PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE (PIC) #2
Mohawk Road (McNiven Road to Hwy 403)
Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

THE STUDY
The City of Hamilton has initiated a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA), Schedule C process to develop and assess design alternatives that address and identify transportation issues along Mohawk Road (McNiven Road to Hwy 403) (map below). This 2nd PIC is being held to present the preferred alternatives and identification of a preferred solution for the roadway.

THE PROCESS
This project is being carried out as a Schedule C project under the Municipal Engineers Association Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (October 2000, as amended in 2007, 2011, and 2015).

PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE
A Public Information Centre (PIC) displaying information will be held to receive public input:

DATE: Thursday, April 11, 2019
TIME: 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. (open house/drop in format)
LOCATION: Ancaster Old Town Hall, 310 Wilson Street East

Upon completion of the study a Environmental Study Report (ESR) will be prepared and made available for public review and comment. Another advertisement will be published at that time, indicating where the report can be viewed.

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:

Megan Salvucci
Project Manager
Asset Management
City of Hamilton, Public Works Department
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 4101
Email: megan.salvucci@hamilton.ca

Phil Weber, P.Eng
Project Manager
Cima+
Phone: 905-695-1005
Email: phil.weber@cima.ca

Please contact the City’s Project Manager regarding disability accommodation requirements for the PIC by April 4, 2019.

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 March 28 and April 4, 2019.

NEW BIZ
LEARN ABOUT NEW BUSINESSES IN YOUR COMMUNITY.
HAMILTONNEWS.COM

BUSINESS

NEW GYM OFFERS SMALLER CLASSES, MORE HANDS-ON TRAINING

A new gym in Ancaster is taking a different tack in the fitness market.

With smaller classes, Optimum Movement offers more hands-on time with coaches, say owners Kim Petrie and Brad Johnston. So it’s like having a personal trainer, but without the cost.

Johnston and Petrie opened Optimum Movement, with 5,000 square feet of space, in January. They offer programs five days a week.

The gym uses Keiser pneumatic resistance equipment.

“It’s easier on the body as it is a matter of pushing buttons to change the air pressure rather than physically changing weights,” says Johnston.

With the Keiser system it’s also easier on the body so there are less injuries, says Johnston.

Optimum offers monthly or by-the-class rates, with no contract and therefore no cancellation fees.

New clients have the opportunity to try classes for one week at no cost. Call 905-304-1600 or email info@omove.ca.

Brad Johnston and Kim Petrie opened Optimum Movement, 680 Tradewind Dr., Ancaster in January.

Metroland staff

Address
680 Tradewind Dr. (unit 5)
Contact
905-304-1600
optimummovement.ca
HOURS
Monday to Friday, 5:30 a.m. to 8 p.m. Closed Saturday and Sunday.

BIG GREEN SAC!
SOIL • MULCH • STONE

NEXT DAY DELIVERY
from $89
BUY 2 SAVE AN EXTRA $20

super sac.ca
905.574.DIRT
Mohawk Road
Class Environmental Assessment
Lime Kiln Road/McNiven Road to Filman Road
Public Information Centre #2, April 11, 2019
Purpose of Public Information Centre #2

- Review the project information on display:
  - ✔ Study Area Overview
  - ✔ Study Process and Schedule
  - ✔ Summary of PIC No. 1
  - ✔ Natural Heritage Features
  - ✔ Stormwater Management
  - ✔ Alternative Design Concepts
  - ✔ Analysis and Evaluation of Alternative Design Concepts
  - ✔ Preliminary Preferred Design
  - ✔ Next steps for the study

- Ask the Project Team questions and discuss areas of interest
- Submit a comment sheet

Please submit a comment sheet by May 10, 2019
Study Area Overview

- The study area is Mohawk Road between Lime Kiln Road/McNiven Road and Filman Road.
- Mohawk Road is a two-lane major arterial with a rural cross-section and sidewalk along some sections.
- The speed limit within the study area is 50 km/h.
- Hiawatha Boulevard to the south is signed as a cycling route and crosses Mohawk Road at Filman Road.
- Refer to the roll plan for more details.
The Municipal Class EA is a planning and design process approved by the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MOECP) to meet the requirements of the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act.

This Study follows the Class EA process for Schedule ‘C’ projects and will complete Phases 1 to 4 as outlined below:

- **Included in the 2011 Ancaster Transportation Master Plan**
- **Phase 1**: Problem and/or Opportunity
- **Phase 2**: Alternative Solutions
- **Phase 3**: Alternative Design Concepts
- **Phase 4**: Environmental Study Report
- **Phase 5**: Implementation
- **PIC #1**: Sept. 24, 2018
- **PIC #2**:
- **Notice of Study Completion**: Fall 2019
Study Area Overview

- The study area is Mohawk Road between Lime Kiln Road/McNiven Road and Filman Road
- Mohawk Road is a two-lane major arterial with a rural cross-section and sidewalk along some sections
- The speed limit within the study area is 50 km/h
- Hiawatha Boulevard to the south is signed as a cycling route and crosses Mohawk Road at Filman Road
- Refer to the roll plan for more details
Municipal Class EA Process

- The Municipal Class EA is a planning and design process approved by the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MOECP) to meet the requirements of the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act
- This Study follows the Class EA process for Schedule ‘C’ projects and will complete Phases 1 to 4 as outlined below:
Summary of Public Information Centre #1

Key Comments Received at PIC #1:

- General support for a 3-lane cross-section
- Concerns regarding safety and high traffic speeds in the study area
- Support for a sidewalk or multi-use trail on at least one side and notes that this is not an area with high pedestrian traffic
- General preference for separation of cyclists from cars (i.e. boulevard cycle tracks or multi-use trail)
- Concern regarding safety of cyclists with on-road bicycle lanes without a physical barrier
- Suggestions to reduce boulevard widths to minimize property impacts

Activities Since PIC #1:

- Reviewed and responded to inquires/questions received from the public and stakeholders
- Confirmed the preferred solution – Widening of Mohawk Road to three lanes with a two-way centre left turn lane and active transportation facilities
- Developed a more broad range of alternative design concepts
Natural Heritage Features

- A natural environment survey and tree survey have been completed for the study area which included a breeding bird inventory, vegetation inventory, and watercourse assessment.
- No significant habitats were found or Species at Risk identified.
- A total of 162 trees and tree groups were surveyed, and trees ranged in trunk diameter from 4 to 186 cm and in spread from 1 to 20 m.
- The majority of trees along Mohawk Road are in good or fair condition, but 7 trees were noted to be in poor condition and one was categorized as dead.

Tree Condition Summary
EXCELLENT (E):
- no apparent health problems; good structural form
GOOD (G):
- minor problems with health and/or structural form
FAIR (F):
- more serious problems with health and/or structural form
POOR (P):
- major problems with health and structural form
DEAD (D):
Stormwater Management

- The study area has multiple outlets, draining into either Tiffany Creek or Ancaster Creek, which are both tributary to Spencer Creek and within the jurisdiction of the Hamilton Conservation Authority (HCA).
- There are three catchment areas, each draining to a different storm sewer system.
- Quality control will be needed to reduce post development runoff flows to pre-development levels.
Cross Section Alternatives

**Existing** (looking east)

**Option 1**
On-Road Bike Lanes and Sidewalks
Both Sides
Cross Section Alternatives

Existing (looking east)

Option 2
Boulevard Cycle Tracks and Sidewalks
Both Sides
Cross Section Alternatives

Existing (looking east)

Option 3A
Boulevard Multi-Use Trail
South Side Only
Cross Section Alternatives

Existing (looking east)

Option 3B
Boulevard Multi-Use Trail South Side and Sidewalk North Side
Cross Section Alternatives

Existing (looking east)

Option 4A
Boulevard Multi-Use Trail
North Side Only
Cross Section Alternatives

Existing (looking east)

Option 4B
Boulevard Multi-Use Trail North Side and Sidewalk South Side
Cross Section Alternatives

Existing (looking east)

Option 5
Sidewalks Only Both Sides
The alternative design concepts were assessed and evaluated based on the following factors:
## Evaluation of Alternative Design Concepts (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TECHNICAL CRITERIA</th>
<th>Do Nothing</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
<th>Option C</th>
<th>Option D</th>
<th>Option E</th>
<th>Option F</th>
<th>Option G</th>
<th>Option H</th>
<th>Option I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Operations and Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Traffic Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety and Comfort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Conflict for Cyclists at Intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Traffic Operations and Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Evaluation of Alternative Design Concepts (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TECHNICAL CRITERIA</th>
<th>Option B: Three Lane Cross Section with Two-Way Left Turn Lane Only</th>
<th>Option 1: Three Lane Cross Section with Bicycle Lanes and Sidewalks on Both Sides</th>
<th>Option 2: Three Lane Cross Section with Cycle Tracks and Sidewalks on Both Sides</th>
<th>Option 3A: Three Lane Cross Section with Multi-Use Trail on South Side Only</th>
<th>Option 3B: Three Lane Cross Section with Multi-Use Trail on North Side Only</th>
<th>Option 4A: Three Lane Cross Section with Multi-Use Trail on North Side and Sidewalk on South Side</th>
<th>Option 4B: Three Lane Cross Section with Multi-Use Trail on South Side and Sidewalk on North Side</th>
<th>Option 5: Three Lane Cross Section with Sidewalks on Both Sides</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Planning Compliance with Planning Policy</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Environment</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>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Management</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>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True Impacts</td>
<td>50 or more</td>
<td>50 or more</td>
<td>50 or more</td>
<td>50 or more</td>
<td>50 or more</td>
<td>50 or more</td>
<td>50 or more</td>
<td>50 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Natural Environment</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Environmental</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>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property 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>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage Impacts</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation Network Connectivity</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Social Economic</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TWLTL:** two-way left-turn lane  
**MUT:** multi-use trail
## Evaluation of Alternative Design Concepts (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Criteria</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
<th>Option 6</th>
<th>Option 7</th>
<th>Option 8</th>
<th>Option 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Relocation</td>
<td>No impacts</td>
<td>No impacts</td>
<td>Requires minor vertical relocations on second level</td>
<td>Requires major vertical relocations on first level</td>
<td>Requires major vertical relocations on second level</td>
<td>Requires minor vertical relocations on second level</td>
<td>Requires major vertical relocations on second level</td>
<td>Requires minor vertical relocations on second level</td>
<td>Requires major vertical relocations on first level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations and Maintenance</td>
<td>No impacts</td>
<td>No impacts</td>
<td>Requires gradual implementation of new operations and minimal downtime for rehabilitation along both sides of road. No parking restrictions to construction. No need for new computer systems to support additional operations.</td>
<td>Requires gradual implementation of new operations and minimal downtime for rehabilitation along both sides of road. No parking restrictions to construction. No need for new computer systems to support additional operations.</td>
<td>Requires gradual implementation of new operations and minimal downtime for rehabilitation along both sides of road. No parking restrictions to construction. No need for new computer systems to support additional operations.</td>
<td>Requires gradual implementation of new operations and minimal downtime for rehabilitation along both sides of road. No parking restrictions to construction. No need for new computer systems to support additional operations.</td>
<td>Requires gradual implementation of new operations and minimal downtime for rehabilitation along both sides of road. No parking restrictions to construction. No need for new computer systems to support additional operations.</td>
<td>Requires gradual implementation of new operations and minimal downtime for rehabilitation along both sides of road. No parking restrictions to construction. No need for new computer systems to support additional operations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Staging and Controllability</td>
<td>No impacts</td>
<td>No impacts</td>
<td>Requires minor vertical relocations on first level</td>
<td>Requires major vertical relocations on both sides</td>
<td>Requires major vertical relocations on both sides</td>
<td>Requires minor vertical relocations on first level</td>
<td>Requires major vertical relocations on both sides</td>
<td>Requires major vertical relocations on both sides</td>
<td>Requires major vertical relocations on both sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requires major vertical relocations on both sides</td>
<td>Requires major vertical relocations on both sides</td>
<td>Requires major vertical relocations on both sides</td>
<td>Requires major vertical relocations on both sides</td>
<td>Requires major vertical relocations on both sides</td>
<td>Requires major vertical relocations on both sides</td>
<td>Requires major vertical relocations on both sides</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Recommendation
- Option 1: Not recommended
- Option 2: Not recommended
- Option 3: Not recommended
- Option 4: Not recommended
- Option 5: Not recommended
- Option 6: Recommended
- Option 7: Not recommended
- Option 8: Not recommended
- Option 9: Not recommended

---

![Hamilton Logo](image)
Preliminary Preferred Alternative Design

- Based on the analysis and evaluation of alternative design concepts, Option 4A, Three-Lane Section with Boulevard Multi-Use Trail North Side Only, was selected as the preliminary preferred alternative design subject to agency and public review.

Primary reasons this option was selected as preferred:

- All options have a centre two-way left-turn lane which will improve traffic operations yet not result in excessive vehicle speeds and passing like a four-lane section.
- All options will feature centre medians to calm traffic and create pedestrian crossing areas.
- All options except Options 1 and 5 provide a dedicated space for pedestrians and cyclists physically separated from motor vehicles.
- Options 3A and 4A don’t have pedestrian and cyclist facilities on both sides of Mohawk Road but will impact fewer trees than Options 2, 3B and 4B.
- Option 4A will not require expensive relocation of an overhead utility line.
Tree Protection and Mitigation

- The most typical construction damage to trees is root damage from compaction and severance.
- Some of the trees inventoried will be close to the construction zone and may be at risk of contact with, and damage from, heavy equipment.
- A tree protection plan will be developed prior to construction to indicate the City’s Tree Protection Zone and locations for Preservation Fencing.
- Mitigation measures will be developed in order to protect trees to the extent possible.
Next Steps

• Following this public meeting the Project Team will:
  ✓ Review comments received
  ✓ Incorporate design refinements based on feedback received
  ✓ Finalize the preliminary design
  ✓ Prepare the Environmental Study Report (ESR)
  ✓ File the ESR on the public record for the 30-day review period

How to get involved

• Submit a comment sheet
• Request that your name be added to the mailing list

Your input is important and your comments are welcome at any time during the study, but we kindly ask that you complete a comment sheet and return it by:

May 10, 2019

This is so we can incorporate critical information into the final phase of the study

Personal information collected and recorded at a Public Information Centre or submitted in writing about this project is collected under the authority of the Municipal Act, 2011, and will be used by members of Council and City of Hamilton staff in their management of this project. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record.

Thank you for attending!
I support all measures to:

- slow traffic down - vehicles drive too fast through this corridor causing safety and noise issues in recent years (since road resurfacing in 2019/20)
speed and traffic noise has become a bigger problem.

- make street more pedestrian-friendly on both sides - the south side is important because people need to walk/bike to the nearby school and adjoining streets. Cayuga, Argyle.
- south side is very dangerous for pedestrians, especially in the winter when snow banks on the side of the road.

- safety and noise are my two biggest concerns

- I’m not an expert but I’m concerned that medians are not enough.
- more should be done to slow vehicles coming from the highway and to

- high volume of heavy duty trucks driving straight in front of my house
- vehicles driving toward highway consistently accelerating in front of my house.

Comments and information regarding this study are being collected to assist the City of Hamilton in meeting the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. They will be maintained on file for use during the study and may be included in study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record.

Please drop these comments in the box provided or forward them by Tuesday, May 10, 2019 to either:

Megan Salvucci
Project Manager
City of Hamilton, Public Works Department
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 4101
Email: Megan.Salvucci@hamilton.ca

Phil Weber, P.Eng
Project Manager
CIMA+ Phone: 905-695-1005
Email: phil.weber@cima.ca
PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #2
Mohawk Road (Lime Kiln Rd/McNiven Rd to Filman Rd) EA
Thursday, April 11, 2019
Ancaster Old Town Hall – 310 Wilson Street East
6:00 pm – 8:00 pm

COMMENT SHEET
(please print)

Comments:
I like the overall table design re 3 lanes twalks.
I prefer designs 3a & 4a. I see more children living on the southside so it would be better if you need some kind of safety on both sides of Mohawk. Edam will have the pavement on the north.
Get winder plus a side walk. All your designs are the same width which is not intruding on the trees. I see more in their design 4a.
I would also have a traffic light at Green Ravine.
Instead of the crosswalks, along work, the main idea was to have a safety zone on both sides of Mohawk and a sidewalk.

Thank you.

Comments and information regarding this study are being collected to assist the City of Hamilton in meeting the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. They will be maintained on file for use during the study and may be included in study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record.

Please drop these comments in the box provided or forward them by Tuesday, May 10, 2019 to either:

Megan Salvucci
Project Manager
Asset Management
City of Hamilton, Public Works Department
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 4101
Email: Megan.Salvucci@hamilton.ca

Phil Weber, PEng
Project Manager
CIMA+
Phone: 905-695-1005
Email: phil.weber@cima.ca
PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #2
Mohawk Road (Lime Kiln Rd/McNiven Rd to Filman Rd) EA
Thursday, April 11, 2019
Ancaster Old Town Hall – 310 Wilson Street East
6:00 pm – 8:00 pm

COMMENT SHEET
(Please Print)

- Speed trap. Reason trap. Now stop and speed way it is not
  anymore.
- Stop light on Hamilton.
- Slow down speed to 40. By doing the work it will be speed way as not in town.
- Sorry I think them all wrong.
- Lower the light will speed can you fix it.
- Both lane going East were done at go!

Comments and information regarding this study are being collected to assist the City of Hamilton in meeting the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. They will be maintained on file for use during the study and may be included in study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record.

Please drop these comments in the box provided or forward them by Tuesday, May 10, 2019 to either:

Megan Salucci  Phil Weber, PEng
Project Manager  Project Manager
Asset Management  CIMA+
City of Hamilton, Public Works Department  Phone: 905-695-1005
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 4101  Email: phil.weber@cima.ca
Email: Megan.Salucci@hamilton.ca
PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #2
Mohawk Road (Lime Kiln Rd/McNiven Rd to Filman Rd) EA
Thursday, April 11, 2019
Ancaster Old Town Hall – 310 Wilson Street East
6:00 pm – 8:00 pm

COMMENT SHEET
(Please Print)

BAScED ON THE CURREN'T DESGIN:
- ADD CROSSWALK LIGHTS (FLASHING) WHERE
  THE CROSSWALK ARE POSITIONED

- AT THE LIGHTS @ ROUSSEAU & WILSON
  EXTEND THE LEFT TURN LANE, BACK UPS
  HERE ADD TO THE CONGESTION OF MOHAWK.
  (TRAFFIC FLOW ISSUES?)

Comments and information regarding this study are being collected to assist the City of Hamilton in meeting the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. They will be maintained on file for use during the study and may be included in study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record.

Please drop these comments in the box provided or forward them by Tuesday, May 10, 2019 to either:

Megan Salvucci  
Project Manager  
Asset Management  
City of Hamilton, Public Works Department  
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 4101  
Email: Megan.Salvucci@hamilton.ca

Phil Weber, PEng  
Project Manager  
CIMA+  
Phone: 905-695-1005  
Email: phil.weber@cima.ca
Mixed use cycle track is an acceptable compromise to allow cyclists & pedestrians use this road. I understand due to costs this is the best option. I have some recommendations:

1) Lanes should be as thin as possible to reduce bleeding. 3.5m is too wide especially for the centre lane. The appearance of lanes being smaller than they are should be added to this.

2) Ped crosswalks should be signalized by a button beside the crosswalk and located in better locations

3) Cycle track should be signed so ped & cyclists can stay safe

4) Where does the cycle lane go? Without connectivity people won't cycle. These types of studies need to plan where these people will travel.

5) Will the cycle/ped trail have lighting? People will likely use it after sunset at some point.

Comments and information regarding this study are being collected to assist the City of Hamilton in meeting the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. They will be maintained on file for use during the study and may be included in study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record.

Please drop these comments in the box provided or forward them by Tuesday, May 10, 2019 to either:

Megan Salvucci
Project Manager
Asset Management
City of Hamilton, Public Works Department
Phone: 905-646-2421 ext. 4101
Email: melen.salvucci@hamilton.ca

Phil Weber, PEng
Project Manager
CIMA+
Phone: 905-695-1005
Email: phil.weber@cima.ca
PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #2
Mohawk Road (Lime Kiln Rd/McNiven Rd to Filman Rd) EA
Thursday, April 11, 2019
Ancaster Old Town Hall – 310 Wilson Street East
6:00 pm – 8:00 pm

COMMENT SHEET
(Please Print)

- Concern of speeding!!
- Centre turn lane is OK if speed reducing medians are added
- North side sidewalk is a good option
- Single bike path on south side is likely sufficient - can't keep going onto the lane anyway
- A flat road becomes a speedway - we live on the hill portion with a wall in front

Comments and information regarding this study are being collected to assist the City of Hamilton in meeting the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. They will be maintained on file for use during the study and may be included in study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record.

Please drop these comments in the box provided or forward them by Tuesday, May 10, 2019 to either:

Megan Salvucci
Project Manager
Asset Management
City of Hamilton, Public Works Department
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 4131
Email: Megan.Salvucci@hamilton.ca

Phil Weber, PEng
Project Manager
CIMA+
Phone: 905-695-1005
Email: phil.weber@cima.ca
PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #2
Mohawk Road (Lime Kiln Rd/McNiven Rd to Filman Rd) EA
Thursday, April 11, 2019
Ancaster Old Town Hall – 310 Wilson Street East
6:00 pm – 8:00 pm

COMMENT SHEET
(Please Print)

COMMENTS:

[Handwritten text]

The above shows the fact you are improving the road. It is definitely going to be a safer option for pedestrians and cyclists.

My only concern is that I have a business on my home. If you look up all the businesses on active streets, it could have a negative impact on our lovely home.

I also have a sign on my lawn that I may have to move wondering if that cost will be compensated.

Stop repeating that one lane be done at a time, so that the clients can have access to my business.

Thank you!

Comments and information regarding this study are being collected to assist the City of Hamilton in meeting the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. They will be maintained on file for use during the study and may be included in study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record.

Please drop these comments in the box provided or forward them by Tuesday, May 10, 2019 to either:

Megan Salvucci
Project Manager
Asset Management
City of Hamilton Public Works Department
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 4101
Email: Megan.Salvucci@hamilton.ca

Phil Weber, P.Eng
Project Manager
CIMA+
Phone: 905-695-1005
Email: phil.weber@cima.ca
January 27, 2014

Attention Valued Customers

In order for Canada Post to serve you better, we will be placing temporary group boxes in your area, to service your mail daily. The area on Mohawk road has become extremely busy with traffic flow, the highway and the Lincoln Alexander Parkway making speed and no sidewalks a factor. Due to safety reasons, we will be placing the new boxes in a convenient location; your box will be located at Filman/Mohawk Road.

You will be responsible for putting a lock on the compartment, the lock of your choice will need to be put on your compartment by February 15, 2014 to receive mail delivery.

Your address is ___________________________ and you will be in Box# ____, and compartment# ________.

If you need further information or need assistance, please contact the Hamilton West office at 905-648-8719 ext. 2002

Regards

Lisa Moore
supervisor
Hamilton West Depot
March 10, 2015

CHANGE TO YOUR MAIL DELIVERY

Dear Canada Post customer,

Due to safety concerns of the delivery route in your area your mail will be delivered on a permanent basis to a locked compartment at a community mailbox (CMB), starting on Monday, March 16 2015. The CMB is located on the side of

You will be assigned a compartment in the community mailbox and we ask that you pick up your keys at your earliest convenience at the Canada Post facility located at 590 Tradewind Drive in Ancaster between the hours of 6 a.m. and 8 p.m. Monday to Friday.

There is also a compartment for parcel pick-up and a mail slot for depositing outgoing mail. Canada Post will provide snow removal and regular maintenance at the site. These boxes, which have 24/7 access, are a convenient option as online shopping becomes more popular.

We thank you for your cooperation and understanding.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us by calling (905) 648-9719, option 4.

Sincerely yours,

Christopher Reed
Supervisor, Canada Post
590 Tradewind Drive Ancaster ON L9G 4V0
PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #2
Mohawk Road (Lime Kiln Rd/McNiven Rd to Filman Rd) EA
Thursday, April 11, 2019
Ancaster Old Town Hall – 310 Wilson Street East
6:00 pm – 8:00 pm

COMMENT SHEET
(Please Print)

COMMENTS:
THE BUS LANE IS GOING TO BE A TURN LANE WITH THE TURNING MOVE.
THE VOLUME OF PEDESTRIANS AND CYCLISTS WILL ALWAYS BE REDUCED (LOCAL TRAFFIC ONLY), BUT THEY NEED GOOD TRAVEL AND ACCESS ON BOTH SIDES.
CONSIDER CHILDREN PARTICULARLY.

HERE ARE MY OPINIONS/SUGGESTIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION</th>
<th>OBSERVATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>NOT SERVING THEM - DANGEROUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>OVERKILL, FOR THE SMALL VOLUME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>NO, WE NEED A SIDEWALK ON BOTH SIDES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>BEST OPTION, WITH SIDEWALK ON SOUTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>SAME AS 3A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>SECOND BEST, MORE PEDESTRIANS ON SOUTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NOT SERVING CYCLISTS SAFELY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WITHOUT A SIDEWALK, PEDESTRIANS WILL EITHER HAVE TO WALK IN THE ROAD TO A CROSSING OR IMMEDIATELY CROSS THE ROAD!!!

Megan Salvucci
Project Manager
Asset Management
City of Hamilton, Public Works Department
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 4101
Email: Megan.Salvucci@hamilton.ca

Phil Weber, P.Eng
Project Manager
CIMA+
Phone: 905-695-1005
Email: phil.weber@cima.ca

Comments and information regarding this study are being collected to assist the City of Hamilton in meeting the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. They will be maintained on file for use during the study and may be included in study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record.

Please drop these comments in the box provided or forward them by **Tuesday, May 10, 2019** to either:
Thanks Phil:

That would be a welcome addition to the project.

Regards,

Hi

We are considering one or two centre medians within the project limits, which may include pedestrian crosswalks and regulatory pedestrian crosswalk signs. If they do happen then candidate locations are Green Ravine Drive or Algonquin Avenue.

Phil Weber, P.Eng.
CIMA+
Mississauga, Ontario
Tel: 905-695-1005 ext. 6732
Cell: 416-371-0292

Hi Phil:

In my email I refer to Lime Kiln road, when I should have said Green Ravine Drive.

Cheers!
To: 'Phil Weber'
Cc: 'megan.salvucci@hamilton.ca'; Jessica Dorgo
Subject: RE: Mohawk Road EA Input from Resident

Hi Phil:

Thank you for your email. Couple of quick questions:

1. How will pedestrian access be provided to our property?

2. How will pedestrians cross the road safely? The distance from Fillman to McNiven is almost 1km. If I walk from my house to McNiven it takes far longer than 3 minutes and I am the fastest walker out there. As the walk is 5 minutes the natural tendency for pedestrians is to cross the road before there is safe pedestrian crossing. This is far longer than desired for spacing between appropriate pedestrian crossings. In close proximity to Lime Kiln road may be suitable location for a pedestrian crossing. Or failing that a 3 way stop would be appropriate at Lime Kiln road and Mohawk.

Thanks again for the feedback and look forward to your response.

Regards,

From: Phil Weber [mailto:Phil.Weber@cima.ca]
Sent: March 26, 2019 12:37 PM
To:
Cc: 'megan.salvucci@hamilton.ca'; Jessica Dorgo
Subject: RE: Mohawk Road EA Input from Resident

Hi,

Thanks for the comments. Megan and I discussed, and responses are as follows:

- Traffic calming. We are proposing at least a couple centre medians, one at each end of the project at the signalized intersections. There may be some potential to create a gateway treatment out of the median at Filman Road. Hopefully the medians will slow drivers, especially coming from Highway 403, and let them know the road environment has changed.
- Pedestrians. All of the alternatives considered have sidewalks or a multi-use trail on at least one side of the road.
- Noise. Hopefully the slower traffic speeds will offset the closer distance from the road to the front of your house. However please note that the widening of the road is to take place within the City right-of-way, with no expropriation of land.
- Vehicle access. The centre two-way left-turn lane should help ingress to residential driveways, and egress since an outbound left turn can be made in two stages if necessary.
- Look and feel. Design features to improve the look and feel of Mohawk Road and make it more consistent with the section to the west will be considered during more detailed design.
- Lighting. This will be looked at during more detailed design.
Crime. The City is working to get someone from Hamilton Police to comment on how the alternatives achieve CPTED. All of the alternatives considered should increase pedestrian and cycling traffic, which may increase “natural security” and improve the street’s safety, as per CPTED principles.

Hopefully this addresses your comments. Will you be attending the PIC?

Phil Weber, P.Eng.
CIMA+
Mississauga, Ontario
Tel: 905-695-1005 ext. 6732
Cell: 416-371-0292

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Thursday, March 21, 2019 12:13 PM
To: Phil Weber <Phil.Weber@cima.ca>; 'megan.salvucci@hamilton.ca'
.Subject: Mohawk Road EA Input from Resident

Hi Phil & Megan:

I am a long term resident at in Ancaster and would like to have the following items addressed prior to the PIC on April 11:

1. What is being planned for speed calming – would like to have combination of speed humps, stop sign, reduced speed limit, centre median decorative islands. Traffic speed is already an issue on the road and would like the plan to recognize and address the issue for the safety of motorists and residents.

2. What is being planned for pedestrian safety and access – would like sidewalks and a pedestrian cross walk. Currently road is dangerous and not pedestrian friendly even though it is used by pedestrians all the time. Currently have to cut through front yards to access surrounding neighbourhoods safely. Would like to see crosswalk similar to one on Wilson street added last year. This is a major issue and needs to be addressed for the safety of motorists and pedestrians.

3. How is noise from increased traffic and road widening being addressed ? Especially given that traffic will move closer to our house with the expropriation of land to allow for the planned 3 lanes.

4. How will vehicle road access be improved outside of the centre lane? Currently the timing of lights, speed of traffic on Mohawk, and traffic volume makes it extremely difficult to access
the road during peak times. The addition of a stop sign, cross walk, and calming features are needed on this street.

5. What design features are being considered to have consistent look and feel of the Mohawk/Rousseaux stretch and to the village.

6. How will lighting impact the area. Currently light pollution is minimal and can see the stars at night, this needs to not be impacted by the project.

7. What design features will be in place to ensure crime along the street remains low. Currently the road is far enough away from our house and pedestrians are restricted so our house has been very secure. We have never had an issue and can leave items unattended in the front yard at all times. Concerned that bringing the street closer and addition of sidewalk will lead to increased opportunity for crime.

Regards,
From: Salvucci, Megan <Megan.Salvucci@hamilton.ca>
Sent: Monday, April 01, 2019 9:41 AM
To:
Cc: Phil Weber <Phil.Weber@cima.ca>
Subject: RE: Mohawk Road Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

Good morning,

We will add you to the mailing list.

Thank you,

Megan Salvucci
Project Manager, Asset Management
Megan.Salvucci@hamilton.ca | 905-546-2424 x 4101
Engineering Services | Public Works Department | City of Hamilton
Address: 77 James Street North, Suite 320, Hamilton ON, L8R 2K3

From: Salvucci, Megan; phil.weber@cima.ca
Subject: Mohawk Road Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

Dear Project Managers Salvucci and Weber,

As offered in the Public Information Centre (PIC) #2 printed in the Ancaster News dated March 28, 2019 we are requesting to be added to the study mailing list on this issue.

As residents of adjacent to Mohawk Road between McNiven Road to Hwy 403 we are interested in the developments on this issue as the occur.

Thank you and best regards,
Dear ,

Thank you for your letter. Right now most of the congestion occurring along this section of Mohawk Road is at the Lime Kiln Road/McNiven Road intersection during the PM peak hour. Adding a second westbound lane would only allow drivers to reach this point of congestion earlier... unless that lane were to be continued through the intersection (which is not within the scope of this study).

The purpose of this study is to improve conditions for all users within this section of Mohawk Road. A second westbound lane will increase vehicle speeds and passing manoeuvres. The former is something may residents along Mohawk Road are already concerned about. The Ancaster Transportation Master Plan (ATMP) recommended the addition of a centre two-way left-turn lane instead, to help people get in and out of driveways along Mohawk Road and increase safety, along with treatments to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists. All of the options presented at the first open house and evaluated during the study included such treatments.

It is understood there are not many pedestrians and cyclists along this section of Mohawk Road right now. However interest in cycling is increasing and the City is committed to promoting cycling as a mode of travel. (Hopefully if you build it they will come!) I myself cycle on occasion, but would do so more often if traffic speeds were lower and better infrastructure was in place.

I hope this response is satisfactory, but please contact me again if you require more information.

Phil Weber, P.Eng.
CIMA+
Mississauga, Ontario
Tel: 905-695-1005 ext. 6732
Cell: 416-371-0292
Thursday evening April 11, 2019 we would like to contribute the following comments as requested by the project team.

1. To begin, we must ask: What is the real objective of this project, understanding from the drop-in session that the project team has selected a preferred option. If the objective is to appease a few hard-core environmentalists in City Hall, then we would conclude that the preferred option with the combination bike/pedestrian lane and adjacent greenspace, on the north side of Mohawk Rd, successfully meets that objective. If the objective is to address the traffic congestion problems in this section of Mohawk Rd, the preferred option is an abject failure.

2. If in fact the objective is to address the traffic congestion problems, our conclusion is based simply on looking at the before and after picture. In the before (which is now), traffic comes onto Mohawk Rd from two directions; the westbound Lincoln Alexander Parkway and the westbound 403. Traffic is then forced to merge into one lane at Filman Rd. In the after (post construction), traffic comes onto Mohawk Rd from the westbound Lincoln Alexander Parkway and the westbound 403. Traffic is then forced to merge into one lane at Filman Rd. Unless we are missing something, how is the after picture an improvement over the before picture?

3. The preferred option appears to have 2 ‘medians’ between Filman Rd and McNiven Rd which will allow for pedestrian crossing similar to the median that is on McNiven Rd at the rail trail by Rousseau school. I would consider these two proposed medians as ‘traffic calmers’ because many years ago when the stretch of Mohawk Rd between McNiven Rd and Wilson St underwent improvements, this is what they called the several centre landscaped medians which currently exist. The presence of these 2 proposed medians with the inclusion of pedestrians will slow traffic down but won’t do anything to address the traffic congestion. What we would suggest to you is that the stretch of road between Filman Rd and McNiven Rd will become one big parking lot because lets face it, the Ancaster portion of Mohawk Rd has been in the past and is still to this day, a country road and all of these options are trying to address a city traffic problem on a country road. It just does not work.

4. What the preferred option does include which is not now in the existing road is a left turning lane for westbound traffic at Cayuga Ave. We have to question why this is even necessary. The housing survey south of Mohawk Rd up to Golf Links Rd and west of McNiven Rd has not changed in population density in 30 years and since there is no more available land in this area to develop, one would not expect a population explosion to occur anytime soon. There is already a left turning lane into this survey at Algonquin Ave. and the only residents that we see benefitting from this left-hand turning lane at Cayuga are the residents that live within 200 ft of Mohawk Rd. This to us
seems a poor justification for this left-hand turning lane.

5. The preferred option also includes a left-hand turning lane for eastbound traffic onto Green Ravine. It has been our contention when we commented on these proposals during the first drop in session, that eastbound traffic on Mohawk Rd will use either the stoplight at Mohawk Rd and McNiven or the stoplight at Mohawk Rd and Filman Rd to access the Tiffany Falls residential survey because it will be much easier to use these two access points than trying to make a left hand turn at Green Ravine during rush hour.

6. Having said all of this, we do offer a proposal that we believe will address the traffic congestion issues and still keep some the preferred option design features intact.

   a. Get rid of the combination bike / pedestrian pathway and the greenspace and construct a proper pedestrian sidewalk.
   b. Since the road in the preferred option is being shifted southward, by eliminating the bike/pedestrian pathway, there should be enough room to add another westbound vehicular lane. This will give westbound traffic two lanes and should more than ease the westbound traffic congestion both now and in the future. Eventually these two lanes will have to merge into one since Mohawk Rd west of McNiven Rd is only single lane traffic westbound. There would appear to be plenty of room immediately west of Lime Kiln Rd to construct a merge lane. After all, this type of merge lane currently exist immediately west of the stoplight at Filman Rd for traffic coming off the 403.
   c. Keep the 2 medians
   d. Remove the centre turning lane between Algonquin Ave and Cayuga Ave.

7. Although the combination bike/pedestrian pathway is a cute idea in theory, we have lived in this area for almost 30 years and have witnessed only extremely limited use by pedestrians and cyclists on the stretch of road between Filman Rd and McNiven Rd. The fact that there is no sidewalk and with the presence of front property drainage ditches (i.e. a country road) probably contributes to this low usage. So, unless there has been a study done to quantify future usage to justify this feature, creating a space for this seems like a colossal waste of money unless someone has this as a pet project. For pedestrians and cyclists, we have a wonderful rail trail just south of Mohawk Rd and running almost parallel to Mohawk Rd that sees extensive use during spring, summer and fall and exploring options to make improvements to this rail trail would seem to be a lot more beneficial in the long run.

Thank you for allowing the opportunity for comments. Although the tone of our comments is slightly on the negative side, as previously stated, we have lived on Lime Kiln Rd for the past
30 years and have seen a significant increase in traffic on Mohawk Rd largely due to the presence of the Lincoln Alexander Parkway spilling westbound traffic onto Mohawk Rd. The infrastructure improvements of Mohawk Rd have just not kept up with the growing population and its ensuring traffic congestion and now it seems to us that all of the proposed options in this study are akin to a band-aid solution.
PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #2

Mohawk Road (Lime Kiln Rd/McNiven Rd to Filman Rd) EA
Thursday, April 11, 2019
Ancaster Old Town Hall – 310 Wilson Street East
6:00 pm – 8:00 pm

COMMENT SHEET
(Please Print)

COMMENTS:

* WE DO NOT AGREE WITH CURRENT PLAN OF ADDING BIKE PATH. IT IS OUR OPINION THAT A DESIGNATED BIKE/MULTI USE PATH WILL ATTRACT BICYCLISTS FROM OUTSIDE OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD.

* ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC OF ANY KIND, WHETHER IT BE VEHICLE, BICYCLE OR PEDESTRIAN WILL ADD TO AN ALREADY EXISTING ISSUE OF RESIDENTIAL DRIVEWAY EGRESS.

* OUR PREFERENCE / RECOMMENDATION WOULD BE FOR SIDEWALKS ONLY (OPTION 5) WHICH WOULD: 1) FAIRLY DISTRIBUTE PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE TRAFFIC TO BOTH SIDES OF MOHAWK, 2) MINIMIZE ADDITIONAL OUT OF NEIGHBOURHOOD BICYCLE TRAFFIC & 3) BE MORE AESTHETICALLY ATTRACTION THAN ASPHALT PATHWAYS.

* IF A PATHWAY IS GOING TO BE ADDED, IT SHOULD BE ADDED TO BOTH SIDES OF THE ROAD IN ORDER TO FAIRLY DISTRIBUTE THE IMPACT OF ADDITIONAL PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE TRAFFIC ON ALL MOHAWK ROAD RESIDENTS (OPTIONS 1 & 2).

Comments and information regarding this study are being collected to assist the City of Hamilton in meeting the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. They will be maintained on file for use during the study and may be included in study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record.

Please drop these comments in the box provided or forward them by Tuesday, May 10, 2019 to either:

Megan Salvucci
Project Manager
Asset Management
City of Hamilton, Public Works Department
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 4101
Email: Megan.Salvucci@hamilton.ca

Phil Weber, PEng
Project Manager
CIMA+
Phone: 905-695-1005
Email: phil.weber@cima.ca
Hi

Sorry you missed the PIC. You can find the material that was displayed there at the following link:


Please let me know if any questions.

Phil Weber, P.Eng.
CIMA+
Mississauga, Ontario
Tel: 905-695-1005 ext. 6732
Cell: 416-371-0292
Good morning

Thank you for providing additional information. I left you a voicemail on Friday - if you would like to still have the phone discussion, please feel free to call me at 905-546-2424 ext. 4101. If through the rest of this email I address your comments and questions, we will move forward with including your existing comments in our assessment to produce the final proposal. Accessibility and safety are high priorities and we are doing our best to address them with the help of comments such as yours.

In response to some of your concerns, below is how we are currently addressing them:

Pedestrian safety: We considered many different active transportation alternatives including sidewalks or multi-use paths on both sides, sidewalk or multi-use path on one side or a sidewalk on one side and a multi-use path on the other. Our preferred alternative has one two-directional multi-use path on the north side with access to the south side through signalized intersections (Filman Road or McNiven Road) or signed pedestrian crossovers (mandatory that vehicles stop). We evaluated all the alternatives based on 16 key considerations (including pedestrian safety and accessibility) and having the multi-use path on the north side only had the highest score. The multi-use path will be 3 metres wide and will be set back from the road; this allows for increased pedestrian safety from vehicles as well as accommodating accessibility needs with a wider pedestrian area. Although the south side does not have complete sidewalks, we are hoping to determine the best locations for the pedestrian crossovers so that they are convenient and will help those that will rely on them.

Traffic congestion: We are suggesting the addition of a two-way centre left turn lane. This will help individuals making left turns onto/ out of side streets and into/out of driveways and should allow for move traffic movement and less congestion.

Traffic speeds: We are proposing at least a couple centre medians, one at each end of the project at the signalized intersections. There may be some potential to create a gateway treatment out of the median at Filman Road. Hopefully the medians will slow drivers, especially coming from Highway 403, and let them know the road environment has changed.
Thank you,

Megan Salvucci
Project Manager, Asset Management
Megan.Salvucci@hamilton.ca | 905-546-2424 x 4101
Engineering Services | Public Works Department | City of Hamilton
Address: 77 James Street North, Suite 320, Hamilton ON, L8R 2K3

From: [Email Address]
Sent: May-16-19 10:30 AM
To: Salvucci, Megan
Cc: Phil Weber
Subject: Re: Side walks on both sides.

Honestly both ways. Trying to get out in the mornings in our car. how one has to budge your way into the traffic when every morning and evening. As for walking it's both ways for me. I'm young. But it's not safe on the road people whip by. getting out to use the bike path which is over near the highway and the opposite direction towards the downtown area and when I head towards Wilson to go pick up mail or get to trails we have to go into oncoming traffic. Not safe. For both of my parents there's no way they can leave the house unless they're in a car and they're getting to the age where they can't be in the car and are just trapped. I bought them electric bikes to get around the town but since they have no accessibility to get to a safe Street to enjoy the many little paths in our neighborhood even just for an outing and fresh air and sense of freedom. you don't have to be on big streets to go out for a coffee around here to access the downtown. But it's the first moments out of the driveway in either direction that are super super dangerous. My mom hurt herself terribly last summer it took her months to recover because she fell where there is slanted gravel and uneven pavement with terrible traffic she's never really recovered. She fell on the road nearly hit by a car a pedestrian picked her up off of the street. My number is . maybe it's easier to talk I love to give you the information you asked me in a more direct way I just not sure how to answer it. We need and have always needed sidewalks both sides. Crosswalk will just cause even more back ups in a too busy road.

Get Outlook for Android

From: Salvucci, Megan <Megan.Salvucci@hamilton.ca>
Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2019 8:56:08 AM
To:
Cc: Phil Weber
Subject: RE: Side walks on both sides.

Good morning

Thank you for providing us with your comments. We definitely understand the importance of accessibility. We are still in the process of assessing the options; components such as the locations of the pedestrian crossings are still being determined. I know that each trip out of the house is different
but are there specific sections of Mohawk Road that are used most often? If so, what direction are you and your family headed? Understanding what areas of Mohawk Road are being used the most and where you are trying to get to can allow us to look into options that specifically address your concerns.

Thank you,

Megan Salvucci
Project Manager, Asset Management
Megan.Salvucci@hamilton.ca | 905-546-2424 x 4101
Engineering Services | Public Works Department | City of Hamilton
Address: 77 James Street North, Suite 320, Hamilton ON, L8R 2K3

From:  
Sent: May-06-19 5:26 PM  
To: Salvucci, Megan  
Subject: Side walks on both sides.

Hi, my name is I just seen the plans For the environment study. I have two elderly parents in their 80s 82 and 84 limited mobility my dad's and amputee and my mother has arthritis. Two elderly people who are constantly stuck in the house because of the sidewalk issue even to get their mail is an issue. Last Summer I bought them motorized bikes so that they wouldn’t be so trapped in the home all the time.my mom was so scared of the traffic that she decided to walk it on the street hit the throttle and hit Mohawk road hurt herself quite badly. Clearly my vote is a sidewalk on both sides.they can't get to any of the trails without hitting major traffic.its very isolating. I've already gone through my daughter growing up who's now 17 and not happy she had to walk on that street catch the bus for school unsafely all of these years I'm just putting in my two cents. Because it really does impact us here it always has. We really need a sidewalk to access safely the streets around us. She. Ever I go for a bike ride I have to also be in Harvey traffic unsafely. Can you please consider both sides of the street. I have pictures somewhere of my mother trying g to get to the street behind and falling in the road into traffic it's was bad for months afterwards.my dad unstable on his feet with prosthetic foot can't walk from. Here because if the road and the meas it is in Thanks please keep us posted.

Get Outlook for Android
This is from the physiotherapist who treats my mom. He was appalled when he asked her to exercise with her walker. He was shocked at what they had to do to get to some place safe for a small walk outside. They literally had to walk with the cars. She is 83 and not very mobile. She knows she has to move or one stops. I hope you reevaluate your poor decisions.
So exactly what improvement will help us? Sounds like nothing. The side shoulder at a minimum should be pavement and much wider. There already is so much gravel that gets uneven quickly and not stable for walking. This is not fair to the residents on our side. So the plan is run to the middle section wait forever for opportunity which never comes because every morning we just dart out and hope that we don’t cause an accident and wish for an opportunity while waiting forever just to try and get out of our own driveway in the morning. Hopefully not getting run over watch for the fast cars and then run to the other side so that you can get across safely to the north side as you put it so we can get to safety???

this isn’t the first time you have heard from me. I started this battle when my daughter was 9 trying to get her safely to her bus stop. This is just a bunch of baloney this is a huge issue. So we have openly discussed along with the danger established, proceeding with this plan would show a willful disregard for our safety and would show clear negligence and liability should a similar incident occur again. It’s the cheapest I bet and best way to try and placate everybody. The trees and stuff you don’t have to take up all the trees even if it’s not the sidewalk we receive. The room is already there it just is very poorly excavated and maintained. One point there was some pavement put down very quickly become uneven potholes everywhere. It really didn’t help. But that being said widened and done properly would be better than nothing.

I respect maintaining trees… to put at a minimum at least a bike lane on our side as well. Everybody on our side has to walk on a very dangerous situation. Even just to get their mail. How can you guys dismiss that and think it’s okay? So trees are more important than human lives is this correct? Makes me think we probably should have sued the town when my mom fell. It took her months to recover from that and now suffers crazy anxiety. And we’re just pretty lucky that nobody was killed because traffic was stopped instantly. And thank God the guy in the car helped out and didn’t hit her.

There has to be something done on our side. I can’t let this be it’s not right at all. Safety is the number one goal in my opinion.

Thank you again for providing your comments. We understand the challenges you and your family face gaining access to pedestrian facilities in your vicinity. Since you sent the first email, City staff have gone through the project to identify any opportunities to address your concerns.

The Environmental Assessment that the project is currently going through is designed to identify the best option, with the greatest benefits, and fewest disadvantages to the community as a whole. This assessment takes into consideration human safety, transportation needs, the natural environment, compliance to policy, and the cost associated with the various options.

For Mohawk Road, multiple options with pedestrian access on both sides of the road were considered. However, the preferred option of a multi-use path on just the north side includes considerably more benefits to improve pedestrian and cycling accessibility and connectivity overall than the options with pedestrian facilities on both sides. Some significant components that led to this conclusion were the number of mature trees that would be impacted, the number of utility poles that would require relocation, the amount of land that would have to be acquired, and ensuring all transportation modes would have an opportunity to safely use this roadway.

Additionally, through the Environmental Assessment process, the project design was presented through two public information centres. At each public meeting, and through the submitted comments following the meetings, the implementation of a multi-use path on the north side was supported by the community:

As mentioned earlier, the project was additionally reviewed to evaluate any opportunities available to address your concerns, while ensuring that the design the community supported maintains the same qualities that made it the preferred option. At this time, a sidewalk on the south side of Mohawk Road is unable to be implemented. Your frustrations with this option are understood, and as much as possible, supplementary improvements to the preferred design are being considered to assist in capturing your concerns. Road components, such as pedestrian islands, traffic calming, and creating a neighbourhood feel, are all aspects that will be used to improve pedestrian safety.

Thank you,

Megan Salvucci
Project Manager, Asset Management
Megan.Salvucci@hamilton.ca
(905) 546-2424 x 4101
Engineering Services | Public Works Department | City of Hamilton
Address: 77 James Street North, Suite 320, Hamilton ON, L8R 2K3

I am incredibly sorry to hear about what happened to your mother.

We are in the process of considering your comments and I will provide you with an update early next week.

Thank you,

Megan Salvucci
Project Manager, Asset Management
Megan.Salvucci@hamilton.ca
(905) 546-2424 x 4101
Engineering Services | Public Works Department | City of Hamilton
Address: 77 James Street North, Suite 320, Hamilton ON, L8R 2K3

That doesn’t help us. Maybe you need to see pic of my mom from her fall trying to get to the road behind us.
Good morning,

Thank you for providing additional information. I left you a voicemail on Friday - if you would like to still have the phone discussion, please feel free to call me at 905-546-2424 ext. 4101. If through the rest of this email I address your comments and questions, we will move forward with including your existing comments in our assessment to produce the final proposal. Accessibility and safety are high priorities and we are doing our best to address them with the help of comments such as yours.

In response to some of your concerns, below is how we are currently addressing them:

Pedestrian safety: We considered many different active transportation alternatives including sidewalks or multi-use paths on both sides, sidewalk or multi-use path on one side or a sidewalk on one side and a multi-use path on the other. Our preferred alternative has one two-directional multi-use path on the north side with access to the south side through signalized intersections (Filman Road or McNiven Road) or signed pedestrian crossovers (mandatory that vehicles stop). We evaluated all the alternatives based on 16 key considerations (including pedestrian safety and accessibility) and having the multi-use path on the north side only had the highest score. The multi-use path will be 3 metres wide and will be set back from the road; this allows for increased pedestrian safety from vehicles as well as accommodating accessibility needs with a wider pedestrian area. Although the south side does not have complete sidewalks, we are hoping to determine the best locations for the pedestrian crossovers so that they are convenient and will help those that will rely on them.

Traffic congestion: We are suggesting the addition of a two-way centre left turn lane. This will help individuals making left turns onto/out of side streets and into/out of driveways and should allow for more traffic movement and less congestion.

Traffic speeds: We are proposing at least a couple centre medians, one at each end of the project at the signalized intersections. There may be some potential to create a gateway treatment out of the median at Filman Road. Hopefully the medians will slow drivers, especially coming from Highway 403, and let them know the road environment has changed.

Thank you,

Megan Salvucci
Project Manager, Asset Management
Megan.Salvucci@hamilton.ca | 905-546-2424 x 4101
Engineering Services | Public Works Department | City of Hamilton
Address: 77 James Street North, Suite 320, Hamilton ON, L8R 2K3
Hi Megan I know you guys feel that you made a decision already. Can't hurt to try I'm sending you an attachment of a letter written by my mother's physiotherapist because he tried to take her out for a small walk part therapy I couldn't believe there was nowhere for her to walk
Hi Megan

I live at ..., and was at the project viewing on April 11, 2019. I have changed my view on what should be done. I don’t believe a bike lane is needed as long as signage directs bike traffic to the existing rail trail. This would allow a much needed sidewalk on both sides of the road to be built. The main objective of this project is safety of residents on both sides of the road first, then improving the driving conditions. I’m sorry for the late response. After talking to my neighbours, I felt I should change my opinion. I hope this takes the right course.

thanks
Hi Megan:

Thank you for stating the City's position on this issue. It is apparent that we have significant differences of opinion about how to manage the safety of pedestrians and those differences will remain unresolved.

Regards

Original message
From: "Salvucci, Megan" <Megan.Salvucci@hamilton.ca>
To:
Dated: 04/07/2019 2:58:45 PM
Subject: RE: Mohawk Road Improvements

Hi

As mentioned, based on the results of the evaluation the option with the multi-use path on the north side had the greatest overall benefits and the least negative impacts. Pedestrian safety was considered, and balanced against other criteria such as cost (as a consequence of additional grading impacts, utility relocation and acquisition of property), and removal of mature trees. This option was generally well-received at the two Public Information Centres, and it represents a considerable improvement for AT (active transportation) users over the status quo.

We are undertaking preliminary design and will look at ways to improve conditions for pedestrians on the south side of Mohawk Road over what was shown at the last PIC. Even if no further improvements can be made at this time, there is always the possibility of adding additional sidewalk along the south side of Mohawk Road in the future.

Thank you,
Hi Megan:

My criticism of the plan is not related to the general concept that was selected. Simply put my criticism is that the selected design has no sidewalk on the south side of the roadway. Consequently, there are safety implications for pedestrians.

Pedestrians on the south side of the road can be anticipated over the life cycle of the project. Their access to the safety provided by the north side multi-use path will result in their walking along the road to a designated crosswalk or alternatively crossing mid-block. To indicate that these pedestrians are adequately served in terms of safety in the absence of a sidewalk is highly disputable.

Please inform me of your reasoning that they may be considered to be in a safe environment before they get to the path or crosswalk.

Either walking along or crossing mid-block has to be considered hazardous for pedestrians on a busy arterial roadway. Further, I have little doubt that the study team and directing committee were aware of the potential hazards for pedestrians in this regard. If not, feel free to advise them of my safety concerns. At issue is whether there was adequate discretion in evaluating safety in the decision not to have a sidewalk on the south side of the road.

I appreciate that in all likelihood there will be few pedestrians that will ever have to decide if they should walk along the south side or cross over from the south side. Hopefully, those that do will recognize the hazards, correctly assess them and respond successfully or otherwise drivers will do what is necessary to accommodate errant pedestrians on the south side of the road. But humans sometimes fail in their assessment/judgements of the time and space available to complete a task.

In truth, I rarely, if ever, have seen a pedestrian in this section of roadway. Given this circumstance, it is likely that the frequency of pedestrian-vehicle crashes will be very low. It may well be that the risks assumed by Hamilton or CIMA in not providing for the safe movement of pedestrians on the south side will never be tested. In such a case, the risk assumed by the engineers may be considered justifiable. If that is the position of the City, I could you please provide documentation or the rationale.

Still, when there is an arterial roadway reconstruction with major changes to the design elements, a failure to allow pedestrians on one side to safely get to a crossing location by way of a design element is a design failure.
Evaluation processes in considering alternatives involve a balancing, or as sometimes inferred, a weighting of many factors (e.g., service, convenience, cost, environment, safety and more). I understand the qualitative arguments you have presented that can be used to support a desired plan. In such a process, the rational used by CIMA and Hamilton for evaluation is open to certain types of unintended or hidden bias. For example, an unintended bias may result in a project failing to satisfy specific safety thresholds or protocols because of the weighting they were given. As you can see my bias, which is not unintended, is directed toward pedestrian safety in this case. As the assessment was done by the engineers of CIMA, they have a responsibly to recommend actions in which safety to the public is paramount. Hamilton may also assume that responsibility should it choose to do so.

As such, the provision of reasonable safety by engineers or Hamilton does not necessarily reside entirely in the domain of social trends and public opinion. It is not unreasonable to evaluate a range of constraints and objectives after nominal safety protocols have been satisfied rather than considered on an equal basis with them. This is done with the alignment and cross-section elements of roadways. In this way, the overall benefits you subscribe to can be satisfied - that the design has the greatest overall benefits and least negative impacts without inherently placing undue safety burdens on some system users (e.g., drivers or pedestrians) to deal with hazards. The result would then be subject to ensuring that the provision of reasonable safety of the public included all pedestrians. If that has been done, then the City and CIMA have fulfilled an important responsibly in ensuring that safety is paramount in the evaluation/decision process. However, the design as set out would not appear to do that in that the provision of safety of some pedestrians seems to be optional.

Where safety issues have been identified in roadway design, a typical engineering practice to deal with the issues is to complete a safety review of the design. CIMA is quite capable of undertaking that work as are other independent engineering firms such as Intus. If such an evaluation showed there was reasonable safety provided to pedestrians on the south side of the road in the absence of a sidewalk, the City and CIMA would have taken care of their responsibilities and significantly reduced the liability exposure on the issue.

I have made some comments related to your list citing the justification for the chosen option as follows. My response is in Blue italic print.

- Accommodates both pedestrians and cyclists in two-directional travel: Other feasible options would not support both pedestrians and cyclists. Actually, this is not correct. Pedestrians on the south side of the road are not accommodated by the path on the north side only.

- Appropriate for the amount of AT traffic: There are low volumes of AT traffic so the facilities and crossovers are appropriate for these volumes. I am not sure what AT traffic means. For a response I have assumed it is a reference to arterial roadways. That being the case, it is not actually correct. Mohawk Road traffic is saturated at times. The gaps available for mid-block crossing can be non-existent at time should pedestrians decide to cross mid-block to get access to the path.

- AT safety: The multi-use path is separated from the road to ensure pedestrian and cyclist safety and improved comfort. Other options would not be separated from the road. This is not correct since pedestrians on the south side would not be separated from traffic in gaining access to a crosswalk. Even a sidewalk abutting the back of curb would provide some separation for pedestrians on the south side.
ROW width: This design has the least impacts to residents’ properties. It is true the plan seems to require no property suggesting a balancing of costs. I am interested in the weighting that was used to determine how the cost of property acquisition assumed priority over the cost of providing for pedestrian safety related the provision of sidewalks on the south side. Is that what the broader public wanted in your assessment?

Mature trees: This design impacts significantly less mature trees than the other options. This should not be used as a means to eliminate safety provided by sidewalks on the south side. Sidewalk can be moved to avoid trees as is often done in Hamilton. Further, they can be constructed to ensure the root system is not deprived of moisture.

Utility poles: This design requires the least amount of utility pole relocation. The same commentary related to the cost of moving utility poles versus the cost of providing for the safety of pedestrians applies. Sidewalks can be built around utility poles at no additional cost.

Finally, I gather from your response that CIMA has not done an evaluation to determine the safety effects of not having a sidewalk on the south side of the road. If that is not the case could you please let me know?

Regards

Original message
From: "Salvucci, Megan"<Megan.Salvucci@hamilton.ca>
To:
Dated: 03/07/2019 9:41:03 AM
Subject: RE: Mohawk Road Improvements

Good morning

Thank you for providing your comments and I will add you to the mailing list.

Through the environmental assessment process, many alternatives are looked at to address the project. Through our evaluation we assessed eight alternatives against 16 criterion – including pedestrian safety and cyclist safety. Our Active Transportation and Traffic Safety staff were also involved in the assessment of alternatives.

Based on the results, the option with the multi-use path on the north side had the greatest overall benefits and the least negative impacts. This option was also shown at two Public Information Centres and we have decided to proceed with this design due to public support.

To address crossings, at each end of the study area (McNiven Rd. and Filman Rd.) there are traffic signals with crosswalks. There will also be two mid-block pedestrian crossovers at Cayuga and Algonquin.

As you mentioned, there were several reasons why this option was selected:
Accommodates both pedestrians and cyclists in two-directional travel: Other feasible options would not support both pedestrians and cyclists.

Appropriate for the amount of AT traffic: There are low volumes of AT traffic so the facilities and crossovers are appropriate for these volumes.

AT safety: The multi-use path is separated from the road to ensure pedestrian and cyclist safety and improved comfort. Other options would not be separated from the road.

ROW width: This design has the least impacts to residents’ properties.

Mature trees: This design impacts significantly less mature trees than the other options.

Utility poles: This design requires the least amount of utility pole relocation.

Hopefully this provides some clarity as to our rationale for this design.

Thank you,

Megan Salvucci
Project Manager, Asset Management
Megan.Salvucci@hamilton.ca | 905-546-2424 x 4101
Engineering Services | Public Works Department | City of Hamilton
Address: 77 James Street North, Suite 320, Hamilton ON, L8R 2K3

Hi Megan:

I have just come across Hamilton's information related to the proposed improvements for Mohawk Road.

On observing the preferred solution with a multiuse path on the north side, it is my opinion that the design is inherently not safe and more particularly it is unsafe.

The reason is that the design encourages pedestrians and cyclists to use the this section of roadway. However, the access location to the path is uncontrolled. Those on the south side of the street wanting access to the multiuse path must walk along the roadway in the absence of a sidewalk and cross at a crosswalk or crossover. On a high-volume arterial road, such actions are considered inherently not safe and lacking in the provision of reasonable safety for pedestrians.

Alternatively, pedestrians may cross the roadway mid-block to access the safety of the path. Again, this type of pedestrian activity is inherently not safe and lacking in the provision of reasonable safety for pedestrians.
Thus, while pathway is an enticement for pedestrians, it does not adequately accommodate their safety, in my opinion. The discussion can also be applied to cyclists.

In view of the safety pedigree of CIMA, I would like to understand their justification for not having a sidewalk on the south side of the roadway. The roadway plan suggests the decision not to have a sidewalk on the south side relates to the convenience of fitting the alignment/cross-section within the existing ROW. In this context, has CIMA done an evaluation to determine the safety impacts of not having a sidewalk on the south side of the road.

As a final note, please add my name to the mailing list.
-----Original Message-----
From: Salvucci, Megan <Megan.Salvucci@hamilton.ca>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2019 2:59 PM
To: 
Cc: 
Subject: RE: Mohawk Rd EA

Hi

Thank you for providing your comments. We will take them into consideration while proceeding with the environmental assessment process.

Thank you,

Megan Salvucci
Project Manager, Asset Management
Megan.Salvucci@hamilton.ca | 905-546-2424 x 2732 Engineering Services | Public Works Department | City of Hamilton
Address: 77 James Street North, Suite 320, Hamilton ON, L8R 2K3

-----Original Message-----
From: 
Sent: August 29, 2019 10:50 AM
To: Salvucci, Megan <Megan.Salvucci@hamilton.ca>
Cc: 
Subject: Mohawk Rd EA

Hey Meagan,

I just caught up on the plans for widening Mohawk Rd in Ancaster. I’d like to add a few thoughts/suggestions to the process.

1 - do we have data on traffic speeds/crashes here? Based on experience, the last thing this road needs is more wide lanes. It’s a speedway 24-7.
2 - no traffic lanes need to be 3.5 metres wide in this environment. As we know, wide lanes encourage speeding. 3 metres would suffice for the live lanes, and even narrower lanes are more than sufficient for the centre turning lanes.
3 - the proposed pedestrian crossing locations should be firmly added to the plan. They are essential for safety along this stretch. I’m sure most of your meeting attendees were older folks, but if you watch the activity along this street you’ll see many cyclists, kids and young families attempting to walk/cross Mohawk.
4 - stop signs should be added at Cayuga/Hiawatha and Algonquin/Hiawatha. Hiawatha is the cycling/pedestrian connector along the Chedoke Radial Trail.

Thx for the info and opportunity to provide input! As someone who cycles in Ancaster regularly, I hope it doesn’t start receiving the ‘Hamilton treatment’ with dangerous, overbuilt roadways that encourage high speeds and crashes. Quality of life plummets when car speeds increase and become hostile.