaria</em></td>
<td>purple loosestrife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ONAGRACEAE</strong></td>
<td><strong>EVENING-PRIMROSE FAMILY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Circaea lutetiana</em> ssp. canadensis*</td>
<td>yellowish enchanter's nightshade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CORNACEAE</strong></td>
<td><strong>DOGWOOD FAMILY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cornus foemina</em> ssp. racemosa*</td>
<td>grey dogwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CELASTRACEAE</strong></td>
<td><strong>STAFF-TREE FAMILY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Euonymus obovata</em></td>
<td>running strawberry-bush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3. WORKING VASCULAR PLANT CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>COSEWIC</th>
<th>OMNR</th>
<th>Local Status</th>
<th>Legal Status</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>ELC Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RHAMNACEAE</td>
<td>BUCKTHORN FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Rhamnus cathartica</td>
<td>common buckthorn</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Rhamnus frangula</td>
<td>glossy buckthorn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VITACEAE</td>
<td>GRAPE FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parthenocissus inserta</td>
<td>thicket creeper</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitis riparia</td>
<td>riverbank grape</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPPOCASTANACEAE</td>
<td>BUCKEYE FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Aesculus hippocastanum</td>
<td>horse chestnut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACERACEAE</td>
<td>MAPLE FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acer negundo</td>
<td>Manitoba maple</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Acer platanoides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acer saccharinum</td>
<td>silver maple</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acer saccharum ssp. saccharum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acer X freemani</td>
<td>Freeman's maple</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANACARDIACEAE</td>
<td>SUMAC FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhus radicans</td>
<td>poison-ivy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhus typhina</td>
<td>staghorn sumac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERANIACEAE</td>
<td>GERANIUM FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Geranium robertianum</td>
<td>herb-Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALSAMINACEAE</td>
<td>TOUCH-ME-NOT FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impatiens capensis</td>
<td>spotted touch-me-not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APIACEAE</td>
<td>PARSLEY FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Daucus carota</td>
<td>wild carrot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE 3. WORKING VASCULAR PLANT CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>COSEWIC</th>
<th>OMNR</th>
<th>Local Status</th>
<th>Legal Status</th>
<th>ELC Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASCLEPIADACEAE</strong></td>
<td>MILKWEED FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asclepias syriaca</td>
<td>common milkweed</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Cynanchum nigrum</td>
<td>black swallow-wort</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solanaceae</strong></td>
<td>POTATO FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Solanum dulcamara</td>
<td>bitter nightshade</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbenaceae</strong></td>
<td>VERVAIN FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbena hastata</td>
<td>blue vervain</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plantaginaceae</strong></td>
<td>PLANTAIN FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Plantago lanceolata</td>
<td>ribgrass</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oleaceae</strong></td>
<td>OLIVE FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraxinus americana</td>
<td>white ash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</td>
<td>red ash</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Syringa vulgaris</td>
<td>common lilac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scrophulariaceae</strong></td>
<td>FIGWORT FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Linaria vulgaris</td>
<td>butter-and-eggs</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Veronica serpyllifolia ssp. serpyllifolia</td>
<td>thyme-leaved speedwell</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rubiaceae</strong></td>
<td>MADDER FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galium triflorum</td>
<td>sweet-scented bedstraw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caprifoliaceae</strong></td>
<td>HONEYSUCKLE FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Lonicera tatarica</td>
<td>Tartarian honeysuckle</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viburnum lentago</td>
<td>nannyberry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viburnum trilobum</td>
<td>high bush cranberry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dipsacaceae</strong></td>
<td>TEASEL FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Dipsacus fullonum ssp. sylvestris</td>
<td>wild teasel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 3.
### WORKING VASCULAR PLANT CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>COSEWIC</th>
<th>OMNR</th>
<th>Local Status</th>
<th>Legal Status</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>ELC Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asteraceae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Achillea millefolium ssp. millefolium</td>
<td>common yarrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Arctium lappa</td>
<td>great burdock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Arctium minus ssp. minus</td>
<td>common burdock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aster macrophyllus</td>
<td>large-leaved aster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aster novae-angliae</td>
<td>New England aster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Chrysanthemum leucanthemum</td>
<td>ox-eye daisy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Cirsium arvense</td>
<td>Canada thistle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euthamia graminifolia</td>
<td>flat-topped bushy goldenrod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Hieracium X floribundum</td>
<td>king devil hawkweed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Inula helenium</td>
<td>elecampane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidago altissima var. altissima</td>
<td>tall goldenrod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidago canadensis</td>
<td>Canada goldenrod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidago flexicaulis</td>
<td>zig-zag goldenrod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidago nemoralis ssp. nemoralis</td>
<td>gray goldenrod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Sonchus oleraceus</td>
<td>common sow-thistle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Taraxacum officinale</td>
<td>common dandelion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potamogetonaceae</td>
<td>PONDWEED FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potamogeton sp.</td>
<td>pondweed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araceae</td>
<td>ARUM FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arisaema triphyllum ssp. triphyllum</td>
<td>small jack-in-the-pulpit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemnaceae</td>
<td>DUCKWEED FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemma minor</td>
<td>lesser duckweed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3.
**WORKING VASCULAR PLANT CHECKLIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>COSEWIC</th>
<th>OMNR</th>
<th>Local Status</th>
<th>Legal Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CYPERACEAE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex stipata</td>
<td>awl-fruited sedge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex sp.</td>
<td>sedge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleocharis sp.</td>
<td>spike-rush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scirpus validus</td>
<td>American great bulrush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POACEAE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Bromus inermis ssp. inermis</td>
<td>awnless brome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x x x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Dactylis glomerata</td>
<td>orchard grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x x x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glyciris striata</td>
<td>fowl meadow grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Poa pratensis ssp. pratensis</td>
<td>Kentucky bluegrass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x x x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPHACEAE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typha angustifolia</td>
<td>narrow-leaved cattail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typha latifolia</td>
<td>broad-leaved cattail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LILIACEAE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Asparagus officinalis</td>
<td>garden asparagus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erythronium americanum ssp. americanum</td>
<td>yellow trout lily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Introduced species

**COSEWIC (Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada):**
- END Endangered
- THR Threatened
- SC Special Concern

**OMNR (Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources):**
- END Endangered
- THR Threatened
- SC Special Concern

**Local Status:**
- R Rare in the City of Hamilton (after Goodban 2003)
- U Uncommon in the City of Hamilton (after Goodban 2003)

**Legal Status:**
- SARA *Species at Risk Act* – Schedules (1), (2), (3)
- ESA *Endangered Species Act*
- PPS Species afforded habitat protection under the Provincial Policy Statement of the *Planning Act*
2.4 Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat

Field investigations were conducted within the study area on June 2 and 14, 2005 to document wildlife and wildlife habitat and to characterize the nature, extent and significance of animal usage within the project limits. Direct observations, calls, tracks, scats, runways and scents were used to document wildlife.

2.4.1 Wildlife Habitat

Considering the size of the study area, there were a number of significantly different habitats that reflected the variety of wildlife documented. Habitats ranged from more naturalized areas, such as cultural meadows, cultural thickets, mature forest, marshes and creek tributaries, to human influenced habitats such as agricultural fields, and residential and commercial lands. Most of the study area was human influenced with smaller pockets of natural heritage features interspersed between them. These smaller natural heritage areas showed the greatest amount of biodiversity and produced most of the wildlife recorded. Urban areas had species that were more tolerant of human presence. With the exception of the north extension area of Trinity Church Road through some natural heritage features and a section of property surrounding Upper Mount Albion Road between Mud Street and Stone Church Road (known as “Special Area C”), the majority of the wildlife documented was along roadside habitats within 30 to 50 m of the existing rights-of-way. A summary of wildlife habitat present within the study area is presented in Table 4.

2.4.2 Fauna

Most of the wildlife was recorded during prime breeding season and therefore were considered to be reproducitively active residents of the study area. A few species were added to the field lists using secondary data collection but most of the wildlife species documented during this time period were observed in the field. A total of 65 wildlife species were recorded for the study area (four herpetofauna, 48 birds and 13 mammals). A summary of the wildlife documented in the study area during field investigations and through secondary source information is presented in Table 5.

Only three species of herpetofauna were documented in the field. A fourth species, snapping turtle (*Chelydra serpentina*), is likely to inhabit the study area based on habitat types and secondary source information. The amount of appropriate habitat within the study area suitable for herpetofauna was minimal.

Birds were abundant, with many of the 48 species documented considered to be potential breeders in and around the study area. Bird species, such as Cooper’s Hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*), Yellow-throated Vireo (*Vireo flavifrons*), Red-eyed Vireo (*Vireo olivaceus*), Eastern Wood Pewee (*Contopus virens*) and Great Crested Flycatcher (*Myiarchus crinitus*), inhabited the deciduous forest along Rymal Road. The cultural thicket and cultural meadows, in the north extension area of Trinity Church Road, contained breeding species such as Meadowlark (*Sturnella magna*), Bobolink (*Dolichonyx oryzivorus*), American Goldfinch (*Carduelis tristis*), Willow Flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii*), and Yellow Warbler (*Dendroica petechia*). Wetland birds, such as Mallard (*Anas platyrhynchos*), Spotted Sandpiper (*Actitis macularius*), Red-winged Blackbird (*Agelaius phoeniceus*) and Common Yellowthroat (*Geothlypis trichas*) were also seen as breeders within the study area. More common species, such as the Chipping Sparrow (*Spizella passerina*), American Robin (*Turdus migratorius*), House Sparrow (*Passer domesticus*) and Mourning Dove (*Zenaida macroura*), resided around the residential and commercial lands.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>ELC Community</th>
<th>Habitat Function</th>
<th>Animal Movement Corridors</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stone Church Road just east of Pritchard Road</td>
<td>Small thicket hedgerow</td>
<td>CUT1-4</td>
<td>• none recorded</td>
<td>• none recorded</td>
<td>• American goldfinch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North side of Rymal Road at Trinity Church Road</td>
<td>Expansive field of shrubs surrounded by hedgerows</td>
<td>CUT1-4</td>
<td>• none recorded</td>
<td>• cultural thicket and meadow</td>
<td>• American Woodcock • American Goldfinch • Barn Swallow • Eastern Kingbird • Eastern Meadowlark • Savannah Sparrow • Spotted Sandpiper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North side of Rymal Road, west of Upper Centennial Parkway</td>
<td>Deciduous forest</td>
<td>FOD9-1</td>
<td>• none recorded</td>
<td>• mature deciduous forest</td>
<td>• Cooper’s Hawk • Yellow-throated Vireo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 56 just south of Rymal Road</td>
<td>Open meadow and large pond</td>
<td>CUM1-1</td>
<td>• none recorded</td>
<td>• marsh and pond</td>
<td>• Barn Swallow • Northern Rough-winged Swallow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tributary of Sinkhole Creek downstream of Highway 56 just south of Rymal Road</td>
<td>Cattail marsh and open aquatic areas</td>
<td>MAS2-1/SAS1-1</td>
<td>• none recorded</td>
<td>• cattail marsh</td>
<td>• American goldfinch • Barn Swallow • Horned Lark • Savannah Sparrow • Spotted Sandpiper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

注1: 海洋栖息地的季节性动物
注2: 特殊的植物群落或为野生动物设计的特殊栖息地
注3: 森林带
注4: 重点保护物种
注5: 动物移动通道

LGL Limited
### TABLE 4. WILDLIFE HABITAT ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>ELC Community</th>
<th>Seasonal Concentration of Animals¹</th>
<th>Rare Vegetation Communities² or Specialized Habitats for Wildlife³</th>
<th>Species of Conservation Concern⁴</th>
<th>Animal Movement Corridors⁵</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Highway 56 at south end of Swayze Road cul-de-sac | Old field with abandoned farm house | CUM1-1 | • none recorded | • open grassy field | • American Goldfinch  
• Barn Swallow  
• Bobolink  
• Eastern Kingbird  
• Eastern Meadowlark  
• Horned Lark  
• Savannah Sparrow | • local movement for raccoon, skunk, coyote, fox and deer. | • good expansive breeding area for grassland birds |
| Special area “C” at Mount Albion Road | Residential area with manicured grasslands | N/A | • none recorded | • none recorded | • American Goldfinch  
• Savannah Sparrow | • none recorded | • local urban wildlife species |

¹ Seasonal concentration of animals includes: winter deer yards; moose late winter habitat; colonial bird nesting sites; waterfowl stopover and staging areas; waterfowl nesting areas; shorebird migratory stopover areas; landbird migratory stopover areas; raptor winter feeding and roosting areas; wild turkey winter range; turkey vulture summer roosting areas; reptile hibernacula; bat hibernacula; bullfrog concentration areas; and, migratory butterfly stopover areas.

² Rare vegetation communities include: alvars; tall-grass prairies; savannahs; rare forest types; talus slopes; rock barrens; sand barrens; and, Great Lakes dunes.

³ Specialized habitats for wildlife include: habitat for area-sensitive species; forests providing a high diversity of habitats; old-growth or mature forest stands; foraging areas with abundant mast (nuts, berries and other fruits); amphibian woodland breeding ponds; turtle nesting habitat; specialized raptor nesting habitat; special moose habitat (calving areas, aquatic feeding areas and mineral licks); and, mink, otter, marten or fisher denning sites; cliffs and caves; and, seeps and springs.

⁴ Species of conservation concern include: globally rare; nationally rare; provincially rare; regionally rare; locally rare; and, species of concern to the planning authority.

⁵ Animal movement corridors include dwelling habitat for plants and animals; and, conduits for daily and seasonal movements of animals, dispersal of organisms and genes and long-distance range shifts of species.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wildlife</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>COSEWIC</th>
<th>OMNR</th>
<th>Local Status</th>
<th>Legal Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herpetofauna</td>
<td>Plethodon cinereus</td>
<td>Eastern Red-backed Salamander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bufo americanus</td>
<td>American Toad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hyla versicolor</td>
<td>Gray Treefrog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pseudacris crucifer</td>
<td>Spring Peeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pseudacris triseriata</td>
<td>Western Chorus Frog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rana sylvatica</td>
<td>Wood Frog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rana pipiens</td>
<td>Northern Leopard Frog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rana clamitans</td>
<td>Green Frog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chelydra serpentina</td>
<td>Snapping Turtle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FWCA(G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chrysemys picta</td>
<td>Painted Turtle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thamnophis sirtalis</td>
<td>Eastern Gartersnake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Storeria dekayi</td>
<td>Dekay's Brown Snake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lampropeltis triangulum</td>
<td>Milk Snake</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td>SARA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>Branta canadensis</td>
<td>Canada Goose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anas platyrhynchos</td>
<td>Mallard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maleagris gallopavo</td>
<td>Wild Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA/FWCA(G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buteo jamaicensis</td>
<td>Red-tailed Hawk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FWCA(P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Falco sparverius</td>
<td>American Kestrel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FWCA(P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charadrius vociferus</td>
<td>Killdeer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actitis macularius</td>
<td>Spotted Sandpiper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scolopax minor</td>
<td>American Woodcock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columba livia</td>
<td>Rock Pigeon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zenaida macroura</td>
<td>Mourning Dove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coccozus erythropthalmus</td>
<td>Black-billed Cuckoo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Megascops asio</td>
<td>Eastern Screech-Owl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FWCA(P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bubo virginianus</td>
<td>Great Horned Owl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FWCA(P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chaetura pelagica</td>
<td>Chimney Swift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archilochus colubris</td>
<td>Ruby-throated Hummingbird</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Picoides pubescens</td>
<td>Downy Woodpecker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Picoides villosus</td>
<td>Hairy Woodpecker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colaptes auratus</td>
<td>Northern Flicker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 5.
### WILDLIFE DOCUMENTED IN THE STUDY AREA BY LGL LIMITED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wildlife</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>COSEWIC</th>
<th>OMNR</th>
<th>Local Status</th>
<th>Legal Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birds</td>
<td><em>Contopus virens</em></td>
<td>Eastern Wood Pewee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(continued)</td>
<td><em>Empidonax traillii</em></td>
<td>Willow Flycatcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sayornis phoebe</em></td>
<td>Eastern Phoebe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BSC</td>
<td>MBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Tyrannus tyrannus</em></td>
<td>Eastern Kingbird</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BSC</td>
<td>MBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Vireo gilvus</em></td>
<td>Warbling Vireo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Vireo olivaceus</em></td>
<td>Red-eyed Vireo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Cyanocitta cristata</em></td>
<td>Blue Jay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FWCA(P)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Corvus brachyrhynchos</em></td>
<td>American Crow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Eremophila alpestris</em></td>
<td>Horned Lark</td>
<td></td>
<td>BSC</td>
<td>MBCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Tachycineta bicolor</em></td>
<td>Tree Swallow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Hirundo rustica</em></td>
<td>Barn Swallow</td>
<td></td>
<td>BSC</td>
<td>MBCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Poecile atricapillus</em></td>
<td>Black-capped Chickadee</td>
<td></td>
<td>BSC</td>
<td>MBCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sitta carolinensis</em></td>
<td>White-breasted Nuthatch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Troglydotes aedon</em></td>
<td>House Wren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Hylocichla mustelina</em></td>
<td>Wood Thrush</td>
<td></td>
<td>BSC</td>
<td>MBCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Turdus migratorius</em></td>
<td>American Robin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Dumetella carolinensis</em></td>
<td>Gray Catbird</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Mimus polyglottos</em></td>
<td>Northern Mockingbird</td>
<td></td>
<td>BSC</td>
<td>MBCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Toxostoma rufum</em></td>
<td>Brown Thrasher</td>
<td></td>
<td>BSC</td>
<td>MBCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sturnus vulgaris</em></td>
<td>Starling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Bombycilla cedrorum</em></td>
<td>Cedar Waxwing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Vermivora pinus</em></td>
<td>Blue-winged Warbler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Dendroica petechia</em></td>
<td>Yellow Warbler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Geothlypis trichas</em></td>
<td>Common Yellowthroat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Spizella passerina</em></td>
<td>Chipping Sparrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Spizella pusilla</em></td>
<td>Field Sparrow</td>
<td></td>
<td>BSC</td>
<td>MBCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Passerculus sandwichensis</em></td>
<td>Savannah Sparrow</td>
<td></td>
<td>BSC</td>
<td>MBCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Melospiza melodia</em></td>
<td>Song Sparrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Cardinalis cardinalis</em></td>
<td>Northern Cardinal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Passerina cyanea</em></td>
<td>Indigo Bunting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Agelaius phoeniceus</em></td>
<td>Red-winged Blackbird</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>COSEWIC</td>
<td>OMNR</td>
<td>Local Status</td>
<td>Legal Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Birds</strong> (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiscalus quiscula</td>
<td>Common Grackle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molothrus ater</td>
<td>Brown-headed Cowbird</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icterus galbula</td>
<td>Baltimore Oriole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpodacus mexicanus</td>
<td>House Finch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carduelis tristis</td>
<td>American Goldfinch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passer domesticus</td>
<td>House Sparrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didelphis virginiana</td>
<td>Virginia Opossum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FWCA(F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blarina brevicauda</td>
<td>N. Short-tailed Shrew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FWCA(P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eptesicus fuscus</td>
<td>Big Brown Bat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FWCA(P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvilagus floridanus</td>
<td>Eastern Cottontail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FWCA(G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepus europaeus</td>
<td>European Hare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FWCA(G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamias striatus</td>
<td>Eastern Chipmunk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FWCA(P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marmota monax</td>
<td>Groundhog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciurus carolinensis</td>
<td>Gray Squirrel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FWCA(G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamiasciurus hudsonicus</td>
<td>Red Squirrel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FWCA(F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microtus pennsylvanicus</td>
<td>Meadow Vole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ondatra zibethica</td>
<td>Muskrat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FWCA(F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zapus hudsonius</td>
<td>Meadow Jumping Mouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canis latrans</td>
<td>Coyote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FWCA(F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulpes vulpes</td>
<td>Red Fox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FWCA(F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procyon lotor</td>
<td>Raccoon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FWCA(F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustela vison</td>
<td>American Mink</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FWCA(F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephitis mephitis</td>
<td>Striped Skunk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FWCA(F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odocoileus virginianus</td>
<td>White-tailed Deer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FWCA(G)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 5 LEGEND

**COSEWIC (Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada):**

- NAR  Not At Risk
- END  Endangered
- THR  Threatened
- SC   Special Concern

**Local Status:**
- BSC  Bird Studies Canada species of conservation priority for the Region of Hamilton-Wentworth.

**OMNR (Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources):**

- NAR  Not At Risk
- END  Endangered
- THR  Threatened
- SC   Special Concern

**Legal Status:**
- SARA  *Species at Risk Act* – Schedules (1), (2), (3)
- ESA   *Endangered Species Act*
- MBCA  *Migratory Bird Convention Act*
- FWCA  *Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act*
  - (P)  Protected Species
  - (G)  Game Species
  - (F)  Furbearing Mammals
- PPS  Species afforded habitat protection under the Provincial Policy Statement of the *Planning Act*
Mammals, being primarily nocturnal, were recorded mostly in the natural heritage areas that provided some kind of clues (tracks, scats, scents) to their presence. Evidence for eight of the 13 species documented was found directly in the field. Tracks around the wetland areas indicated the presence of raccoon (*Procyon lotor*), striped skunk (*Mephitis mephitis*) and muskrat (*Ondatra zibethica*) while forested areas and roadsides showed evidence of coyote (*Canis latrans*) and white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*). Based on habitat types and secondary source information, an additional five mammal species are likely to inhabit the study area.

### 2.4.3 Species at Risk

None of the species recorded in the study area are considered to be of conservation concern by the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC) or the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (OMNR)/Committee on the Status of Species at Risk in Ontario (COSSARO). The *Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act* regulates 10 of the 13 mammal species recorded plus one herpetofauna and three bird species. The *Migratory Birds Convention Act* (*MBCA*) regulates 38 of the 48 bird species. Fourteen of the bird species listed within the study area are recommended by Bird Studies Canada as a priority species of conservation in the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth. Many of these, such as American Goldfinch, Spotted Sandpiper, Savannah Sparrow (*Passerculus sandwichensis*) and Cooper’s Hawk, are considered ‘Area Sensitive’ and could potentially be detrimentally impacted by any human disturbance that minimizes their breeding areas. Although the natural heritage features cover only a small portion of the study area, the area sensitive species found within these areas indicate their importance to the municipality and region for conservation.

### 2.5 Designated Natural Areas

There are no Provincially Significant Wetlands (PSWs) or evaluated wetlands in the study area. There is one Area of Natural and Scientific Interest in the study area. The Eramosa Karst ANSI extends from Highland Road to just south of Rymal Road between Upper Mount Albion Road and Second Road in the study area. This Earth Science ANSI is characterized by fissures and sinkholes that have resulted from limestone being dissolved slowly over time by carbonic acid. This ANSI will soon be designated as an Environmentally Significant Area (ESA) by the City of Hamilton (XCG Consultants Limited 2005). There are no additional ESAs in the study area.

Within the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth, the majority of land in the study area is designated ‘Urban’. Land designated ‘Rural Area’ surrounds Regional Road 56 south of Rymal Road and land beyond the urban boundary south of Rymal Road is designated ‘Prime Agricultural Land’. Land designated ‘Business Park’ is located to the west of the proposed extension of Trinity Church Road according to the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan.
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APPENDIX A
PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
HANNON CREEK TRIBUTARIES

Crossing 1: Facing east (upstream) from Trinity Church Road along a tributary of Hannon Creek.

Crossing 1: Facing west (downstream) from Trinity Church Road along a tributary of Hannon Creek.

Crossing 2: Facing east (upstream) from Trinity Church Road along a tributary of Hannon Creek.

Crossing 2: Facing west (downstream) from Trinity Church Road towards a catchment drain associated with a tributary of Hannon Creek.
Crossing 3: Facing south (upstream) from Rymal Road towards a stormwater management facility associated with a tributary of Upper Davis Creek.

Crossing 3: Facing north (downstream) from Rymal Road along a tributary of Upper Davis Creek.

Crossing 4: Facing south (upstream) from Rymal Road towards along a tributary of Upper Davis Creek.

Crossing 4: Facing north (downstream) from Rymal Road towards along a tributary of Upper Davis Creek.

Crossing 5: Facing south (upstream) from Rymal Road along a tributary of Upper Davis Creek.

Crossing 5: Facing north (downstream) from Rymal Road along a tributary of Upper Davis Creek.
Crossing 7: Facing north (upstream) from Rymal Road along a tributary of Sinkhole Creek. FOD9-1 community in background.

Crossing 7: Facing south (downstream) from Rymal Road along a tributary of Sinkhole Creek.

Crossing 8: Facing north (upstream) from Rymal Road towards a stormwater management facility associated with a tributary of Sinkhole Creek.

Crossing 8: Facing south (downstream) from Rymal Road along a tributary of Sinkhole Creek.

Crossing 6: Facing north (downstream) from Paramount Drive along a tributary of Montgomery Creek. Lincoln Alexander Parkway in background.
Crossing 9: Facing west (upstream) from Regional Road 56 along a tributary of Sinkhole Creek.

Crossing 9: Facing east (downstream) towards the tributary of Sinkhole Creek culvert at Regional Road 56.

Crossing 9: Facing east (downstream) from Regional Road 56 along a tributary of Sinkhole Creek.

Crossing 9: Facing west (upstream) towards the tributary of Sinkhole Creek culvert at Regional Road 56.
APPENDIX B
TREE INVENTORY SUMMARY TABLES
## APPENDIX B1.
### RYMAL ROAD¹ AND REGIONAL ROAD 56² ROADSIDE TREE INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>D.B.H.</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>American Elm <em>(Ulmus americana)</em></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>North side of Rymal Road, within fence line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siberian Elm <em>(Ulmus pumila)</em></td>
<td>10-45</td>
<td>Fair-Good</td>
<td>Hedge/Open Grown</td>
<td>North side of Rymal Road, ten trees in a row next to privacy fence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>American Elm</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>North side of Rymal Road, in a row of dead standing larger American Elms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Silver Maple <em>(Acer saccharinum)</em></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Silver Maple</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Silver Maple</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Silver Maple</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Horsechestnut <em>(Aesculus hippocastanum)</em></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>North side of Rymal Road, at 1957 Rymal Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Weeping Willow <em>(Salix X sepulcralis)</em></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Red Ash <em>(Fraxinus pennsylvanica)</em></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fair-Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>North side of Rymal Road, at 1957 Rymal Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Horsechestnut</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sugar Maple</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Manitoba Maple <em>(Acer negundo)</em></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Manitoba Maple</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Crack Willow <em>(Salix fragilis)</em></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>North side of Rymal Road, at 1885 Rymal Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Freeman’s Maple <em>(Acer X freemani)</em></td>
<td>10 &amp; 25</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>North side of Rymal Road, at 1883 Rymal Road. Multi-stemmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Norway Maple <em>(Acer platanoides)</em></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>North side of Rymal Road, at 1883 Rymal Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Scotch Pine <em>(Pinus sylvestris)</em></td>
<td>14 &amp; 18</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>North side of Rymal Road, at 1883 Rymal Road. Multi-stemmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Norway Spruce <em>(Picea abies)</em></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>North side of Rymal Road, at the corner of Upper Mount Albion Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Norway Spruce</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Norway Maple</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>North side of Rymal Road, at 1847 Rymal Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Silver Maple</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>North side of Rymal Road, at 1837 Rymal Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Siberian Elm</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Siberian Elm</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Siberian Elm</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Fair-Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Freeman’s Maple</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>North side of Rymal Road, at 1835 Rymal Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Norway Maple</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Fair-Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Siberian Crab-apple <em>(Malus baccata)</em></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fair-Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>North side of Rymal Road, at 1825 Rymal Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Honey Locust <em>(Gleditsia triacanthos)</em></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>South side of Rymal Road, near utility pole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Siberian Elm</td>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>Fair-Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>South side of Rymal Road, near utility pole, at 2062 Rymal Road. Multi-stemmed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX B1.
#### RYMAL ROAD¹ AND REGIONAL ROAD 56² ROADSIDE TREE INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>D.B.H.</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Common Pear (Pyrus communis)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>South side of Rymal Road, near utility pole, at 2100 Rymal Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Common Pear</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Common Pear</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Freeman’s Maple</td>
<td>25 &amp; 30</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>South side of Rymal Road, near utility pole, at 2120 Rymal Road. Major crown dieback. Multi-stemmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>American Elm</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>South side of Rymal Road, at 2150 Rymal Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Carolina Poplar (Populus X canadensis)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Poor-Fair</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>West side of Regional Road 20, south of Rymal Road, at curve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Red Ash</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Carolina Poplar</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Poor-Fair</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>West side of Regional Road 20, south of Rymal Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Carolina Poplar</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Poor-Fair</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Carolina Poplar</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Poor-Fair</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Carolina Poplar</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Poor-Fair</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Carolina Poplar</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Dead</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>West side of Regional Road 20, south of Rymal Road. Dead standing trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Carolina Poplar</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Dead</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>West side of Regional Road 20, south of Rymal Road. Dead standing trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>American Elm</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>East side of Regional Road 20, south of Rymal Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** ¹Trees 1 to 35 adjacent to Rymal Road. ²Trees 36 to 45 adjacent to Regional Road 20.
# Appendix B2.
**Trinity Church Road Roadside Tree Inventory**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>D.B.H.</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hawthorn <em>(Crataegus sp.)</em></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>East side of Trinity Church Road. Much dieback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td>East side of Trinity Church Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td>East side of Trinity Church Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td>East side of Trinity Church Road. Multi-stemmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td>East side of Trinity Church Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
<td>10 &amp; 12</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td>East side of Trinity Church Road. Multi-stemmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
<td>10 &amp; 20</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td>East side of Trinity Church Road. Multi-stemmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td>East side of Trinity Church Road. Multi-stemmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
<td>10-25</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td>East side of Trinity Church Road. Die back in crown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
<td>10-21</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td>East side of Trinity Church Road. Much die back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
<td>10-25</td>
<td>Poor-Good</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td>East side of Trinity Church Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Fair-Good</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td>East side of Trinity Church Road. Multi-stemmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
<td>10-45</td>
<td>Fair-Good</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td>East side of Trinity Church Road. Multi-stemmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Large-fruited Thorn <em>(Crataegus punctata)</em></td>
<td>10 &amp; 15</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td>East side of Trinity Church Road. Multi-stemmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td>East side of Trinity Church Road. Die back at base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
<td>15 &amp; 20</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td>East side of Trinity Church Road. Multi-stemmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Large-fruited Thorn</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>Fair-Good</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td>East side of Trinity Church Road. Multi-stemmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Large-fruited Thorn</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td>East side of Trinity Church Road. Multi-stemmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
<td>10-30</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td>East side of Trinity Church Road. Multi-stemmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sugar Maple <em>(Acer saccharum)</em></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>East side of Trinity Church Road. At 31 Trinity Church Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sugar Maple</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>West side of Trinity Church Road. On lawn of cemetery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Common Crab-apple <em>(Malus pumila)</em></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>West side of Trinity Church Road. On lawn of cemetery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Honey Locust <em>(Gleditsia triacanthos)</em></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>West side of Trinity Church Road. On lawn of cemetery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Honey Locust</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>West side of Trinity Church Road. On lawn of cemetery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Honey Locust</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>West side of Trinity Church Road. On lawn of cemetery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Honey Locust</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>West side of Trinity Church Road. On lawn of cemetery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Honey Locust</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>West side of Trinity Church Road. On lawn of cemetery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Honey Locust</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>West side of Trinity Church Road. On lawn of cemetery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Honey Locust</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>West side of Trinity Church Road. On lawn of cemetery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Honey Locust</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>West side of Trinity Church Road. On lawn of cemetery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Honey Locust</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>West side of Trinity Church Road. On lawn of cemetery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Honey Locust</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>West side of Trinity Church Road. On lawn of cemetery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Honey Locust</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Fair-Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>West side of Trinity Church Road. On lawn of cemetery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Honey Locust</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Fair-Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>West side of Trinity Church Road. On lawn of cemetery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Honey Locust</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>West side of Trinity Church Road. On lawn of cemetery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Norway Maple <em>(Acer platanoides)</em></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>West side of Trinity Church Road. First house south of cemetery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Norway Maple</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Open Grown</td>
<td>West side of Trinity Church Road. First house south of cemetery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>D.B.H.</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Common Crab-apple</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Common Crab-apple</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Siberian Elm (Ulmus pumila)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td>West side of Trinity Church Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Siberian Elm</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Sour Cherry (Prunus cerasus)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
<td>15-30</td>
<td>Fair-Good</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td>West side of Trinity Church Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Sugar Maple</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Common Pear (Pyrus communis)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td>West side of Trinity Church Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Sweet Cherry (Prunus avium)</td>
<td>10-40</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td>West side of Trinity Church Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Red Ash (Fraxinus pennsylvanica)</td>
<td>30-75</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Sweet Cherry</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td>West side of Trinity Church Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Sweet Cherry</td>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td>West side of Trinity Church Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 TERMS OF REFERENCE

WESA was retained by the City of Hamilton in response to their Request for Proposal (RFP) dated February 1, 2006 to perform a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) along the Rymal Road Corridor (the study area) (Figure 1). A Phase II ESA was then to be completed along the road corridor if the preliminary results of the Phase I ESA indicated potential or actual environmental concerns in the study area. The Rymal Road corridor extends along Rymal Road East from Regional Road 56 to 300 meters (m) west of Glover Road and along Regional Road 56 from Rymal Road East 900 m south.

The objective of this ESA work was to identify potential or actual areas of environmental concern in the study area that may affect the progress of the proposed construction activities along the road corridor. The focus of the investigation was on actual or potential areas of environmental concern along the corridor that may affect worker health and safety or material management during construction.

1.2 GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY AREA

The study area encompasses a corridor bordering Rymal Road East in the City of Hamilton, Ontario (Figure 1). The segment of Rymal Road East examined extends from the intersection of Rymal Road East and Regional Road 56 to 300 m west of the intersection of Rymal Road East and Glover Road. This study also includes the examination of approximately 900 m of Regional Road 56 south of the intersection of Regional Road 56 and Rymal Road East. The study area is primarily occupied by paved portions of Rymal Road East and Regional Road 56. The western end of the study area is bordered to the north and south by residential and agricultural properties. The eastern end of the study area and the western side of the section of Regional Road 56 included in the study area is bordered by primarily commercial land uses. The eastern side of the 900 m section of Regional Road 56 is primarily utilised for agricultural purposes.
1.3 Scope of Work

1.3.1 Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Scope of Work

The following tasks were completed in the performance of the updated Phase I ESA.

Site Visit

A site visit to the study area was conducted on February 21, 2006. The weather conditions during the site visit were clear and sunny, with no snow cover.

WESA staff commenced the corridor inspection from the west end at the intersection of Rymal Road East and Dartnell Road. The inspection followed Rymal Road East to the intersection of Rymal Road East and Regional Road 56.

Interviews

Interviews were conducted with the employees of Brian’s Tire on February 21, 2006. Brian’s Tire is located on the north side of Rymal Road East at Swayne Road.

Records Review

The following mandatory and optional records were requested and reviewed:

- Historical reports provided by the City of Hamilton;
- CGI Group Inc. (formerly Insurance Advisory Organization (IAO) Inc.) (ERIS) records were requested on February 20, 2006;
- The following topographical and geological maps were consulted:
  - Energy, Mines and Resources Canada, Hamilton-Grimsby,
  - Ontario – Map 30 M/4, 1:50,000, 1984.
  - Ontario Division of Mines-Quaternary Geology of Grimsby
    - Area- Map P.993, 1:50,000, 1975.
- MOE documents entitled “Waste Disposal Site Inventory” 1991 and “Ontario Inventory of PCB Storage Sites” 1995 were reviewed.
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All tasks were completed by Karen Greer, Melanie MacKinnon, Ian Benger and Ron Donaldson of WESA. Assessor qualifications are provided in Appendix A.

1.3.2 Phase II Scope of Work

Based on the preliminary results of the Phase I ESA, the following tasks were completed as part of the Phase II investigation. The study area for the Phase II ESA is shown in Figure 2.

Service Locates

Prior to the drilling activities, all buried utilities were located at the site. WESA contacted Ontario One Call to determine the location of buried services in the vicinity of potential drilling locations.

Drilling Investigation

Six (6) boreholes were drilled in the area around the intersection of Rymal Road East and Swayze Road (Figure 2). Three boreholes were drilled on the north side of Rymal Road East (BH1 to BH3) and three were drilled on the south side (BH4 to BH6). The boreholes were spaced to cover approximately 100 m on each side of the intersection. Four boreholes were located on the east side of the intersection and two were located on the west side of the intersection of Rymal Road East and Swayze Road. The boreholes were advanced to a depth of approximately 3 metres below ground surface (m bgs) to determine the soil quality with respect to petroleum hydrocarbon compounds.

The boreholes were drilled by Aardvark Drilling of Guelph, Ontario under WESA supervision on March 7, 2006.

1.4 Limiting Conditions

The Phase I ESA portion of this project was performed in accordance with the substance and intent of the Phase I ESA guideline document produced by the Canadian Standards Association (CSA Z768-01). As such, it is based on visual observations made during a site visit, interviews with persons familiar with the study area, a review of historical records concerning the current and past land-use within the study area and requests for information filed with regulatory agencies.
The Phase II ESA portion of the project involved with the drilling of boreholes and the collection of soil samples for geochemical analyses. The soil conditions encountered represent the condition at the sampled locations only. Conditions away from the sampled locations may be different from those encountered during this study.

The Phase I and Phase II ESA did not include the collection of sufficient data for the preparation of a record of site condition.

The conclusions presented in the above captioned report represent our professional opinion, in light of the terms of reference, scope of work, and any limiting conditions noted herein. It is not intended to be a definitive investigation of contamination or other environmental concerns at the property.

The conclusions presented herein are based on information obtained up to and including the submission date of this document. Any site operations or land uses that may have changed since this submission may render the conclusions invalid. This document and the information contained herein have been prepared solely for the use of the City of Hamilton. No other party may use or rely upon the above captioned report or any portion thereof without the express written consent of WESA.

1.5 **Environmental Guidelines**

The document "Soil, Groundwater and Sediment Standards for Use under Part XV.1 of the Environmental Protection Act" (MOE, 2004) (Standard) defines generic soil and groundwater quality criteria depending on land use and whether the groundwater in a particular area is considered to be potable or non-potable. The selected Guideline criteria for the Hamilton area are presented in Table 2: Soil Standards for Industrial/Commercial/Community Property Use in a Potable Groundwater Condition, of this document.
2.0 PHYSICAL SETTING

2.1 TOPOGRAPHY

Ground elevation at the site is approximately 210 m above sea level. The study area is relatively flat lying, with less than one metre of relief. The surrounding area is gently sloping to the north, with a less than approximately 5 metres of relief.

2.2 SURFACE WATER HYDROLOGY

The study area is located approximately 8 kilometres (km) south of Lake Ontario. There are many water ways in the area including the Twenty Mile Creek and other small tributaries that drain into Lake Ontario just north of the study area.

Surface run-off from precipitation falling on the study area is collected in storm water catchments located along Rymal Road East.

2.3 REGIONAL GEOL OGY AND HYDROGEOLOGY

The Rymal Road corridor is situated within the Haldimand Clay Plain physiographic region (Chapman and Putnam, 1984). The clay plain is located between the Niagara Escarpment and the Lake Erie covering an area of approximately 3500 square kilometres. The plain is composed interstratified of clays and silts. Clay and silt were deposited as lacustrine sediments associated with the proglacial Lake Warren. These sediments thicken southwards to a maximum thickness of over 20 m (ODM, 1975). The clay and silt is underlain by a clayey silt-clay till known as the Halton Till. The till is found at the surface in the form of Niagara Falls Moraine. The moraine trends parallel to the Rymal Road approximately 1 km north of the study area. A review of drift thickness maps for the study area (ODM 1968), indicates the overburden thickness in the vicinity of Rymal Road is generally less than 7.6 m and may be as thin as 1.8 metres in places.

The underlying bedrock in the area consists of dolostone from the Lockport formations deposited during Middle and Lower Silurian.
Based on the topography in the vicinity of the study area and the proximity to Lake Ontario, the regional groundwater flow would be expected to be northwards towards Lake Ontario.

3.0 CURRENT SITE USE AND OPERATIONS

3.1 ON-SITE BUILDINGS AND OPERATIONS

The study area encompasses a corridor bordering Rymal Road East in the City of Hamilton, Ontario. The study area is primarily occupied by paved portions of Rymal Road East and Regional Road 56. The western end of the study area is bordered to the north and south by residential and agricultural properties. The eastern end of the study area is bordered by primarily commercial land uses as is the western side of the section of Regional Road 56, included in this study. The eastern side of the 900 m section of Regional Road 56 is primarily utilized for agricultural purposes.

City services such as hydro, gas, water and sewer run along both sides of Rymal Road East along the study area.

3.2 CURRENT SURROUNDING LAND USES

The current surrounding land uses were noted as follows by WESA staff. An abandoned quarry located approximately 20 m north of Rymal Road East and 300 m east of Dartnell Road was noted. The quarry appeared to have been abandoned for a long period of time. No mining equipment or structures were observed in the quarry or surrounding it. Further east an abandoned residential structure was located on the north side of the intersection of Glover and Rymal Road East. A small sign located above the garage attached to the east side of the home advertised “stone cutting” services, but both structures appeared to have been abandoned for some time. A large building supply and brick sales business was located further east on Rymal Road; number 1549 Rymal Road East. This business was identified as Ferrell Landscape Supplies Inc. The south side of Rymal Road East in this area was found to be occupied by residential structures and agricultural uses.

The property east of Ferrell Landscaping, 1565 Rymal Road East, was occupied by a residential structure that was found to be surrounded with non-operative motor vehicles of various ages.
An abandoned Ontario Hydro transformer station, identified as Hamilton Highlands Station, is located on the south side of Rymal Road East opposite side of Pritchard Road, just east of 1565 Rymal Road East. The station is located on a topographic high approximately 100 m from Rymal Road East. This station was found to currently contain three small transformers and appeared to have housed more when it was in service. Two driveways were also located in this area on the north side of Rymal Road East, slightly east of Prichard Road. These driveways appear to have been linked by a semi circular paved area.

Moving east on Rymal Road East both north and south sides of the corridor were found to be occupied by a mix of residential and agricultural land uses. A large residential development was observed to be under construction on the south side of the road opposite the terminus of Upper Mount Albion Road. An above ground fuel storage tank (AST) was observed beside the construction office area but was not closely inspected.

A large storm water retention pond, on the south west corner of Rymal Road East and Fletcher Road, was observed. A church with an attached cemetery was located on the north side of Rymal Road East slightly east of the storm water retention pond. A small fenced off parking area was also located near the church on the west side of the cemetery. The next feature observed was Farmer Al’s Market located at 2070 Rymal Road East. A small golf course was also located in this area adjacent to Farmer Al’s. A small potable water hauling firm was also found to be located on the south side of Rymal Road East slightly east of the golf course.

A second large area under development was located on the south side of Rymal Road East opposite the intersection of Whitedeer Road. This development project was observed to extend Swayze Road and included a recently opened Wal-Mart Store. A portable AST was observed near the intersection of Whitedeer Road and Rymal Road East; no staining was observed under the tank. The zone extending from the intersection of Swayze Road to the end of the study area at Regional Road 56 was found to be the most developed area within the corridor.

The first structure of interest within the Swayze Road area was located on the north side of intersection of Rymal Road East and Swayze Road. This structure was identified as Brian’s Tire and Auto Repairs (Figure 2). The size, shape and exterior appearance of the structure closely resemble that commonly observed in historical fuel dispensing stations. The pavement surrounding the structure also appeared to have recently been disturbed. The property immediately to the east was observed to be currently occupied by an OILCO gas station (Figure 2). The pump island was estimated to be within 15 m of the north side of Rymal Road East.
The lands to the south, 2200 Rymal Road East, were observed to be occupied by a small shopping plaza (Figure 2). An ESSO gas station was located on the eastern side of the plaza approximately 20 m from the south side of Rymal Road East. The remainder of the lands bordering the south side of the road in this area were under development with the parcel at the intersection of Rymal Road East and Regional Road 56 occupied by a large car dealership. The lands located to the north of Rymal Road East were observed to be occupied by a historical church structure, currently occupied by a food service business, and a mix of retail and service based businesses.

The last area of the corridor to be investigated was the area surrounding Swayze Road and the northern end of Regional Road 56. The area enclosed by these two streets was found to be occupied by various automotive mechanical and body repair shops as well as a variety of light industrial establishments. A school bus depot was located at the southern end of Swayze Road. This bus depot was observed to contain three ASTs, but the presence or absence of any soil staining could not be observed from outside the fenced yard. A medium sized AST was also observed beside the structure at 151 Swayze Road. An assortment of metal 225 L drums was also located in the area surrounding the AST. The lands to the east of Regional Road 56 were observed to be undeveloped agricultural land.

### 3.3 Other Areas of Concern

#### 3.3.1 Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)

Hamilton Highlands Ontario Hydro transformer station is located on the south side of Rymal Road East just east of 1565 Rymal Road East along the corridor (as noted above). The station is currently inactive, but was found to currently contain three small transformers. Transformer stations are known to be sources of PCBs, but the current condition and status of PCBs at this location is unknown and therefore presents a moderate level of concern.

### 3.4 Discussion of Findings

The current gas station and auto body shop located adjacent to the study area in the Rymal Road East and Swayze Road area present a moderate level of concern. The concern is a result of the potential for USTs to be located on the properties.
No details or documentations regarding to the condition of the tanks or conditions of the soil or groundwater on these properties was reviewed for the purpose of this report and are therefore unknown. A moderate level of concern is also present in the vicinity of the former Ontario Hydro transformer. The concern is due to the potential for PCBs contamination of the soil and groundwater in the area. The threat of impact on the study area due to the storage of PCBs on this site is reduced to low based on the geology in the area and the legal requirements for PCB storage and reporting.

4.0 HISTORICAL REVIEW

Historical aspects of the subject and nearby properties were reviewed during the Phase I by examining the following records:

- Historical air photo
- Interviews with persons knowledgeable about the subject property
- Ministry of the Environment “Waste Disposal Inventory” 1991
- Ministry of the Environment “Ontario Inventory of PCB Storage Sites” 1995
- CGI (ERIS) search results

4.1 SUBJECT PROPERTY AND SURROUNDING LAND USES

Historical air photos from 1943, 1960, 1978, 1988, 1999 and 2002 were reviewed as part of the Phase I. The air photos show the development and construction of the Rymal Road Corridor and the surrounding properties. A summary is presented below.

In 1943, Regional Road 56 ended at Rymal Road East where Swayze Road now joins Rymal Road East. A structure was visible in the location now occupied by Brian’s Tire and Service. Based on the air photos a small area in front of structure can be seen that may be a former pump island. A medium sized pond can also be seen located behind the structure. A secondary structure is visible on the opposite side of Rymal Road East (south east side of Rymal Road East and Swayze Road). The structure appeared to have been connected to Rymal Road East by two separate driveways.
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The central section of the study area appeared to be exclusively agricultural with some residential structures abutting Rymal Road East. At the time of the air photo, construction activity near Prichard Road at the western end of the study area was taking place. Also, the abandoned quarry identified on the western edge of the study area during the site visit was in operation.

The 1960 air photo showed that Regional Road 56 still ended at Rymal Road East where Swayze Road currently joins Rymal Road East. The property located on the south side of Rymal Road East just east of Swayze Road that is now operated as an ESSO gas station had a small structure that was visible. The property located northwest of the end of Swayze Road at Rymal Road East adjacent to the current Brian's Tire property showed star patterns in the field. The pattern appeared to be man made but was overgrown with grasses and weeds making identification difficult. The origin of the pattern is suspected to be a former municipal water works or storm water retention pond. The environmental concern is low. The air photo also showed numerous vehicles parked on the property that is now occupied by Brian's Tire. The quarry located on the western side of the study area appears in 1960 to be over grown with vegetation and therefore inactive at that time.

The Air Photo from 1978 revealed that Regional Road 56 had been re-aligned to meet Hwy 20 directly. Development and construction was taking place in the area. A new structure was visible between the current location of Brian's Tire and the church building, the current location occupied by the OLCO service station. A structure was also present in the area in which the current ESSO station is located. Further west along Rymal Road East development was occurring on the property now occupied by Farmer Al's Market. Construction activity appears to be ongoing on both sides of Rymal Road East just east of Prichard Road at that time with the possible construction of that natural gas pipeline which runs through the area and the installation of high-tension hydro wire towers. The area north of Rymal Road East and east of Pritchard where the abandoned hydro sub station is located was under construction at the time of the air photo.

Observations obtained from the 1988 and 1999 air photos indicated that development and construction continued in the area. The lands adjacent to Swayze Road continued to be primarily agricultural to the west and light commercial to the east. The quarry and brick retailing locations west of Pritchard Road were developed and appeared as they do today. The hydro sub-station east of Pritchard Road had been abandoned by 1999. The current Wal-Mart property located east of Swayze Road was occupied by a house with detached barn. The properties now occupied by the OLCO and ESSO stations appeared as they do today in 1999.
The 2002 air photo showed little change in the area to what was observed during the site visit by WESA.

4.2 **Waste Disposal Sites**

A review of the MOE document entitled “Waste Disposal Site Inventory” 1991 was performed. There are no active or closed waste disposal sites within a one-kilometre radius of the study area.

4.3 **PCB Storage Sites**

A review of the MOE document entitled “Ontario Inventory of PCB Storage Sites” 1993 was performed. There was no PCB storage located within the study area. As noted above in section 3.3.1 of this report an Ontario Hydro transformer was noted within the study area. No record of the transformer was noted in the search.

4.4 **Historical ERIS Search Results**

An EcoLog ERIS search was requested for properties located within two kilometres of the Rymal Road corridor. The search results are as follows:

- One Automobile Wrecking and Supplies was reported between 2001 and June 2005;
- Four Certificates of Approval were issued between 1985 and September 2002;
- Ontario Regulation 347 Waste Generator Summary reported 21 registrations between 1986 and 2004;
- Occurrence Reporting Information System reported four spills between 1988 and 2002;
- Three Retail Fuel Storage Tanks were reported between 1989 and June 2005;
- Scott’s Manufacturing Directory identified five manufactures between 1992 and 2003;

4.5 **Discussion of Findings**

A review of the ERIS search results for properties within a 0.3 km of the study area presented the following results that maybe of a concern to the subject property.
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- Three Underground Storage Tanks were noted within 0.3 km of the site. The underground fuel storage tanks (USTs) are located in the Rymal Road East and Swayze Road area;
- Four reportable spills were reported within 0.3 km of the study area between 1989 and 2000. The spills were reported to have occurred in the Rymal Road East and Swayze Road area. The most significant spill was reported in 1992 as a 15 litres of gasoline from a leaking fuel line at the corner Rymal Road East and Swayze Road.

The reported surrounding land uses pose a moderate to high potential for environmental impact to the study area in the vicinity of Rymal Road East and Swayze Road.

5.0 REVIEW OF OTHER INFORMATION SOURCES

5.1 PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTS

Historical reports relating to activates within the study area were provided by the City of Hamilton. The reports were reviewed for the purposes of this report.

5.2 INTERVIEWS

WESA interviewed the staff of Brian’s Tire on February 21, 2006. The employees indicated that before the current owner took possession of the property the previous owner had the USTs that were located on the property removed as well as a significant volume of soil. No documentation was provided with respect to the condition of the tanks, soil or groundwater at the time the tanks were removed.

5.3 DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

A review of the historical reports revealed concentrations of Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH) heavy oils above the applicable guideline criteria in soil that originated from a water main trench in the area of Rymal Road East and Swayze Road (Landtek, 2002). No further investigations were done in the area and no other concerns were noted in the additional reports that were provided.
6.0  PHASE I CONCLUSIONS

6.1  ACTUAL CONTAMINATION

Actual contamination was noted in the area of Rymal Road East and Swayze Road by Landtek Limited Consulting Engineers in December 2002 as a result of water main work in the area. The source of the contamination at the time was unknown and no further investigations were performed.

6.2  POTENTIAL CONTAMINATION

Historical and current land uses within the Rymal Road East and Swayze Road region of the study area present potential areas of contamination. The land uses included both historical and current gas stations with three USTs noted and four reportable spills reported between 1989 and 2000 in the area.

In order to determine whether there is an actual concern in this area the Phase II portion of the project was completed.

7.0  PHASE II METHOD OF STUDY

The methods used in this study are presented below.

7.1  BOREHOLE DRILLING

Aardvark Drilling of Guelph, Ontario under WESA supervision drilled six (6) boreholes in the area around the intersection of Rymal Road East and Swayze Road on March 7, 2006. The boreholes were backfilled to surface with drill cuttings and bentonite well seal upon completion. Excess drill cuttings were stored on-site in a sealed, steel drum for later disposal. Borehole records are provided in Appendix B.
The six boreholes were located as follows:

- Two on the north side of Rymal Road East, east of Swayze Road (BH1 and BH2);
- One on the north side of Rymal Road East, west of Swayze Road (BH3);
- Two on the south side of Rymal Road East, east of Swayze Road (BH5 and BH6); and
- One on the south side of Rymal Road East, west of Swayze Road (BH4).

7.2 Soil Sampling

Split spoon sampling techniques were used to collect soil samples for stratigraphic logging and field screening for geochemical sampling. Clean N-Dex Nitrile gloves were used, and were replaced between each sample. Duplicate, split soil samples were collected into clean glass jars with Teflon lined lids as well as clean, polyethylene, ziploc bags for detailed observation and field screening. An Eagle® combustible hydrocarbon monitor was used in the field to screen for petroleum hydrocarbon vapours from the soil samples from each location following MOE protocol. The samples were brought to room temperature (approx. 20°C) for a minimum of 2 hours prior to screening. The field screening results along with observations made in the field were used to assist in the selection of soil samples to be submitted to the laboratory. The samples selected for analysis were stored at approximately 4°C and delivered to EnviroTest Laboratories of Waterloo, Ontario for testing.

The samples were analyzed for Petroleum Hydrocarbon Compounds (PHC) Fraction 1 (C_{6-10}), Fraction 2 (C_{10-16}), Fraction 3 (C_{16-34}) and Fraction 4 (C_{>34}) (F1-F4) plus benzene, toluene, ethyl-benzene and xylene (BTEX).

8.0 Phase II Results and Discussion

The results of the investigation are presented and discussed below.

8.1 Soil Geochemistry

The soil geochemical results for the PHC (F1 - F4) and BTEX analysis are summarized in Table 1.
The results indicate that the selected Standards were met for all samples and all parameters collected from BH1, BH3, BH4, BH5 and BH6. Geochemical results for BTEX, F1 and F2 were below detection limit in the soil samples at these locations. The soil sample collected from the boreholes had very low concentrations of F3 and F4 PHC's, well below the selected Standard.

The analytical results for the soil samples collected from BH2 reported concentrations above the Standard. Sample BH2-SS2 exceeded the Standard for benzene. Sample BH2-SS3 exceeded the Standard for benzene, ethylbenzene and F1. The remainder of the parameters were above detection limit but below the Standard. These samples were collected between approximately 0.8 and 2.2 m bgs. Field observations indicated that the PHCs at this location did not likely continue deeper.

The original laboratory certificates of analyses are included in Appendix C.

9.0 PHASE II CONCLUSIONS

A Phase II environmental site assessment was completed to confirm suspected hydrocarbon contamination in the area of Rymal Road East and Swayze Road.

The soil geochemical results were compared to the selected Standard criteria in Table 2: Surface Soil Criteria for Industrial/Commercial/Community Property Use in a Potable Groundwater Condition of the MOE document “Soil, Ground Water and Sediment Standards for Use under Part XV.1 of the Environmental Protection Act” (MOE 2004). Based on this investigation the following summary and conclusions are presented:

- Groundwater was not encountered during the investigation.
- The soil geochemical results indicate that the selected Standard for petroleum hydrocarbon compounds F1 to F4 and BTEX were met in five of the six boreholes installed in the suspected areas of environmental concern.
- Analytical results from BH2 reported benzene, ethylbenzene and F1 concentrations above the Standard between 0.8 and 2.2 metres below ground surface.

10.0 OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The potential for impacts to the study area is considered to be low from the historical and current land uses with the exception of the Rymal Road East and Swayze Road area.
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The Phase II investigation reported hydrocarbon concentrations above the Standard in BH2 between approximately 0.8 and 2.2 metres below ground surface. The concentrations noted are consistent with gasoline contamination. It is recommended that the necessary precautions be taken by City staff and contractors when work occurs in the area. PHC containing soil removed from the area should be contained, handled and disposed of in accordance with Ontario Regulation 347 and 558 to insure no further environmental impacts occur.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]
Karen Greer, B.Sc., G.I.T.
Environmental Consultant

[Signature]
Senior Hydrogeologist

[Signature]
Ian Benger BSc. EMPG
Environmental Specialist
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### TABLE 1
Summary of Soil Geochemistry Results - Petroleum Hydrocarbon Compounds
City of Hamilton, Rymal Road Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Benzene</th>
<th>Toluene</th>
<th>Ethylbenzene</th>
<th>m+p-Xylenes</th>
<th>o-Xylenes</th>
<th>Total Xylenes</th>
<th>F1 (C6-C10)</th>
<th>F2 (C10-C14)</th>
<th>F3 (C16-C24)</th>
<th>F4 (C31-C50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(180) 230</td>
<td>(250) 150</td>
<td>(2500) 1700</td>
<td>(6600) 3300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH1-SS1</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.15</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH2-SS2</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH2-SS3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH3-SS2</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.15</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH4-SS2</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.15</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH5-SS3</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.15</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH6-SS3</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.15</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
All units are in µg/g

Standards - Ontario Regulation 133/84 made under Part XV.1 of the Environmental Protection Act. Table 2 Potable Groundwater Situation
Industrial/Commercial/Community Property Use

value in brackets indicates criteria for fine/medium textured soil conditions

| 5000 | Exceeds Standards |
NOTE: Drawing is not to scale.
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Assessor Qualifications
Position: Project Hydrogeologist, 2003-present
- W ESA Group Inc.
- Water and Earth Science Associates Ltd.

Role(s): Project Hydrogeologist
- Field Technician

Education:
- 2003, B.Sc., Hydrogeology, University of Waterloo
  Thesis Title: Effects of the Presence of BTEX-Ethanol in Groundwater on Biofilm Development

Languages: English
- French

Nationality: Canadian

Employment History:
2003-Present W ESA (Water and Earth Science Associates Ltd.), Project Hydrogeologist
Jan to Sept. 2002 Environment Canada, Environmental Research Assistant
April to Sept. 2001 Aqua Terre Solutions Inc., Field Technician
Sept. to Dec. 2000 University of Waterloo - Dr. John Cherry, Hydrogeology Field Assistant
Jan. to April 2000 Natural Resources Canada - Continental Geosciences Division, Lab Assistant

PROFESSIONAL PROFILE
Karen Greer, B.Sc., is a Hydrogeologist and Geoscientist in Training at WESA's (Water and Earth Science Associates Ltd.) Kitchener office. She received her Bachelor of Science degree in Earth Science - Hydrogeology from the University of Waterloo. Ms. Greer's experience has focused on the physical and chemical characterization of hydrogeological sites, working primarily with chlorinated solvent and hydrocarbon contamination. She has worked extensively on projects detailing the hydrogeological properties of fractured bedrock using packer systems. Her work with packer systems ranges from the technical design and construction to the testing and ultimately the data analysis. Her experience also includes GUDI (Groundwater Under the Direct Influence of Surface Water) investigations from a field collection of data to ultimately the data analyses and report writing.

Ms. Greer's experience includes Phase I Environmental Site Assessments. Ms. Greer has been the project manager and principal researcher and author on Phase I for over two and a half years. The ESAs have included large industrial facilities, commercial, food processing, retail and residential properties and office buildings at sites across southwestern Ontario.
Ms. Greer has experience with the installation of monitoring wells and with supervising the borehole drilling using numerous different drilling techniques including hollow steam auger, fluid and air rotary and sonic. Ms. Greer has a strong ability to interpret data and to assess the physical and chemical characteristics of hydrogeological sites. She is highly experienced with the analysis of pump and slug test data using the Aquifer Test™ software. Ms. Greer is a Geoscientist in training and is gaining experience on many levels of project management. She is fluent in English and French.

REPRESENTATIVE EXPERIENCE

Physical Hydrogeology
- Physical and chemical characterization of hydrogeological sites
- GUDI investigations
- Experienced with both methods and techniques of well construction, aquifer testing, drilling, test pitting, and excavation
- Monitoring well installation, including water table and deep aquifer installations using many different drilling techniques
- Aquifer analyses and characterization from pump test, slug and bail test data
- Construction of piezometers and multilevel hydrogeological monitoring devices
- Co-ordinated delivery and analysis of soil and water samples
- Detailed hydrogeological properties of fractured bedrock using packer systems
- Experienced in operating and maintaining a pump and treat system as part of remediation efforts in place
- Experienced with core logging, porosity, and permeameter testing, as well as profiling and surveying

Contaminant Hydrogeology
- Research focusing on the development of experimental methods to evaluate the effects of BTEX - ethanol on biofilms both in a lab and field setting
- Involved with the delineation and investigation of chlorinated solvent plumes in overburden and bedrock
- Extensive work regarding the implementation of Remediation by Natural Attenuation (RNA) for application on specific sites
- Experience with hydrocarbon remediation, from site assessment to clean up
- Highly involved with DNAPL (Dense Non-aqueous Phase Liquid) injection site at CFB Borden, constant monitoring, sampling, and data analysis for plum monitoring

Environmental Site Assessments
- Performed numerous Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs) according to the CSA standard for land transactions
- Conducted ESA at large industrial property with over 50 buildings with unique land uses and tenants
Position: Environmental Field Technologist
- Water and Earth Science Associates Ltd.

Role(s)
- Field Technologist
- Data Analysis and Interpretation
- Reporting

Expertise:
- Physical and Contaminant Hydrogeology
- Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessments
- Municipal Water Supply Studies
- Groundwater Recovery and Remediation Systems
- Aquifer Tests including GUD and well interference
- Soil Vapor Extraction Systems
- Decommissioning, excavation and verification sampling
- Investigative and confirmatory drilling supervision and well installation
- Environmental Waste Audits
- Well decommissioning
- Data logging programs and applications
- CAD drafting

Education:
- Sir Sandford Fleming College, Geotechnical Environmental Engineering Technologist, 1995
- WHMIS certification, Standard First Aid (St. John Ambulance), OSHA/NIOSH - Hazardous Materials & Site Investigations training and Operation of Small Drinking Water System Trained Person

Languages:
- English
- Basic French

Nationality: Canadian

Employment History:
2002 – Present  WESA (Water and Earth Science Associates Ltd.), Environmental Technologist
1995 – 1999  Dames & Moore Canada, Environmental Technologist

Membership in Professional Societies:
- Ontario Association of Certified Engineering Technicians and Technologists; Applied Science Technologist (A.Sc.T.)
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Melanie M. MacKinnon is an Environmental Field Technologist with WESA in their Kitchener office. Ms. MacKinnon received her Environmental Engineering Geology Diploma from Sir Sanford Fleming College in 1995. She worked for several years as an Environmental Field Technologist with Dames & Moore Canada in their Cambridge office before coming to WESA. Ms. MacKinnon's project experience includes water resource assessment studies and contaminant impact studies at industrial sites such as chemical, automotive, appliance and paint manufacturing facilities, industrial and municipal landfill sites, public airports, hospitals and correctional centres, mines, quarries, fuel distribution facilities, and Brownfield development properties. Ms. MacKinnon has extensive experience supervising borehole drilling (hollow stem auger, split spoon, bedrock core and sonic rig drilling), test-pitting, monitoring and supply well installations and stratigraphic logging as well as soil, groundwater and air sampling. Ms. MacKinnon's experience has included numerous site remediation activities such as soil oval and treatment of surface and subsurface contamination (including soil, water and air) as well as on-going monitoring and verification sampling. Ms. MacKinnon has extensive experience supervising borehole drilling (hollow stem auger, split spoon, bedrock core and sonic rig drilling), test-pitting, monitoring and supply well installations and stratigraphic logging as well as soil, groundwater and air sampling. Ms. MacKinnon's experience has included numerous site remediation activities such as soil oval and treatment of surface and subsurface contamination (including soil, water and air) as well as on-going monitoring and verification sampling. Ms. MacKinnon's experience has included numerous site remediation activities such as soil oval and treatment of surface and subsurface contamination (including soil, water and air) as well as on-going monitoring and verification sampling. Ms. MacKinnon's experience has included numerous site remediation activities such as soil oval and treatment of surface and subsurface contamination (including soil, water and air) as well as on-going monitoring and verification sampling. Ms. MacKinnon's experience has included numerous site remediation activities such as soil oval and treatment of surface and subsurface contamination (including soil, water and air) as well as on-going monitoring and verification sampling. Ms. MacKinnon has a good working knowledge of AutoCAD. She coordinates directly with contractors and clients to ensure that schedules, site safety and sampling protocols are all maintained.

REPRESENTATIVE EXPERIENCE

Monitoring and Sampling Procedures:
- Supervision of borehole drilling and well installation, including water table and deep aquifer installations for both water supply and contaminant monitoring;
- Split spoon and rock core sampling;
- Simulprobe® soil/gas - soil/water sampling;
- Site safety and headspace analyses with Photoionization detector and Gas chromatography and RKI Eagle;
- Develop and purge monitoring wells;
- Sample groundwater, surface water and soil for most parameters in the MOE Guideline for Use at Contaminated Sites in Ontario;
- Hydraulic testing;
- Sediment sampling;
- Test pit (in-situ) sampling;
- Groundwater and surface water level monitoring; and various routine sampling and monitoring programs for MOE compliance.

Groundwater Resource Assessments:
- Short and long term aquifer tests and analysis;
- GUDI studies; and
- Well interference assessments

Remediation Methods:
- Groundwater pump and treat systems, monitoring and sampling;
- Soil vapour extraction systems, monitoring and sampling; and
- Supervision of soil excavation and verification sampling.
Investigation and Delineation:
- shallow soil vapour surveys;
- extensive contaminant investigation drilling including simulprobe® soil/gas - soil/water sampling; and
- surface soil and test pit investigation.

Drilling Methods:
- bedrock coring, air rotary and fluid rotary;
- hollow stem/solid stem augering;
- decontamination procedures; and
- containment procedures.

Data Logger Programming and Application:
- familiar with use of various models including STARLOGGER (Unidata) and HANDAR logger, Solinst LeveLogger and In-Situ MiniTROLL datalogger systems;
- groundwater level monitoring;
- stream flow velocity monitoring and calculation; and
- weather station monitoring including temperature, humidity, barometric pressure, precipitation and rate of evaporation.

Surveying:
- leveling and elevation surveys; and
- GPS surveys.

Data Compilation and Presentation:
- data compilation and presentation using database, word processors and spreadsheet programs;
- data interpretation using geostatistical and mapping software;
- mapping, site plans and schematic drawing using AutoCAD;
- scheduling and flow chart preparation; and
- meeting and presentation preparation of slides, overheads and figures.

Health and Safety:
- compliance with generic and site specific health & safety plans; and
- understanding of hazardous materials handling procedures.
Position: Environmental Specialist, 2004-Present
- WESA (Water and Earth Science Associates Ltd.)

Role(s):
- Environmental Specialist, Environmental Field Technician
- Indoor Air Quality (IAQ)
- Business Development

Expertise:
- Air monitoring for variety of workplace contaminants
- Mould, asbestos and Indoor Air Quality (IAQ)
- Environmental soil, water sampling and monitoring
- Industrial waste assessments
- Sub-contractor administration and coordination
- Conducted air quality assessments.
- Conducted confined space entry assessment.
- Produced confined space entry and rescue procedures for large industrial clients.
- Conducted industrial storm water runoff sampling in compliance with municipal sewer use by-law.
- Conducted industrial air quality sampling assessments for a variety of potential contaminants.

Education:
- 2000, Niagara College, Postgraduate Environmental Management Program
- 1995, B.Sc., Geography and Anthropology, Trent University,

Training:
- Emergency Response Technician - Echelon Emergency Response and Training Inc. (2000-Present)
- Hazardous Materials Emergency Responder
- Spill containment and site remediation
- Safety Training: Confined Space Rescue
- Certificates: TDGA certification

Languages:
- English

Employment History:
- 2004-Present: WESA (Water and Earth Science Associates Ltd.), Environmental Specialist
- 2004-2004: Omer Environmental and Safety Inc.
- 2001-2002: R.V. Anderson Associates Ltd., Environmental Field Technician
- 2000-2001: Photech Environmental Solutions Inc., Field Technician
PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Orser Environmental and Safety Inc. (2002 - September 2004)
- Inspected and monitored industrial clients’ operations for compliance with Environmental and Health and Safety legislation.
- Conducted pre- and post-remedial air and surface sampling for mold contamination.
- Conducted asbestos surveys in industrial situations for regulatory compliance.
- Researched and completed Phase 1 site assessments for residential, commercial and industrial clients.
- Collected soil and groundwater samples for laboratory analysis.
- Analyzed laboratory results and presented results to clients.
- Resolved waste management challenges for industrial clients. Found cost effective alternatives for industrial and commercial clients’ hazardous waste.
- Constructed and maintained specialized environmental sampling equipment.
- Responded to client inquiries and produced quotations for approval.

- Investigated industrial waste systems and provided recommendations for improvement.
- Designed and implemented sewer connectivity assessments for local industrial facilities.
- Scheduled and supervised the activities of subcontractors and client union personnel.
- Modified blueprints to reflect undocumented changes to industrial structures.
- Collected drinking water samples for analysis.

Photech Environmental Solutions Inc. (2000 - 2001)
- Identified waste types and classifications under Ministry of the Environment waste codes.
- Completed MOE manifests and bills of lading in accordance with federal Transportation of Dangerous Goods legislation.
- Identified and categorized waste chemicals for safe transport as a “lab pack”.

WESMA
A Better Environment for Business
C. RONALD DONALDSON, M SC., P. GEO.

Position: Principal and Vice President, South Western Ontario Operations

Role(s):
- Branch Manager, W ESA Kitchener
- Project Manager / Project Team Leader
- Senior Peer Reviewer, Expert Witness / Senior Advisor
- Senior Hydrogeologist / Environmental Impact Specialist

Expertise:
- Environmental Management, Best Practices and Pollution Prevention
- Industrial, Agricultural, Greenfield, Gray Field and Brownfield Property Impact Definition and Remediation (Soil, Sediment, Groundwater, Surface Water)
- Municipal and Industrial Water Resource Development and Protection

Education:

Employment History:
- 2001 - Present: WESA Group Inc., Vice President/Principal
- 1989 - 1992: University of Waterloo, Research Assistant/Principal Investigator

Membership in Professional Societies:
- Association of Professional Geoscientists of Ontario (P. Geo)
- Association of Professional Engineers, Geologists and Geophysicists of Alberta (P. Geol)
- National Ground Water Association

Affiliations:
- Chair (1993 to Present), Regional Municipality of Waterloo Ecological and Environmental Advisory Committee
- Steering Committee Member (1997 to 2003), CRESTech (Centre for Research in Earth and Space Technology), Land Resource Management Committee
- Environmental Technologies Committee Member (2003 to Present), CRESTech (Centre for Research in Earth and Space Technology) a member of Ontario Centre for Excellence Inc. (OCE Inc.)
PROFESSIONAL PROFILE

Mr. C. Ronald Donaldson, M. Sc., P.Geo.

Mr. Donaldson is a Principal of W.E.S.A., a privately owned, Canadian environmental, health and safety consulting firm founded in 1976. The firm’s head office is situated in Ottawa (Carp) and currently operates from offices situated in Toronto, Burlington, Kitchener, Ottawa, Kingston, Sudbury, Montreal and Gatineau. He has been a groundwater specialist and the Manager of W.E.S.A.’s Kitchener office since 1992. Mr. Donaldson is a licensed Professional Geologist with the Association of Professional Geoscientists of Ontario and the Association of Professional Engineers, Geologists and Geophysicists of Alberta.

Domestic Project Experience

As a company principal and senior hydrogeologist of W.E.S.A. Mr. Donaldson has been involved in the planning and execution of over 1000 consulting assignments. He routinely supervises large multidisciplinary investigations and complex multisite consulting and remedial implementation assignments. A representative cross section of this work is presented below by discipline or assignment type.

Spill Abatement

Project Manager, Client Manager and Hydrogeologist. Spill abatement and clean-up activities for petroleum fuels, oils, and lubricants. These activities include spill containment, liquid, gas and dissolved phase recovery and treatment from soil, groundwater, surface water and confined spaces. Recovery technologies included Soil Vapour extraction, groundwater purge and treat, vacuum enhanced product recovery, emplacement of impermeable barrier technologies, enhanced in-situ remediation. Technical services provided included problem definition, remedial alternative assessment and cost estimation, hydrogeologic analysis, environmental risk analysis, contaminant pathway analysis, product identification and fingerprinting (organic and isotope) alternate water service provision (infrastructure, water treatment).

Industrial Site Decommissioning and Brownfields Redevelopment

Project Manager, Client Manager and Hydrogeologist. Industrial Site Contamination Definition, Remedial Alternatives Assessment and Site Clean-up. Mr. Donaldson has been extensively involved with the provision of environmental services to industry as it relates to the identification, control and clean-up of contaminated industrial lands throughout Ontario. The primary objective of much of this work has been for the reintroduction of contaminated lands back into the market. Problems have involved a variety of contaminants including heavy metals, acids, bases, chlorinated organic solvents (Dense Non-Aqueous Phase Liquids DNAPLs), hydrocarbon solvents (LNAPLs), fuels and lubricants. Complex environmental interactions relying on a variety of investigative and sampling techniques have been developed for each site. Project management of remedial projects in excess of $2.5 million.

Environmental Management Systems

Project Manager and Client Manager. EMS consultation and implementation was undertaken for an international automotive parts manufacturing company at 6 facilities in Ontario, Canada...
The services delivered included Phase 1 and 2 environmental site assessments and inter-site prioritization of environmental issues, remedial action planning, environmental abatement programs, spill and hazard response, environmental remediation, environmental compliance reporting to boards of directors in charge of environmental responsibility, in plan auditing of EMS to the ISO 14001 standard, compilation and development of Best Management Practices for Pollution Prevention in 34 industrial sectors. Functions also included the pre-aquisition and pre-disposition environmental assessment of real estate. These EMS programs are ongoing and include waste auditing and recycling functions as well as staff training and procedure modification.

Soil and Groundwater Treatment, Research and Development
Project Manager, Primary Researcher Hydrogeologist. The development of innovative soil and groundwater treatment and decontamination methods has been the focus of much of WESA’s efforts for site remediation, control and clean-up. Methods have included the utilization of emerging technology such as in-situ and ex-situ bioremediation of soils and groundwater, enhanced chemical degradation of chlorinated solvents, in conjunction with a variety of classical remedial tools such as pump and treat and excavation methods.

Environmental Forensics
Discipline Leader. Environmental Forensics is defined as a scientific methodology developed for identifying petroleum-related and other potentially hazardous environmental contaminants and for determining their sources and time of release. It combines experimental analytical procedures with scientific principles derived from the disciplines of organic geochemistry and hydrogeology. When applied to investigation of escaped petroleum products, Environmental Forensics provide a valuable tool for obtaining scientifically proven, court admissible evidence in environmental legal disputes. Mr. Donaldson has been involved in this evolving field since the mid-1980’s when the tools were used to identify the source material for crude oils. Today, the tools employ information generated through Phase I ESAs, literature reviews, isotopic analyses, gas chromatography, mass spectrophotometry, and specialized organic compound analyses.

Environmental Impact Assessment
Project Manager, Client Manager, Hydrogeologist. Environmental impact and its assessment and mitigation form a substantial component of most of the project work undertaken by Mr. Donaldson. Results of these studies have been submitted in supporting documentation for the Solid Waste Management sector, land development sector, the energy sector (petroleum and electrical) and the agricultural and industrial sectors. WESA experience has included site assessment for purposes of development or expansion, corridor assessment and has included the integration of financial and social environmental aspects.

Expert Testimony, Peer Review and Litigation Support
Expert opinion and litigation support has been rendered to tribunals and the courts in Canada including the Ontario Environmental Review Tribunal, the Ontario Municipal Board and Provincial Courts of Ontario. Areas of specialization include those listed above. Peer review services have been provided for the preparation of litigation and preparation of technical opinions based on the past performance of private industry in Civil Proceedings.
APPENDIX B

Borehole Records
## Log of Borehole: BH2

**Project No:** W-B4908  
**Project:** Rymal Road Corridor - Phase II ESA  
**Client:** City of Hamilton  
**Location:** Rymal Road  
**Supervisor:** Mel MacKinnon

### Subsurface Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (ft)</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Elev.</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Recovery</th>
<th>Eagle ppm</th>
<th>% LEI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ground Surface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>sand and gravel, silty, brown, damp to dry</td>
<td>SS1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>dark brownish gray, soft, wet, rootlets, wood fragments, sewage-like odor, trace hydrocarbon odor noted</td>
<td>SS2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**End of Borehole**

### Well Completion Details

- No well installation

**Drill Method:** Solid Stem Auger  
**Datum:** NA  
**Drill Date:** March 7, 2006  
**Checked by:** K. Greer  
**Driller:** Aardvark Drilling Inc.

**Sheet:** 1 of 1
# Log of Borehole: BH3

**Project No:** W-84908  
**Project:** Rymal Road Corridor - Phase II ESA  
**Client:** City of Hamilton  
**Location:** Rymal Road  
**Supervisor:** Mel MacKinnon

## Subsurface Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (ft/m)</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Elev.</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Recovery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Ground Surface</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>sand and gravel, brown</td>
<td>SS1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>dark brownish gray, soft, moist</td>
<td>SS2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Trace silt, brown, gray veins, hard, dry</td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>End of Borehole</td>
<td></td>
<td>SS4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Well Completion Details:** No well installation

**Drill Method:** Solid Stem Auger  
**Datum:** NA  
**Drill Date:** March 7, 2006  
**Checked by:** K. Greer  
**Driller:** Aardvark Drilling Inc.

**Sheet:** 1 of 1  
**WESA**  
182 Victoria St. South  
Kitchener, Ontario  
Canada N2G 2B9
## Log of Borehole: BH4

**Project No:** W-B4908  
**Project:** Rymer Road Corridor - Phase II ESA  
**Client:** City of Hamilton  
**Location:** Rymer Road  
**Supervisor:** Mel MacKinnon

### Subsurface Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (ft)</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Elev.</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Recovery</th>
<th>Eagle ppm</th>
<th>%LEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ground Surface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>sand and gravel, silty, brown, damp</td>
<td></td>
<td>SS1</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>gray, firm, moist, trace sewage-like odour</td>
<td></td>
<td>SS2</td>
<td></td>
<td>375</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trace silt, brown, gray veins, firm to hard, dry</td>
<td></td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Well Completion Details:** No well installation

---

**Drill Method:** Solid Stem Auger  
**Datum:** NA  
**Drill Date:** March 7, 2006  
**Checked by:** K. Greer  
**Driller:** Aardvark Drilling Inc.  
**Sheet:** 1 of 1
### Subsurface Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Elev.</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Recovery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ground Surface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td></td>
<td>SS1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sand and gravel, brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td></td>
<td>SS2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dark brownish gray, soft, moist, rotted, sewage-like, colour noted</td>
<td></td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trace silt, brown, gray veins, firm, damp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard</td>
<td></td>
<td>SS4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>End of Borehole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Well Completion Details
- No well installation
# Log of Borehole: BH6

**Project No:** W-84908  
**Project:** Rymal Road Corridor - Phase II ESA  
**Client:** City of Hamilton  
**Location:** Rymal Road  
**Supervisor:** Mel MacKinnon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Elev.</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Recovery</th>
<th>Eagle ppm</th>
<th>Well Completion Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 ft</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ground Surface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No well installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 m</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Asphalt</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ft</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill sand and gravel, brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ft</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clay dark brownish gray, soft, moist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ft</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sand well graded, silty, trace clay, brown, loose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ft</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clay dark brownish gray, soft, moist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ft</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trace silt, occasional gravel, brown, gray veins, hard, dry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 ft</td>
<td></td>
<td>End of Borehole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Drill Method:** Solid Stem Auger  
**Datum:** NA  
**Drill Date:** March 7, 2006  
**Checked by:** K. Greer  
**Driller:** Aardvark Drilling Inc.  
**Sheet:** 1 of 1
APPENDIX C

Analytical Results
ANALYTICAL REPORT

WESA / ENVIR-EAU
ATTN: KAREN GREER
WESA
KITCHENER, ON N2G 2V9

Lab Work Order #: L369006
Project P.O. #: B4908
Job Reference: B4908
Legal Site Desc:
CofC Numbers:
Other Information:

Comments:

APPROVED BY: Wayne Smith
WAYNE SMITH, C. CHEM., C.E.T.
Project Manager

THIS REPORT SHALL NOT BE REPRODUCED EXCEPT IN FULL WITHOUT THE WRITTEN AUTHORITY OF THE LABORATORY. ALL SAMPLES WILL BE DISPOSED OF AFTER 30 DAYS FOLLOWING ANALYSIS. PLEASE CONTACT THE LAB IF YOU REQUIRE ADDITIONAL SAMPLE STORAGE TIME.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Analyte</th>
<th>DL</th>
<th>L369006-1</th>
<th>L369006-2</th>
<th>L369006-3</th>
<th>L369006-4</th>
<th>L369006-5</th>
<th>L369006-6</th>
<th>L369006-7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Packages</td>
<td>Benzene (mg/kg)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethyl Benzene (mg/kg)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m,p-Xylenes (mg/kg)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o-Xylene (mg/kg)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toluene (mg/kg)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Xylene, (total) (mg/kg)</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>&lt;0.15</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>&lt;0.15</td>
<td>&lt;0.15</td>
<td>&lt;0.15</td>
<td>&lt;0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1 (C6-C10) (mg/kg)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1-BTEX (mg/kg)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F2 (C10-C16) (mg/kg)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F3 (C16-C34) (mg/kg)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F4 (C34-C50) (mg/kg)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Hydrocarbons (C6-C50) (mg/kg)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chromatogram to baseline at nC50</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surrogate: Octacosane (%)</td>
<td>60-120</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Parameter</td>
<td>% Moisture (%)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reference Information

Methods Listed (if applicable):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALS Test Code</th>
<th>Matrix</th>
<th>Test Description</th>
<th>Preparation Method Reference (Based On)</th>
<th>Analytical Method Reference (Based On)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BTX-R153-WT</td>
<td>Soil</td>
<td>BTEX (O.Reg.153/04)</td>
<td>MOE DECPH-E3389/CCME</td>
<td>CALCULATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETL-TVH,TEH-CCME-WT</td>
<td>Soil</td>
<td>CCME Total Hydrocarbons</td>
<td>MOE DECPH-E3389/CCME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analytical methods used for analysis of CCME Petroleum Hydrocarbons have been validated and comply with the Reference Method for the CWS PHC.

Hydrocarbon results are expressed on a dry weight basis.

In cases where results for both F4 and F4G are reported, the greater of the two results must be used in any application of the CWS PHC guidelines and the gravimetric heavy hydrocarbons cannot be added to the C5 to C50 hydrocarbons.

In samples where BTEX and F4 were analyzed, F1-BTEX represents a value where the sum of Benzene, Toluene, Ethylbenzene and Total Xylenes has been subtracted from F1.

In samples where PAHs, F2 and F3 were analyzed, F2-Naphthalene represents the result where Naphthalene has been subtracted from F2. F3-PAH represents a result where the sum of Benzo(a)anthracene, Benzo(a)pyrene, Benzo(b)fluoranthene, Benzo(k)fluoranthene, Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene, Fluoranthene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene, Phenanthrene, and Pyrene has been subtracted from F3.

Unless otherwise qualified, the following quality control criteria have been met for the F1 hydrocarbon range:
1. All extraction and analysis holding times were met.
2. Instrument performance showing response factors for C6 and C10 within 30% of the response factor for toluene.
3. Linearity of gasoline response within 15% throughout the calibration range.

Unless otherwise qualified, the following quality control criteria have been met for the F2-F4 hydrocarbon ranges:
1. All extraction and analysis holding times were met.
2. Instrument performance showing C10, C16 and C34 response factors within 10% of their average.
3. Instrument performance showing the C50 response factor within 30% of the average of the C10, C16 and C34 response factors.
4. Linearity of diesel or motor oil response within 15% throughout the calibration range.

F1-WT Soil F1 (O.Reg.153/04) MOE DECPH-E3389/CCME
F2-F4-WT Soil F2-F4 (O.Reg.153/04) MOE DECPH-E3389/CCME
MOISTURE-WT Soil % Moisture GRAVIMETRIC

** Laboratory Methods employed follow in-house procedures, which are generally based on nationally or internationally accepted methodologies.

Chain of Custody Numbers:

The last two letters of the above test code(s) indicate the laboratory that performed analytical analysis for that test. Refer to the list below:

Laboratory Definition Code Laboratory Location Laboratory Definition Code Laboratory Location
WT ALS LABORATORY GROUP - WATERLOO (SENTINEL), ONTARIO, CAN...
Reference Information

GLOSSARY OF REPORT TERMS:
Surrogate - A surrogate is an organic compound that is similar to the target analyte(s) in chemical composition and behavior but not normally detected in environmental samples. Prior to sample processing, samples are fortified with one or more surrogate compounds.
The reported surrogate recovery value provides a measure of method efficiency. The Laboratory control limits are determined under column heading D.L.
mg/kg (units) - unit of concentration based on mass, parts per million
mg/L (units) - unit of concentration based on volume, parts per million
< - Less than
D.L. - Detection Limit
N/A - Result not available. Refer to qualifier code and definition for explanation

Test results reported relate only to the samples as received by the laboratory.
UNLESS OTHERWISE STATED, ALL SAMPLES WERE RECEIVED IN ACCEPTABLE CONDITION.
UNLESS OTHERWISE STATED, SAMPLES ARE NOT CORRECTED FOR CLIENT FIELD BLANKS.
Although test results are generated under strict QA/QC protocols, any unsigned test reports, faxes, or emails are considered preliminary.

ALS Laboratory Group has an extensive QA/QC program where all analytical data reported is analyzed using approved referenced procedures followed by checks and reviews by senior managers and quality assurance personnel. However, since the results are obtained from chemical measurements and thus cannot be guaranteed, ALS Laboratory Group assumes no liability for the use or interpretation of the results.
# ALS Laboratory Group Quality Control Report

**Workorder:** L369006  
**Report Date:** 14-MAR-06

### Client:
WESA / ENVIR-EAU  
WESA 182 VICTORIA STREET, SOUTH  
KITCHENER ON N2G 2V9

### Contact:
KAREN GREER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Matrix</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Qualifier</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>RPD</th>
<th>Limit</th>
<th>Analyzed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BTX-R155-WT</strong></td>
<td><strong>Soil</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batch</td>
<td>R379235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4G17867-1</td>
<td>CVS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzene</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63-138</td>
<td>09-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethyl Benzene</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53-138</td>
<td>09-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m+p-Xylenes</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63-138</td>
<td>09-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o-Xylene</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63-138</td>
<td>09-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toluene</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63-138</td>
<td>09-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4G17867-2</td>
<td>DUP</td>
<td>L369006-1</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>RPD-NA</td>
<td>mg/kg</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>09-MAR-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzene</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>RPD-NA</td>
<td>mg/kg</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>09-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethyl Benzene</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>RPD-NA</td>
<td>mg/kg</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>09-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m+p-Xylenes</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>RPD-NA</td>
<td>mg/kg</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>09-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o-Xylene</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>RPD-NA</td>
<td>mg/kg</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>09-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toluene</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>RPD-NA</td>
<td>mg/kg</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>09-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4G17867-1</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>mg/kg</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>09-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzene</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>mg/kg</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>09-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethyl Benzene</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>mg/kg</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>09-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m+p-Xylenes</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>mg/kg</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>09-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o-Xylene</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>mg/kg</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>09-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toluene</td>
<td>&lt;0.03</td>
<td>mg/kg</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>09-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F1-WT</strong></td>
<td><strong>Soil</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batch</td>
<td>R379239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4G17868-1</td>
<td>CVS</td>
<td>TVH: (C6-C10 / No BTEX Correction)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>65-130</td>
<td>09-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4G17867-2</td>
<td>DUP</td>
<td>L369006-1</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>RPD-NA</td>
<td>mg/kg</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>09-MAR-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVH: (C6-C10 / No BTEX Correction)</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>RPD-NA</td>
<td>mg/kg</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>09-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4G17867-1</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>TVH: (C6-C10 / No BTEX Correction)</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>mg/kg</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>09-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batch</td>
<td>R380274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4G19028-1</td>
<td>CVS</td>
<td>TVH: (C6-C10 / No BTEX Correction)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>65-130</td>
<td>13-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F2-F4-WT</strong></td>
<td><strong>Soil</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batch</td>
<td>R380072</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4G19433-1</td>
<td>CVS</td>
<td>F2 (C10-C16)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>70-130</td>
<td>10-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 (C16-C34)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>70-130</td>
<td>10-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4 (C34-C50)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>70-130</td>
<td>10-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Matrix</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Qualifier</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>RPD</th>
<th>Limit</th>
<th>Analyzed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>F2-F4-WT</strong></td>
<td><strong>Soil</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batch</td>
<td>R380072</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG419433-1</td>
<td>CVS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4 (C34-C50)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>70-130</td>
<td>10-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WG418145-3</strong></td>
<td><strong>DUP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L369027-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 (C10-C16)</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>RPD-NA</td>
<td>mg/kg</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 (C16-C34)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>J,G</td>
<td>mg/kg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4 (C34-C50)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>J,G</td>
<td>mg/kg</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WG418145-2</strong></td>
<td><strong>LCS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 (C10-C16)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>60-130</td>
<td>10-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 (C16-C34)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>60-130</td>
<td>10-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4 (C34-C50)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>60-130</td>
<td>10-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WG418145-1</strong></td>
<td><strong>MB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 (C10-C16)</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td></td>
<td>mg/kg</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 (C16-C34)</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td></td>
<td>mg/kg</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4 (C34-C50)</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td></td>
<td>mg/kg</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MOISTURE-WT</strong></td>
<td><strong>Soil</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batch</td>
<td>R378975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WG417895-3</strong></td>
<td><strong>DUP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L369006-7</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>08-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WG417895-2</strong></td>
<td><strong>LCS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Moisture</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>66-128</td>
<td>09-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WG417895-1</strong></td>
<td><strong>MB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Moisture</td>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>08-MAR-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Legend:

Limit 99% Confidence Interval (Laboratory Control Limits)
DUP Duplicate
RPD Relative Percent Difference
N/A Not Available
LCS Laboratory Control Sample
SRM Standard Reference Material
MS Matrix Spike
MSD Matrix Spike Duplicate
ADE Average Desorption Efficiency
MB Method Blank
IRM Internal Reference Material
CRM Certified Reference Material
CCV Continuing Calibration Verification
CVS Calibration Verification Standard
LCSD Laboratory Control Sample Duplicate

Qualifier:

RPD-NA Relative Percent Difference Not Available due to result(s) being less than detection limit.
A Method blank exceeds acceptance limit. Blank correction not applied, unless the qualifier "RAMB" (result adjusted for method blank) appears in the Analytical Report.
B Method blank result exceeds acceptance limit, however, it is less than 5% of sample concentration. Blank correction not applied.
E Matrix spike recovery may fall outside the acceptance limits due to high sample background.
F Silver recovery low, likely due to elevated chloride levels in sample.
G Outlier - No assignable cause for nonconformity has been determined.
J Duplicate results and limit(s) are expressed in terms of absolute difference.
K The sample referenced above is of a non-standard matrix type; standard QC acceptance criteria may not be achievable.
# Chain of Custody / Analytical Services Request Form

**Company Name:** LWSA

**Project Manager:** K. Greer

**Project No.:** By908

**Phone:** 742-0655

**Sample Information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/Time</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Matrix</th>
<th>Number of Containers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06/03/07</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>BH1 SS2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>BH2 SS2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>BH3 SS2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>BH4 SS2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>BH5 SS3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>BH6 SS3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>BH7 SS2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Special Instructions/Comments:**

**Sample Condition:**

- **PHC:** 12.45

**Notes and Conditions:**

1. Cluster number must be provided to ensure proper tracking.
2. TAT may vary dependent on complexity of analysis and lab workload at time of submission. Please contact the lab to confirm TATs.
3. Any other known or suspected hazards relating to a sample must be noted on the chain of custody in comments section.
# Chain of Custody / Analytical Services Request Form

## Company Information
- **Company Name:** [Name]
- **Project Manager:** [Name]
- **Projects:** [Name]
- **Sample Date/Time:** [Date/Time]
- **Sample Location:** [Location]
- **Sample Description:** [Description]
- **Sample Condition:** [Condition]
- **Notes and Conditions:**
  1. Quote number must be provided to ensure proper tracking.
  2. TAT may vary depending on complexity of analysis and lab workload at time of submission. Please consult the lab to confirm TATs.
  3. Any known or suspected hazards relating to a sample must be noted on the chain of custody in comments section.

## Analysis Request
- **Indicate Method:** [Method]
- **Sample Description:** [Description]
- **Sample Condition:** [Condition]
- **Notes and Conditions:**
  1. Quote number must be provided to ensure proper tracking.
  2. TAT may vary depending on complexity of analysis and lab workload at time of submission. Please consult the lab to confirm TATs.
  3. Any known or suspected hazards relating to a sample must be noted on the chain of custody in comments section.

## Special Instructions/Comments

## Sample Condition
- **Sample Identification:** [ID]
- **Sample Description:** [Description]
- **Sample Condition:** [Condition]
- **Notes and Conditions:**
  1. Quote number must be provided to ensure proper tracking.
  2. TAT may vary depending on complexity of analysis and lab workload at time of submission. Please consult the lab to confirm TATs.
  3. Any known or suspected hazards relating to a sample must be noted on the chain of custody in comments section.
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MRC’s memo on *Clarification of RRPA traffic data memo* dated June 13, 2005
MEMO

TO: Suzette Shiu / Ray Bacquie, iTRANS
FROM: Alice Lee, MRC
DATE: Monday, June 13, 2005
COPIES: Gavin Norman, City of Hamilton
        Helene Tanguay-Ellermeyer, City of Hamilton
        Margaret Fazio, City of Hamilton
        Jack Thompson, MRC
OUR FILE: W O . 6011
SUBJECT: RRPA Traffic Data

1. Request for Traffic Data

As per the memo provided by iTRANS dated March 21, 2005 traffic data was requested for the ROPA 9 Class EA study, also referenced as the Rymal Road Planning Area (RRPA). The request for data included the following:

- Updated traffic counts for the following intersections:
  § Upper Mount Albion Road and Rymal Road
  § Fletcher Road and Rymal Road
  § 2nd Road West and Rymal Road
  § Upper Centennial Parkway and Rymal Road
  § Pritchard Road and Rymal Road
  § Darlington Road and Pritchard Road

- Road link and intersection movement volumes for the AM and PM peak periods for the following scenarios:
  § Base year traffic forecasts
  § 2011 base road network with and without ROPA 9 developments
  § 2011 future road network with and without ROPA 9 developments
  § 2021 base road network with and without ROPA 9 developments
  § 2021 future road network with and without ROPA 9 developments

This memo provides a summary of the traffic count data (included in Appendix A) and road link volumes for the AM and PM peak period for the noted scenarios.
2. MRC Modeling

2.1 Model Calibration

For purposes of estimating future volumes in the RRPA, the existing 2001 City of Hamilton EMME/2 model was used as a base. Prior to performing model runs for future network scenarios, the 2001 model was calibrated to provide a better representation of existing vehicle volume flows.

The calibration process included the following steps:

- Reviewed network to include current lane configurations
- Reviewed location of centroid connectors
- Reviewed assumed network speeds

Following the calibration process, a screenline analysis of the area bounded by the Lincoln M. Alexander Parkway/Mud Street to the north, Upper Centennial Parkway to the east and Upper Ottawa Street to the west was undertaken to determine the validity of modelled volumes. Screenline results shown in Tables 1 to 3 represent modelled auto volumes increased to account for trucks. In general, each screenline was within 10% of existing traffic volumes with the exception of the non-peak direction for the east-west screenline.

Table 1. North-South Screenline East of Upper Ottawa Street (Total Vehicles)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Simulated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Alexander Parkway</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>1496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Church Road</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rymal Road</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>2274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. North-South Screenline: West of Upper Centennial Parkway (Total Vehicles)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Simulated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mud Street</td>
<td>1506</td>
<td>778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rymal Road</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>1232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. East-West Screenline: South of Mud Street/the LINC (Total Vehicles)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Simulated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Centennial Parkway</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Road</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Brock Road</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parnell Drive</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Interberry Drive</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pritchard Road</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartnell Road</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Ottawa Street</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3620</td>
<td>2604</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An assessment of individual link volumes on Rymal Road within the study area was also undertaken to verify that 2001 traffic count volumes were represented along Rymal Road.
As indicated in Table 4, simulated vehicle volumes on Rymal Road entering and exiting the study area are similar in value to existing 2001 vehicle volumes. However, it is noted that non-peak direction volumes in the model are much lower than existing volumes. The discrepancy between these volumes may be due to the fact that the 2001 EMME/2 model does not account for non-work trips related to post-secondary schools, recreation, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Simulated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rymal Road E of Trinity Church</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rymal Road W of Upper Centennial Parkway</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A summary of the modelled auto volumes along the corridor for 2001 conditions is shown in Figure 1. A plot of the modelled volumes on Rymal Road and the surrounding area is attached in Appendix B.

2.2 Future Model Assignments

As requested by iTRANS, various network and trip table scenarios were modelled in EMME/2 for the AM peak hour. A total of four main scenarios were evaluated in this process. Each of the scenarios was evaluated for the planning horizon years of 2011 and 2021. The scenarios included the following:

- **Scenario 1**: Future background growth, no RRPA development, existing road network
- **Scenario 2**: Future background growth, no RRPA development, future road network
- **Scenario 3**: Future background growth, RRPA development, existing road network
- **Scenario 4**: Future background growth, RRPA development, future road network

As a note, development and network improvements proposed for an adjacent study area, the North Glenbrook Industrial Business Park (NGIBP) and Heritage Green (HG) commercial development, is also included in the analysis of this study to ensure accurate representation of modelled volumes on Rymal Road and Trinity Church Road. A summary of the assumptions that were made with regards to future development, future trip generation and future network improvements as applicable to the respective scenarios is described below.
2011 Development Assumptions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial (sq ft)</th>
<th>Residential (units)</th>
<th>Industrial (acres)</th>
<th>Manufacturing (acres)</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RRPA</td>
<td>761,845</td>
<td>3590</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HG</td>
<td>300,300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG IBP1</td>
<td>347,740</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2021 Development Assumptions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial (sq ft)</th>
<th>Residential (units)</th>
<th>Industrial (acres)</th>
<th>Manufacturing (acres)</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NG IBP2</td>
<td>284,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG IBP3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Future Trip Generation Assumptions:

1. For industrial and manufacturing landuses, 55% of available land was assumed to be developable.
2. 60% of developable land was assumed to be the GLA for RRPA (due to dispersed in study area).
3. 100% of developable land was assumed to be the GLA for HG (due to clustered commercial area).
4. 40% of commercial trips were assumed to be linked trips.
5. Residential units were assumed to be 50% single family dwellings and 50% townhomes.
6. Trips rates obtained from the ITE Trip Generation Manual 7th Edition for the following:
   - Shopping Centre (ITE Code: 820) for commercial development
   - Industrial Park (ITE Code: 130) for business industrial development
   - Manufacturing (ITE Code: 140) for general industrial development
   - Single family detached housing for single family dwellings
   - Residential condo/townhouse for townhomes
7. All RRPA and HG trips were assumed to occur by 2011.
8. NG IBP trips were split into three phases, with the assumption that Phase 1 would occur by 2011 and Phases 2 and 3 by 2021.
9. As a note, NG IBP trips assumed that only 50% of total developable land would be implemented by the noted horizon year of 2021.

2011 Network Assumptions:

1. Trinity Church Road extended as 4-lane arterial north of Rymal Road to RHCE
2. Rymal Road widened to 4 lanes between Upper Centennial Parkway and Trinity Church Road
3. ROPA 9 proposed local network included
4. Dartnall Road extended as a 4-lane arterial from Rymal Road to Twenty Road

2011 Network Assumptions:

1. Dartnall Road extended as a 4-lane arterial from Twenty Road to Dickenson Road
2. NG IBP proposed alternative 5 network included

Assignment Results:

The AM peak hour assignment results on Rymal Road for each of the scenarios and their respective horizon years are summarized in the following sheets. The plots of each of these assignment runs are included in Appendix C. As noted earlier, the non-peak direction modeled volumes are lower than existing volumes. As a result, to obtain more representative flows in the non-peak direction, the absolute growth in vehicle volumes between the future horizon year modeled volumes and the existing 2001 modeled volumes was applied to the existing (2005 synthesized) volumes to obtain adjusted future horizon year volumes. These adjusted volumes are also summarized in the following sheets.
Scenario 1: Future background growth, no RRPA, HG or NGP development, existing road network

Summary of Findings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Section</th>
<th>2011 Model Volumes</th>
<th>2011 Adjusted Volumes</th>
<th>2021 Model Volumes</th>
<th>2021 Adjusted Volumes</th>
<th>Road Width or Lane Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rymal Road east of Upper Mount Albion Road</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>4-lane in either 2011 or 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Church Road north of Upper Mount Albion Road</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Trinity Church Road volumes obtained from plots. These are no adjusted volumes as Trinity Church Road sections have no existing volumes.

Conclusion:
The addition of background growth to existing volumes on Rymal Road will not require lane widening to 4-lanes in either 2011 or 2021.
Scenario 2: Future background growth, no RRPA, HG or NGEP development, future road network

Figure 8. 2001 AM Peak Hour Volumes

Figure 9. Existing (2005 Synthesized) AM Peak Hour Total Volumes

Figure 10. 2011 AM Peak Hour Volumes

Figure 11. 2011 AM Peak Hour Adjusted Total Volumes

Figure 12. 2021 AM Peak Hour Volumes

Figure 13. 2021 AM Peak Hour Adjusted Total Volumes

Summary of Findings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Section</th>
<th>2011 Model Volumes</th>
<th>2011 Adjusted Volumes</th>
<th>2011 Model Volumes</th>
<th>2011 Adjusted Volumes</th>
<th>PKT PK D &amp; Lanes Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rymal Road east of Upper Mount Albion Road</td>
<td>355 750</td>
<td>645 1020</td>
<td>535 720</td>
<td>385 990</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Church Road north of Rymal Road</td>
<td>795 465</td>
<td>735 695</td>
<td>735 695</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Trinity Church Road volumes are obtained from plots. There are no adjusted volumes for Trinity Church Road as there are no existing volumes.

Conclusion:

Even with the provision of four lanes, with only background growth, Rymal Road will only require a 2-lane cross-section; however, it will be operating near or at capacity. Trinity Church Road when extended to RHCE indicates travel demand consistent with a 2-lane road.
Scenario 3: Future background growth, RRPA, NG and NG IP development, existing road network

Summary of Findings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Section</th>
<th>2011 Model Volumes</th>
<th>2011 Adjusted Volumes</th>
<th>2021 Model Volumes</th>
<th>2021 Adjusted Volumes</th>
<th>PK Hr</th>
<th>PK Dir</th>
<th>Lane Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rymal Road east of Upper Mount Albion Road</td>
<td>435 835 725 1105 500 850 790 1120</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Church Road north of Rymal Road</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Trinity Church Road volumes were obtained from plots. There are no adjusted volumes for Trinity Church Road as there are no existing volumes.

Conclusion:
The implementation of ROPA developments results in an increase of vehicle volumes on Rymal Road. However, use of Rymal Road is constrained assuming the existing 2-lane cross-section for future planning horizons. Vehicles would be travelling in a congested state. Hence, there is a need to improve Rymal Road.
Scenario 4: Future background growth, RRPA, HG and NG IBP development, future road network.

Figure 20. 2001 AM Peak Hour Auto Volumes

Figure 21. Existing (2005 Synthesized) AM Peak Hour Total Vehicle Volumes

Figure 22. 2011 AM Peak Hour Auto Volumes

Figure 23. 2011 AM Peak Hour Adjusted Total Vehicle Volumes

Figure 24. 2021 AM Peak Hour Auto Volumes

Figure 25. 2021 AM Peak Hour Adjusted Total Vehicle Volumes

Summary of Findings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Section</th>
<th>2011 Model Volumes</th>
<th>2011 Adjusted Volumes</th>
<th>2021 Model Volumes</th>
<th>2021 Adjusted Volumes</th>
<th>Ph HR PK Dr Lane Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rymal Road east of Upper Mount Albion Road</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Church Road north of Rymal Road</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>1085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Trinity Church Road volumes obtained from plots. There are no adjusted volumes for Trinity Church Road as there are no existing volumes.

Conclusion:

The future 2011 and 2021 volumes on Rymal Road and Trinity Church Road show a demand for a 4-lane cross-section on both facilities.
### 2.3 Future Spreadsheet Model Assignments

In addition to undertaking model runs for the various network and trip table scenarios, future link volumes on Rymal Road were also estimated by a spreadsheet model that assigns trips to the network based on trip generation and trip distribution characteristics within the study area.

The same trip generation assumptions that were assumed for the modelling procedure was also applied to determine future "in" and "out" trips assigned to the network in the spreadsheet model. Trip distribution patterns to the new development areas were obtained by reviewing and using the trip distribution patterns of a nearby zone with similar land uses. Based on an understanding of the origins/destinations of these trips, new development trips were assigned to the network on a turning movement basis. These development trips were then added to existing (2005 synthesized) link volumes and background traffic within the study area to determine 2011 and 2021 future volumes.

The spreadsheet model 2011 and 2021 AM peak hour volumes along with the existing (2005 synthesized) volumes are shown in Figures 26 to 28.

#### Figure 26. Existing (2005 Synthesized) AM Peak Hour Total Vehicle Volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dartnell Road</th>
<th>Glover Road</th>
<th>Trinity Church Road</th>
<th>Upper Mount Albion Road</th>
<th>Fletcher Road</th>
<th>Second Road West</th>
<th>White Deer Road</th>
<th>Pritchard Road</th>
<th>Rymal Road</th>
<th>Upper Centennial Parkway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>580</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Figure 27. 2011 Spreadsheet Model AM Peak Hour Total Vehicle Volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dartnell Road</th>
<th>Glover Road</th>
<th>Trinity Church Road</th>
<th>Upper Mount Albion Road</th>
<th>Fletcher Road</th>
<th>Second Road West</th>
<th>White Deer Road</th>
<th>Pritchard Road</th>
<th>Rymal Road</th>
<th>Upper Centennial Parkway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>775</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>785</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>1055</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Figure 28. 2021 Spreadsheet Model AM Peak Hour Total Vehicle Volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dartnell Road</th>
<th>Glover Road</th>
<th>Trinity Church Road</th>
<th>Upper Mount Albion Road</th>
<th>Fletcher Road</th>
<th>Second Road West</th>
<th>White Deer Road</th>
<th>Pritchard Road</th>
<th>Rymal Road</th>
<th>Upper Centennial Parkway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>850</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>1465</td>
<td>1495</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>785</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A comparison of the spreadsheet model assignment link volumes with the modelled volumes for Scenario 4 on Rymal Road west of Upper Mount Albion Road shows a reasonable correlation (same order of magnitude), as shown in Table 4.

### Table 4. Comparison of Model and Spreadsheet Model Assignment Vehicle Volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011 Model</th>
<th>2011 Spreadsheet Model</th>
<th>2021 Model</th>
<th>2021 Spreadsheet Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RymalRoad</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>1395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result, an average PM:AM factor was calculated from existing link volumes for the WB and EB directions and applied to the AM peak hour EMME/2 link volumes to determine future PM peak hour volumes. The average PM:AM factor for the WB direction was calculated to be approximately 1.15 and approximately 1.5 for the EB direction. Using these factors, the PM peak hour link volumes for 2011 and 2021 were estimated. These volume estimates are shown in Figures 29 and 30.

**Figure 29. Estimated 2011 PM Peak Hour Adjusted Total Vehicle Volumes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>993</th>
<th>1211</th>
<th>1776</th>
<th>1510</th>
<th>1566</th>
<th>1191</th>
<th>984</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1373</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>1699</td>
<td>1179</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 30. Estimated 2021 PM Peak Hour Adjusted Total Vehicle Volumes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>993</th>
<th>1208</th>
<th>1510</th>
<th>1110</th>
<th>1566</th>
<th>1208</th>
<th>796</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1373</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>1699</td>
<td>1179</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A review of PM peak hour link volumes for both 2011 and 2021 show the need for a 4-lane cross section on Rymal Road as volumes are well above the capacity of a 2-lane roadway that assumes 1000 vehicles/lane in the peak hour peak direction.

As a note, AM and PM peak hour turning movements estimated for Rymal Road are provided in Appendix D based on the spreadsheet model.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Configurations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph/ft)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost time (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Protected</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sald Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>3216</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>3305</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>3466</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>3466</td>
<td>1551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Permitted</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sald Flow (perm)</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>3216</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>3305</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>3466</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>3466</td>
<td>1551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (vph)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-hour factor, PHF</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj Flow (vph)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTOR Reduction (vph)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles (%)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn Type</th>
<th>pm+pt</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>pm+pt</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Prot</th>
<th>Perm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, g (s)</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Grp Cap (vph)</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>1257</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Perm</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Delay, d1</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Delay, d2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s)</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intersection Summary

| HCM Average Control Delay | 34.8 |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.82 |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 120.0 | Sum of lost time (s) | 16.0 |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | 75.4% | ICU Level of Service | D |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |
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Synchro 6 Report
HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

15: Rymal Road E. & Upper Mt. Albion Rd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Configurations</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph/lph)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost time (s)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util. Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Protected</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sd. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>3191</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>3191</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>3191</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>3191</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>3191</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>3191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Permitted</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>3191</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>3241</td>
<td>1284</td>
<td>1686</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>1686</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>1686</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>1686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (vph)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1112</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-hour factor, PHF</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1236</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TROR Reduction (vph)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles (%)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn Type</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, g (s)</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Gp Cap (vph)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2056</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>2089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Prot</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>c0.46</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Perm</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>c0.18</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Delay, d1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Delay, d2</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s)</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intersection Summary**

- HCM Average Control Delay: 13.1
- HCM Volume to Capacity ratio: 0.73
- Actuated Cycle Length (s): 90.0
- Intersection Capacity Utilization: 99.8%
- Analysis Period (min): 15
- Critical Lane Group

6/8/2008
ITRANS Consulting Inc.
# HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

## 14: Rymal Road E. & Fletcher Rd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Configurations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vphp)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost Time (s)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util. Factor</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Protected</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>3192</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>3305</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Permitted</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>3192</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>3305</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (vph)</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1159</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-hour factor, PHF</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1268</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTOR Reduction (vph)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>1132</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1288</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles (%)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Turn Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected Phases</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Phases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, g (s)</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Grp Cap (vph)</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/C Ratio Prot</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/C Ratio Perm</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Delay, d1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Factor</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Delay, d2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s)</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intersection Summary

| HCM Average Control Delay | 18.3 | HCM Level of Service | B |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.61 | |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 90.0 | Sum of lost time (s) | 10.0 |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | 64.1% | ICU Level of Service | C |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 | c | Critical Lane Group |

---
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### Movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lane Configurations</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NSR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph/lh)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost time (s)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util. Factor</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Protected</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>3298</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Permitted</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>3298</td>
<td>1253</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>1657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Volume (vph)

| 22 | 860 | 58 | 24 | 989 | 23 | 166 | 85 | 69 | 44 | 35 | 55 |

### Peak-hour Factor, PHF

| 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |

### Adj. Flow (vph)

| 24 | 958 | 64 | 27 | 1099 | 26 | 184 | 94 | 77 | 49 | 39 | 61 |

### RTOR Reduction (vph)

| 0 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 49 | 66 |

### Lane Group Flow (vph)

| 24 | 1012 | 0 | 27 | 1122 | 0 | 184 | 122 | 0 | 49 | 86 | 0 |

### Heavy Vehicles (%)

| 3% | 11% | 3% | 3% | 8% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |

### Turn Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Protected Phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Actuated Green, G (s)

| 28.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 |

### Effective Green, g (s)

| 29.0 | 29.0 | 29.0 | 29.0 |

### Actuated g/C Ratio

| 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.48 |

### Clearance Time (s)

| 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |

### Lane Gro Cap (vph)

| 145 | 1547 | 176 | 1594 |

### v/s Ratio Prot

| 0.06 | 0.07 |

### v/s Ratio Perm

| 0.07 | 0.07 |

### Uniform Delay, d1

| 8.7 | 11.7 | 8.6 | 12.1 |

### Progression Factor

| 1.00 | 100 | 0.56 | 0.45 |

### Incremental Delay, d2

| 2.4 | 2.2 | 1.5 | 2.2 |

### Delay (s)

| 11.2 | 13.9 | 0.4 | 7.7 |

### Level of Service

| B    | B    | A    | B    | B    |

### Approach Delay (s)

| 13.8 | 7.6 | 16.1 | 13.7 |

### Approach LOS

| B    | A    | B    | B    |

### Intersection Summary

- **HCM Average Control Delay**: 11.5
- **HCM Volume-to-Capacity ratio**: 0.58
- **Actuated Cycle Length (s)**: 60.0
- **Intersection Capacity Utilization**: 73.0%
- **Analysis Period (min)**: 15

---

6/8/2006

ITRANS Consulting Inc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Configurations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph/ft)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost time (s)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util. Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frl</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Protected</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>3188</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>3282</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Permitted</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>3188</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>3282</td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>1551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (vph)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-hour factor, PHF</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTOR Reduction (vph)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles (%)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turn Type | Perm | Perm | Perm | Perm | Perm | Perm
| Protected Phases | 2 | 6 | 4 | 8 |
| Permitted Phases | | | | |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 27.0 | 27.0 | 27.0 | 27.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 28.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 22.0 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.37 |
| Clearance Time (s) | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Lane Group Cap (vph) | 175 | 1486 | 170 | 1532 | 465 | 569 | 495 | 569 |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.31 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.30 |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.13 | 0.04 | 0.09 | 0.09 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.27 | 0.67 | 0.09 | 0.64 | 0.23 | 0.02 | 0.12 | 0.08 |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 9.8 | 12.4 | 8.9 | 12.2 | 13.2 | 12.1 | 12.6 | 12.4 |
| Progression Factor | 0.36 | 0.30 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.89 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 1.00 |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 3.1 | 1.9 | 1.1 | 2.1 | 1.2 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.3 |
| Delay (s) | 6.5 | 5.7 | 10.0 | 14.3 | 26.0 | 12.2 | 13.1 | 12.7 |
| Level of Service | A | A | B | B | C | B | B | B |
| Approach Delay (s) | 6.7 | 14.2 | 23.3 | 12.9 |
| Approach LOS | A | B | C | B |

**Intersection Summary:**
- HCM Average Control Delay: 10.8
- HCM Level of Service: B
- HCM Volume to Capacity ratio: 0.48
- Actuated Cycle Length (s): 60.0
- Sum of lost time (s): 10.0
- Intersection Capacity Utilization: 60.7%
- ICU Level of Service: B
- Analysis Period (min): 15

Critical Lane Group:

---
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### Movement Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EST</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Configurations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost Time (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit Protected</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>3145</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>3305</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>3416</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>3214</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>3214</td>
<td>1733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit Permited</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>3145</td>
<td>1058</td>
<td>3305</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>3416</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>3214</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>3214</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (vph)</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-hour factor, PHF</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTOR Reduction (vph)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles (%)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Turn Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn Type</th>
<th>pm+pt</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, g (s)</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Extension</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Grp Cap (vph)</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/s Ratio Prot</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/s Ratio Perm</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Delay, d1</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Delay, d2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s)</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intersection Summary

- HCM Average Control Delay: 30.7
- HCM Volume to Capacity ratio: 0.79
- Actuated Cycle Length (s): 109.8
- Intersection Capacity Utilization: 92.1%
- Analysis Period (min): 15

---
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Synchro 6 Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Configurations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost Time (s)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Protected</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sld. Flow (prox)</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>3466</td>
<td>3345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Permitted</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sld. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>3466</td>
<td>3345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (vph)</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-hour factor, PHF</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTOR Reduction (vph)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn Type</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, g (s)</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Gp Cap (vph)</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vis Ratio Prot</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Perm &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Delay, d1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Factor</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Delay, d2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s)</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection Summary</th>
<th>HCM Average Control Delay</th>
<th>12.0</th>
<th>HCM Level of Service</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCM Volume to Capacity ratio</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Cycle Length (s)</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of lost time (s)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Capacity Utilization</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>ICU Level of Service</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis Period (min)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Lane Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F.2.2

Detailed ROPA 9 level of service calculations for 2011 PM
| Movement       | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
|---------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Lane Configurations |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Ideal Flow (vphph)  | 1900| 1900| 1900| 1900| 1900| 1900| 1900| 1900| 1900| 1900| 1900| 1900| 1900|
| Total Lost Time (s)  | 3.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Lane Util Factor    | 1.00| 0.95| 1.00| 1.00| 0.95| 1.00| 1.00| 0.95| 1.00| 0.95| 1.00| 1.00| 1.00|
| Frt               | 1.00| 1.00| 0.85| 1.00| 1.00| 0.85| 1.00| 1.00| 0.85| 1.00| 1.00| 0.85| 1.00|
| Flt Protected     | 0.95| 1.00| 1.00| 0.95| 1.00| 1.00| 0.95| 1.00| 1.00| 0.95| 1.00| 1.00| 1.00|
| Sald. Flow (prot)  | 1767| 3466| 1581| 1767| 3466| 1581| 1767| 3535| 1581| 1767| 3535| 1581| 1581|
| Flt Permitted     | 0.09| 1.00| 1.00| 0.09| 1.00| 1.00| 0.59| 1.00| 1.00| 0.95| 1.00| 1.00| 1.00|
| Sald. Flow (perm)  | 105 | 3466| 1581| 105 | 3466| 1581| 1104| 3535| 1581| 1767| 3535| 1581| 1581|
| Volume (vph)      | 31  | 1152| 103 | 99  | 1111| 451 | 88  | 258 | 82  | 490 | 243 | 26  | 28  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.95| 0.95| 0.95| 0.95| 0.95| 0.95| 0.95| 0.95| 0.95| 0.95| 0.95| 0.95| 0.95|
| Adj. Flow (vph)   | 33  | 1213| 108 | 104 | 1169| 475 | 93  | 269 | 86  | 516 | 256 | 27  | 13  |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0  | 0   | 32  | 0   | 0   | 145 | 0   | 0   | 72  | 0   | 0   | 14  |     |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 33 | 1213| 76  | 104 | 1169| 330 | 93  | 269 | 14  | 516 | 256 | 13  |     |
| Heavy Vehicles (%)| 1%  | 1%  | 1%  | 1%  | 3%  | 1%  | 1%  | 1%  | 1%  | 1%  | 1%  | 1%  | 1%  |
| Turn Type          | pm+pt|     | pm+pt|     | Perm| pm+pt|     | Perm| Perm| Perm| Prot| Perm|     |
| Protected Phases   | 5   | 2   | 1   | 6   | 4   | 4   | 4   | 8   |     |     |     |     |     |
| Permitted Phases   | 2   |     | 2   | 6   | 4   | 4   | 4   | 8   |     |     |     |     |     |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 47.0| 42.0| 42.0| 47.0| 42.0| 42.0| 19.0| 19.0| 19.0| 36.0| 59.0| 59.0| 59.0|
| Effective Green, g (s) | 50.0| 43.0| 43.0| 50.0| 43.0| 43.0| 20.0| 20.0| 20.0| 36.0| 59.0| 59.0| 59.0|
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.42| 0.36| 0.36| 0.42| 0.36| 0.36| 0.17| 0.17| 0.17| 0.30| 0.49| 0.49|     |
| Clearance Time (s) | 3.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 3.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 136 | 1242| 567 | 136 | 1242| 567 | 184 | 589 | 264 | 530 | 1758| 777 |     |
| v/s Ratio Prot     | 0.01| 0.35| 0.03| 0.34| 0.08| 0.08| 0.28| 0.07|     |     |     |     |     |
| v/s Ratio Perm     | 0.09| 0.05| 0.29| 0.21| c0.08| c0.08| 0.01| 0.01|     |     |     |     |     |
| v/c Ratio          | 0.24| 0.98| 0.13| 0.76| 0.94| 0.58| 0.61| 0.46| 0.05| 0.97| 0.15| 0.02|     |
| Uniform Delay, d1  | 26.1| 38.0| 25.9| 26.2| 37.3| 31.2| 45.5| 45.1| 42.0| 41.5| 16.7| 15.6|     |
| Progression Factor | 1.00| 1.00| 1.00| 1.00| 1.00| 1.00| 1.00| 1.00| 1.00| 1.00| 1.00| 1.00|     |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 4.2| 20.5| 0.5 | 32.8| 14.9| 4.3 | 9.6 | 2.5 | 0.4 | 33.1| 0.2 | 0.0 |     |
| Delay (s)           | 30.3| 58.5| 26.4| 61.0| 52.1| 35.5| 55.1| 47.6| 42.4| 74.6| 18.9| 15.7|     |
| Level of Service    | C   | E   | E   | D   | E   | D   | D   | D   | E   | B   |     |     |     |
| Approach Delay (s)  | 55.3| 48.2| 48.2| 54.1|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Approach LOS        | E   | D   | D   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |

**Intersection Summary**

- HCM Average Control Delay: 51.5
- HCM Level of Service: D
- HCM Volume to Capacity ratio: 0.87
- Sum of lost time (s): 16.0
- Intersection Capacity Utilization: 95.3%
- ICU Level of Service: F
- Analysis Period (min): 15

- Critical Lane Group

---

6/8/2006
iTRANS Consulting Inc.
### HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

**15: Rymal Road E. & Upper Mt. Albion Rd.**

#### Movement Lane Configurations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vphpl)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost time (s)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util. Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit Protected</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>3413</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>3420</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1682</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit Permitted</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>3413</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>3420</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td>1682</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td>1682</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Volume (vph)

- 89 | 1422 | 186 | 37 | 1325 | 151 | 170 | 54 | 26 | 135 | 62 | 109

#### Peak-hour factor, PHF

- 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95

#### Adj. Flow (vph)

- 93 | 1497 | 196 | 39 | 1395 | 159 | 179 | 57 | 27 | 142 | 65 | 115

#### RTOR Reduction (vph)

- 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 0

#### Lane Group Flow (vph)

- 93 | 1682 | 0 | 39 | 1544 | 0 | 179 | 65 | 0 | 142 | 131 | 0

#### Heavy Vehicles (%)

- 1% | 3% | 1% | 1% | 3% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1%

#### Turn Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected Phases</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Actuated Green, G (s)

- 58.0 | 58.0 | 58.0 | 58.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0

#### Effective Green, g (s)

- 59.0 | 59.0 | 59.0 | 59.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 | 21.0

#### Actuated g/C Ratio

- 0.66 | 0.66 | 0.66 | 0.66 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.23

#### Clearance Time (s)

- 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |

#### Lane Group Cap (vph)

- 130 | 2237 | 99 | 2242 | 244 | 413 | 305 | 392

#### v/s Ratio Prot

- 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.49

#### v/s Ratio Perm

- 0.47 | 0.26 | 0.17 | 0.11

#### v/c Ratio

- 0.72 | 0.75 | 0.39 | 0.69 | 0.73 | 0.18 | 0.47 | 0.33

#### Uniform Delay, d1

- 10.1 | 10.5 | 7.2 | 9.7 | 31.9 | 27.5 | 29.7 | 28.7

#### Progression Factor

- 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00

#### Incremental Delay, d2

- 28.5 | 24.0 | 10.1 | 1.6 | 17.7 | 0.8 | 5.0 | 2.3

#### Delay (s)

- 38.5 | 12.9 | 16.1 | 9.6 | 49.0 | 28.3 | 34.7 | 31.0

#### Level of Service

| D | B | A | D | C | C | C |

#### Approach Delay (s)

| 14.2 | 9.5 | 42.8 | 32.6 |

#### Approach LOS

| B | A | D | C |

### Intersection Summary

- HCM Average Control Delay: 15.8
- HCM Level of Service: B
- HCM Volume to Capacity ratio: 0.75
- Actuated Cycle Length (s): 90.0
- Sum of lost time (s): 10.0
- Intersection Capacity Utilization: 106.9%
- ICU Level of Service: G
- Analysis Period (min): 15
- c.: Critical Lane Group
## HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

### Movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Configurations</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph/ft)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost time (s)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util. Factor</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Protected</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>3428</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>3466</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>1581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt. Permitted</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>3428</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>3466</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>1581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (vph)</td>
<td>1441</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-hour factor, PHF</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1306</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTOR Reduction (vph)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1506</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles (%)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Turn Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn Type</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, g (s)</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Grp Cap (vph)</td>
<td>2247</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Prot</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Perm</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Delay, d1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Factor</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Delay, d2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s)</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Intersection Summary

- HCM Average Control Delay: 11.6
- HCM Volume to Capacity ratio: 0.60
- Actuated Cycle Length (s): 90.0
- Intersection Capacity Utilization: 84.8%
- Analysis Period (min): 15
- Critical Lane Group

---

6/5/2006
ITRANS Consulting Inc.
### Movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Configurations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph/ln)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost time (s)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util. Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit Protected</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>3351</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>3435</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit Permitted</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>3351</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>3435</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>1775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (vph)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1209</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-hour factor, PHF</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1074</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTOR Reduction (vph)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanel Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles (%)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Turn Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn Type</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, g(s)</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time [s]</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Grp Cap (vph)</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Prot</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Perm</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Delay, d1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Delay, d2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s)</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intersection Summary

| HCM Average Control Delay | 10.4 |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.47 |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 60.0 |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | 75.7% |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Configurations</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost Time (s)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util Factor</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit Protected</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>3340</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>3407</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit Permitted</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>3340</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>3407</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>1581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (vph)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-hour factor, PHF</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTOR Reduction (vph)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1221</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles (%)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Type</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>Perm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, g (s)</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Grp Cap (vph)</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Prot</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Perm</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Delay, d1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Factor</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Delay, d2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s)</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intersection Summary**

- HCM Average Control Delay: 19.5
- HCM Volume to Capacity ratio: 0.77
- Actuated Cycle Length (s): 60.0
- Intersection Capacity Utilization: 91.0%
- Analysis Period (min): 15
- Critical Lane Group: 60.0
- Sum of lost time (s): 10.0
- ICU Level of Service: E
- Level of Service: B
- HCM Level of Service: B
- Critical Lane Group: B

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>VBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBC</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Configurations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost time (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util. Factor</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitt Protected</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satt. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>3318</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>3466</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>3497</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>3328</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>3328</td>
<td>1767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitt Permitted</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satt. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>3318</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>3466</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>3497</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>3328</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>3328</td>
<td>828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (vph)</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-hour factor, PHF</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTOR Reduction (vph)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles (%)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn Type</th>
<th>pm+pt</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>pm+pt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, g (s)</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Extension (s)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Grp Cap (vph)</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Prot</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Perm</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Delay, d1</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Delay, d2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s)</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection Summary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCM Average Control Delay</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Volume to Capacity ratio</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Cycle Length (s)</td>
<td>97.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of lost time (s)</td>
<td>110.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Capacity Utilization</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICU Level of Service</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6/8/2006
ITRANS Consulting Inc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost time (s)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util. Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit Protected</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>3535</td>
<td>3405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit. Permitted</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>3535</td>
<td>3405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (vph)</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-hour factor, PHF</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTOR Reduction (vph)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn Type</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, g (s)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Grp Cap (vph)</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Prot</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Perm</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Delay, d1</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Factor</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Delay, d2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s)</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intersection Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HCM Average Control Delay</th>
<th>12.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCM Level of Service</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Volume to Capacity ratio</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Cycle Length (s)</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of lost time (s)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Capacity Utilization</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICU Level of Service</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis Period (min)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Lane Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F.2.3

Detailed ROPA 9 level of service calculations for 2021 AM
### Movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Configurations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph/p)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost time (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lan Util Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filt Protected</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filt Permitted</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>3216</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>3305</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>3466</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>3466</td>
<td>1551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (vph)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-hour factor, PHF</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTOR Reduction (vph)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles (%)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn Type</th>
<th>pm+pt</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>pm+pt</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Prot</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, g (s)</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Extension (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Grp Cap (vph)</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1302</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>1542</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Prot</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Perm</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Delay, d1</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Factor</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Delay, d2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s)</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LCS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Result

- **HCM Average Control Delay**: 31.0
- **HCM Level of Service**: C
- **HCM Volume to Capacity ratio**: 0.65
- **Actuated Cycle Length (s)**: 112.4
- **Sum of lost time (s)**: 14.0
- **Intersection Capacity Utilization**: 76.9%
- **ICU Level of Service**: D
- **Analysis Period (min)**: 15

c: Critical Lane Group
### Movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Configurations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph/l)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost Time (s)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Protected</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>3193</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>3240</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1686</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Permitted</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3193</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>3240</td>
<td>1239</td>
<td>1686</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>1675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (vph)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-hour factor, PHF</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1291</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTOR Reduction (vph)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1103</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles (%)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Turn Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn Type</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, g (s)</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Grp Cap (vph)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>2093</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>2124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Prot</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Perm</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Delay, d1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Delay, d2</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s)</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intersection Summary

- HCM Average Control Delay: 13.6
- HCM Volume to Capacity ratio: 0.75
- Actuated Cycle Length (s): 90.0
- Sum of lost time (s): 10.0
- Intersection Capacity Utilization: 102.5%
- Analysis Period (min): 15
- Critical Lane Group

---

6/8/2006

Synchro 6 Report

TRAINS Consulting Inc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EST</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NSB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Configurations</td>
<td>↑↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td></td>
<td>↑↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph/ln)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost time (s)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util Factor</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fnt Protected</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>3193</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>3305</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fnt Permitted</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>3193</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>3305</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (vph)</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-hour factor, PHF</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1361</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTOR Reduction (vph)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1361</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles (%)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Type</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>Prot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, g (s)</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Grp Cap (vph)</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>483</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Prot</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Perm</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Delay, d1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Factor, d2</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Delay, d2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s)</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intersection Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCM Average Control Delay</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Level of Service</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Volume to Capacity ratio</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Cycle Length (s)</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of lost time (s)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Capacity Utilization</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICU Level of Service</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis Period (min)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Lane Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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iTRANS Consulting Inc.
### Movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Configurations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ideal Flow (vphp)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Total Lost time (s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Lane Util. Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>0.95</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>0.95</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>0.93</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>0.91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Flt Protected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0.95</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>0.95</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>0.95</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>0.95</th>
<th>1.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Flt Permitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0.16</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>0.19</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>0.69</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>0.65</th>
<th>1.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Flt Flow (perm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>256</th>
<th>3201</th>
<th>339</th>
<th>3297</th>
<th>1257</th>
<th>1701</th>
<th>1184</th>
<th>1652</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Volume (vph)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>24</th>
<th>629</th>
<th>58</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>1053</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>168</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>68</th>
<th>48</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Peak-hour factor, PHF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0.90</th>
<th>0.90</th>
<th>0.90</th>
<th>0.90</th>
<th>0.90</th>
<th>0.90</th>
<th>0.90</th>
<th>0.90</th>
<th>0.90</th>
<th>0.90</th>
<th>0.90</th>
<th>0.90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Adj Flow (vph)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>27</th>
<th>999</th>
<th>64</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>1170</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>184</th>
<th>94</th>
<th>77</th>
<th>53</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>66</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### RTOR Reduction (vph)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>45</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Lane Group Flow (vph)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>27</th>
<th>1055</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>1195</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>184</th>
<th>126</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>53</th>
<th>78</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Heavy Vehicles (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>11%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>8%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Turn Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perm Type</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Protected Phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Permitted Phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Actuated Green, g (s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>28.0</th>
<th>28.0</th>
<th>28.0</th>
<th>28.0</th>
<th>20.0</th>
<th>20.0</th>
<th>20.0</th>
<th>20.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Effective Green, g (s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>29.0</th>
<th>29.0</th>
<th>29.0</th>
<th>29.0</th>
<th>21.0</th>
<th>21.0</th>
<th>21.0</th>
<th>21.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Actuated g/C Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0.48</th>
<th>0.48</th>
<th>0.48</th>
<th>0.48</th>
<th>0.35</th>
<th>0.35</th>
<th>0.35</th>
<th>0.35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Clearance Time (s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6.0</th>
<th>6.0</th>
<th>6.0</th>
<th>6.0</th>
<th>6.0</th>
<th>6.0</th>
<th>6.0</th>
<th>6.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Lane Grp Cap (vph)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>124</th>
<th>1547</th>
<th>164</th>
<th>1694</th>
<th>440</th>
<th>596</th>
<th>414</th>
<th>578</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### v/s Ratio Perm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0.33</th>
<th>0.38</th>
<th>0.38</th>
<th>0.07</th>
<th>0.07</th>
<th>0.05</th>
<th>0.05</th>
<th>0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### v/s Ratio Perm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0.11</th>
<th>0.08</th>
<th>0.15</th>
<th>0.04</th>
<th>0.04</th>
<th>0.04</th>
<th>0.04</th>
<th>0.04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### v/f Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0.22</th>
<th>0.68</th>
<th>0.16</th>
<th>0.75</th>
<th>0.42</th>
<th>0.21</th>
<th>0.13</th>
<th>0.13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Uniform Delay, d1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9.0</th>
<th>11.9</th>
<th>8.7</th>
<th>12.6</th>
<th>14.8</th>
<th>13.7</th>
<th>13.3</th>
<th>13.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Progression Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>0.54</th>
<th>0.42</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>1.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Incremental Delay, d2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>1.7</th>
<th>2.7</th>
<th>2.9</th>
<th>2.6</th>
<th>2.6</th>
<th>2.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Delay (s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>42.9</th>
<th>14.4</th>
<th>9.5</th>
<th>8.0</th>
<th>17.8</th>
<th>14.5</th>
<th>13.9</th>
<th>13.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Level of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Approach Delay (s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>14.4</th>
<th>7.9</th>
<th>16.2</th>
<th>13.8</th>
<th>13.8</th>
<th>13.8</th>
<th>13.8</th>
<th>13.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Approach LOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Intersection Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCM Average Control Delay</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>HCM Level of Service</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Volume to Capacity ratio</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Cycle Length (s)</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>Sum of lost time (s)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Capacity Utilization</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>ICU Level of Service</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis Period (min)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Configurations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph/l)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost Time (s)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frl</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Protected</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Permitted</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd Flow (perm)</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>3189</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>3282</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (vph)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-hour factor, PHF</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj Flow (vph)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTOR Reduction (vph)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1053</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles (%)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Type</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perm Phases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, g (s)</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Grp Cap (vph)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1486</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1532</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Prot</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Delay, d1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Factor</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Delay, d2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s)</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>1405.6</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>295.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>295.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>295.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>295.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>295.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intersection Summary**
- HCM Average Control Delay: 26.1
- HCM Volume to Capacity ratio: 0.49
- Actuated Cycle Length (s): 60.0
- Sum of lost time (s): 10.0
- Intersection Capacity Utilization: 63.2%
- Analysis Period (min): 15

© Critical Lane Group
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
|----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Lane Configurations | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ideal Flow (vph/pl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 3.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | | |
| Lane Util Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | | |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.96 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 0.93 | | | | |
| Plt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | | | | |
| Sald. Flow (prot) | 1733 | 3146 | 1733 | 3305 | 1551 | 1733 | 3416 | 1733 | 3219 | | | | |
| Plt Permitted | 0.30 | 1.00 | 0.57 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.43 | 1.00 | 0.29 | 1.00 | | | | |
| Sald. Flow (perm) | 538 | 3146 | 1037 | 3305 | 1551 | 779 | 3416 | 527 | 3219 | | | | |
| Volume (vph) | 486 | 196 | 75 | 36 | 382 | 265 | 177 | 450 | 48 | 213 | 282 | 265 | |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 540 | 218 | 83 | 40 | 424 | 294 | 197 | 600 | 53 | 237 | 313 | 283 | |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 201 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 141 | 0 | | |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 549 | 259 | 0 | 40 | 424 | 93 | 197 | 546 | 0 | 317 | 455 | 0 | |
| Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3% 11% 3% 3% 3% 3% 3% 3% 3% 3% 3% 3% 3% | | | | | | | | | | | | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn Type</th>
<th>pm+pt</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>pm+pt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, g (s)</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Extension (s)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Grp Cap (vph)</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Prot</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Perm</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Delay, d1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Delay, d2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s)</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intersection Summary:**
- HCM Average Control Delay: 33.5
- HCM Level of Service: G
- HCM Volume to Capacity ratio: 0.84
- Actuated Cycle Length (s): 112.6
- Sum of lost time (s): 11.0
- Intersection Capacity Utilization: 92.8%
- ICU Level of Service: F
- Analysis Period (min): 15

---
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Synchro 6 Report
## HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

18: Whitedeer Rd. & Upper Centennial Pkwy

With Improvement

### Movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph/pk)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost time (s)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util. Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pct Protected</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>3466</td>
<td>3351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pct Permitted</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>3456</td>
<td>3351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (vph)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-hour factor, PHF</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTOR Reduction (vph)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Turn Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn Type</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, g (s)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Cap (vph)</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/S Ratio Prot</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/S Ratio Perm</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Delay, d1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Factor</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Delay, d2</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intersection Summary

- HCM Average Control Delay: 12.3
- HCM Level of Service: B
- HCM Volume to Capacity ratio: 0.33
- Actuated Cycle Length (s): 66.0
- Sum of lost time (s): 10.0
- Intersection Capacity Utilization: 45.8%
- ICU Level of Service: A
- Analysis Period (min): 15
  - Critical Lane Group
Appendix F.2.4

Detailed ROPA 9 level of service calculations for 2021 PM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBE</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lane Configurations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph/pt)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost time (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util. Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fte</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit Protected</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>3466</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>3466</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>3535</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>3535</td>
<td>1581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit Permitted</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>3466</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>3466</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>3535</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>3535</td>
<td>1581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volume (vph)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>1223</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1179</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-hour factor, PHF</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTOR Reduction (vph)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles (%)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turn Type</strong></td>
<td>pm+pt</td>
<td>pm+pt</td>
<td>pm+pt</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>Prot</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, g (s)</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Extension (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Grp Cap (vph)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Prot</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>c0.37</td>
<td>c0.03</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>c0.29</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Perm</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>c0.06</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>c0.18</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Delay, d1</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Delay, d2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s)</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>101.7</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>142.2</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intersection Summary**

- HCM Average Control Delay: 66.3
- HCM Level of Service: E
- HCM Volume to Capacity ratio: 1.01
- Actuated Cycle Length (s): 119.8
- Sum of lost time (s): 16.0
- Intersection Capacity Utilization: 98.4%
- ICU Level of Service: F
- Analysis Period (min): 15
- Critical Lane Group:  

---
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Synchro 6 Report
| Movement       | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBC | SBT | SBR |
|---------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Lane Configurations |       |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Local Flow (vph) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 5.0  | 5.0  | 5.0  | 5.0  | 5.0  | 5.0  | 5.0  | 5.0  | 5.0  | 5.0  | 5.0  | 5.0  |
| Lane Util Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.98 | 1.00 | 0.98 | 1.00 | 0.91 | 1.00 | 0.90 |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Slatd Flow (prot) | 1767 | 3416 | 1767 | 3416 | 1767 | 3416 | 1767 | 3416 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.09 | 1.00 | 0.07 | 1.00 | 0.55 | 1.00 | 0.63 | 1.00 |
| Slatd Flow (perm) | 170  | 3416 | 128  | 3418 | 1031 | 1689 | 1164 | 1660 |
| Volume (vph)   | 91   | 1492 | 186  | 37   | 1389 | 162  | 170  | 54  | 86  | 144  | 62  | 113  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Adj Flow (vph) | 1571 | 196  | 39   | 1462 | 171  | 179  | 57   | 91  | 152  | 65  | 119  |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0   | 11   | 0    | 10   | 0    | 33   | 0    | 33  | 42   |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 96  | 1756 | 0    | 39   | 1623 | 0    | 179  | 115 | 0    | 152  | 142  | 0    |
| Heavy Vehicles (%) | 1%  | 3%   | 1%   | 1%   | 3%   | 1%   | 1%   | 1%  | 1%   | 1%   | 1%   | 1%   |

### Turn Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn Type</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, g (s)</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Grp Cap (vph)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>2239</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Prot</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Perm</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Delay, d1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Delay, d2</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s)</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intersection Summary

| HCM Average Control Delay | 17.4 |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.83 |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 90.0 |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | 108.8% |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |
| Critical Lane Group | G |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EB1</th>
<th>EB2</th>
<th>WB1</th>
<th>WB2</th>
<th>NB1</th>
<th>NB2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Configurations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost time (s)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util Factor</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Protected</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>3429</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>3466</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Permitted</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>3429</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>3466</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (vph)</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-hour factor, PHF</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj Flow (vph)</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1368</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTOR Reduction (vph)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1368</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles (%)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn Type</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Prot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green; g (s)</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Grp Cap (vph)</td>
<td>2248</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Prot</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Perm</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Delay, d1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Factor</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Delay, d2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intersection Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HCM Average Control Delay</th>
<th>13.2</th>
<th>HCM Level of Service</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCM Volume to Capacity ratio</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Cycle Length (s)</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>Sum of lost time (s)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Capacity Utilization</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>ICU Level of Service</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis Period (min)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

6/8/2006

iTRANS Consulting Inc.
### Movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>VBL</th>
<th>VBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Configurations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph/ln)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost time (s)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit Protected</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>3438</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>3434</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit. Permitted</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>3438</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>3434</td>
<td>1284</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>1309</td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>1309</td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>1309</td>
<td>1757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Volume (vph)

| Volume | 66 | 1327 | 87 | 33 | 1064 | 80 | 69 | 54 | 24 | 44 | 62 | 36 |

#### Peak-hour factor, PHF

| PHF | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |

#### Adj. Flow (vph)

| Flow | 89 | 1397 | 92 | 35 | 1120 | 84 | 73 | 57 | 25 | 46 | 65 | 38 |

#### RTOR Reduction (vph)

| RTOR | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 25 |

#### Lane Group Flow (vph)

| Flow | 79 | 1481 | 0 | 35 | 1195 | 0 | 73 | 68 | 0 | 48 | 78 | 0 |

#### Heavy Vehicles (%)

| Percent | 1% | 3% | 1% | 1% | 3% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |

#### Turn Type

| Perm. Phases | 2 | 6 | 4 | 8 |

#### Actuated Green, G (s)

| Green | 28.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 |

#### Effective Green, g (s)

| Green | 29.0 | 29.0 | 29.0 | 29.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 |

#### Actuated g/C Ratio

| Ratio | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.35 |

#### Clearance Time (s)

| Time | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |

#### Lane Grp Cap (vph)

| Cap | 124 | 1662 | 124 | 1660 | 449 | 621 | 458 | 615 |

#### v/s Ratio Prot

| Ratio | 0.43 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.04 | 0.04 |

#### v/s Ratio Perm

| Ratio | 0.27 | 0.14 | 0.06 | 0.04 |

#### v/c Ratio

| Ratio | 0.56 | 0.89 | 0.28 | 0.72 | 0.16 | 0.11 | 0.10 | 0.13 |

#### Uniform Delay, d1

| Delay | 11.0 | 14.1 | 9.3 | 12.3 | 13.4 | 13.2 | 13.1 | 13.3 |

#### Progression Factor

| Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.60 | 0.61 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

#### Incremental Delay, d2

| Delay | 16.8 | 7.7 | 4.4 | 2.2 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 |

#### Delay (s)

| Delay | 27.8 | 21.7 | 10.0 | 9.7 | 14.2 | 13.5 | 13.6 | 13.7 |

#### Level of Service

| Service | C | C | A | A | B | B | B | B |

#### Approach Delay (s)

| Delay | 22.0 | 9.7 | 13.9 | 13.7 |

#### Approach LOS

| LOS | C | A | B | B |

### Intersection Summary

- HCM Average Control Delay: 16.3
- HCM Level of Service: B
- HCM Volume to Capacity ratio: 0.59
- HCM Level of Service: B
- Actuated Cycle Length (s): 60.0
- Sum of lost time (s): 10.0
- Intersection Capacity Utilization: 79.8%
- ICU Level of Service: D
- Analysis Period (min): 15
- Critical Lane Group: C

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lane Configurations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideal Flow (vphpl)</strong></td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Lost time (s)</strong></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lane Util Factor</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frt</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fit Protected</strong></td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satd. Flow (prot)</strong></td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>3347</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>3406</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fit Permitted</strong></td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satd. Flow (perm)</strong></td>
<td>436</td>
<td>3347</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>3406</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>1581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volume (vph)</strong></td>
<td>128</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peak-hour factor, PHF</strong></td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adj. Flow (vph)</strong></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RTOR Reduction (vph)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lane Group Flow (vph)</strong></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1294</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heavy Vehicles (%)</strong></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turn Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protected Phases</strong></td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permitted Phases</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actuated Green, G (s)</strong></td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective Green, g(s)</strong></td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actuated g/C Ratio</strong></td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clearance Time (s)</strong></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lane Grp Cap (vph)</strong></td>
<td>211</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>553</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>v/s Ratio Prot</strong></td>
<td>c0.39</td>
<td>c0.27</td>
<td>c0.28</td>
<td>c0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>v/s Ratio Perm</strong></td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>v/c Ratio</strong></td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uniform Delay, d1</strong></td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progression Factor</strong></td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incremental Delay, d2</strong></td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delay (s)</strong></td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Service</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach Delay (s)</strong></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach LOS</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intersection Summary:

- **HCM Average Control Delay**: 12.8
- **HCM Level of Service**: B
- **HCM Volume to Capacity ratio**: 0.60
- **Actuated Cycle Length (s)**: 60.0
- **Sum of lost time (s)**: 10.0
- **Intersection Capacity Utilization**: 92.7%
- **ICU Level of Service**: F
- **Analysis Period (min)**: 15

6/6/2006

iTRANS Consulting Inc.
# HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

**2021 PM**

**1: Rymal Road E. & Upper Centennial Pkway**

---

### Movement Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lane Configurations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideal Flow (vph/ht)</strong></td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Lost time (s)</strong></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lane Util. Factor</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fr</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flt. Protected</strong></td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satt. Flow (prot)</strong></td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>3319</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>3466</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>3497</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>3332</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>3332</td>
<td>1767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flt. Permitted</strong></td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satt. Flow (perm)</strong></td>
<td>749</td>
<td>3319</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>3466</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>3497</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>3332</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>3332</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volume (vph)</strong></td>
<td>249</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peak-hour factor, PHF</strong></td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adj. Flow (vph)</strong></td>
<td>262</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RTOR Reduction (vph)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lane Group Flow (vph)</strong></td>
<td>262</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heavy Vehicles (%)</strong></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Turn Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn Type</th>
<th>pm+pt</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>pm+pt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, g (s)</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Extension (s)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Grp Cap (vph)</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>1276</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Prot</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Perm</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Delay, d1</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Delay, d2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s)</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intersection Summary

- **HCM Average Control Delay:** 23.9
- **HCM Volume to Capacity ratio:** 0.69
- **Actuated Cycle Length (s):** 101.2
- **Intersection Capacity Utilization:** 94.1%
- **Summary of lost time (s):** 11.0
- **Analysis Period (min):** 15

---

6/8/2006

ITRANS Consulting Inc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SSR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lane Configurations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost time (s)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Protected</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>1787</td>
<td>3535</td>
<td>3385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Permitted</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>3535</td>
<td>3385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volume (vph)</strong></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-hour factor, PHF</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTOR Reduction (vph)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turn Type</strong></td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, g (s)</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Grp Cap (vph)</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>1805</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Prot</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Perm</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Delay, d1</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Factor</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Delay, d2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s)</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intersection Summary**

- HCM Average Control Delay: 11.3
- HCM Level of Service: B
- HCM Volume to Capacity ratio: 0.44
- Actuated Cycle Length (s): 60.0
- Sum of lost time (s): 10.0
- Intersection Capacity Utilization: 65.0%
- ICU Level of Service: C
- Analysis Period (min): 15
- Critical Lane Group
Appendix F.3

MRC in their memo on *Future Network Variations – Additional EMME/2 Assignment Runs* dated July 19, 2005
Network Alternative 1:
The extension of the adjacent (approximately 400 metres to the west) Trinity Church Road is expected to divert a portion of the north-south traffic demands on Upper Mount Albion Road in the future. Even with the Trinity Church Road extension in place by 2011, Upper Mount Albion Road is forecasted to carry approximately 550 vehicles during the AM peak hour and approximately 600 vehicles during the PM peak hour. These anticipated volumes still exceed the typical volumes on a local road. Trinity Church Road is expected to carry 1,300 vph (both directions) during the AM peak hour and 1,500 vph during the PM peak hour. A 2-lane (1 lane per direction) cross section is sufficient to accommodate the demands on Trinity Church Road if Upper Mount Albion Road remains open.

Network Alternative 2:
The traffic volumes on Upper Mount Albion Road already exceed the functional capacity of a local road. To maintain the function of Upper Mount Albion Road as a local road, it is recommended that Upper Mount Albion Road be closed north of Rymal Road when Trinity Church Road is extended.

Network Alternative 3:
Without the extension of Trinity Church Road, the closure of Upper Mount Albion Road will result in inconvenience and circuitous routes for north-south demand as alternative north-south routes are approximately 750m to the west or 1,600m to the east. It would also result in an increase in traffic on other north-south local roads in the road network.

Network Alternative 4:
With the closure of Upper Mount Albion Road, the majority of the north-south traffic demand is expected to divert to the adjacent Trinity Church Road extension. Under a worst-case scenario where all traffic is diverted to Trinity Church Road, a 4-lane cross section on Trinity Church Road is needed to accommodate 1,850 vehicles during AM peak hour and 2,100 vehicles during PM peak hour in 2011.

A 4-lane cross section on the Trinity Church Road extension is sufficient to accommodate traffic demands up to 2021. Double left turn lanes may be required to accommodate the high southbound left turn volumes at the Trinity Church Road / Rymal Road intersection in 2021.
As requested in your email dated Friday, June 24, 2005, additional assignment runs were performed for variations of the future road network described in Scenario 4 (reference: memo dated June 13, 2005), where volumes assigned to the network included HG, RRPA, and NG IBP development traffic and proposed networks for the latter two development areas. In addition to these changes, road network assumptions in the North Glenbrook Industrial Business Park area were revised to provide a more representative network following a review of lane requirements within the study area for that particular study. As a result, the revised network alternative results for the ultimate future network (as assumed in Scenario 4 of the aforementioned memo) are also included in this memo for reference.

Based on the requested variations, the following runs were performed, as described below:

Network alternative 1:

§ 2011 network with Upper Mount Albion Road and with Trinity Church Road extension (scenario 20111)

§ 2021 network with Upper Mount Albion Road and with Trinity Church Road extension (scenario 20211)

Network alternative 2:

§ 2011 network with Upper Mount Albion Road and without Trinity Church Road extension (scenario 20112)

§ 2021 network with Upper Mount Albion Road and without Trinity Church Road extension (scenario 20212)
Network alternative 3:
§ 2011 network without Upper Mount Albion Road and without Trinity Church Road extension (scenario 20113)
§ 2021 network without Upper Mount Albion Road and without Trinity Church Road extension (scenario 20213)

Network alternative 4:
§ 2011 network without Upper Mount Albion Road and with Trinity Church Road extension (scenario 20114)
§ 2021 network without Upper Mount Albion Road and with Trinity Church Road extension (scenario 20214)

In the scenarios where Trinity Church Road was not extended, it was assumed that the Red Hill Valley Parkway (RHVP) would terminate at Stone Church Road.

Corresponding PM peak hour volumes for each of the above noted scenarios were also requested. The previous approach (reference: memo dated June 13, 2005) to obtain PM peak hour traffic volume estimates was revised, as a further review suggested that the estimated PM peak direction volumes were lower than anticipated, given current traffic volume relationships. The revised approach included the following assumptions:

§ PM to AM factor (+15%) applied to AM peak direction volumes to obtain PM off-peak direction volumes
§ PM peak direction flows estimated based on the relationship between PM peak direction and PM off-peak direction volumes (+10%) obtained from existing counts and the spreadsheet model

This revised approach provided a PM peak direction to non-peak direction ratio of approximately 52:48.

A summary of the AM and PM peak hour adjusted (as described in memo dated June 13, 2005) total vehicle volumes for each respective horizon year and network alternative is displayed on the following pages. The EMME/2 assignment plots for the AM peak hour have also been included in Appendix A for your reference. As per your additional request, future volumes for the intersection of Upper Centennial and the new collector road south of Rymal Road (connected to Whiteoak Road) were obtained from the EMME/2 model and have been included in Appendix B for your reference.
Scenario 4: Future background growth, RRPA, HG and NG IBP development traffic, future road network with variations for Trinity Church Road and Upper Mount Albion Road, AM peak hour volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 1. Network Alternative 1 – 2011 AM Peak Hour Adjusted Total Vehicle Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dartnall Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Network Alternative 1 – 2021 AM Peak Hour Adjusted Total Vehicle Volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 3. Network Alternative 2 – 2011 AM Peak Hour Adjusted Total Vehicle Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dartnall Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Network Alternative 2 – 2021 AM Peak Hour Adjusted Total Vehicle Volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 5. Network Alternative 3 – 2011 AM Peak Hour Adjusted Total Vehicle Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dartnall Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Network Alternative 3 – 2021 AM Peak Hour Adjusted Total Vehicle Volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 7. Network Alternative 4 – 2011 AM Peak Hour Adjusted Total Vehicle Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dartnall Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. Network Alternative 4 – 2021 AM Peak Hour Adjusted Total Vehicle Volumes
Scenario 4: Future background growth, RRPA, HG and NG IBP development traffic, future road network with variations for Trinity Church Road and Upper Mount Albion Road, PM peak hour volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 9</th>
<th>Network Alternative 1 – 2011 PM Peak Hour Adjusted Total Vehicle Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Year</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 10</th>
<th>Network Alternative 1 – 2021 PM Peak Hour Adjusted Total Vehicle Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Year</td>
<td>1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 11</th>
<th>Network Alternative 2 – 2011 PM Peak Hour Adjusted Total Vehicle Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Year</td>
<td>905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 12</th>
<th>Network Alternative 2 – 2021 PM Peak Hour Adjusted Total Vehicle Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Year</td>
<td>935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 13</th>
<th>Network Alternative 3 – 2011 PM Peak Hour Adjusted Total Vehicle Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Year</td>
<td>895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 14</th>
<th>Network Alternative 3 – 2021 PM Peak Hour Adjusted Total Vehicle Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Year</td>
<td>905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 15</th>
<th>Network Alternative 4 – 2011 PM Peak Hour Adjusted Total Vehicle Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Year</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 16</th>
<th>Network Alternative 4 – 2021 PM Peak Hour Adjusted Total Vehicle Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Year</td>
<td>1005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Network Alternative Implications:

A brief review of the assignment results for the four network alternatives under Scenario 4 (future road network with future development volumes) indicates that future volumes on Rymal Road support the need for widening to four lanes between Upper Centennial Parkway and Dartnall Road by 2011. Furthermore, an assessment of vehicle volumes in the northbound direction for the major north-south local, collector and arterial roads within the vicinity of the study area was undertaken to determine the impacts of keeping / removing Trinity Church Road and / or Upper Mount Albion Road. A comparison of the northbound (peak direction) auto vehicle volumes from the assignment results are shown in the following table.

Table 1. 2011 AM Peak Hour Northbound Auto Volumes (Unadjusted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South of Stone Church Road / Highland Road</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gage Avenue</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Ottawa Street</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebo Road</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartnall Road</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pritchard Road</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Church Road</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>1253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Mount Albion Road</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>Na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Road</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone Drive</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aubrey Avenue</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highbury Drive</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Centennial Parkway</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4684</strong></td>
<td><strong>4564</strong></td>
<td><strong>4455</strong></td>
<td><strong>4639</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternative 1:

With the availability of both Trinity Church Road and Upper Mount Albion Road between Rymal Road and Stone Church Road, the majority of the northbound volumes utilize Dartnall Road, Trinity Church Road and Upper Centennial Parkway. Minimal volumes are observed on Upper Mount Albion Road.

Alternative 2:

Without the provision of the extension of Trinity Church Road from Rymal Road to the Red Hill Valley Parkway (RHVP), a majority of the vehicle volumes utilize Upper Mount Albion Road, Pritchard Road with some increase also on Upper Ottawa Street, Dartnall Road and Upper Centennial Parkway.

Alternative 3:

Without providing an extension of Trinity Church Road from Rymal Road to the RHVP and a connection between Highland Road and Rymal Road via Upper Mount Albion Road, the majority of the vehicle volumes were redistributed to Upper Ottawa Street, Dartnall Road,
Pritchard Road and Upper Centennial Parkway. In addition, as some of the trips using Trinity Church Road were noted to originate/be destined to locations external to the City of Hamilton, some of these trips were observed to be diverted to routes external to the study area.

Alternative 4:

Assignment results indicated that the removal of access from Highland Road to Rymal Road via Upper Mount Albion Road did not have a major effect on neighbouring north-south roads. However, it can be noted that vehicle volumes assigned to Upper Mount Albion Road in Alternative 1 were relatively low and as a result, the impact of the diversion of these low volumes to adjacent roadways would be limited.
APPENDIX A

EMME/2 Assignment Run Plots
APPENDIX B

New Intersection Turning Movements

(EW Collector and Upper Centennial Parkway)
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Detailed SPA ‘C’
Level of Service Calculations
AM Peak
### Lane Configurations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph)</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost time (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util. Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Protected</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slatd. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>3362</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>1784</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>3360</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>3288</td>
<td>3390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Permitted</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slatd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>3360</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>3288</td>
<td>3390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Volume (vph)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn Type</th>
<th>pm+pl</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>pm+ov</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Prot</th>
<th>Perm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, g (s)</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Extension (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lane Group Flow (vph)

| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 326 | 390 | 0 | 43 | 414 | 484 | 103 | 1228 | 20 | 168 | 982 | 115 |

### Lane Cap (vph)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>v/s Ratio Prot</th>
<th>0.15</th>
<th>0.12</th>
<th>0.23</th>
<th>0.05</th>
<th>0.36</th>
<th>0.05</th>
<th>0.29</th>
<th>0.08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Perm</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intersection Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis Period (min)</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synchro 6 Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITRANS Consulting Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- HCM Average Control Delay: 37.3
- HCM Volume to Capacity ratio: 0.93
- Actuated Cycle Length (s): 90.0
- Intersection Capacity Utilization: 91.6%
- ICU Level of Service: F
- Level of Service: D
- Approach LOS: C
- Critical Lane Group: 4/21/2006
## HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

13: Stone Church & Up Mt Albion Rd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBC</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Configurations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph/l)</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost time (s)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util. Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Protected</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>3367</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>1799</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>1591</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>1532</td>
<td>1532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Permitted</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>3367</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>1799</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>1591</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>1532</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>1532</td>
<td>1532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (vph)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-hour factor, PHF</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTOR Reduction (vph)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles (%)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn Type</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, g (s)</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Extension (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Grp. Cap (vph)</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>2492</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Perm</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Prot</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Delay, d1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Delay, d2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s)</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interaction Summary

- **HCM Average Control Delay**: 11.3
- **HCM Level of Service**: B
- **HCM Volume to Capacity ratio**: 0.54
- **Actuated Cycle Length (s)**: 90.0
- **Sum of lost time (s)**: 8.0
- **Intersection Capacity Utilization**: 64.1%
- **ICU Level of Service**: C
- **Analysis Period (min)**: 15

C Critical Lane Group

---
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Synchro 6 Report

iTRANS Consulting Inc.
### Movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lane Configurations</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph)</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost (s)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util. Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Protected</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>1736</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>1736</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>1773</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>1773</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>1646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Permitted</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>1736</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>1739</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>1646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (vph)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-hour factor, PHF</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTOR Reduction (vph)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles (%)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Turn Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn Type</th>
<th>Perm + pt</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Actuated Green, G (s) | 36.9 | 36.9 | 28.1 | 28.1 | 41.1 | 41.1 | 41.1 | 41.1 |
| Effective Green, g(s) | 38.9 | 38.9 | 39.1 | 39.1 | 43.3 | 43.3 | 43.3 | 43.3 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.43 | 0.43 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.48 |
| Clearance Time (s) | 4.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 203 | 750 | 332 | 582 | 521 | 849 | 491 | 766 |
| v/s Ratio Prot | 0.23 | 0.19 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.60 | 0.45 | 0.10 | 0.82 | 0.43 | 0.27 | 0.06 | 0.20 |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 18.9 | 18.9 | 20.6 | 27.5 | 15.4 | 14.0 | 12.8 | 13.5 |
| Progression Factor | 0.96 | 0.73 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 4.8 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 9.1 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.6 |
| Delay (s) | 22.8 | 13.6 | 20.8 | 36.6 | 17.9 | 14.8 | 14.3 | 19.0 |
| Level of Service | C | B | C | D | B | B | B | B |
| Approach Delay (s) | 16.0 | 35.6 | 16.3 | 18.4 |
| Approach LOS | B | B | B | B |

### Intersection Summary

- **HCM Average Control Delay:** 22.5
- **HCM Level of Service:** C
- **HCM Volume to Capacity ratio:** 0.59
- **Actuated Cycle Length (s):** 90.0
- **Sum of lost time (s):** 12.0
- **Intersection Capacity Utilization:** 69.1%
- **ICU Level of Service:** C
- **Analysis Period:** 15

**c** Critical Lane Group

---

*4/21/2005* Synchro 6 Report
ITRANS Consulting Inc.
### Movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
<th>NEE</th>
<th>NER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>![Arrows]</td>
<td>![Arrows]</td>
<td>![Arrows]</td>
<td>![Arrows]</td>
<td>![Arrows]</td>
<td>![Arrows]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lane Configurations
- **Ideal Flow (vph)**: 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800
- **Total Lost time (s)**: 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0
- **Lane Util. Factor**:
  - Frl: 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00
  - Frt: 1.00 1.00 1.00 0.85 1.00 0.85
  - Flt Protected: 0.95 1.00 1.00 0.95 1.00 0.95
  - Satd. Flow (prot): 1695 1784 1784 1517 1695 1517
  - Flt Permitted: 0.62 1.00 1.00 0.95 1.00 0.95
  - Satd. Flow (perm): 1111 1784 1784 1517 1695 1517

### Traffic Volume (vph)
- 21 389 200 111 130 11
- Peak-hour factor, PHF: 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92
- Adj. Flow (vph): 23 423 217 121 141 12
- RTOR Reduction (vph): 0 0 0 29 0 10
- Lane Group Flow (vph): 23 423 217 82 141 2

### Turn Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn Type</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, g (s)</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Extension (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Grp Cap (vph)</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>1352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Signal Timing

| v/s Ratio Prot | 0.02 | 0.06 | 0.0 |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.03 | 0.31 | 0.16 | 0.08 | 0.54 | 0.01 |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 2.7 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 35.2 | 32.3 |
| Progression Factor | 0.73 | 0.78 | 0.66 | 0.74 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 2.3 | 0.0 |
| Delay (s) | 2.0 | 3.3 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 37.5 | 32.3 |

### Level of Service
- A A A A D C

### Approach Delay (s)
- 3.2 2.2 37.1

### Intersection Summary

| HCM Average Control Delay | 8.4 |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.35 |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 50.0 |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | 35.9% |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |

### Critical Lane Group

---

4/21/2006

Synchro 6 Report

iTRANS Consulting Inc.
| Movement     | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| **Lane Configurations** |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Ideal Flow (vph/lane) | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Lane Util Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Fip, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Fr | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 0.98 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |
| Fpt, Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1695 | 3202 | 1495 | 1684 | 3178 | 1685 | 1744 | 1685 | 1745 | 1517 |
| Fit Permitted | 0.10 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.24 | 1.00 | 0.41 | 1.00 | 0.67 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 183 | 3202 | 1495 | 427 | 3178 | 734 | 1744 | 1192 | 1745 | 1517 |
| **Volume (vph)** | 121 | 939 | 105 | 41 | 993 | 83 | 391 | 109 | 19 | 43 | 185 | 147 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 132 | 1021 | 114 | 45 | 1079 | 99 | 426 | 118 | 21 | 47 | 179 | 160 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 128 |
| Lang Group Flow (vph) | 132 | 1021 | 57 | 45 | 1162 | 0 | 426 | 132 | 0 | 47 | 179 | 32 |
| Conf. Peds. (4/hr) | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| **Heavy Vehicles (%)** | 2% | 8% | 2% | 2% | 8% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| **Turn Type** | pm+pt | Perm | Perm | pm+pt | Perm | Perm | pm+pt | Perm | Perm | pm+pt | Perm | Perm | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Permitted Phases | 2 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 33.0 | 33.0 | 35.0 | 35.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 45.0 | 45.0 | 45.0 | 35.0 | 35.0 | 37.0 | 37.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 |
| Clearance Time (s) | 4.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 192 | 1601 | 748 | 166 | 1236 | 462 | 717 | 238 | 357 | 303 |
| v/s Ratio Prot | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.12 | 0.03 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.08 | 0.10 |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.30 | 0.04 | 0.11 | 0.02 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.04 | 0.02 |
| s/c Ratio | 0.69 | 0.64 | 0.08 | 0.27 | 0.94 | 0.92 | 0.18 | 0.20 | 0.50 | 0.11 |
| Uniform Delay, d1 (s) | 17.8 | 16.6 | 11.7 | 16.8 | 25.8 | 22.6 | 16.8 | 30.0 | 52.0 | 28.4 |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.76 | 0.68 | 0.69 | 0.91 | 0.65 |
| Incremental Delay, d2 (s) | 9.8 | 2.0 | 0.2 | 4.0 | 14.8 | 22.8 | 0.6 | 1.8 | 4.9 | 0.7 |
| Delay (s) | 27.6 | 18.5 | 11.9 | 22.8 | 41.3 | 40.0 | 11.1 | 28.5 | 33.9 | 16.8 |
| Level of Service C | C | B | B | C | D | B | C | B | C |
| Approach Delay (s) | 18.8 | 40.6 | 32.9 | 26.2 |
| Approach LOS B | D | C | C |

**Intersection Summary**

- **HCM Average Control Delay**: 29.7
- **HCM Level of Service**: C
- **Actuated Volume to Capacity ratio**: 0.91
- **Actuated Cycle Length (s)**: 90.0
- **Sum of lost time (s)**: 12.0
- **Intersection Capacity Utilization**: 84.2%
- **ICU Level of Service**: E
- **Analysis Period (min)**: 15

---
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Synchro 6 Report

ITRANS Consulting Inc.
## Lane Configurations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph)</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost Time (s)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util. Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt Protected</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>1695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt Permitted</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>1335</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>1781</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>1696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (vph)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-hour factor, PHF</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTOR Reduction (vph)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Turn Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn Type</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>Actuated Green, C (s)</td>
<td>Effective Green, g (s)</td>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>Perm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intersection Summary

| HCM Average Control Delay | 17.4 |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.27 |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 90.0 |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | 44.2% |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |

Critical Lane Group: A
### Lane Configurations
- EB: Free
- WB: Free
- NB: Stop
- SB: Yield

### Sign Control
- EB: 0%
- WB: 0%
- NB: 0%
- SB: 0%

### Grade
- EB: 0%
- WB: 0%
- NB: 0%
- SB: 0%

### Volume (veh/h)
- EB: 422
- WB: 5
- NB: 13
- SB: 0

### Peak Hour Factor
- EB: 0.92
- WB: 0.92
- NB: 0.92
- SB: 0.92

### Hourly Flow Rate (vph)
- EB: 459
- WB: 2
- NB: 705
- SB: 4

### Pedestrians
- Lane Width (m)
- Walking Speed (m/s)
- Percent Blockage
- Right turn flare (veh)

### Median Type
- TWLTL: None

### Median Storage Veh
- 0

### Upstream Signal (m)
- PX: 173
- pX: 0.73
- vC: 461
- vC1: 1167
- vC2: 736
- vCu: 605
- tC: 4.1

### IF (s)
- 2.2
- 2.2
- 3.5

### p0 Queue Free%
- 100
- 90

### Cm Capacity (veh/h)
- 708
- 1067

### Direction/Travel

#### Volume Total
- EB: 461
- WB: 5
- NB: 711
- SB: 26

#### Volume Left
- 0
- 5
- 0
- 14

#### Volume Right
- 2
- 0
- 5
- 12

#### cSH
- 1700
- 1067
- 1700
- 210

#### Volume to Capacity
- 0.27
- 0.01
- 0.42
- 0.12

#### Queue Length 95th (m)
- 0.0
- 0.1
- 0.0
- 3.2

#### Control Delay (s)
- 0.0
- 8.4
- 0.0
- 24.6

#### Lane LOS
- A
- C

#### Approach Delay (s)
- 0.0
- 0.3
- 24.6
- 15.0

#### Approach LOS
- C
- C

### Intersection Summary
- Average Delay: 0.6
- Intersection Capacity Utilization: 46.4%
- ICU Level of Service: A
- Analysis Period (min): 15
### HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

**19: Stone Church & Access A**

#### Movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EB1</th>
<th>WBC</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>SBE</th>
<th>SB1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Configurations</td>
<td>↑↑↑</td>
<td>↑↑↑</td>
<td>↑↑↑</td>
<td>Yield</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (veh/h)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly flow rate (vph)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Pedestrians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
<th>Lane Width (m)</th>
<th>Walking Speed (m/s)</th>
<th>Percent Blockage</th>
<th>Right turn flare (veh)</th>
<th>Median type</th>
<th>Median storage veh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Upstream signal (m)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pX, platoon unblocked</th>
<th>vC, conflicting volume</th>
<th>vC1, stage 1 conf vol</th>
<th>vC2, stage 2 conf vol</th>
<th>vCu, unblocked vol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>925</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>462</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### IC, single (s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IC, single (s)</th>
<th>4.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### IC, 2 stage (s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IC, 2 stage (s)</th>
<th>6.6</th>
<th>6.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### IF (s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IF (s)</th>
<th>2.2</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>3.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### p0 queue free %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p0 queue free %</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### cM capacity (veh/h)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cM capacity (veh/h)</th>
<th>734</th>
<th>134</th>
<th>546</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Direction Lane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction Lane</th>
<th>EB1</th>
<th>EB2</th>
<th>EB3</th>
<th>WBC</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>SBE</th>
<th>SB1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Volume Total

| Volume Total | 73 | 261 | 261 | 600 | 325 | 47 |

#### Volume Left

| Volume Left | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

#### Volume Right

| Volume Right | 734 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 546 |

#### Volume to Capacity

| Volume to Capacity | 0.10 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.35 | 0.19 | 0.09 |

#### Queue Length 95th (m)

| Queue Length 95th (m) | 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 |

#### Control Delay (s)

| Control Delay (s) | 10.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.2 |

#### Lane LOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lane LOS</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Approach LOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach LOS</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Intersection Summary

| Intersection Summary | Average Delay | Intersection Capacity Utilization | ICU Level of Service | Analysis Period (min) | 35.5% | A | 15 |

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign Control</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Yield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (veh/h)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly flow rate (vph)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Width (m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Speed (m/s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Blockage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right turn flare (veh)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median type</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median storage veh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upstream signal (m)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pX, platoon unblocked</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vC, conflicting volume</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>1245</td>
<td>473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vC1, stage 1 conf vol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vC2, stage 2 conf vol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vCu, unblocked vol</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>1204</td>
<td>473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tC, single (s)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tC, 2 stage (s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF (s)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p0 queue free %</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cM capacity (veh/h)</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction, Lane #</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volume Total</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume Left</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume Right</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cSH</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>537</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume to Capacity</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queue Length 95th (m)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Delay (s)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intersection Summary**

- Average Delay: 0.2
- Intersection Capacity Utilization: 95.4%
- ICU Level of Service: A
- Analysis Period (min): 15
Appendix F.4.2
Detailed SPA ‘C’
Level of Service Calculations
PM Peak
## HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WSL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>NSL</th>
<th>NSB</th>
<th>NSR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Configurations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost Time (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Protected</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>3322</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>1794</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>3390</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>3288</td>
<td>3390</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Permitted</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>3322</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>1784</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>3390</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>3288</td>
<td>3390</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (vph)</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>1339</td>
<td>343</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-hour Factor, PHF</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>373</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTOR Reduction (vph)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Type</td>
<td>pm+pt</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>pm+ov</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>Prot</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, g (s)</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Extension (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Cap (vph)</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>1285</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Pct</td>
<td>c0.06</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Perm</td>
<td>c0.27</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Delay, d1</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Delay, d2</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s)</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intersection Summary

- **HCM Average Control Delay**: 32.1
- **HCM Level of Service**: C
- **HCM Volume to Capacity ratio**: 0.88
- **Actuated Cycle Length (s)**: 90.0
- **Sum of Lost Time (s)**: 10.0
- **Intersection Capacity Utilization**: 86.3%
- **ICU Level of Service**: E
- **Analysis Period (min)**: 15

---

4/21/2006

Synchro 6 Report
iTRANS Consulting Inc.
### HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

#### 13: Stone Church & Up Mt Albion Rd

**2012 PM Total - iTRANS**

With TC Ext

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lane Configurations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph)</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost time (s)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util. Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lit Protected</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>3410</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>1532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lit Permitted</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>3410</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>1333</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>1289</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>1532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (vph)</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-hour factor, PHF</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTOR Reduction (vph)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles (%)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Turn Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn Type</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, g (s)</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Extension (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Grp Cap (vph)</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>2641</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Prot</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Delay, d1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Factor</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Delay, d2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Intersection Summary

- HCM Average Control Delay: 10.5
- HCM Level of Service: B
- HCM Volume to Capacity ratio: 0.39
- Actuated Cycle Length (s): 90.0
- Sum of lost time (s): 8.0
- Intersection Capacity Utilization: 59.7%
- ICU Level of Service: B
- Analysis Period (min): 19

---
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### Lane Configurations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EB1</th>
<th>EB2</th>
<th>EB3</th>
<th>WB1</th>
<th>WB2</th>
<th>WB3</th>
<th>NS1</th>
<th>NS2</th>
<th>NS3</th>
<th>SB1</th>
<th>SB2</th>
<th>SB3</th>
<th>LB1</th>
<th>LB2</th>
<th>LB3</th>
<th>RB1</th>
<th>RB2</th>
<th>RB3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost time (s)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Protected Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>1714</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>1737</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>1737</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>1737</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>1737</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>1737</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>1737</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>1737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Permitted Flow (perm)</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>1714</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>1737</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Volume (vph)

- 199 | 388 | 189 | 23 | 227 | 75 | 71 | 98 | 31 | 96 | 199 | 142

### Miscellaneous

- Actuated Green, G (s) | 39.9 | 39.9 | 25.7 | 25.7 | 38.1 | 38.1 | 38.1 | 38.1
- Effective Green, g (s) | 41.9 | 41.9 | 27.7 | 27.7 | 40.1 | 40.1 | 40.1 | 40.1
- Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.31 | 0.31 | 0.45 | 0.45 | 0.45 | 0.45
- Clearance Time (s) | 4.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0
- Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0

### Lane Grp Cap (vph)

- 394 | 798 | 173 | 534 | 347 | 774 | 532 | 751

### Intersection Summary

- HCM Average Control Delay | 18.2 |
- HCM Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.60 |
- HCM Level of Service | B |
- Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 90.0 |
- Sum of lost time (s) | 8.0 |
- Intersection Capacity Utilization | 74.2% |
- ICU Level of Service | D |
- Analysis Period (min) | 15 |
- Critical Lane Group |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>NBI</th>
<th>NRT</th>
<th>SB1</th>
<th>SBR</th>
<th>NEL</th>
<th>NER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph)</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost time (s)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph Taked</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>1517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph Permitted</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd Flow (perm)</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>1751</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>1517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (vph)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak hour Factor, PHF</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTOR Reduction (vph)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Type</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, g (s)</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Extension (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Grp Cap (vph)</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>1312</td>
<td>1312</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Prot</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Perm</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/l Ratio</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Delay, d1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Factor</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Delay, d2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intersection Summary**

- HCM Average Control Delay: 9.3
- HCM Level of Service: A
- HCM Volume to Capacity ratio: 0.38
- Sum of lost time (s): 8.0
- Actuated Cycle Length (s): 90.0
- ICU Level of Service: A
- Intersection Capacity Utilization: 37.9%
- Analysis Period (min): 15
- Critical Lane Group: C
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### HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

**5: Mud Street Diversion & Winterberry**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EB1</th>
<th>EB2</th>
<th>EB3</th>
<th>WB1</th>
<th>WB2</th>
<th>WB3</th>
<th>NB1</th>
<th>NB2</th>
<th>NB3</th>
<th>SB1</th>
<th>SB2</th>
<th>SB3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lane Configurations</strong></td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost time (s)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util. Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frpb, ped/bikes</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fpt, ped/bikes</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fpt</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FitProtected</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadt. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>3202</td>
<td>1495</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>3181</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit Permitted</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadt. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>3202</td>
<td>1495</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>3181</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volume (vph)</strong></td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-hour factor, PHF</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1047</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTOR Reduction (vph)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confl. Peds. (#/hr)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles (%)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Type</td>
<td>pm+pl</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>pm+pl</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, g (s)</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Extension (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Grp Cap (vph)</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1322</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Prot</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Perm</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Delay, d1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Delay, d2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s)</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intersection Summary**

| HCM Average Control Delay | 22.1 |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.77 |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 90.0 |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | 75.6% |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |
| Critical Lane Group | &nbsp; |

---
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### Movement Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBI</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WST</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Configurations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph/p)</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost time (s)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util. Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FltProtected</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>1781</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>1687</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>1687</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>1687</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>1687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FltPermitted</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>1335</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>1363</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>1781</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>1837</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>1837</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>1837</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>1837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (vph)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-hour factor, PHF</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTOR Reduction (vph)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Turn Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn Type</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated Green, G (s)</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Green, g (s)</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C:Ratio</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time (s)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Extension (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Grp Cap (vph)</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Prot</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/s Ratio Perm</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Delay, d1</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Delay, d2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s)</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intersection Summary

- HCM Average Control Delay: 15.0
- HCM Level of Service: B
- HCM Volume to Capacity ratio: 0.40
- Actuated Cycle Length (s): 90.0
- Sum of lost time (s): 8.0
- Intersection Capacity Utilization: 48.8%
- ICU Level of Service: A
- Analysis Period (min): 15

**Critical Lane Group**
### Movement - Lane Configuration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>All Inclusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign Control</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Yield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (veh/h)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly Flow Rate (vph)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pedestrians
- **Lane Width (m):**
- **Walking Speed (m/s):**
- **Percent Blockage:**
- **Right Turn Flare (veh):** TWLTL
- **Median Type:** None
- **Median Storage Veh:** 0
- **Upstream Signal (m):** 175
- **pX, Platoon Unblocked:** 0.90
- **VC, Conflicting Volume:** 464
- **VC1, Stage 1 Conf Vol:** 837
- **VC2, Stage 2 Conf Vol:** 1317
- **VCu, Unblocked Vol:** 834
- **IC, Single (s):** 4.1
- **IC, 2 Stage (s):** 7.1
- **IF (s):** 2.2
- **p0 Queue Free %:** 100
- **cM Capacity (veh/h):** 1037

### Direction - Lane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume Total</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>All Inclusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>837</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume Left</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume Right</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cSH</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume to Capacity</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queue Length 95th (m)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Delay (s)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intersection Summary

- **Average Delay:** 1.2
- **Intersection Capacity Utilization:** 52.8%
- **ICU Level of Service:** A
- **Analysis Period (min):** 15

---
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### Movement Configurations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lane Configurations</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EB1</th>
<th>WB1</th>
<th>WB2</th>
<th>SB1</th>
<th>SB2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign Control</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (veh/h)</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly Flow Rate (vph)</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pedestrians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lane Width (m)</th>
<th>Walking Speed (m/s)</th>
<th>Percent Blockage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Median type

- None

### Median storage veh

| Upstream signal (m) | 232 | 157 |

### pX, platoon unblocked

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vC, conflicting volume</th>
<th>741</th>
<th>1622</th>
<th>371</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vC1, stage 1 conf vol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vC2, stage 2 conf vol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vCu, unblocked vol</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### tC, single (s)

| tC, 2 stage (s) | 4.1 | 6.8 | 6.9 |

### tF (s)

| p0 queue free % | 76  | 100 | 66  |

### cM capacity (veh/h)

| 861 | 76  | 627 |

### Prediction Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume Total</th>
<th>210</th>
<th>477</th>
<th>477</th>
<th>472</th>
<th>269</th>
<th>212</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volume Left</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume Right</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cSH</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume to Capacity</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queue Length 95th (m)</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Delay (s)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intersection Summary

| Average Delay     | 2.4 |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | 39.4% |
| ICU Level of Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |
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### Movement Lane Configurations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>WGT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>SEL</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign Control</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Yield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (veh/h)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly flow rate (vph)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pedestrians
- Lane Width (m)
- Walking Speed (m/s)
- Percent Blockage
- Right turn flake (veh)
- Median type
  - None
- Median storage veh
- Upstream signal (m)
  - 118
- 270
- pX, platoon unblocked
- 0.88
- vC, conflicting volume
  - 921
  - 1503
  - 460
- vC1, stage 1 conf vol
- vC2, stage 2 conf vol
- vC3, unblocked vol
- 821
- 1433
- 460
- tC, single (s)
  - 4.1
  - 6.8
  - 6.9
- tC, 2 stage (s)
  - 2.2
  - 3.5
  - 3.3
- p0 queue free %
  - 100
  - 100
  - 89
- cM capacity (veh/h)
  - 737
  - 110
  - 548

### Direction, Lane #

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume Total</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>WGT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>SEL</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volume Left</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume Right</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cSH</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume to Capacity</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queue Length S5th (m)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Delay (s)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lane LOS

- Approach Delay (s): 0.0
- Approach LOS: B

### Intersection Summary

- Average Delay: 0.3
- Intersection Capacity Utilization: 35.0%
- ICU Level of Service: A
- Analysis Period (min): 15
Appendix G

Collision Summary Diagram