Appendix C
Agency Consultation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City and Province</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fazio</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Senior Project Manager, Infrastructure Planning</td>
<td>Growth Management, Planning and Economic Development</td>
<td>28 James Street North, 6th Floor</td>
<td>Hamilton, ON</td>
<td>L8R 4Y5</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Margaret.Fazio@hamilton.ca">Margaret.Fazio@hamilton.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Councillor, Ward 11</td>
<td>City of Hamilton</td>
<td>71 Main Street West, 2nd Floor</td>
<td>Hamilton, ON</td>
<td>L8P 4Y5</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brenda.johnson@hamilton.ca">brenda.johnson@hamilton.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Councillor, Ward 10</td>
<td>City of Hamilton</td>
<td>74 Main Street West, 2nd Floor</td>
<td>Hamilton, ON</td>
<td>L8P 4Y5</td>
<td><a href="mailto:maria.pearson@hamilton.ca">maria.pearson@hamilton.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Manager, Watershed Planning Services</td>
<td>Hamilton Conservation Authority</td>
<td>838 Mineral Springs Road, Box 81067</td>
<td>Ancaster, ON</td>
<td>L9J 4X1</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mstone@conservationhamilton.ca">mstone@conservationhamilton.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verhaeghe</td>
<td>Tammy</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>District Manager, Guelph District Office</td>
<td>Ministry of Natural Resources</td>
<td>1 Stone Rd. W.</td>
<td>Guelph, ON</td>
<td>L7G 4Y2</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tammy.verhaeghe@ontario.ca">tammy.verhaeghe@ontario.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slattery</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Environmental Assessment &amp; Planning Co-ordinator</td>
<td>Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change</td>
<td>119 King St. W., 12th Floor</td>
<td>Hamilton, ON</td>
<td>L8P 4Y7</td>
<td><a href="mailto:barbara.slattery@ontario.ca">barbara.slattery@ontario.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Roon</td>
<td>Pauline</td>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Highway Engineering Hamilton</td>
<td>Ministry of Transportation</td>
<td>1201 Wilson Ave; Bldg. D, 4th Floor</td>
<td>Downsview, ON</td>
<td>L8L 1L5</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pauline.vanroon@ontario.ca">pauline.vanroon@ontario.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baran</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Niagara Escarpment Commission</td>
<td>232 A Guelph Street</td>
<td>Georgetown, ON</td>
<td>L7G 4B1</td>
<td><a href="mailto:michael.baran@ontario.ca">michael.baran@ontario.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>Ministry of Municipal Affairs &amp; Housing</td>
<td>777 Bay St., 13th Floor</td>
<td>Toronto, ON</td>
<td>M5G 2C8</td>
<td><a href="mailto:laurie.miller@ontario.ca">laurie.miller@ontario.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barboza</td>
<td>Karla</td>
<td></td>
<td>Team Lead - Heritage Land Use Planning</td>
<td>Ministry of Tourism, Culture &amp; Sport</td>
<td>401 Bay Street, 17th Floor</td>
<td>Toronto, ON</td>
<td>M7A 0A7</td>
<td><a href="mailto:karla.barboza@ontario.ca">karla.barboza@ontario.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lukasik</td>
<td>Lynda</td>
<td></td>
<td>Environment Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 Wilson Street, Unit 4</td>
<td>Hamilton, ON</td>
<td>L8R 1G7</td>
<td><a href="mailto:contactus@environmenthamilton.org">contactus@environmenthamilton.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLean</td>
<td>Don</td>
<td></td>
<td>Organizer</td>
<td>Citizens at City Hall (CATCH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L8R 1G7</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@hamiltoncatch.org">info@hamiltoncatch.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murchie</td>
<td>Angela</td>
<td></td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Hamilton Wentworth Council of Home &amp; School Associations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:runtimecouncil@gmail.com">runtimecouncil@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephenson</td>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Hamilton Community Foundation</td>
<td>120 King St. W., Suite 700</td>
<td>Hamilton, ON</td>
<td>L8P 4V2</td>
<td><a href="mailto:information@hcf.on.ca">information@hcf.on.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltsberg</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Manager, Strategic Planning and Policy</td>
<td>Metrolinx</td>
<td>97 Front St W, 4th Floor</td>
<td>Toronto, ON</td>
<td>M5J 1E6</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lisa.saltsberg@metrolinx.com">lisa.saltsberg@metrolinx.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sin/Madam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smart Commute Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:smartcommute@hamilton.ca">smartcommute@hamilton.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Prefix</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City, Province</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>Platts</td>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Manager, Government &amp; External Relations</td>
<td>REALTOR® Association of Hamilton-Burlington</td>
<td>505 York Blvd.</td>
<td>Hamilton, ON</td>
<td>905-529-8101 ext. 295</td>
<td>905-529-4349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minutes of Meeting

Date: August 18, 2015
File #: TP115082
Date & Time: August 11, 2015 @ 09:00 am
Meeting at: Hamilton City Hall – Hamilton, Ontario
Subject: Fruitland-Winona Block 1 Servicing - SCUBE

Attendees:
Melanie Anderton, City of Hamilton
Margaret Fazio, City of Hamilton
Angelo Cutaia, Amec Foster Wheeler
Heather Dearlove, Amec Foster Wheeler
Vince Pugliese, Amec Foster Wheeler

MATTERS DISCUSSED

Introduction

- Angelo Cutaia introduced the reasoning behind the meeting. Amec Foster Wheeler is asking for feedback from the City of Hamilton on how they would like to see the Municipal Class EA process for the north-south collector road being completed within the Fruitland-Winona Block 1 Servicing (SCUBE).

Contacts and Communication

- Main point of contact is Melanie Anderton, Margaret will be providing support and overseeing the EA process on behalf of the City.

Key Element Discussion

Municipal Class EA

- When the City of Hamilton conducted the EA, they stopped after phase 1 and 2 to allow the future land owners to develop the land with greater flexibility including the ultimate location of the collector road. This also
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### MATTERS DISCUSSED

leaves developers the responsibility of conducting the remaining phases of the EA process.

- Only the items that directly impact the layout of the proposed north/south road need to be considered as part of the EA.

- Archeological study will need to be conducted at some point. Stage 2 could be pushed to the detailed design phase once the exact footprint has been determined. Stage 1 will need to be completed during the phase 3 and 4 EA.

- Additional traffic analysis will need to be completed especially to review the potential for roundabouts at various intersections

- Natural environment investigations are currently underway and will be incorporated into the Municipal EA process.

- Other reports requirements will be reviewed and determined with discussions with the City.

- Amec Foster Wheeler would like to have the Public Information Centre for end of September, or early October. This will require co-ordination of information for advertising, and facility booking.
  - Please note: Materials need to be available 1 month prior. The newspaper ‘At your Service’ requires 3 weeks advance notice. Please discuss proposed PIC with City of Hamilton staff ASAP.

- Amec Foster Wheeler should speak with the local councilor

- Advertising costs will apply for PIC and will be the responsibility of AFW. The City stated they will contribute to the cost of the facility rental for the PIC.

- Proponency of the project was discussed. The City’s preference is to support the Municipal Class EA process but would not be included as a key contact person. The City logo would be included on all public notices.

- Notification to residents and businesses will be required as a component of the Municipal Class EA process. Post card type communication to each resident, which has links to City website for complete details. Letters to businesses.

- City to provide current agency mailing list. Agencies would receive a letter notification.

| ACTION BY: |  |
|------------|  |
| AFW        |  |
| AFW        |  |
| AFW / City |  |
| AFW        |  |
| Info.      |  |
| AFW        |  |
| AFW / City |  |
| AFW        |  |
| AFW / City |  |
| AFW        |  |
| AFW / City |  |
| AFW        |  |
| AFW / City |  |
| AFW        |  |
| AFW / City |  |
Continued...
July 21, 2015

MATTERS DISCUSSED

Miscellaneous

• AFW should check with Hydro (Property A) as to whether they are moving locations. This could impact the preferred option decision. AFW

• The City would like to see a multi-use pathway along the north/south road to accommodate cyclists and pedestrians as part of the design. AFW

• The proposed road is to be a collector, and it is expected that there be no residential individual driveways along the collector road. AFW

• The City would like to see roundabouts options evaluated at the proposed intersections. An intersection may not be able to feasibly have a roundabout due to space restrictions, but the option is to be considered as part of the EA Phase 3 process. AFW

• Weighted evaluation process could be used and should be similar to what was used during Phase 1 and 2 report. AFW

• A status report on all of the outstanding appeals to Block 1 is required. Need to know status with regards to OMB hearing before proceeding to public consultation. City to forward report. AFW / City

Summary

• In order to proceed to the PIC, design analysis and alternative selection and evaluation must be complete. In order to prevent having a second PIC, the preferred alternative must be presented at the PIC. AFW

• All reporting, and formal emails must follow the AODA format. City is to forward their AODA guidance document. AFW / City

Meeting Minutes prepared by,

Amec Foster Wheeler Environment & Infrastructure
a division of Amec Foster Wheeler Americas Limited

Per: Angelo Cutaia, P. Eng.
     Vince Pugliese, P. Eng
AC/vp
Meeting agenda

Date: December 1, 2016 at 9:30 a.m. Meeting at: Hamilton City Hall

File No.: TP115082

Subject/purpose: SCUBE Block 1

To be presented/discussed:

1. Land Purchase of 716, 718, 720 Barton Street to facilitate Street A connection to Barton Street and also Lands at Hwy 8 to facilitate Street A connection to HWY 8. It was discussed and agreed that this Arterial Road serves as a truck routes and future LRT Route for the entire SCUBE Secondary Plan and thus all land owners in the SCUBE Area, including the City, should contribute to the cost of the Land and Road construction accordingly.

2. Phasing of development for Block 1 to allow the construction of the East/West road with cul-de-sacs at both the north and south end, depending on timing for land purchase of the above lands.

3. Cost and implementation of Pond 3 requiring 13 properties to facilitate this SWM block. Possible option for the relocation to the Fontana lands under contract with the City and/or 332 Jones just south of Barton.

We must stay focused on these issues to get some resolution.

AJC/kf
Meeting agenda

Date: February 6, 2017 at 9:30 a.m.  Meeting at: Hamilton City Hall

File No.: TP115082

Subject/purpose: SCUBE Block 1

To be presented/discussed:

1. Land Purchase of 716, 718, 720 Barton Street to facilitate Street A connection to Barton Street and also Lands at Hwy 8 to facilitate Street A connection to HWY 8. It was discussed and agreed that this Arterial Road serves as a truck route and future LRT Route for the entire SCUBE Secondary Plan and thus all land owners in the SCUBE Area, including the City, should contribute to the cost of the Land and Road construction accordingly. City response/support of this position.

2. Phasing of development for Block 1 to allow the construction of the East/West road with cul-de-sacs at both the north and south end, depending on timing for land purchase of the above lands. Reopen discussions.

3. Cost and implementation of Pond 3 requiring 13 properties to facilitate this SWM Block. Possible option for the relocation to the Fontana lands under contract with the City. City to update on OMB status.


5. Other Business.

AJC/
Minutes

Date: July 13, 2018
File #: TP115082
Meeting Date & Time: April 19, 2018 – 10:30 a.m.
Meeting at: Hamilton City Hall
Subject: SCUBE 1 Block Servicing Strategy (BSS)
Attendees:
Margaret Fazio, City of Hamilton
Sally Yong Lee, City of Hamilton
Monir Moniruzzaman, City of Hamilton
Mohan Philip, City of Hamilton
Alissa Mahood, City of Hamilton
Stephen Cooper, City of Hamilton
Michael Fang, City of Hamilton
Ian Richards, Dougan & Associates
Mike Stone, Hamilton Conservation Authority
Jonathan Bastien, Hamilton Conservation Authority
Colin Oaks, Hamilton Conservation Authority
Gene Chartier, Paradigm
Heather Goodman, Paradigm
Steve Chipps, Wood
Jim Enos, Wood
Angelo Cutia

MATTERS DISCUSSED

1. This is a ‘Block Servicing Strategy Study’ (BSS), not a detailed design. Reporting & level of assessment have been provided at the BSS level.

2. Detail of internal road layout is ‘high level’ only except for the 2 major roads which are shown as per the approved Secondary Plan as directed by the City. Road layout and detailed design is subject to the next level of development, Plan of Subdivision /Site Plan etc.

3. Population densities have a wide range but maximum densities have been used for traffic design purposes but not beyond maximum. The City is supportive of ‘not beyond maximum’.

PLEASE NOTE: If there is any comment or amendment to be made to these meeting notes, they should be brought to the notice of Wood within five (5) business days of issue and confirmed in writing.

3450 Harvester Road
Burlington, ON L7N 3W5
+1 905 335 2353
www.woodplc.com

Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions
a Division of Wood Canada Limited
Registered office: 2020 Winston Park Drive, Suite 700, Oakville, Ontario L6H 6X7
Registered in Canada No. 773289-9; GST: 899879050 RT0008; DUNS: 25-362-6642
MATTERS DISCUSSED

4. Block 1 SS consultant team stated that the City comments are considered to be very detailed for a high level report and well beyond the scope of the Block Servicing Strategy.

Gordon Dean Drive (north-south major road) is to be 36.58m R.O.W as per the Secondary Plan, which is sufficient for 4 driving lanes, 2 bike lanes (if required) sidewalks and/or multi-purpose corridors.

Block 1 SS Consultant team felt that the projecting of specific needs for LRT or BRT is too much detail at this point in time and therefore not part of the BSS. City staff answered that it was not expected that specific BRT/LRT requirements are met, since those details are not known at this time, but that the presence of the corridor/ROW and attention to potential needs at intersections – to minimize land needs be preserved as part of the Gordon Dean Study is needed, based on the information known today. Therefore, as a result of the above discussion it may be better to have no roundabout for Gordon Dean Drive at the intersection with Collector Road B.

5. Barton Street may have exclusive RT lane, reviewing under current EA.

6. Ultimately the intersection of any 2 roads should not form a skewed intersection. The road alignment (Gordon Dean Ave in this case, but applicable to all roads) should be adjusted accordingly, based on City Development Design Standards. Provide a statement in BSS and Traffic Impact Study that angle of intersection must be dealt with at the detailed design stage.

7. Block 1 SS Consultant: Traffic Impact Study (TIS) was not required in the Scope of this BSS, it was an add-on, Block 2 BSS does not have a TIS but was approved.

8. Intersection of Gordon Dean Ave. with Collector Road B currently is as per Secondary Plan and should not be adjusted at this stage.

If a roundabout was required it would require a 100m diameter area to accommodate large trucks, buses etc. The City is not supporting a roundabout at this time.

This intersection may require signalization at some stage (RT implementation) and is to be discussed in the TIS.
MATTERS DISCUSSED

City will assist with wording to deal with timing of signalization.

9. Wetlands in south west sector are not really frog habitat, as such frog studies not undertaken recently Dougan & Associates. Should HCA suggest that a frog study be undertaken, fieldwork would have to be conducted within the next 2 weeks. HCA to confirm if assessment required.

MNRF does not expect to be consulted, just follow MNRF regulations.

MNRF is currently attentive to bats and bat habitat.

Watercourse 5 will require fisheries and watercourse assessment, as part of detailed design.

10. HCA staff indicated that a Fisheries Assessment could be done at detailed design for Watercourse 5.

11. City requested Wood to show restoration areas from PIC plans on BSS plans, Ref Plan B.7.4.2.

12. For Watercourse 5 in BSS, HCA staff requested Wood to provide justification for channelization south of Sherwood Drive i.e., it improves the area and enlarges the area.

HCA staff requested Wood to replace term ‘channelization’ with ‘realignment with naturalization design’ and to add 2 lines indicating the natural low flow channel within the watercourse corridor.

13. Wood staff noted that erosion setbacks for WC5 and WC6 are based on meander belt and setbacks (based on MNRF guidelines) as determined by Matrix. Matrix has noted a lack of ongoing erosion in the watercourses.

14. Wood staff noted that erosion control incorporated Aquafor Beech SWS criteria and has not included determining critical flows. Further additional analysis could be done at detailed design.

15. Block 2 suggests a 70m wide meander belt for Watercourse 6, Block 1 determined 40m. HCA staff requested Wood to review the Block 2 study to determine if 70m is agreeable and provide comment. Wood is to also include wording the BSS requiring further assessment during
Matters Discussed

detailed design. City is to provide wording included in the Block 2 BSS for consistency.

16. Wording re: meander belts, flood plains etc. ‘HCA to provide final floodplain later which may require adjustments at detailed design stage’ is to be added to BSS by Wood.

17. Regarding the Sunnyhurst Ave. storm sewer and ditch system, the City indicated that Wood is to provide wording in the BSS that this system downstream of Barton St. must assessed at detailed design stage.

18. Wood staff indicated that SWM facility 2 has been oversized to account for Barton Street improvements which cannot be accommodated due to grading constraints.

19. Wood is to assess the impact of an upgraded Watercourse 5 culvert at Barton Street – increase in flows downstream as requested by HCA staff.

20. Wood is to assess the impact to SWM Facility 1 elevations due to the Watercourse 5 crossing of Barton Street remaining as is. Wood is to also assess a scenario of the channel corridor through the Olympia property with upgraded driveway crossing on SWM Facility 1 elevations.

21. SWM Pond 3 was briefly discussed, with Wood staff noting that a pond may not be possible and that they are proposing that Pond 3 be replaced with on-site controls.
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Date: April 8, 2019
File #: TP115082
Meeting Date & Time: July 23, 2018 – 2:00 p.m.
Meeting at: Hamilton City Hall, Room 830
Subject: SCUBE Block 1 Collector Roads Intersection Design

Attendees:
Margaret Fazio, City of Hamilton
Sally Yong Lee, City of Hamilton
Monir Moniruzzaman, City of Hamilton
Mohan Philip, City of Hamilton
Stephen Cooper, City of Hamilton
Yvette Rybensky, City of Hamilton

Discussion regarding the current skewed intersection of the 2 collector roads (‘A’ north-south, ‘B’ east-west). The current angle of the intersection is approximately 71.5° with the desired angle being 90°. Some City staff stated that the angle is not appropriate for a controlled intersection and that a roundabout should be considered. Other City staff stated that the current angle is suitable provided that turning movements for a large garbage truck can be suitably accommodated for right turns from ‘B’ onto ‘A’ from both directions. This may require curb radii of 15.0 m, to be reviewed.

City staff inquired about what lands would be required to accommodate the roundabout, where sidewalks could be located, and other variables, if the roundabout was constructed.

The roundabout design was eliminated from consideration after City staff determined potential safety issues resulting from high-pedestrian traffic (i.e., park, community centre). As a result, a
MATTERS DISCUSSED

signalized intersection should be designed which reflects ultimate traffic needs while accommodating sidewalks an ad multi-use path.

4. It was suggested that Collector Road ‘A’ approaching the intersection have a pavement width which contains 4 thru-lanes @ 3.5 m wide, 1 left turn lane @ 3.5 m wide, 1 median @ 1.5 m wide and 1 bus bay at a width to be determined by the City. The City will consider eliminating the cycling lanes from the roadway as it appears to serve as a redundancy to the multi-use path that would run along the boulevard.

It was suggested that Collector Road ‘B’ approaching the intersection would have a pavement width comprising 2 thru lanes @ 3.5 m wide, and 1 left turn lane @ 3.5 m wide.

The City will consider the information above for internal discussion purposes in providing Wood with an acceptable intersection layout from a pavement width perspective.

5. Wood will explore the possibility of adjusting the intersection angle to 85° or better.

6. Upon the City providing acceptable pavement widths at the intersection, Wood will produce an intersection plan on which turning movements for garbage trucks turning right and left onto and off of Collector ‘B’ will be shown.

7. The City will designate width, length and location of bus bays required on Collector ‘A’.

Meeting Minutes prepared by:

Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions
a Division of Wood Canada Limited

Per: James W. Enos, C.E.T
Senior Technologist

JWE/kf
Minutes

Date: March 8, 2019
File #: TP115082
Meeting Date: March 7, 2019
Meeting at: Marz Homes Office
Subject: Gordon Dean Alignments for SCUBE Block 1

Attendees:
Domenic Chiaravalle, Todoc Construction
Marc Marini, 1787482 Ontario Inc.
Mark De Benedictis, Benemar Homes
Dan Joyce, Sydney W. Woods
John Conciator, 2261305 Ontario Inc.
Carl Galli, NGE Land Holdings/Galli Homes
Angelo Cutaia, AC III Group
Maria Pearson, City Councillor Ward 10
Anthony Chiarella, Marz Homes
Jim Enos, Wood

MATTERS DISCUSSED

1. MP advised, it seems that the City may now prefer the curved alignment for Gordon Dean per the Secondary Plan with adjustments to the intersection with the east-west collector road.

2. MP asked, Could the Gordon Dean curvature not occur within the north portion of the Block 1 such that it meets the east-west collector road at 90°? Group advised, Perhaps, but this has substantial impact on landowners and perhaps land usage.

3. Group advised that from a safety perspective, the straightest alignment of Gordon Dean would seem to be the safest.

4. Group advised that the suggested high level safety assessment must be based on facts of design and not various/anyone’s preferences.

5. It was agreed that a meeting is to be held with development group, Tony Sergi, Brian Hollingworth, Margaret Fazio, Councillor Pearson, Wood and AC III at City Hall to review and discuss the Gordon Dean...
Continued...
Meeting Date: March 7, 2019

MATTERS DISCUSSED

assessment/EA scope. This is tentatively on the morning of March 27, 2019.

6. Wood is to prepare a written scope outline regarding a high level safety review including roll plans of three (3) Gordon Dean Avenue alignments in advance of the March 27 meeting for City to consider.

ACTION BY: Wood
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Date: March 28, 2019

File #: TP115082

Meeting Date: March 27, 2019

Meeting at: Hamilton City Hall, Room 287

Subject: Clarification of Process to Establish Gordon Dean Alignment Options for SCUBE Block 1

Attendees:
Tony Sergi, City of Hamilton  Mark De Benedictis, Benemar Homes
Brian Hollingworth, City of Hamilton  Dan Joyce, Sidney W. Woods
Margaret Fazio, City of Hamilton  Anthony Chiarella, Marz Homes
Sally Yong-Lee, City of Hamilton  Jack Restivo, J. R. Professional Corp.
Maria Pearson, City Councilor, Ward 10  Rudy Sooklall, Wood
Domenic Chiaravalle, Todoc Construction  Loren Polonsky, Wood
Angelo Cutaia, AC III Group  Jim Enos, Wood

MATTERS DISCUSSED

1. The City has been discussing the various alignments and requirements to determine the best Gordian Dean Avenue alternative. City requested that a second version of Option 1 to be considered could be one with an 80° intersection skew. The Phase 3 & 4 Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) functional design should, among other things address the question or whether is can be fit within the Secondary Plan road allowance even if not centred within it?

2. It was agreed that the final preferred alignment must be determined via an open-minded fulsome EA which is defendable.

3. Safety must be one of the key factors as well as all other typical factors such as ease of implementation, land ownership impact and

ACTION BY: Wood
MATTERS DISCUSSED

socio-economics, as well as archaeology and cultural heritage, as required within an EA project.

4. It is vital that a clear and agreed upon scope of works for Phase 3 of EA be established prior to undertaking the efforts. Wood to prepare and submit a checklist of items deemed necessary, and City to do the same. Lists to be shared and merged in a manner agreed to by all parties. Agreed checklist to be established for April 12 at the latest. Wood / City

5. The EA process must clearly demonstrate why the preferred alignment is recommended and why other options are not recommended. Wood

6. It is vital that City and Development Group work together in cooperation. Wood / City

7. The 2 collector roads are to be considered as having posted speeds of 50 km/hr and design speeds of 60 km/hr. Wood

8. Consideration will be given for truck turning movements, storage lengths, turning lanes, lane widths, pedestrian crossing safety, midway resting areas for pedestrians etc. Additional/Full list of transportation design criteria will be provided by City staff. Ask Margaret for this list. Wood/City

9. Wood will only use current Paradigm TIS and AECOM’s previous TIS; a new TIS is not required for the EA. Wood

10. Where Gordon Dean intersects Highway 8 is a factor for consideration as well as vertical and horizontal site lines along Highway 8. The location of options as to where it meets Highway 8 has been approved within the Fruitland-Winona Secondary Plan. However, the City directed Wood to explore various options. Wood

11. Any relevant information from Barton Street and Highway 8 EA’s to be reflected. Wood

12. EA shall include roll plans for each alignment showing sidewalks, lanes, lane widths, storage, islands, etc. Traffic islands to be minimum 1.0 m wide. Wood

13. The goal is to complete Phase 3 EA PIC information for mid-May submission to City and to hold a Public Information Centre (PIC) meeting (if necessary) by mid-June (specific time TBD). A Wood / City
MATTERS DISCUSSED

proposed/amended project schedule to be worked out and agreed upon by all involved. It shall include time for staff to review PIC materials prior to PIC itself, this is to be finalized by Wood, after staff review, 3 weeks prior to PIC itself. Staff are discouraged by Council from holding PICs during the summer months, due to constituents being away on vacation during that time – to give them a fair change to express opinions/attend, etc. Therefore, if a PIC is needed, it is desirable to do so by June 2019.

14. Advertising deadlines 1 and 2 weeks prior to the PIC dictate the 3 week lead for PIC. Also, once PIC is finalized, Block 1 Servicing Strategy may or may not need to be adjusted, e.g. drainage, and the rest of Block 1 SS finalized. Once the full report is submitted, City staff will need to review. Then, a Report to Council will be written once a Finalized Report is in hand. City will help write this report. The time between Submission of report and when it reaches Planning Committee is 6 weeks lead time. Once Committee passes it, it needs to go to Full Council for final approval.

Note: Secondary Plan is now in effect except for areas under appeal. If lands are under appeal they will not be developable until the appeals are finalized.

It is in everyone’s interest to finalize the Block 1 SS as soon as possible – land owners and City.

15. City staff will provide Wood staff with a checklist of various items to be covered in Phase 3 EA by April 3 and Wood staff are to provide their version of checklist to City by April 3. Checklists to be discussed and merged to the satisfaction of all parties by April 12.

16. PIC meeting may not be necessary if Option 1 alignment becomes the recommended alignment. However, the Environmental Study Report/any amendments to the documents provided at the last PIC should still be inclusive of the details/requirements stated by the City.

17. Anyone can appeal an EA project, but the appeals can only really be made as to whether or not the A process has been followed. City
Continued...
Meeting Date: March 27, 2019

**MATTERS DISCUSSED**

staff therefore recommend that the EA process be well followed in order to avoid unnecessary delays in the process.

18. A noise study is not required as part of EA but is to be mentioned as necessary for detailed development design.  

19. Parks Department will have opportunity to comment on resulting park areas when documents are submitted with full EA functional design information.

20. It was affirmed that construction of the east-west collector road and only the north portion of Gordon Dean Avenue will be sufficient for developments along both sides of these collector roads.

21. EA to discuss implement-ability of various alignment options such as purchase of necessary lands.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Phone #</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Enos</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>905 335 2353</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jim.enos@woodplc.com">jim.enos@woodplc.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loren Polonsky</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>905 335 2353</td>
<td><a href="mailto:loren.polonsky@woodplc.com">loren.polonsky@woodplc.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria King</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>905 335 2353</td>
<td><a href="mailto:maria.king@woodplc.com">maria.king@woodplc.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelo Cutaria</td>
<td>AE III Group</td>
<td>905.580.6441</td>
<td><a href="mailto:defina.duarte@hamilton.ca">defina.duarte@hamilton.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deifina Duarte</td>
<td>CTH</td>
<td>905 546-2424/661</td>
<td><a href="mailto:defina.duarte@hamilton.ca">defina.duarte@hamilton.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Hollingworth</td>
<td>City of Hamilton</td>
<td>1428</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brian.hollingworth@hamilton.ca">brian.hollingworth@hamilton.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Yong-Lee</td>
<td>City of Hamilton</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sally.yong-lee@hamilton.ca">sally.yong-lee@hamilton.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Cullagh</td>
<td>CTH</td>
<td>1804</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gail.cullagh@hamilton.ca">gail.cullagh@hamilton.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Kesser</td>
<td>City of Hamilton</td>
<td>2701</td>
<td><a href="mailto:raymond.kesser@hamilton.ca">raymond.kesser@hamilton.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Reason</td>
<td>Councillor Ward 10</td>
<td>2218</td>
<td><a href="mailto:maria.reason@hamilton.ca">maria.reason@hamilton.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Fazio</td>
<td>City of Hamilton</td>
<td>2218</td>
<td><a href="mailto:margaret.fazio@hamilton.ca">margaret.fazio@hamilton.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minutes

Date: June 12, 2019
File #: TP115082
Meeting Date: May 27, 2019
Meeting at: Hamilton City hall, Room 433
Subject: Draft Tech Memo for Fruitland-Winona Block 1 Phase 3 EA

Attendees:
Margaret Fazio, City of Hamilton
Delfina Duarte, City of Hamilton
Brian Hollingworth, City of Hamilton
Sally Yong-Lee, City of Hamilton
Dave McCullagh, City of Hamilton
Ray Kessler, City of Hamilton
Councilor Pearson, City of Hamilton
Angelo Cutaia, AC III Group (Developer Agent)
Maria King, Wood
Loren Polonsky, Wood
Jim Enos, Wood

MATTERS DISCUSSED

1. General background history leading up to the current status of the Gordon Dean Avenue alignment options was provided by Wood.

2. City staff asked why Options 3a and 3b were introduced and why they differ from the Secondary Plan. Wood responded that the City requested additional alignments be reviewed with 80-90 degree intersection of Street A and Street B and that this alignment would not require expropriation of private lands as it passes through lands now owned by the City.

3. The City staff stated that the ‘no expropriation’ policy only applies to park lands, not roads. City staff to review Council minutes to confirm this.

4. City Realty staff stated that the City wears 2 hats, one being City Corporate and the other being City Public and that the City did not purchase this property for the road. The City is not interested in dedicating lands.

PLEASE NOTE: If there is any comment or amendment to be made to these meeting notes, they should be brought to the notice of Wood within five (5) business days of issue and confirmed in writing.

Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions
a Division of Wood Canada Limited
Registered office: 2020 Winston Park Drive, Suite 700, Oakville, Ontario L6H 6X7
Registered in Canada No. 773289-9; GST: 899879050 RT0008; DUNS: 25-362-6642
MATTERS DISCUSSED

5. Wood enquired as to how long it might take to develop the south portion of Gordon Dean if City is not interested in dedicating lands. City Facilities/Public Works staff stated that they do not need Gordon Dean Avenue roadway as they have access from Hwy 8.

6. City Public Works staff stated that Public Works intends to use the former Alectra Lands to expand the cemetery and for a Public Works Yard.

7. City stated that they would normally be counting on developers to purchase lands for south leg of Gordon Dean.

8. Wood emphasized that the development can proceed as agreed by the City with 3 collector road connection points at Barton, Jones and Fruitland and that the City will need to acquire and construct the south leg of Gordon Dean.

9. Real Estate and Facilities staff stated that $6.68 million was the registered purchase price of the former Alectra Lands and being a value slightly below that what was appraised by City staff. As more detailed in point 4 herein these minutes, Real Estate and Facilities staff gave clarity that the lands are for the redevelopment into a new Public Works yard and other materials real estate commitments that are dependent on the timely opening of this new Public Works yard. Documentation of the City’s purchase of the former Alectra property can be obtained from the Land Titles office which hold these as public records. City confirmed that Council approved the purchase of the Alectra Lands for the specific purpose of relocating the public works yard from 911 Arvin, which is sold firm and the Street Lighting group from 125 Barton which is also to be disposed of.

10. City staff asked why option 1 (running on west side of Alectra Lands) cannot be moved further west so as not to impact the Alectra Lands. Reason provided is that the house on the West side property would have to be expropriated and that expropriation was understood to not be allowed for the road.

11. City staff expressed that they believed that the only limits on expropriation were that no lands would be expropriated for the purpose of park lands and that expropriation could take place for road allowances. See Item 16 below.

12. Wood staff emphasized that the City needs the south portion of Gordon Dean as per Fruitland Road Phases 1 & 2 Municipal Class EA,
MATTERS DISCUSSED

and Fruitland-Winona Secondary Plan including the shifting of the truck route from Fruitland Road to Gordon Dean Ave. City staff agreed that Gordon Dean Ave. was indicated as a future truck route and Rapid Transit route, so for public good purposes it would be beneficial to having this road built. From the perspective of the City as the former Alectra lands land owner and in terms of timing, the Alectra property already has access to the property in question, so operations are not reliant on the construction of the southerly portion of Gordon Dean Ave. for some time. Typically, City of Hamilton would ask adjacent/affected developers to construct roads which aid their development, with applicable cost sharing with the City.

13. City affirmed that all EA analysis must be carried out objectively.

14. City Realty staff stated that they do not agree with or support any impact on the Alectra Lands site and that if any land taking was to proceed on the former Alectra property that there would be full expectation for compensation to be made back to the City inclusive not only of land value, based on highest and best use, but also including injurious affection and possible other resultant damages that may be incurred by the City as would be applicable with any institutional land use/businesses equally impacted at this location.

15. Wood staff explained the various matrices in the draft tech memo and recognized that some additional environmental items remain to be addressed/documentated prior to finalization of the EA. These items, however, will not impact on any proposed alignment(s) for Gordon Dean Avenue.

16. City staff expressed that they felt that the criteria of ‘Acquisition of Non-participating Lands’ should be changed to ‘Acquisition of Lands’ on the basis that all EAs need to consider all land impacts, not just whether someone is part of the study or not. Developer Agent stated that City is a participating landowner due to expropriation limitations that were understood to be applicable within Fruitland-Winona Secondary Plan. City disagreed based on 2 hats viewpoint, and stated that expropriation is allowed for the roadway. Wood to consider this item, once City staff double-check specifics of Council Meetings, and Urban Hamilton Official Plan.

17. City objects to ratings under Category 4 on page 4 of tech memo. Wood to consider. It was discussed the economic impact in the
**MATTERS DISCUSSED**

Matrices need to be further worked on and the City does not agree with the assessment of the economic impact in some of the options.

18. City indicated that consideration should be given to re-evaluating Implementation (Category 7), Economic (Category 4) and Acquisition of Lands (Category 2). Wood to consider.

19. The east-west collector road alignments are not considered problematic either way. It was explained that the alignment along the centre line of this collector’s corridor is shifted slightly from the Fruitland-Winona Secondary Plan layout, in options “b” of each presented option within this Gordon Dean EA, in order to be more equitable to the impacted land owners.

20. Wood staff stated that the development group will likely say that the economic value of the former Alectra lands is small in light of the value of building permit fees that the City will collect from development of SCUBE. The City did not agree with this point. The economic value of land purchase on City’s lands is just one cost, and in and of itself is not small. The cascade effect of other transactions dependent on City’s ability to move its operations and operate this newly acquired land/PW Yard, etc., are additional and costly, beyond land value of the Alectra property alone. It was understood that Wood staff would not have known about this previously, since the property only came to City of Hamilton’s possession in mid-April. This information was considered confidential and could therefore not be shared by City staff with the Block 1 SS project team until the end of transaction/it became public.

21. City staff are to provide written comments on the tech memo for Wood to consider.

22. City staff are to provide evidence of what types of expropriation are available for Block 1 for Wood to consider.

23. City Public Works staff are asked to provide overall estimated costs to Public Works beyond the $6.68 million purchase price for Wood to add to the EA evaluation matrices.

24. Developer Agent restated that the City is one entity for the City of Hamilton public good and is a stakeholder/participating party in the Gordon Dean Avenue EA process.

**ACTION BY:**

Wood

City / Wood

City / Wood

City / Wood

City / Wood
25. June 13\textsuperscript{th} PIC meetings are no longer achievable; the new goal is late June, but this will require expedient responses from the City on their three (3) actions named above. Wood staff stated that even if a Public Information Centre is held in September, there is enough to do in the meantime to fully finalize the EA evaluation criteria and other outstanding items, which will allow the project to move forward. This can allow for the project to go directly from PIC and its comment period, to Council and filing with MOECP immediately thereafter.
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Date: July 3, 2019
File #: TP115082
Meeting Date: June 27, 2019
Meeting at: Marz Homes Office
Subject: Fruitland-Winona Block 1 – Phase 3 EA Adjusted Alignments

Attendees:
Domenic Chiaravalle, Todoc Construction
Dan Joyce, Sidney W. Woods
Mark De Benedictis, Benemar Homes
John Conciatori, 2261305 Ontario Inc.
Dan Gabriele, Marz Homes
Dani Gabriele, Marz Homes
Marc Marini, 1787482 Ont. Inc.
Jack Restivo, Future Homes
Angelo Cutaia, AC III Group (Developer Agent)
Carl Galli, NGE Land Holdings Inc.
Councillor Maria Pearson, City of Hamilton
Jim Enos, Wood

MATTERS DISCUSSED

1. Angelo Cutaia provided status updates as follows:
   - City in 2019 required that several alignments be considered for Gordon Dean EA.
   - City was not impartial with some of their comments on Phase 3 EA Tech Memo, therefore these comments will be noted but not be considered in the EA review.
   - Due to the City comments, the June 23rd PIC was cancelled; new goal for the PIC is mid-September, 2019.
   - Development Group met recently and agreed to tweak Option 1 off of #703 Highway 8 lands as much as possible. This is reflected in plans presented at this meeting.
   - All were reminded that Phase 3 EA must be an impartial review and assessment process.

PLEASE NOTE: If there is any comment or amendment to be made to these meeting notes, they should be brought to the notice of Wood within five (5) business days of issue and confirmed in writing.
MATTERS DISCUSSED

- Proposed alignments were discussed, explained/summarized.
- Based on previous public meetings the Developer Owners Group had the clear understanding that expropriation would not be used by City to acquire any lands for Gordon Dean, so the Group purchased #716, #718 and #720 Barton Street East at great cost. Now, Four (4) years later, the City has provided meeting minutes which indicate that expropriation was only ruled out for park lands.

2. Jack Restivo commented as follows:
   - City made a mistake in the Secondary Plan, their 72° alignment is now not acceptable and the City is requiring Developer Group to pay to fix the problem/issue.
   - The City must work with Group; they cannot reject any encroachment on #703 Highway 8.

3. Angelo Cutaia - Developers paid high price for #716, #718 and #720 Barton Street East, and these costs must be included in City’s share for Gordon Dean costs.

4. Mark De Benedictis - How will the costs of the 3 homes on Barton be reimbursed?
   Angelo Cutaia – Most likely through Development Charges.
   Jack Restivo –
   - Value of 3 homes must be considered in a satisfactory manner.
   - City should make an offer to acquire the 3 homes to the Group prior to expropriation efforts.
   Councilor Pearson – She must discuss this with City staff.

5. PIC new tentative timeline is mid-September, however, it was explained that the City reply to Dougan’s May, 2018 letter was not received until June, 2019 and that HCA has not responded to a May 2018 letter to this point in time. These 2 items may impact timing.

6. Group instructed Wood to complete the Phase 3 EA without HCA comments at this time.
MATTERS DISCUSSED
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Date: October 15, 2019
File #: TPB115082
Meeting Date & Time: October 10, 2019 at 10:30 a.m.
Meeting at: Wood, Environment & Infrastructure Solutions – Burlington Office (3450 Harvester Road, Suite 100 Burlington L7N 3W5)
Subject: Gordon Dean Avenue Municipal Class EA – Technical Agency Committee Meeting

Attendees:
Margaret Fazio, City of Hamilton
Melissa Kiddie, City of Hamilton
Dave McCullagh, City of Hamilton
Brian Hollingworth, City of Hamilton
Jim Dougan, Dougan & Associates
Dan Minkin, Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) (By Phone)
Angelo Cutaia, ACIII Group (PM)
Jim Enos, Wood (PM)
Andreas Stenzel, Wood (Environmental)
Maria King, Wood (Assistant PM)
Aniqa Shams, Wood (Env. Planner)
Ian Richards, Dougan & Associates

MATTERS DISCUSSED

1. Project Status Update

J. Enos thanked all in attendance for taking the time to meet with Wood for the Gordon Dean Avenue Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Study (MCEA). He requested that all in attendance provide an overview of their role on the project:

Jim Enos (Wood) – Consultant Project Manager
Angelo Cutaia (ACIII Group) – Project Manager
Maria King (Wood) – Transportation Lead
Andreas Stenzel (Wood) – Head of the Environmental Assessment Group
Aniqa Shams (Wood) – Environmental Planner
Melissa Kiddie (City of Hamilton) – Natural Heritage (Aquatic and Terrestrial)
Margaret Fazio (City of Hamilton) – Infrastructure Planning

PLEASE NOTE: If there is any comment or amendment to be made to these meeting notes, they should be brought to the notice of Wood within five (5) business days of issue and confirmed in writing.
### MATTERS DISCUSSED

| Brian Hollingworth (City of Hamilton) - Director, Transportation Planning and Parking |
| Dave McCullagh (City of Hamilton) – Senior Business Development Consultant |
| Dan Minkin (Ministry of Tourism, Sport and Culture) – Heritage Planner |
| Jim Dougan (Dougan & Associates) – Senior Ecologist |
| Ian Richards (Dougan & Associates) - Wildlife Ecologist |

J. Enos explained that the purpose of this meeting is to review the Public Information Centre (PIC) slides and next steps.

#### 2. PIC Slides

M. King reviewed all PIC slides with attendees. Questions and comments were received and discussed throughout the presentation.

The City of Hamilton staff appreciated the meeting as a chance to address their questions.

B. Hollingworth asked what the top two reasons were for choosing the preferred alignment as Option 4b over Option 1. M. King explained that one reason was noise from the truck route since the entirety of Option 1 would be adjacent to a residential neighbourhood, this would be less desirable. Option 4 in which a portion of the truck route is not through a residential neighbourhood. The second reason is because Option 4b better conforms to the Secondary Plan.

#### 3. Natural Environment Comments

**a) Pond Located on north-eastern portion of the Former Alectra Lands**

- B. Hollingworth asked if this pond was a significant feature.
- M. Kiddie explained that there are no size requirements within the City of Hamilton standards that characterize wetlands.
- I. Richards indicated that the pond and associated marshes are not significant as natural features and do not warrant inclusion in the recommended Natural Heritage System for the area.

#### 4. Business Impacts

**a) Impact to Former Alectra lands**

- D. McCullagh expressed concern with the evaluation table, specifically the business impacts category. Option 4a / 4b is currently categorized as ‘Good’. D. McCullagh requested 4a /
MATTERS DISCUSSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4b to be changed to ‘Poor’. The north-eastern portion of the former Alectra lands will be impacted by 4a / 4b, which the City of Hamilton intends to use as an extension of the cemetery. This ruins the contiguous nature of the future use of land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Fazio clarified that the Fruitland – Winona Secondary Plan (Secondary Plan) identified two preferred alignments for Gordon Dean Avenue (Route Option 1 and Option 4a / 4b). The Secondary Plan is the last approved legal document that this project can rely upon. The City of Hamilton’s purchase of the former Alectra lands occurred after the Secondary Plan was approved and thus the alignment of Gordon Dean cannot heavily consider the impact to the former Alectra lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. McCullagh expressed concern with the optics of the presentation. The general public will not understand the concern with Option 4a / 4b as residents are only concerned with impacts to their own land. The Project Team needs to be transparent regarding the impact of 4a / 4b on the City of Hamilton land (former Alectra lands).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. King explained that the Project Team is not changing the Secondary Plan recommendations, as the Secondary Plan identifies that the 4a / 4b alignments includes right-of-way space that was set aside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Fazio explained that City-owned property does not supersede other businesses and uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Hollingworth further explained that the former Alectra lands should be viewed as a contiguous land piece and the impact on this land is relevant regardless of the owner of this land. In the Secondary Plan, the alignment proposed would have also impacted this piece of the land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. King explained that if this land was still owned by Alectra, the part that is being impacted would not impact their operations as the alignment runs through a gravel pathway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Cultural / Archeological Impact

a) Cultural Heritage Evaluation

- D. Minkin requested clarification on the evaluation of alternatives based on cultural heritage impacts.
- M. King explained that the distinction is based on the impact on the adjacent cemetery. However, the proposed alignment does not impact the existing cemetery.
MATTERS DISCUSSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Potential Cemetery Impact</th>
<th>ACTION BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- D. Minkin discussed the potential impact cemeteries may have on the 4a / 4b alignment. Older cemeteries may not have the same boundaries as they do today, which increases the risk of finding human remains outside of cemetery boundaries. Since 4a / 4b alignment will be directly adjacent to the existing cemetery, there may be a risk of finding human remains in that area.</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- D. Minkin further explained that the evaluation of alternatives should be based on the existing report. If the existing report states no findings, then all alignments should be considered equal. The Stage 1 Archeological Assessment Report recommends a Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment, which will be completed during detailed design. There is no such thing as levels of archaeological potential, which means that alternative 4a / 4b cannot be stated as different and must be considered equal to other alternatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- D. McCullagh clarified that the cemetery is active and has existed for a while, however he did not know the exact age. D. McCullagh asked if the Stage 1 report looked at set back requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- M. Fazio (PM for Phase 1 and 2 – Fruitland Road MCEA) stated that she is unsure if the report considered set back requirements, however she was advised that the proposed alignment should not impact the existing cemetery.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- B. Hollingworth asked if human remains are found, how will this affect the alignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- D. Minkin explained that if human remains are found, it becomes complicated and there are several factors to consider. However, if homestead is found, then excavation if required and there are mitigation measures for this. This would not impact the design. MTCS recommends completing a Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment during the Environmental Assessment Stage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Access to Future EMS

- M. Fazio explained that the City of Hamilton respects the Project Team’s consideration to the future potential EMS station on the former Alectra lands; however, this category is
Continued...
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATTERS DISCUSSED</th>
<th>ACTION BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>recommended to be removed as the future potential EMS station was not considered in the Secondary Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Lane Configuration</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>a) Bike Lanes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- B. Hollingworth asked why bike lanes cannot be removed and replaced with multi-use paths right away</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- M. King explained that space will be reserved for bike lanes, however this space will later be turned into on-street parking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b) Truck Queues</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- M. Fazio asked how long the queues will be for trucks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- M. King explained that there will be a dedicated left turn lane for trucks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c) Overall Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- B. Hollingworth asked if all safety checks were made and if M. King is confident in the design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- M. King responded that safety checks were made, and she is okay with the preferred design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Capital Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>a) Capital Cost Calculations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- M. Fazio asked how the estimated capital costs were determined. She asked why Option 1 vs Option 4a / 4b are similar even though Option 1 has one house and Option 4a / 4b has two houses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- M. King explained that the estimated capital costs were determined based on a number of considerations. This will be better explained in the technical memorandum. The residential land required for Option 1 is greater than for Option 4 and thus offsets the cost of one additional home for Option 4. The amount of land associated with the properties in each alignment is comparable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b) Landowner</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- B. Hollingworth asked if individual landowners have been notified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- M. King responded that registered letters have been distributed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c) Construction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MATTERS DISCUSSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action by:</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. King</td>
<td>M. King stated that the southern portion of the road is the City of Hamilton’s responsibility to build.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Fazio</td>
<td>M. Fazio stated that the direction she received is that the entire road will be developed by developers, not the City of Hamilton. The southern portion will be given to developers interested in developing the southern portion of Gordon Dean Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The message at the PIC for residents asking about implementation of the southern portion: <em>Construction will be dealt with at a later date. This will not be developed right now, and we will contact you when more information is available.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9. Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action by:</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Comment deadline should be changed to November 1 in order to provide the public with time until the end of that week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hamilton</td>
<td>Implementation is undecided, however a separate meeting after the PIC can be arranged. M. Fazio to arrange a meeting. Post Meeting Note: This meeting may not be necessary until after the EA process is completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>The Environmental Study Report (ESR) may be ready for review in February 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Slide 6 of the presentation slides to be updated to include why Option 1b was not longer included in the alternative evaluation matrix (due to angle of intersection and roundabout). City staff felt that this information should still be provided in the ESR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Project Team will be revising the cross-sections and including another cross-section showing different active transportation options and a 4-lane cross section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Kiddie requested that the ESR include more information regarding the connection about compensation between this Study and the Block Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Project Team will include a commitment section in the ESR as well as next steps, which will discuss compensation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting Minutes prepared by:

Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions  
a Division of Wood Canada Limited

Per: Aniqa Shams  
Environmental Planner
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>E-mail Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Enos</td>
<td>WOOD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jim.enos@wood.ca">jim.enos@wood.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Kinder</td>
<td>WOOD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:king.mario@wood.ca">king.mario@wood.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anika Shams</td>
<td>WOOD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:shams.anika@wood.ca">shams.anika@wood.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Stenzel</td>
<td>WOOD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stenzel.andrea@wood.ca">stenzel.andrea@wood.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Richards</td>
<td>Poukey &amp; Assoc</td>
<td>irichards@poukey-ca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Hollingworth</td>
<td>CITY OF HAMILTON</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brian.hollingworth@hison.ca">brian.hollingworth@hison.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelo Cuticchio</td>
<td>AE III Group</td>
<td><a href="mailto:angelo.cuticchio@ae.ca">angelo.cuticchio@ae.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Douglas</td>
<td>Douglas + Assoc</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jdouglas@douglas.ca">jdouglas@douglas.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave McCollard</td>
<td>CITY OF HAMILTON</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dave.mccollard@hison.ca">dave.mccollard@hison.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Kiddie</td>
<td>CITY OF HAMILTON</td>
<td><a href="mailto:melissa.kiddie@hison.ca">melissa.kiddie@hison.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Fazio</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Margaret.Fazio@hison.ca">Margaret.Fazio@hison.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV Payne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Minkin</td>
<td>MINISTRY OF CULTURE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Information Centre

Gordon Dean Avenue Schedule “C” Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Phase 3 & 4)

Date: October 17, 2019
Time: 5:00pm – 7:00pm
Location: Stoney Creek Municipal Centre – 777 Highway 8, Stoney Creek
Land Acknowledgement

Located within the traditional territories of the Erie, Neutral, Huron-Wendat, Haudenosaunee and Mississaugas. This land is covered by the Dish With One Spoon Wampum Belt Covenant, whan agreement between the Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabek to share and care for the resources around the Great Lakes. We further acknowledge that this land is covered by the Between the Lakes Purchase, 1792, between the Crown and the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation.
Welcome to the Public Information Centre

Tonight, we invite you to....

01. Sign-in and take a comment sheet
02. Learn about the process.
03. Review findings of previous studies.
04. Learn about the preferred alternative
05. Discover the problems and opportunities being addressed.
06. Ask questions and provide insight.
07. Provide feedback.
08. Let us know what is most important to you.
09. Find out where the study is going next...

Your feedback is important, and will be incorporated and considered in the design process!
Comment Deadline is **October 31, 2019**
Study Area
Previous Project Work

In 2010, the City of Hamilton completed a Class Environmental Assessment (EA) on Fruitland Road between Barton Street to Highway 8), which included two phases.

– Phase 1: Identify problem and opportunity.
  • Problem: Residents concerned about high vehicle speeds and overly-aggressive driving which makes it difficult to enter and exit driveways fronting Fruitland Road.
  • Opportunity: Fruitland-Winona Secondary Plan presents opportunity to address these problems and to redistribute traffic to proposed growth areas.

– Phase 2: Develop alternative solutions to address the problem and opportunity, and select a preliminary preferred alternative.
  • Alternatives included:
    – “Do Nothing”
    – Alternative 2 Series: two options using cul-de-sacs on Fruitland Road
    – Alternative 3 Series: four options based on creating a new North-South road east of Fruitland Road
  • Preferred Alternative: New North-South Road with Fruitland Road gateway features and pedestrian crosswalk enhancements

This provided the foundation for this project, the Gordon Dean Avenue Class EA.
Background Information: PIC # 1 (April 2017)

Phase 1 and 2 (Fruitland Road MCEA):
- Based on the findings of the Fruitland Road (from Barton Street to Highway 8) Schedule ‘C’ Municipal Class EA Study, the preferred alternative solution was chosen to create a new north-south collector road between Fruitland Road and Jones Road. This project satisfied Phase 1 and 2 of the current Gordon Dean Avenue Class EA project.

Phase 3 and 4 (Gordon Dean MCEA):
- The Gordon Dean Avenue Phase 3 and 4 Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (MCEA) commenced in 2017. In April 2017, a Public Information Update (PIU) was held after technical studies were completed to determine existing conditions and corresponding mitigation measures. At this point a preliminary preferred alignment was chosen.

Phase 3 and 4 (Gordon Dean MCEA): 2019 Update
- Further consultation with the City of Hamilton revealed the need to undertake a more rigorous assessment to determine the preferred alternative. Although the City of Hamilton is not the proponent, they provided oversight on this MCEA to ensure the MCEA process was followed and the design reflected the City of Hamilton’s values.
- Further natural heritage studies were undertaken, such as a breeding bird study and fisheries and watercourse assessment to determine impacts to terrestrial and aquatic habitats.

Phase 3 and 4 (Gordon Dean MCEA): PIC #2 (October 2019)
- Based on the updated evaluation of alternatives undertaken in early 2019, a new preliminary preferred alternative was identified. Due to the change in the preferred alternative, the current Public Information Centre is being held to present the new alternative and gain feedback.
Planning and Policy Context

The current MCEA Study builds upon several other studies including:

- **Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP) (2009)** – Almost the entire Block 1, including all Gordon Dean alternative alignments is located in the land use designation neighbourhoods.

- **Rapid Ready- Expanding Mobility Choices in Hamilton (2013)** – This document outlines the planning for rapid transit service and identifies Highway 8 and Fifty Road as a part of the future extension of the ‘B’ line rapid transit network. The ‘B’ line has not been recommended to service Gordon Dean Avenue.

- **Shifting Gears - Cycling Master Plan (2018)** – No cycling lanes / multi-use pathways identified for Gordon Dean Avenue in the Cycling Master Plan as it predated completion of Phases 1 and 2 of the current Class EA Study.

- **Barton Street and Fifty Road Schedule ‘C’ Municipal Class EA (Ongoing)** - The Barton Street and Fifty Road Improvements Class EA is currently being undertaken, which will include widening and a pedestrian promenade.

- **Highway 8 Schedule ‘C’ Municipal Class EA (Ongoing)** – The Highway 8 Improvements Class EA is currently being undertaken to investigate the need for widening, along with improving safety, connectivity and accessibility.

- **Complete Streets** is a concept that involves designing streets in a manner that is safe for all users, regardless of age and physical ability.

- **Vision Zero** supports the goal of zero fatalities or serious injuries on the roadway. Vision Zero’s target for safer streets can be achieved by addressing traffic safety holistically through education, enforcement, engineering, evaluation and engagement.
Planning and Policy Context Cont’d

Stoney Creek Urban Boundary Expansion Transportation Master Plan (SCUBE TMP) (2008)

- Conducting a new Class EA for Fruitland Road between Barton Street and Highway 8
- Collectors and local roads to appropriately subdivide land for development (SCUBE West):
  - North-South collector between Jones and Glover
  - East-West collector between Fruitland Road and North-South collector

Fruitland – Winona Secondary Plan (2014)

- Applies to areas identified in the map to the right
- Identifies current zoning and future development
- Identifies the transportation, transit and active transportation linkage objectives including addressing the following issues:
  - Truck traffic on Fruitland Road between Barton Street and Highway 8
  - Excessive Speeding
  - Truck routes
- In June 2018, the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal approved the Fruitland-Winona Secondary Plan (except for lands subject to site specific appeals)
Existing and Future Land Use

Existing Land Use

- Primarily low-density residential and agricultural with a single office space and a few commercial buildings
- Land to the south of Highway 8 designated as ‘Escarpe ment Protection Area’ as well as Greenbelt Area

Future Land Use

- Future land use has been identified through the Fruitland-Winona Secondary Plan.
- Several development applications requesting land use to be rezoned from agricultural to residential throughout the Study Area. This is significant as the goal of the Fruitland-Winona area is become more urban and support additional growth

1 Portions of this Secondary Plan are still under Appeal at the Ontario Municipal Board.
Technical Studies

• Technical studies were completed to understand the existing conditions within the Study Area.

• To avoid duplication of effort, many of these studies were completed for the entire Block 1 area (see map on the right), as part of the Block 1 Servicing Strategy.

• Archaeology (Stage 1) and Cultural Heritage studies were completed during the Fruitland Road Class EA.
  – Stage 2 Archeological Assessment will be completed during detailed design.

• Other technical studies (i.e. Noise Assessments and Air Quality Impact Assessments) will be completed during the Block 1 Site Plan Application stage.

• Technical studies for consideration in the Gordon Dean Avenue MCEA include:
  – Fruitland – Winona Block 1 Servicing Strategy Environmental Assessment & Natural Heritage System Plan.
  – Hydrological Assessment Block 1 Fruitland- Winona Block Servicing Strategy.
Natural Heritage

Natural Heritage Assessment: completed as part of the Fruitland – Winona Block 1 Servicing Strategy, which had a significantly larger study area than the Gordon Dean Avenue Study Area, may have identified potential impacts and mitigation measures outside of the Gordon Dean Avenue Study Area.

Findings:
• The Block 1 study area contains portions of significant woodlands, wetlands, habitat of endangered or threatened species and fish habitat.
• Three Species at Risk (Barn Swallow, Bobolink, and Eastern Meadowlark) bird species confirmed as present on portions of the Block 1 lands; compensation will be determined in consultation with MECP by the affected landowners at the Environmental Impact Assessment stage.
• Further surveys have been completed in 2019 which determined if any of the breeding distribution of birds have changed.
• Feature alteration occurred on lands abutting Watercourse 5 and 6; these areas will require restoration and compensation as discussed in the draft BSS report (September 2017).
• Protection of core features with minimum 15m Vegetation Protection Zones is recommended, with a 15% overall woodland target for Block 1.
• Channel habitat creation (5%) and stormwater management facilities, combined with protected NHS and VPZs, will provide approximately 25% natural/restored future cover overall, aligned with a well-linked Natural Heritage System (NHS).
• Feature based water balance will be required at detailed design stage to confirm that the Vegetative Protection Zones will adequately maintain the existing water balance despite adjoining development.

Recommendations:
• An impact assessment will be required for the preferred alternative. This will be integrated into the final Environmental Study Report.
• Vegetation removal for road construction should be completed outside of the breeding bird window (April 15 – August 15).
• Where NHS features have been removed or altered, restoration areas will be required as defined in the Secondary Plan.
• Future forest cover of 15% is desirable for Block 1. Habitats in the created channel for Watercourse 5 will represent an additional 5% of natural cover.
• Within restoration areas, an initial tree canopy cover of 30% should be established using native species that will spread aggressively to give 60% canopy cover in 20-30 years.
Natural Heritage: SAR and ELC Mapping
A presentation by the Fruitland – Winona Development Group and Wood.
Findings:
• A Hydrogeological Assessment report was completed by Amec Foster Wheeler (2015) to analyze the impacts of the development on the existing water table and aquifers.
• The existing subsurface of Block 1 contains low permeability shale, a poor aquifer, and low permeability till.
• There is concern over the high groundwater level in some areas where it was measured as being approximately 1-1.5m.
• Overall, the amount of infiltration in the area is expected to decrease due to new surface paving and new buildings.

Recommendations:
• Requires foundation drainage and sump pumps for buildings that have a basement.
• During construction, it is suggested that dewatering may be required when excavating for basements and utility trenches to prevent water from flowing into construction sites.
• Groundwater monitoring should also occur during and after construction to assess the amount of natural seasonal fluctuation.
Transportation / Traffic Study

Findings:

- Analysis of the following proposed intersections to be built as part of the Gordon Dean Avenue development.
  - Barton Street at Sunnyhurst Avenue;
  - Gordon Dean Avenue at Collector Road ‘B’;
  - Gordon Dean Avenue at Highway 8;
- The intersections were first analyzed as unsignalized intersections and then as signalized intersections.
- As unsignalized intersections, the Level of Service (LOS) at several locations was beyond the acceptable limits.
  - Barton Street northbound left movement as well as Highway 8 southbound left movement are both anticipated to experience intolerable delays and queues.
- When analyzed under the signalized alternative, there was enough capacity to provide acceptable service.
  - All movements at all intersections expected to operate with minimal delay and queueing.

Recommendations:

- The study recommends constructing all new intersections as signalized to improve traffic operations and pedestrian flow.
Moving Towards a Preferred Design

As we move towards a preferred design, alternatives will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

**Socio-Economic Environment**
- Residential / business impacts
- Access to future community services
- Noise level impacts
- Access to community services
- Recreational features impacts

**Natural Environment**
- Natural heritage systems, avian species at risk
- Wetlands, watercourses
- Non-core area woodlands, hedgerows & thickets
- Avian and wildlife resources
- Candidate significant wildlife habitat
- Groundwater impacts, hydraulics and hydrogeology
- Stormwater management and LID

**Arch. / Cultural Heritage Impacts**
- Cultural / built heritage features / landscaped impacts
- Archaeological impacts

**Operations and Safety**
- Truck operation (2 lanes)
- Truck operations (4 lanes)
- Drivers – capacity, speed, intersection operations
- Sight distance checks
- Overall safety

**Governance**
- Impacts to non-participating lands
- Conforms to secondary plan
- Ease of implementation
- Estimated capital costs

**Sustainability**
- Pedestrians- safety, walking environment, encourages walking
- Cycling infrastructure
- Transit supportive development
- Incorporates innovative products / practices

Evaluation Criteria

A presentation by the Fruitland – Winona Development Group and Wood.
Alternative Design Option 1
Alternative Design Option 2a and 2b

Option 2a

Option 2b
Alternative Design Option 3a and 3b

Option 3a

Option 3b
Alternative Design Option 4a and 4b
## Alternative Evaluation Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category and Criteria</th>
<th>Route 1</th>
<th>Route 2a</th>
<th>Route 2b</th>
<th>Route 3a</th>
<th>Route 3b</th>
<th>Route 4a</th>
<th>Route 4b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS: Core Areas, including Significant Woodlands, PSWs</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS: Linkages, Restoration Areas, and Vegetation Protection Zones</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avian Species at Risk (SAR)</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Core Area Woodlands</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedgerows and Thickets</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avian and Wildlife Resources</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Significant Wildlife Habitat (SWH)</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watercourses</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater Impacts</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydraulics &amp; Hydrology</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management and LID</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio-economic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Impacts</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Impacts</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Future EMS Station</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Level Impacts</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Community Services</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Features Impacts</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archaeology / Built Heritage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/Built Heritage Features/ Landscapes Impacts</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Impacts</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts to Non-Participating Lands</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conforms to Secondary Plan</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Implementation</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Capital Costs</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians – Safety, walking environment, encourages walking</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling Infrastructure</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Supportive Development</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporates innovative products / practices</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Operations (2 lanes)</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Operations (4 lanes)</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers - Capacity, speed, intersection operations</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sight Distance Checks</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Safety</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please see the technical memorandum for more details.
Typical Cross Sections
1st Preliminary Preferred Alternative: Option 4b
2nd Preliminary Preferred Alternative: Option 1
Thank You for Attending!

Next Steps

1. Prepare the Environmental Study Report (ESR)
2. The ESR will be provided for public review and comment during a 30 day review period.
3. If anyone is strongly opposed to the report, an appeal may be made to the Minister of Environment, Conservation and Parks under the EA Act (Part II Order).

Contact Us

Let us know what is most important to you, your family and/or your business! Please place comment sheets in the Comment Box or send to one of the mailing or email addresses listed on the comment sheet and below.

By Mail: Angelo Cutaia, P.Eng.
Project Manager
Fruitland – Winona Development Group
3380 South Service Road, Unit 104,
Burlington, Ont. L7N 3J5

By Phone: 905-580 6441
By E-mail: angelocutaia@ac3group.ca

Jim Enos, CET
Consultant Project Manager
Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions
3450 Harvester Road Suite 100
Burlington, ON, L7N 3W5

By Phone: 905-335-2353 Ext. 3049
By E-mail: jim.enos@woodplc.com

Comment Deadline
October 31, 2019

A presentation by the Fruitland – Winona Development Group and Wood.
MEETING MINUTES:

Re: Block Servicing Strategy Environmental Assessment
Fruitland Winona Secondary Plan, Block 1
Meeting at offices of Hamilton Conservation Authority on Monday July 08 2019

Attendees:
Mike Stone, HCA, Manager of Stewardship & Ecological Services
Jonathan Bastien, HCA, Water Resources Engineer
Colin Oaks, HCA, Ecologist
Melissa Kiddie, City of Hamilton
Glen Wellings, Wellings Planning Consultant
Angelo Cutaia, AC3 Group
Ian Barrett, Colville Consulting
Daniel Joyce, Sidney W Woods Engineering
Jim Enos, WOOD PLC

Note: The Block1 landowner group asked Glen Wellings to arrange this meeting with the HCA as a consequence of a previous meeting with the City of Hamilton (dated May 08'19) wherein agreement was reached for the removal of natural heritage designation from lands along the west side of Block 1. The previous meeting comprised resolution of the LPAT appeal but City representatives indicated that related issues involving proposed creek channel block width etc would have to be discussed directly with the HCA.

Action by:

1.) G. Wellings outlines recent background of City's agreement to remove the original Secondary Plan natural heritage designation from lands at west side of Block 1 south of proposed Road B, refers to recent study & report by Colville Consulting which provided the basis for this re-designation.

2.) A. Cutaia (AC) outlines background of why progress on completion of the BSS was stalled after the initial submission of late 2017, i.e. during April/May of 2018 the issue of the natural heritage designation on the west side of Block 1 became critical as part of the LPAT appeal, and in early 2018 the alignment of the north-south “Gordon Dean Avenue” has become an issue. The environmental components of the BSS cannot be completed without incorporating the removal of the natural heritage designation and the final road alignments. Additionally, AC proposes that the removal of the natural heritage designation and absence of any existing wetlands should now allow for re-alignment of the existing channel south of the proposed east-west Road 'B'.

3.) M Kiddie acknowledges the City's agreement to removal of the natural heritage designation subject to the BSS being updated and modified accordingly. The BSS work completed by Dougan & Associates will have to be updated to reflect the latest work by Colville. M Kiddie asks that the
HCA be provided with the Colville study. Reference is made to the LPAT process and that the Colville report should be provided to the HCA subject to confirmation by the appellant’s lawyer.

4.) Ian Barrett (IB) describes the basis and conclusions/recommendations of his Colville study recommending removal of the natural heritage designation and proposing required channel block dimensions. The Colville study proposes 15 metre wide buffers from top-of-low-flow-bank on either side of creek to satisfy ecological requirements. Based on an approx 4.5m wide minor storm channel width, this would translate to a 34.5 metre wide creek block to satisfy ecological criteria. Yes, that is what Ian Barrett seemed to be saying, however, Wood is not necessarily supportive of this. For instance, the meander allowance on each side of the 4.5m wide low flow channel is 10.25m. The low flow channel at detail design will meander back and forth within the 25.0m wide meander belt not simply be centred. It would seem that the buffer would be required at least beyond the meander belt. It must also be remembered that a 6.0m wide access may also be required on each side of the meander belt, though they could likely be accommodated in the buffer area, they would not likely be located in the 4:1 side slopes of the major channel. This needs to be clarified and agreed to by all parties concerned.

5.) Mike Stone and Jonathan Bastien confirm that other than incorporating 6 metre wide maintenance access buffers on either side of the proposed channel from the greater of either the meander belt requirement limit or erosion hazard protection limit, no other buffer widths will be required. Based on the studies submitted to date, this would result in a total creek block width in the order of 46.5 metres. It is acknowledged that the original stream morphology analysis by Parrish (now Matrix) will have to be updated to reflect the latest floodplain hydrology and Hec Ras hydraulics (once available), the removal of the natural heritage designated lands etc., and required channel widths fine-tuned accordingly.

6.) Mike Stone and Jonathan Bastien advise that work is still continuing on their current flood plain and Hec Ras analysis for this area including Watercourse 5. They have sub-contracted this work out to EWRG consultants to whom who they are providing topographical and hydrologic data to. The HCA expect that their finalized current analysis will be available during month of September. The BSS should then utilize the HCA's latest floodplain and Hec Ras data to finalize all creek channel design.

Wood Plc to incorporate the finalized data from the HCA.

7.) Colin Oaks advises that a monitoring plan should be incorporated into the final channel design. The HCA are observing poor performance and degradation of constructed channels, mainly due to
subsequent changes in upstream runoff condition. Colin advises that the DFO and/or the City of Hamilton will also have to be involved with the monitoring.

8.) Mike Stone recommends that a comprehensive overall plan be adopted to address species-at-risk, i.e. the Bobolink issue. The HCA's past experience of these situations where different developers deal with these requirements on a phase-by-phase basis, do not end well. The required set-aside area is generally not available for the later phases. It would be better and fairer to establish an overall solution for 100% of the Block 1 lands at the outset.

M Kiddie advises that the bobolink requirement may be affected by the final alignment of the major north-south “Gordon Dean Avenue” road.

Prepared by:

Daniel Joyce, P.Eng

Date: July 23 2019
Meeting agenda

Date: October 10, 2019

Meeting at: Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions (Burlington Office) - 3450 Harvester Road, Suite 100 Burlington, ON L7N 3W5, Canada

File No.: TP115082

Subject/purpose: Technical Agency Meeting Gordon Dean Avenue Municipal Class EA Study (Phase 3 and 4)

Attendees: To be confirmed

To be presented/discussed:

1. Introduction
2. Brief Project Overview
3. Natural Environment Findings Overview
4. Alternatives Overview
   a. Evaluation of Design Alternatives
   b. Preliminary Preferred Alternative
   c. Design – Cross sections
5. Open Discussion
6. Next Steps
Hello all,

The Fruitland Winona Block 1 Development Group has initiated a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) related to the creation of a new north-south collector road between Barton Street and Highway 8 (See Key Plan attached).

Wood is leading the study on behalf of the Fruitland Winona Block 1 Development Group and requests your assistance with definition of existing and proposed utility infrastructure within the study area limits.

To assist with evaluation of alternatives, and subsequent definition of preferred alignments, we are requesting details related to existing and/or proposed utility infrastructure within the study limits. This information will be used to ensure that any impacts to utility infrastructure is clearly identified and considered during the assessment process. Of critical importance is identification of vital or trunk mains/services. In this regard, could you kindly provide the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If you DO NOT have facilities within the study area:</th>
<th>Kindly respond to this email, EXPLICITLY stating that your utility/organization does not have facilities within the study area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you DO have facilities within the study area:</td>
<td>Kindly provide us with details regarding location, size and type of facilities in one or more of the following formats:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mark-ups on the attached basemapping;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- AutoCAD, MicroStation or GIS drawings (preferred); or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Digital copies of facility design drawings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you PLAN TO have facilities, or are modifying existing facilities within the study area:</td>
<td>Kindly provide us with details regarding proposed location, sizing and type of facilities in one or more the following formats:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mark-ups on the attached basemapping;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- AutoCAD, MicroStation or GIS drawings (preferred); or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Digital copies of facility design drawings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please be sure to indicate that these are for future installations and, if known, provide timelines for implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please do not hesitate to contact us should you require additional information and/or file formats to work with. Your involvement with this study is greatly appreciated, and we will assist in any way possible.

Best regards,
Aniqa
Primary Locate Sheet
Line Location Request

Locating For: City of Hamilton (HW01),

Requested by: Jim Enos
Company: Wood

Appt. Date: 1-Sep-19
Received Date: 1-Sep-19
Type of Work: DESIGN AND PLANNING

Locate Address: HIGHWAY 8, HAMILTON
Excavator Address: 3450 Harvester RD, Burlington

Caller’s Remarks:
CORLOT=U Planning stage of road construction.DEPTH UNKNOWN

Gas Bell CATV Hydro Water Sewer Street Lighting Fibre

Located Area: EXCAVATOR SHALL NOT WORK OUTSIDE THE LOCATED AREA WITHOUT OBTAINING ANOTHER LOCATE

DPT Remarks: Third Party Notification

Records Referenced:
- Utility Map
- Multiviewer Datasnap K

Atlas Plates:
- Field Notes:
- Other:

Diameter of Main:

Excavator shall notify and receive a clearance from Regional Contacts Prior to excavation for the following:
- Gas: End Thrust, Vital Main, Valve
- Telephone: High Priority Cables, Central Office Vicinity

Material Types:
- Gas: Cast Iron, Steel, Plastic
- Cable, Conduit, Telephone Fibre
- CATV: TV Fibre
- Hydro: Primary, Secondary, Duct, Street Lighting

Method of Field Marking:
- Paint, Stakes, Flags, Offset Stakes, Chalk, Steel

Caution: Locate is VOID after 30 days. See attached for Bell Canada. Alectra, Burlington Hydro, Cogeco, Region of Halton, Toronto Hydro, Toronto BIA and Traffic/Rescue Locates valid for 60 days. Toronto Water valid for project. For locate requests, including remarks, contact Ontario One Call 1-800-400-2255.

Caution: The markings may disappear or be misplaced. Should sketch markings not coincide, a new locate must be obtained. This is based on information given at the time. Any changes to location or nature of work requires a new locate. The EXCAVATOR must not work outside the indicated Located Area without a further locate by the company. Privately owned facilities may be present in the Locate Area.

Documents given to be used with this locate:
- None
- NEE Excavation/Construction Booklet
- Gas Excavation Guidelines
- Hydro Electric Excavation Guidelines
- Bell Guidelines for Excavation

ID Number: 969 Elis S.
Date/Time: 03-Sep-2019 7:12 am

In/Out: Accepted By:

Print:

Mark and Fax/Email

Left on Site

A copy of this Primary Locate Report and the Auxiliary Locate Sheet(s) must be on site and in the hands of the machine operator during work operations. Should sketch and markings not coincide, a new locate must be obtained.
Hi Aniqa,

Enbridge Gas only has facilities on the existing roadways encompassed by the EA area. Please see the attached for our basemapping.

Thank you,
Alicia

---

EXTERNAL: PLEASE PROCEED WITH CAUTION.
This e-mail has originated from outside of the organization. Do not respond, click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender or know the content is safe.

Hello all,

The Fruitland Winona Block 1 Development Group has initiated a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) related to the creation of a new north-south collector road between Barton Street and Highway 8 (See Key Plan attached).

Wood is leading the study on behalf of the Fruitland Winona Block 1 Development Group and requests your assistance with definition of existing and proposed utility infrastructure within the study area limits.

To assist with evaluation of alternatives, and subsequent definition of preferred alignments, we are requesting details related to existing and/or proposed utility infrastructure within the study limits. This information will be used to ensure that any impacts to utility infrastructure is clearly identified and considered during the assessment process. Of critical importance is identification of vital or trunk mains/services. In this regard, could you kindly provide the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If you DO NOT have facilities within the study area:</th>
<th>Kindly respond to this email, EXPLICITLY stating that your utility/organization does not have facilities within the study area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you DO have facilities within the study area:</td>
<td>Kindly provide us with details regarding location, size and type of facilities in one or more of the following formats:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mark-ups on the attached basemapping;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AutoCAD, MicroStation or GIS drawings (preferred); or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Digital copies of facility design drawings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| If you **PLAN TO** have facilities, or are modifying existing facilities within the study area: | Kindly provide us with details regarding proposed location, sizing and type of facilities in one or more the following formats:

- Mark-ups on the attached basemapping;
- AutoCAD, MicroStation or GIS drawings (preferred); or
- Digital copies of facility design drawings.

Please be sure to indicate that these are for future installations and, if known, provide timelines for implementation. |

---

Please do not hesitate to contact us should you require additional information and/or file formats to work with. Your involvement with this study is greatly appreciated, and we will assist in any way possible.

Best regards,

Aniqa

---

Aniqa Shams, B.E.S. LEED Green Associate  
Junior Environmental Planner  
160 Traders Blvd E., Suite 110  
Mississauga, ON L4Z 3K7  
Office: +1 (905) 568-2929 ext. 4149  
Mobile: (416) 357-2093  
[www.woodplc.com](http://www.woodplc.com)

---

This message is the property of John Wood Group PLC and/or its subsidiaries and/or affiliates and is intended only for the named recipient(s). Its contents (including any attachments) may be confidential, legally privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure by law. Unauthorized use, copying, distribution or disclosure of any of it may be unlawful and is strictly prohibited. We assume no responsibility to persons other than the intended named recipient(s) and do not accept liability for any errors or omissions which are a result of email transmission. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply email to the sender and confirm that the original message and any attachments and copies have been destroyed and deleted from your system.

If you do not wish to receive future unsolicited commercial electronic messages from us, please forward this email to: unsubscribe@woodplc.com and include “Unsubscribe” in the subject line. If applicable, you will continue to receive invoices, project communications and similar factual, non-commercial electronic communications.

Please click [http://www.woodplc.com/email-disclaimer](http://www.woodplc.com/email-disclaimer) for notices and company information in relation to emails originating in the UK, Italy or France.
Hi,

Please see the attached drawing & document for the location requested.

If you have any concerns do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank You,
Dalima Abraham
Administrateur de projects MOC, Ingénierie - Centre du Canada Project Support MOC, Engineering - Central Canada
T: (289) 657-8439
7777 Weston Road
Vaughan, ON L4L 0G9

www.telecon.ca

-----Original Message-----
From: Bell Solutions <BellSolutions@topshelfsolutions.ca>
Sent: Sunday, September 1, 2019 5:55 PM
To: MOC (Bell) <bell.moc@Telecon.ca>
Subject: PLANNING Request 2019360300

BELL CANADA 360 NETWORKS/GROUP TELECOM

Station Code: BCPRE Start Date: 2019-09-01 5:52:00 PM

Ticket Type: NORMAL Priority: PLANNING
Request No: 2019360300 Prev. Request:
Excav. Name: WOOD Phone: (416)-357-2093 ext.
Caller: JIM ENOS Fax:

Cell: Pager:
Alternate Contact:
Alt. Phone: (905)-335-2353 ext.3049 Callback: 9AM - 5PM
Excav. Address:

Excav. Street: 3450 HARVESTER RD
Excav. City: BURLINGTON
Excav. Zip/Postal Code:
Civic No. From:  
Civic No. To:  
Street: HIGHWAY 8  
Intersect. 1: GLOVER RD  
Intersect. 2: FRUITLAND RD  
City: HAMILTON  
County/Neighb./Quarter: HAMILTON-WENTWO  
State:  
Excav. Email: aniqa.shams@woodplc.com  
Excav. Doing Work:  
Type of Work: DESIGN AND PLANNING  
Plant Type: TO BE DETERMINED  
Work Date: 2019-09-10  
Meeting Date: 2019-09-03 1:00:00 AM  
Area Marked:  
Depth: 0  
Length: 0  
Orientation: Width: 0  
Remarks:  
LOT/UNIT#: NB OF SEGMENTS: 6  
LATITUDE: 43.21722050  
LONGITUDE: -79.69670850  
DEPTH UNKNOWN: DEPTH: 0.00 FT  
HW01 PVS FOR HAMILTON WEN  
CPVS2 -C  MULTIVIEW FOR COGECO  
HHP1PRE HORIZON UTILITIES PR  
BCPRE BELL CANADA  
- PLANNI UGPHAM G-TEL FOR UNION GAS  
HHP3 CRAMM FOR STREET LTG  
CH01 -C  CITY OF HAMILTON TRA  
ROGHN01 PVS FOR ROGERS (ROGHNO1)  
Add Loc Info:  
WINOON09 CORLOT=U  
PLANNING STAGE OF ROAD CONSTRUCTION.  
Utility Remarks:  
Add Dig Info:  
PUBLIC PROPERTY: NO  
MARK & FAX: NO  
AREA IS NOT MARKED: NO  
MACHINE DIG: NO  
PRIVATE PROPERTY: NO  
SITE MEET REQ.: NO  
PREMARKED: NO  
HAND DIG: NO  
DIRECTIONAL DRILLING: NO
Good morning Joe

We are working with Margaret Fazio and her team.

We trust that this is helpful.

Thank you

Jim Enos, CET
Senior Technologist, Land Development
905-335-2353  ex. 3049
www.woodplc.com

Hello

Who at the City of Hamilton are you doing work for?

Thanks

Regards,

Joe Scarcelli
Project Manager, Special Utilities Program
Geomatics & Corridor Management
Hello all,

The Fruitland Winona Block 1 Development Group has initiated a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) related to the creation of a new north-south collector road between Barton Street and Highway 8 (See Key Plan attached).

Wood is leading the study on behalf of the Fruitland Winona Block 1 Development Group and requests your assistance with definition of existing and proposed utility infrastructure within the study area limits.

To assist with evaluation of alternatives, and subsequent definition of preferred alignments, we are requesting details related to existing and/or proposed utility infrastructure within the study limits. This information will be used to ensure that any impacts to utility infrastructure is clearly identified and considered during the assessment process. Of critical importance is identification of vital or trunk mains/services. In this regard, could you kindly provide the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If you <strong>DO NOT</strong> have facilities within the study area:</th>
<th>Kindly respond to this email, <strong>EXPLICITLY</strong> stating that your utility/organization <strong>does not</strong> have facilities within the study area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you <strong>DO</strong> have facilities within the study area:</td>
<td>Kindly provide us with details regarding location, size and type of facilities in one or more of the following formats:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mark-ups on the attached basemapping;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AutoCAD, MicroStation or GIS drawings (preferred); or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Digital copies of facility design drawings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you <strong>PLAN TO</strong> have facilities, or are modifying existing facilities within the study area:</td>
<td>Kindly provide us with details regarding proposed location, sizing and type of facilities in one or more the following formats:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mark-ups on the attached basemapping;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AutoCAD, MicroStation or GIS drawings (preferred); or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Digital copies of facility design drawings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please be sure to indicate that these are for future installations and, if known, provide timelines for implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please do not hesitate to contact us should you require additional information and/or file formats to work with. Your involvement with this study is greatly appreciated, and we will assist in any way possible.

Best regards,
Aniqa

Aniqa Shams, B.E.S. LEED Green Associate
Junior Environmental Planner
160 Traders Blvd E., Suite 110
Mississauga, ON L4Z 3K7
Office: +1 (905) 568-2929 ext. 4149
Good morning Aniqa,

In regards to this request, Cogeco is 100% aerial within the boundaries of your request, either on BELL or hydro poles. Any questions or concerns, please let me know.

---------- Forwarded message----------
From: Jordan Poole <jordan.poole@cogeco.com>
Date: Tue, Sep 3, 2019 at 11:13 AM
Subject: Fwd: Gordon Dean Municipal Class EA: Utilities Locate - ACTION NEEDED
To: John Kerchner <john.kerchner@cogeco.com>, Mike Coombe <mike.coombe@cogeco.com>

Hi John, Mike,

Please see the attached request for info from the City's consultant on a planned new road construction connecting Barton St & Hwy 8 near Fruitland Rd.

Thanks

JORDAN POOLE
Network Planner - Permit Design
T: 905 407 7554
jordan.poole@cogeco.com

7170 McLeod Rd
Niagara Falls
L2G 3H2
Canada
cogeco.ca

---------- Forwarded message----------
From: Shams, Aniqa <aniqa.shams@woodplc.com>
Date: Sun, Sep 1, 2019 at 5:05 PM
Subject: Gordon Dean Municipal Class EA: Utilities Locate - ACTION NEEDED
To: angelocutaia@ac3group.ca <angelocutaia@ac3group.ca>, Enos, Jim <jim.enos@woodplc.com>, King, Maria E <maria.e.king@woodplc.com>
Hello all,

The Fruitland Winona Block 1 Development Group has initiated a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) related to the creation of a new north-south collector road between Barton Street and Highway 8 (See Key Plan attached).

Wood is leading the study on behalf of the Fruitland Winona Block 1 Development Group and requests your assistance with definition of existing and proposed utility infrastructure within the study area limits.

To assist with evaluation of alternatives, and subsequent definition of preferred alignments, we are requesting details related to existing and/or proposed utility infrastructure within the study limits. This information will be used to ensure that any impacts to utility infrastructure is clearly identified and considered during the assessment process. Of critical importance is identification of vital or trunk mains/services. In this regard, could you kindly provide the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If you <strong>DO NOT</strong> have facilities within the study area:</th>
<th>Kindly respond to this email, <strong>EXPLICITLY</strong> stating that your utility/organization <strong>does not</strong> have facilities within the study area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you <strong>DO</strong> have facilities within the study area:</td>
<td>Kindly provide us with details regarding location, size and type of facilities in one or more of the following formats:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mark-ups on the attached basemapping;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AutoCAD, MicroStation or GIS drawings (preferred); or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Digital copies of facility design drawings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you <strong>PLAN TO</strong> have facilities, or are modifying existing facilities within the study area:</td>
<td>Kindly provide us with details regarding proposed location, sizing and type of facilities in one or more the following formats:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mark-ups on the attached basemapping;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AutoCAD, MicroStation or GIS drawings (preferred); or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Digital copies of facility design drawings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please be sure to indicate that these are for future installations and, if known, provide timelines for implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please do not hesitate to contact us should you require additional information and/or file formats to work with. Your involvement with this study is greatly appreciated, and we will assist in any way possible.

Best regards,

Aniqa

---

**Aniqa Shams, B.E.S. LEED Green Associate**

Junior Environmental Planner

160 Traders Blvd E., Suite 110

Mississauga, ON L4Z 3K7

Office: +1 (905) 568-2929 ext. 4149

Mobile: (416) 357-2093

[www.woodplc.com](http://www.woodplc.com)
Here is the locate you have requested, for RequestNumber:2019360300

Please send all inquiries regarding your locate to: customerservice@gtel.ca (include your request number).

GTEL Engineering
Hi Aniqa,

Not sure if this will impact your project. Rogers is all clear within the study area (Block 1). At the intersection of Fruitland & Sherwood Park Drive we have a underground road cross from Fruitland to Sherwood.

Thanks,
Dan

---

From: Shams, Aniqa [mailto:aniqa.shams@woodplc.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 01, 2019 5:05 PM
Cc: angelocutaia@ac3group.ca; Enos, Jim <jim.enos@woodplc.com>; King, Maria E <maria.e.king@woodplc.com>
Subject: Gordon Dean Municipal Class EA: Utilities Locate - ACTION NEEDED

Hello all,

The Fruitland Winona Block 1 Development Group has initiated a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) related to the creation of a new north-south collector road between Barton Street and Highway 8 (See Key Plan attached).

Wood is leading the study on behalf of the Fruitland Winona Block 1 Development Group and requests your assistance with definition of existing and proposed utility infrastructure within the study area limits.

To assist with evaluation of alternatives, and subsequent definition of preferred alignments, we are requesting details related to existing and/or proposed utility infrastructure within the study limits. This information will be used to ensure that any impacts to utility infrastructure is clearly identified and considered during the assessment process. Of critical importance is identification of vital or trunk mains/services. In this regard, could you kindly provide the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If you <strong>DO NOT</strong> have facilities within the study area:</th>
<th>Kindly respond to this email, <strong>EXPLICITLY</strong> stating that your utility/organization does not have facilities within the study area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you <strong>DO</strong> have facilities within the study area:</td>
<td>Kindly provide us with details regarding location, size and type of facilities in one or more of the following formats:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mark-ups on the attached basemapping;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AutoCAD, MicroStation or GIS drawings (preferred); or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Digital copies of facility design drawings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you **PLAN TO** have facilities, or are modifying existing facilities within the study area:

Kindly provide us with details regarding proposed location, sizing and type of facilities in one or more the following formats:

- Mark-ups on the attached basemapping;
- AutoCAD, MicroStation or GIS drawings (preferred); or
- Digital copies of facility design drawings.

Please be sure to indicate that these are for future installations and, if known, provide timelines for implementation.

Please do not hesitate to contact us should you require additional information and/or file formats to work with. Your involvement with this study is greatly appreciated, and we will assist in any way possible.

Best regards,
Aniqa

---

**Aniqa Shams, B.E.S. LEED Green Associate**
Junior Environmental Planner
160 Traders Blvd E., Suite 110
Mississauga, ON L4Z 3K7
Office:  +1 (905) 568-2929 ext. 4149
Mobile: (416) 357-2093
www.woodplc.com

---

This message is the property of John Wood Group PLC and/or its subsidiaries and/or affiliates and is intended only for the named recipient(s). Its contents (including any attachments) may be confidential, legally privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure by law. Unauthorized use, copying, distribution or disclosure of any of it may be unlawful and is strictly prohibited. We assume no responsibility to persons other than the intended named recipient(s) and do not accept liability for any errors or omissions which are a result of email transmission. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply email to the sender and confirm that the original message and any attachments and copies have been destroyed and deleted from your system.

If you do not wish to receive future unsolicited commercial electronic messages from us, please forward this email to: unsubscribe@woodplc.com and include “Unsubscribe” in the subject line. If applicable, you will continue to receive invoices, project communications and similar factual, non-commercial electronic communications.

Please click http://www.woodplc.com/email-disclaimer for notices and company information in relation to emails originating in the UK, Italy or France.
Rogers Communications has reviewed your drawing(s) as requested and returns one marked-up copy. Our comments follow below with an "X" indicating Rogers' stance on your proposed plan.

### Comments:

- **No Conflict**
  - Rogers Communications currently does not possess existing plant in the area indicated on your attached plans.

- **No Conflict**
  - Rogers Communications currently has existing plant as marked on your drawing. Our standard depth in this municipality is 1m. Please ensure you maintain clearances of 0.3m vertically and 0.6m horizontally.

- **EXTREME CAUTION**
  - Use vactruck and expose ducts, maintain minimum of 0.6m clearance.

- **CONFLICT**
  - Your proposed construction appears to encroach within existing Rogers Communications plant. Please relocate your proposed construction to allow adequate clearance of 0.3 m vertically and 1 m horizontally.

- **CAUTION**
  - Rogers Communications has aerial plant in this area, as it is indicated on the attached plans.

- **CAUTION**
  - Fiber Optic Cable is present in the area of your proposed construction.

- **Note**
  - Proposed Fiber Optic Cable in a joint use duct structure.

- **Note**
  - Plant currently under construction.

- **Note**
  - Please inform Rogers Communications well in advance of the proposed construction schedule in order to coordinate our plant relocation.

- **Note**
  - Locates are still required. Call for locates at 1-800-738-7893

- **Note**
  - Hand dig when crossing, or within 1.0m of existing Rogers plant.

- **Note**
  - Plant is to Approximation.

---

Deepak Dayalani  
CAD Technician  
289-657-8160  

September 20, 2019  
DATE
Morning, As Source Cable we do not have any plant in the area nor do we need any.

Thanks

Carl Rossignoli
Manager Field Operations

Rogers Hamilton/Source Cable
1090 Upper Wellington St.
Hamilton, ON L9A 3S6

carl.rossignoli@rci.rogers.com
o 905-574-6464 x251  m 905-981-0792

Hello all,

The Fruitland Winona Block 1 Development Group has initiated a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) related to the creation of a new north-south collector road between Barton Street and Highway 8 (See Key Plan attached).

Wood is leading the study on behalf of the Fruitland Winona Block 1 Development Group and requests your assistance with definition of existing and proposed utility infrastructure within the study area limits.

To assist with evaluation of alternatives, and subsequent definition of preferred alignments, we are requesting details related to existing and/or proposed utility infrastructure within the study limits. This information will be used to ensure that any impacts to utility infrastructure is clearly identified and considered during the assessment process. Of critical importance is identification of vital or trunk mains/services. In this regard, could you kindly provide the following:

| If you **DO NOT** have facilities within the study area: | Kindly respond to this email, **EXPLICITLY** stating that your utility/organization does not have facilities within the study area. |
If you **DO** have facilities within the study area: Kindly provide us with details regarding location, size and type of facilities in one or more of the following formats:

- Mark-ups on the attached basemapping;
- AutoCAD, MicroStation or GIS drawings (preferred); or
- Digital copies of facility design drawings.

If you **PLAN TO** have facilities, or are modifying existing facilities within the study area: Kindly provide us with details regarding proposed location, sizing and type of facilities in one or more the following formats:

- Mark-ups on the attached basemapping;
- AutoCAD, MicroStation or GIS drawings (preferred); or
- Digital copies of facility design drawings.

Please be sure to indicate that these are for future installations and, if known, provide timelines for implementation.

Please do not hesitate to contact us should you require additional information and/or file formats to work with. Your involvement with this study is greatly appreciated, and we will assist in any way possible.

Best regards,

Aniqa

**Aniqa Shams, B.E.S. LEED Green Associate**  
Junior Environmental Planner  
160 Traders Blvd E., Suite 110  
Mississauga, ON L4Z 3K7  
Office: +1 (905) 568-2929 ext. 4149  
Mobile: (416) 357-2093  
[www.woodplc.com](http://www.woodplc.com)

---

This message is the property of John Wood Group PLC and/or its subsidiaries and/or affiliates and is intended only for the named recipient(s). Its contents (including any attachments) may be confidential, legally privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure by law. Unauthorized use, copying, distribution or disclosure of any of it may be unlawful and is strictly prohibited. We assume no responsibility to persons other than the intended named recipient(s) and do not accept liability for any errors or omissions which are a result of email transmission. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply email to the sender and confirm that the original message and any attachments and copies have been destroyed and deleted from your system.

If you do not wish to receive future unsolicited commercial electronic messages from us, please forward this email to: unsubscribe@woodplc.com and include “Unsubscribe” in the subject line. If applicable, you will continue to receive invoices, project communications and similar factual, non-commercial electronic communications.
Here is the locate you have requested, for RequestNumber:2019360300

PVS Locators
APPLICATION FOR PLANT LOCATION AND CONSENT

Applicant: Wood
Mark Up #: 79571
Applicant Ref #: 2019360300
Location: Hwy 8 from Glover Rd to Fruitland Rd
Switching Center/NNX: Winona/ 643
Date Received from Applicant: 2019-09-03
Marked By: PHONG NGUYEN

APPLICATION FOR PLANT LOCATION AND REQUEST

✓ Existing and/or proposed Bell Canada underground plant are indicated on the attached plan

☐ Our records show no existing and / or proposed underground plant within 2m of your proposed installation

☐ Conflict indicated

☐ Meets with our approval

✓ Not for PUCC approval - Mark up only

☐ If within 1 meter of Bell plant, hand dig

REMARKS: Call for locates 1.800.400.2255. Tie-in measurements are a guideline only and physical verification may be required by applicant to determine the true separation between plants. Maintain clearance of 0.6m. Hand dig when crossing Bell plant.

PROCEDURES TO FOLLOW:

1. Request locates prior to construction 1-800-400-2255
2. If exact location and depth are critical - test pits are recommended
3. Bell Canada plant location information is approximate
4. If the location of your proposed design changes, it will be necessary to re-apply
5. Permits expire six (6) months from approval date

Signature: PHONG NGUYEN
Date: October 1, 2019
NOTICE OF INTENT TO EXCAVATE

Ticket No: 2019360300 Seq. No: 3
Update of:

Send To: HHP3 Seq No: 0003 Map Ref: 905 643

Original Call Date: 09/01/2019 Time: 05:52:02 PM OP: 1889
Transmit Date: 09/01/2019 Time: 05:52:02 PM
Work to Begin Date: 09/10/2019 Time: 12:00:00 AM

Company: Wood
Contact Name: Jim Eнос
Alternate Contact:
Best Time to Call: 9am - 5pm
Cell Phone:
Caller Address: 3450 Harvester RD
Burlington, ON L7N 3W5
Email Address: aniga.shams@woodplc.com

Reg/County: HAMILTON-WENTWO City: HAMILTON
Address: , HIGHWAY 8
Lot/Unit#: 
To Address: 
Nearest Intersecting Street: GLOVER RD
2nd Intersecting Street: FRUITLAND RD
Community: STONEY CREEK
Nb of Segments: 6
WAP No: 1079743
Latitude: 43.21722050 Longitude: -79.69670850

Work Extent/Locn: CORLOT=U Planning stage of road construction.

Remarks: DEPTH UNKNOWN

Type of Work: DESIGN AND PLANNING Depth: 0.00 FT
Public property: NO Mark & Fax: NO Area is Not Marked: NO Machine Dig: NO
Private property: NO Site Meet Req.: NO Premarked: NO Hand Dig: NO
Directional Drilling: NO

Work Being Done For:

Sending to: (listing of utilities tkt sent to)
HW01 FVS FOR HAMILTON WEN
HHP1PRE HORIZON UTILITIES PR
UGPHAM G-TEL FOR UNION GAS
CH01 -C CITY OF HAMILTON TRA
Note: -C = Cleared, -S = Supressed, -L = Lookup center cleared, -A = Alternate Locate
-R = Existing locate valid - maintain marks

CLEAR FOR STREET LIGHT WIRES
FOR CITY OF HAMILTON (HHP3)
VALID 30 DAYS FROM WTB DATE
Hi,

Please find attached completed markup request.

*** Please use “REGEN” command for proper line style ***

Thank you.

Regards,

Deepak Dayalani

CAD Technician, Engineering - Central Canada
Technicien CAO, Ingénierie - Centre du Canada

T 289-657-8160
7777 Weston Rd, Woodbridge (Ontario) L4L 0G9

telecon.ca

-----Original Message-----
From: Solutions@on1call.com <Solutions@on1call.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 01, 2019 5:52 PM
To: Rogers.MOC <Rogers.MOC@telecon.ca>
Subject: Request 2019360300

[1]

ONTARIO ONE CALL
NOTICE OF INTENT TO EXCAVATE  Header Code:PLANNING
Ticket No: 2019360300 Seq. No: 949
Update of:

Send To: ROGHN01  Seq No: 0949  Map Ref: 905 643-L8E

Original Call Date:  09/01/2019  Time:  05:52:02 PM  OP: 1889
Transmit Date:  09/01/2019  Time:  05:52:02 PM
Work to Begin Date:  09/10/2019  Time:  12:00:00 AM

Company:  Wood
Contact Name: Jim Enos          Contact Phone: (416)357-2093
Alternate Contact:            Altern. Phone: (905)335-2353 Ext: 3049
Best Time to Call: 9am - 5pm            Fax No:
Cell Phone:                   Pager No:
Caller Address: 3450 Harvester RD  
                      Burlington, ON L7N 3W5
Email Address: aniqa.shams@woodplc.com

Reg/County: HAMILTON-WENTWO City: HAMILTON
Address:         , HIGHWAY 8
Lot/Unit#:
To Address:
Nearest Intersecting Street: GLOVER RD
2nd Intersecting Street:     FRUITLAND RD
Community: STONEY CREEK
Nb of Segments: 6
WAP No: 1079743
Latitude: 43.21722050     Longitude: -79.69670850

Work Extent/Locn: CORLOT=U Planning stage of road construction.

Remarks: DEPTH UNKNOWN

Type of Work: DESIGN AND PLANNING         Depth: 0.00 FT
Public property:  NO  Mark & Fax:   NO  Area is Not Marked: NO  Machine Dig: NO
Private property: NO  Site Meet Req.: NO  Premarked:  NO  Hand Dig:  NO
Directional Drilling: NO

Work Being Done For:

Sending to: (listing of utilities tkt sent to)
HW01         PVS FOR HAMILTON WEN    CPVS2    -C  MULTIVIEW FOR COGECO
HHP1PRE      HORIZON UTILITIES PR    BCPRE    BELL CANADA - PLANNI
UGPHAM       G-TEL FOR UNION GAS     HHP3      CRAMM FOR STREET LTG
CH01     -C  CITY OF HAMILTON TRA    ROGHN01    PVS FOR ROGERS (ROGH
Note: -C = Cleared,  -S = Supressed,  -L = Lookup center cleared, -A = Alternate Locate  
-R = Existing locate valid - maintain marks
Yes, we needed to know if there was any underground alectra works outside of the Public Road Allowance that would be with the private lands surrounded by the 4 public roads.

You have just confirmed that there are not, thank you.

Jim Enos, CET
Senior Technologist, Land Development
905-335-2353  ex. 3049
www.woodplc.com

Good afternoon Jim,

Not in agreement with what you have stated below.

I have gone back to our Engineering group and we are confirming that we have infrastructure in the surrounding area that was identified by Aniqa, but nothing inside the study area.

Sorry for the confusion.

Regards,

Vicky Khamar
Good afternoon Vicky

Thank you for calls to clarify.

As we now understand things, you left a voice message to me saying the Alectra Utilities has underground plant within the block of land surrounded by Fruitland Road on the west, Jones Road on the east, Hwy 8 on the south and Barton Street on the north. There do not seem to be any easements in this block of land reflecting this.

Please provide us with the NDA agreement form to be executed and I will place it on the right hands.

Time is of the essence.

Thank you

Jim Enos, CET
Senior Technologist, Land Development
905-335-2353 ex. 3049
www.woodplc.com
Hi Dusan,

Yes, please provide any utilities located on Fruitland Rd, Barton St, Highway 8 and Jones Road. I apologize, I provided the incorrect road last time. Our study does not extend to Glover Road. We will also need to know of any existing utility easements within Block 1. Please see the key plan attached to the previous email for Block 1 and specifically where the study area is located.

Thanks,
Aniqa
Hello all,

The Fruitland Winona Block 1 Development Group has initiated a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) related to the creation of a new north-south collector road between Barton Street and Highway 8 (See Key Plan attached).

Wood is leading the study on behalf of the Fruitland Winona Block 1 Development Group and requests your assistance with definition of existing and proposed utility infrastructure within the study area limits.

To assist with evaluation of alternatives, and subsequent definition of preferred alignments, we are requesting details related to existing and/or proposed utility infrastructure within the study limits. This information will be used to ensure that any impacts to utility infrastructure is clearly identified and considered during the assessment process. Of critical importance is identification of vital or trunk mains/services. In this regard, could you kindly provide the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If you DO NOT have facilities within the study area:</th>
<th>Kindly respond to this email, EXPLICITLY stating that your utility/organization does not have facilities within the study area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you DO have facilities within the study area:</td>
<td>Kindly provide us with details regarding location, size and type of facilities in one or more of the following formats:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mark-ups on the attached basemapping;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AutoCAD, MicroStation or GIS drawings (preferred); or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Digital copies of facility design drawings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you PLAN TO have facilities, or are modifying</td>
<td>Kindly provide us with details regarding proposed location, sizing and type of facilities in one or more the following formats:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>existing facilities within the study area:</td>
<td>• Mark-ups on the attached basemapping;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AutoCAD, MicroStation or GIS drawings (preferred); or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Digital copies of facility design drawings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please be sure to indicate that these are for future installations and, if known, provide timelines for implementation.

Please do not hesitate to contact us should you require additional information and/or file formats to work with. Your involvement with this study is greatly appreciated, and we will assist in any way possible.

Best regards,
Aniqa

Aniqa Shams, B.E.S. LEED Green Associate
Junior Environmental Planner
160 Traders Blvd E., Suite 110
Mississauga, ON L4Z 3K7
Office:  +1 (905) 568-2929 ext. 4149
Mobile:      (416) 357-2093
www.woodplc.com

This message is the property of John Wood Group PLC and/or its subsidiaries and/or affiliates and is intended only for the named recipient(s). Its contents (including any attachments) may be confidential, legally privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure by law. Unauthorized use, copying, distribution or disclosure of any of it may be unlawful and is strictly prohibited. We assume no responsibility to persons other than the intended named recipient(s) and do not accept liability for any errors or omissions which are a result of email transmission. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply email to the sender and confirm that the original message and any attachments and copies have been destroyed and deleted from your system.

If you do not wish to receive future unsolicited commercial electronic messages from us, please forward this email to: unsubscribe@woodplc.com and include “Unsubscribe” in the subject line. If applicable, you will continue to receive invoices, project communications and similar factual, non-commercial electronic communications.

Please click http://www.woodplc.com/email-disclaimer for notices and company information in relation to emails originating in the UK, Italy or France.

As a recipient of an email from a John Wood Group Plc company, your contact information will be on our systems and we may hold other personal data about you such as identification information, CVs, financial information and information contained in correspondence. For more information on our privacy practices and your data protection rights, please see our privacy notice at https://www.woodplc.com/policies/privacy-notice
Good afternoon

Zayo has no existing plant in the area indicated in your submission. No markup and no objection. Thank you.

Utility Circulations
Caroline Rysyk

On Sun, 1 Sep 2019 at 17:05, Shams, Aniqa <aniqa.shams@woodplc.com> wrote:

Hello all,

The Fruitland Winona Block 1 Development Group has initiated a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) related to the creation of a new north-south collector road between Barton Street and Highway 8 (See Key Plan attached).

Wood is leading the study on behalf of the Fruitland Winona Block 1 Development Group and requests your assistance with definition of existing and proposed utility infrastructure within the study area limits.

To assist with evaluation of alternatives, and subsequent definition of preferred alignments, we are requesting details related to existing and/or proposed utility infrastructure within the study limits. This information will be used to ensure that any impacts to utility infrastructure is clearly identified and considered during the assessment process. Of critical importance is identification of vital or trunk mains/services. In this regard, could you kindly provide the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If you <strong>DO NOT</strong> have facilities within the study area:</th>
<th>Kindly respond to this email, <strong>EXPLICITLY</strong> stating that your utility/organization <strong>does not</strong> have facilities within the study area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you <strong>DO</strong> have facilities within the study area:</td>
<td>Kindly provide us with details regarding location, size and type of facilities in one or more of the following formats:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mark-ups on the attached basemapping;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AutoCAD, MicroStation or GIS drawings (preferred); or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Digital copies of facility design drawings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you <strong>PLAN TO</strong> have facilities, or are modifying existing facilities within the study area:</td>
<td>Kindly provide us with details regarding proposed location, sizing and type of facilities in one or more the following formats:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mark-ups on the attached basemapping;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AutoCAD, MicroStation or GIS drawings (preferred); or</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please do not hesitate to contact us should you require additional information and/or file formats to work with. Your involvement with this study is greatly appreciated, and we will assist in any way possible.

Best regards,
Aniqa

Aniqa Shams, B.E.S. LEED Green Associate
Junior Environmental Planner
160 Traders Blvd E., Suite 110
Mississauga, ON L4Z 3K7
Office: +1 (905) 568-2929 ext. 4149
Mobile: (416) 357-2093

www.woodplc.com

This message is the property of John Wood Group PLC and/or its subsidiaries and/or affiliates and is intended only for the named recipient(s). Its contents (including any attachments) may be confidential, legally privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure by law. Unauthorized use, copying, distribution or disclosure of any of it may be unlawful and is strictly prohibited. We assume no responsibility to persons other than the intended named recipient(s) and do not accept liability for any errors or omissions which are a result of email transmission. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by reply email to the sender and confirm that the original message and any attachments and copies have been destroyed and deleted from your system.

If you do not wish to receive future unsolicited commercial electronic messages from us, please forward this email to: unsubscribe@woodplc.com and include “Unsubscribe” in the subject line. If applicable, you will continue to receive invoices, project communications and similar factual, non-commercial electronic communications.

Please click http://www.woodplc.com/email-disclaimer for notices and company information in relation to emails
No worries, Mike. We are currently preparing the ESR and will provide to HCA for review in near future.

Sincerely,

Mir

---

Mir Ahsan Talpur, M.Env.Sc., EP
Environmental Planner
E: mir.talpur@woodplc.com
M: +1 (647) 545 8974
D: +1 (905) 335 2353 (Ext. 3069)
www.woodplc.com

---

Hello Mir,

Thank you for your email. My apologies for not responding sooner. I managed to lose track of this.

At this stage, if the ESR is nearing completion perhaps we don’t need the virtual meeting. HCA can review the ESR once submitted and provide comments at that time.

However, I would be happy to discuss further if you have specific questions for HCA at this stage.

Kind regards,

Mike
From: Talpur, Mir <mir.talpur@woodplc.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 23, 2020 4:59 PM
To: Stone, Mike <Mike.Stone@conservationhamilton.ca>
Cc: Enos, Jim <jim.enos@woodplc.com>; Torchia, Melissa <melissa.torchia@woodplc.com>; Dibbley, Roxanne <roxanne.dibbley@woodplc.com>; Shams, Aniqa <aniqa.shams@woodplc.com>; Jim Dougan <jdougan@dougan.ca>; Ian Richards <irichards@dougan.ca>
Subject: Gordon Dean Avenue MCEA Phase 3 & 4 - Meeting with Hamilton Conservation Authority

Dear Mike,

I hope this email finds you well. I am contacting you regarding the Municipal Class Environment Assessment (EA) (Schedule ‘C’) Phase 3 & 4 for Gordon Dean Avenue. You were previously contacted about this project to attend its Technical Agency Meeting, but it appears that you weren’t able to attend that meeting.

As you may be aware that, Fruitland – Winona Development Group (proponent) is carrying out Municipal Class EA Study for this project. A Public Information Centre was held on October 17, 2019, where the Preliminary Preferred Alternative was presented to the public. The Preliminary Preferred Alternative includes a north-south alignment of the Gordon Dean Avenue from Barton Street to Highway 8; and an east-west alignment from Fruitland Road to the future Gordon Dean Avenue. For more information about the project, please refer to display panels for the PIC available on City of Hamilton’s website: https://www.hamilton.ca/city-planning/master-plans-class-eas/block-servicing-strategies-stoney-creek-and-gordon-dean-class

The purpose of this email is to request a virtual meeting (via MS Teams) with Hamilton Conservation Authority to provide an update on the project, and obtain feedback for consideration into the ESR and implementation phase, as appropriate. Please provide a few time slots and dates that work for you, and I will coordinate with our team members. Thanks

Sincerely,

Mir

Mir Ahsan Talpur, M.Env.Sc., EP
Environmental Planner
E: mir.talpur@woodplc.com
M: +1 (647) 545 8974
D: +1 (905) 335 2353 (Ext. 3069)
Good Afternoon,

You are invited to the **Technical Agency Meeting** for the Municipal Class Environment Assessment (EA) (Schedule ‘C’) Phase 3 & 4 for **Gordon Dean Avenue**. The Fruitland – Winona Development Group is considering a number of design alternatives for the new north-south road (Gordon Dean Avenue). The study is being conducted in accordance with the requirements for a Municipal Class EA, which is approved under the **Ontario Environmental Assessment Act**.
The purpose of the meeting is to present the preferred alternative for Gordon Dean Avenue and to discuss the study background, results of the technical studies completed, road design alternatives evaluation, the preliminary recommended design and the upcoming Public Information Centre (PIC). You may express any design or environmental issues that your Agency may have during this meeting.

The agency meeting will be held at:

Date: **October 10th, 2019**

Location: **Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions**

3450 Harvester Road, Suite 100
Burlington L7N 3W5
Redhill Boardroom

Time: **10:30 p.m. to 11:30 p.m.**

Please find attached the agenda for this meeting. Feel free to forward this meeting invite to staff within your organization. Kindly acknowledge either your or other staff attendance by October 9th, 2019.

I have also attached the Notice of PIC to this email. This notice will be distributed early next week. If you have any questions prior to the meeting, please feel free to contact me at the number listed below.

**Call-in Information:**

**Join Skype Meeting**
Trouble Joining? Try Skype Web App

**Join by phone**

Toll-free number: +1 (888) 304-2647,,387572428# (Dial-in Number)  English (United States)
Toll number: +1 (647) 749-7026,,387572428# (Dial-in Number)  English (United States)

Find a local number

Conference ID: 387572428

Forgot your dial-in PIN?  |  Help

---

Regards,
Aniqa

Aniqa Shams, B.E.S. LEED Green Associate
Junior Environmental Planner
160 Traders Blvd E., Suite 110
Mississauga, ON L4Z 3K7
Office: +1 (905) 568-2929 ext. 4149
Mobile: (416) 357-2093
www.woodplc.com
Gordon Dean Ave. Evaluation Memo - City of Hamilton Comment Summary and Wood Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>City of Hamilton: Received – June 10, 2019</th>
<th>Wood’s Response: Sent - August 12, 2019</th>
<th>City of Hamilton: Received – September 6 and 16, 2019</th>
<th>Wood’s Final Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not enough detail provided regarding property impact evaluations/cost</td>
<td>The Project Team has reevaluated all options, taking into consideration the impact on property, specifically the impact on the former Alecra land.</td>
<td>Business Impacts: Please see comment Number 5. The alternative where the east-west road was meandered, and north-south corridor could be adjusted to fit in with the Secondary Plan proposed layout around Alecra Lands is missing – Alternative 1b. Why?</td>
<td>Alternative 1b was eliminated due to discussions held with the City and the Project Team in 2018 regarding the design of the intersection. The roundabout alternative was dismissed and concerns over the angle of intersection was raised. As such, due to safety concerns, Wood has removed Alternative 1b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gordon Dean Ave. Cross Section(s) need to be updated and shown provided. Given that the City of Hamilton has now declared a Climate Change state of Emergency, we would like to request options/direction for sustainable materials use, such as LED lighting, LID considerations, in the final project recommendations.</td>
<td>The Gordon Dean Ave. Cross Sections will be updated and provided. The preliminary design and the ESR will provide further detail regarding any climate change measures and practices. The current criterion is similar to the one used to evaluate the alternatives for the Barton St. EA.</td>
<td>The Purpose of Phase 3 EA process is not just to place alternative locations of the roadway, but to propose and evaluate alternative functional designs of the roadway. Cross Sections and alternatives, interim and long term solutions should be shown and evaluated for this EA requirements. This is missing entirely from the Tech Memo.</td>
<td>Cross-sections and functional design details are provided in the final ESR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Please provide more details/explanation regarding the basis for the angle of where the various options impact various lands. This was in part asked for during the May 22, 2019 meeting, impacts versus no impacts on all lands, including Alecra lands, which are a departure from the Secondary Plan, etc.</td>
<td>Wood has reassessed the impacts to existing land uses, especially as it relates to the former Alecra lands.</td>
<td>The wording of “Without prejudice” will be removed in the next set of drawings since they don’t apply here.</td>
<td>The wording has been removed from the final version.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>RE: East-West Collector corridor was set by the Secondary Plan Background/justification for variance on the Secondary Plan approved layout needs to be itemized in the EA analysis. City staff don’t believe that the variance proposed in the provided drawings is a big departure from the Secondary Plan, but a written justification should be provided in the EA drawings/evaluation process. This detail in justification - i.e. more equitable impacts on landowners’ lands, we suggest to be documented in the EA evaluation as a differential between straight versus bent option. It seems from our discussions, that the more equitable version would be more beneficial to all concerned, so this should transparent in the documentation.</td>
<td>Wood has reassessed the impacts to existing land uses, especially as it relates to the former Alecra lands. Wood also added a criterion, ‘Conforms to Secondary Plan’ to compare and contrast those alternatives who do (and do not) comply with the Secondary Plan.</td>
<td>Summery has a sentence which reads: “This portion of lands was previously anticipated within the Approved Fruitland-Winona Secondary Plan” – What is meant by this statement? An explanation is needed.</td>
<td>The sentence will be reworded to provide further clarification – “The displacement of this portion of lands was previously accounted for within the Approved Fruitland-Winona Secondary Plan.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>There are no alternatives shown which follow the Secondary Plan, as it intended to have Gordon Dean Ave. link to Highway 8 abutting Alecra lands, not impacting them in any way. We would ultimately like to see the range of alternatives and/or seeing a written justification as to why another alternative without impacts to Alecra lands were not included in this analysis. If there is another piece of information not discussed/understood by staff, please also include this in the amended evaluation.</td>
<td>Alignments have been updated to include an option that follows the Secondary Plan.</td>
<td>General evaluation of each criterion per alternative is not substantiated FOR each alternative separately – in all categories, but rather given as a range. This makes the evaluation process NOT transparent and needs to be amended before going before the public/staff can support it.</td>
<td>A thorough evaluation of each alternative was completed based on various criteria. Ranges are provided in areas where there are no differences between each alternative. Further detail is provided in the ESR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>We do not see the previous alternatives being included/discussed within the Memo. We believe that this work should still be considered both at the coming PIC and in the EAR, to illustrate how the study moved from the last PIC to the new alternatives - in the new PIC as well as in the ESR document. Given the amount of detail missing from the Memo, City staff are not certain that the intended June 13, 2019 PIC date is achievable.</td>
<td>The memo associated with the evaluation table will be updated to include a review of the Phase 1 and 2 alternatives. A summary of the discussions with the City and the justification will be included.</td>
<td>The Alternative presented with the previous set of drawings proposed Alternative 1b. Why was it now excluded from the evaluation? See Item #1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Natural Heritage**

| 9 | Natural Heritage Impacts - no detail has been provided to substantiate equal claim to all alternatives. | See responses to comments 6 to 16 below. Furthermore, the updated Evaluation Matrix will provide full details to support the revised ranking of alternatives from an environmental perspective. | Watercourse 5 & 5 EA document was never filed with the approving Ministry, therefore has no legal standing and should not be relied upon for information – please see our All references to Watercourse 5 & 6 EA will be removed. |
| 10 | Species at Risk - no EIS information has been provided specific to the locations at hand. Use of Watercourse 5 & 6 Report, which was not finalized/Filed with the MOECP (former MOE), is incorrect. | For SAR, no site-specific EIS data is available for the alternatives. The alternative evaluation will be reliant on SAR data available for the Block 1 lands as found within the report Fruitland-Winona Block 1 Servicing | | }
C10.C21+1C10.C12 Evaluation of Alternative Alignments: Overall, Natural Heritage Planning staff is concerned with the evaluation of the impacts on the natural environment. It is the opinion of Natural Heritage Planning staff that the habitat and roadway; some steps taken to mitigate risk to SAR). There is concern with this approach. The evaluation does not take into consideration short-term, long-term and cumulative impacts. The spatial extent, magnitude, frequency and duration of impacts should also be considered.

The evaluation of alternative alignments has been based on "excellent", "good", "neutral" and "poor" indicators. In the case of the natural environment, there is concern with this approach. The evaluation does not take into consideration short-term, long-term and cumulative impacts. The spatial extent, magnitude, frequency and duration of impacts should also be considered.

Mitigation measures that reduce or minimize significant impacts have not been included within the evaluation. While impacts from these activities are not relevant to ranking the alternatives (as they are all essentially equal), a high-level discussion of them will be provided in a revised evaluation matrix. Again, it should be emphasized that the entire road corridors fall within an approved Secondary Plan, with all Block 1 lands being developed except the NHS.

Species at Risk (SAR): It has been identified that all of the proposed alignments would not negatively impact SAR ("good" indicator-smaller corridor between SAR habitat and roadway; some steps taken to mitigate SAR). There is concern with this approach. The proposed alignments will impact SAR by further removing and fragmenting habitat. It is the opinion of Natural Heritage Planning staff that the evaluation should be revised to "poor" (large area of SAR habitat removed). SAR impacts will be ranked as low, medium or high. These will be defined for Bobolink/Eastern Meadowlark as: low – less than 4 ha of suitable habitat being removed; medium – 4 to 30 ha (the maximum allowed per ESA Section 23.6); high – greater than 30 ha (no regulatory exemption allowed per 23.6). Overall Benefit permit required. All alternatives will thus be categorized as low. Furthermore, any remaining habitat for SAR (including Category 3 (foraging habitat) for Barn Swallow) will be lost to development per the approved Secondary

See responses below.

In previous comments (May 22, 2019), there was concern that the evaluation of alignments did not take into consideration the short-term, long-term and cumulative impacts. Within the Wood Comment Response, it has been identified that these impacts will be the same for all seven alternatives. In addition, it has been identified that only subtle differences in impacts will be discussed. Natural Heritage Planning staff is concerned with this approach. All impacts on the Natural Heritage System should be evaluated for all alternatives.

In previous comments (May 22, 2019), there was concern that the impacts of the alignment alternatives had not been discussed with regards to the entire Natural Heritage System (the Natural Heritage System is comprised of Core Areas, Linkages, Vegetation Protection Zones and Restoration Areas). There is concern that this comment has not been adequately addressed. Discussions of impacts on vegetation protection zones and restoration areas should be included at this stage and not left strictly to the site-specific Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) stage.

Compensation of wetland loss – and mitigation locations are not specified – it is our understanding that in this functional design stage of the EA process an indication of location should be provided, no matter that they’re all equivalent impacts.

In previous comments (May 22, 2019), there were concerns that mitigation measures to minimize or reduce the impacts were not included within the evaluation. Natural Heritage Planning staff is satisfied that this information will be included within the evaluation.

In previous comments in the attached “FINAL Responses to City Comments”, EIS is required for an EA, and the impact on how many trees will be removed, is also standard practice for an EA alternative evaluation process. An EIS has been prepared and will be included as part of the final ESR. A tree inventory and protection plan will be completed during detailed design.

Impact has been discussed for ‘natural heritage features’, ‘Species at Risk’, ‘avian and wildlife’, ‘watercourse and aquatic’ and ‘vegetation and wetlands’. There is concern with this approach. It appears that there is a misunderstanding with regards to the Natural Heritage System (NHS). The NHS is not just comprised of Environmentally Significant Areas (ESAs) or Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSIs). The NHS within the Fruitland–Winona Secondary Plan consists of Core Areas (i.e. watercourses, wetlands, Species at Risk), Linkages, Vegetation Protection Zones and Restoration Areas.

The evaluation matrix has been revised. However, it should be noted that all the alternatives cross the NHS (at WC 5.0 and 6.0) at the same location, with the same width Right-of-Way, so anticipated impacts will be identical. Also, it is not possible to provide an impact assessment of the VPZs and Restorations Zones (RAs) as they will be determined through site-specific EISs so they therefore have not been spatially determined. The enhanced channel corridors recommended in the BSS will represent major RAs in their own right, given the predominantly degraded conditions of the existing watercourses. At present, these future VPZs and RAs are existing agricultural, cultural and disturbed habitats and it is premature to assign impacts to VPZs and RAs that will be recommended and designed on the basis of future site-specific EISs. The road corridor (both north-south and east-west) will be already completed so the VPZs and RAs will reflect the built road infrastructure.

In addition, impacts of specific activities such as vegetation removal (i.e. clearing/grubbing), grading, watercourse crossings, installation of services and paving of roads should be included within the evaluation. The impacts of specific activities such as vegetation removal (i.e. clearing/grubbing), grading, watercourse crossings, installation of services and paving of roads should be included within the evaluation.

The indicators for the evaluation of alternative alignments have been refined. The short-term, long-term and cumulative impacts, including the spatial extent, magnitude, frequency and duration of these impacts, will be essentially the same for all seven alternatives. The BSS EA and NHS report by D&A provides high level impacts for the Block 1 lands and some of these will be adapted for this analysis. Only where there are subtle differences in impacts for the alternatives will these impacts be discussed for the revised environmental evaluation matrix. It should be noted that these road corridor alternatives exist within an approved Secondary Plan; it is not appropriate to discuss impacts of new roads within the current (mostly agricultural) context as the entire Block 1 lands will eventually be developed for residential, commercial, stormwater management and institutional uses, with some natural open space and NHS.

The evaluation of alternative alignments has been based on "excellent", "good", "neutral" and "poor" indicators. In the case of the natural environment, there is concern with this approach. All impacts on the Natural Heritage System should be evaluated for all alternatives.

An EIS has been prepared, which looks at direct, indirect and cumulative impacts and includes short- and long-term impact assessment. The alternative assessment table will not be updated to include further detail as this is a high-level summary. Please refer to the EIS for a more detailed impact assessment.
### Groundwater Impacts

- What is the basis of the claim that no changes are anticipated for any of the design options?
  - The creation of roads on the property will affect the site water balance by creating impervious surfaces and the magnitude of the effect will be dependent upon the area of the impervious surfaces. This is expected to decrease evapotranspiration, decrease infiltration of precipitation and increase surface runoff; thus resulting in some decrease of recharge to groundwater and potentially a localized lowering of the groundwater table. As indicated in the Hydrogeology Report this can be mitigated to some extent by directing runoff from the impervious areas towards pervious areas. As the alternative proposed road alignments are very similar in extent and location no significant difference in effects on groundwater between the alternative road locations are expected.
  - **Groundwater Impacts:** It is staff's understanding that Hamilton Conservation Authority and City discussions about the EIS are still ongoing so this needs to be flushed out before finalization of the evaluation criteria and ESR/finalization of the EA.
  
### Natural Heritage: Aquatic

- Based on information provided in Appendix A (Table 1), a small pond has been identified within the former Alectra lands. It has been identified that this pond should be assessed for aquatic features. There is concern that this assessment has not been included within the evaluation.
  - The pond was assessed by D&B staff on June 24, 2019 and categorized as mineral marsh and open aquatic; the size was less than 0.5 ha (0.028 ha) so the feature is not to be included as NHS. It will be considered in the revised alternative evaluation as options 4a and 4b involve removing this feature.
  - **In previous comments (May 22, 2019), there was concern that a small pond on the former Alectra lands was not included in the evaluation. Natural Heritage Planning staff is satisfied that an impact assessment for tree and vegetation removal will be included within the evaluation.**

### Natural Heritage: Vegetation

- There are trees that would need to be removed to facilitate all proposed alternative alignments. The impacts of the removal of these trees have not been discussed, and how different alternatives would have different impacts. In addition, vegetation is associated with Watercourse 5.0. There is concern that impacts on the vegetation along the watercourse have not been evaluated.
  - An impact assessment for tree and vegetation removal will be included with the evaluation matrix, appropriate to a preliminary design stage. **Note that impacts to vegetation along WC 5.0 and 6.0 will be the same for all seven alternatives as they cross at the same location and are the same width. Also, beyond WC 5.0 and 6.0, the tree impacts will be along hedgerows, Hawthorn Deciduous Shrub Thicket, and Oak-Hardwood Deciduous Forest. For the deciduous forest (which was not included in the Secondary Plan NHS), the amount of habitat lost is the same for all seven alternatives, so it has no bearing on the ranking of alternatives. Note that a tree inventory was not conducted as part of the Block 1 BSS so the number and species (along with size, health, etc.) of individual trees being lost to each alternative is not known. A tree survey should be completed as part of detailed design for the preferred alternative.**

### Natural Heritage: Aquatic

- What is the basis of the claim that no changes are anticipated for any of the design options?
  - The creation of roads on the property will affect the site water balance by creating impervious surfaces and the magnitude of the effect will be dependent upon the area of the impervious surfaces. This is expected to decrease evapotranspiration, decrease infiltration of precipitation and increase surface runoff; thus resulting in some decrease of recharge to groundwater and potentially a localized lowering of the groundwater table. As indicated in the Hydrogeology Report this can be mitigated to some extent by directing runoff from the impervious areas towards pervious areas. As the alternative proposed road alignments are very similar in extent and location no significant difference in effects on groundwater between the alternative road locations are expected.
  - **Natural Assessment Reports for Block 1 SS—were only provided in first drafts to staff and HCA and have not been finalized. Staff feel that the information relied upon there is incomplete and cannot be relied upon for the evaluation – PIC.**

### Natural Heritage: Vegetation

- There are trees that would need to be removed to facilitate all proposed alternative alignments. The impacts of the removal of these trees have not been discussed, and how different alternatives would have different impacts. In addition, vegetation is associated with Watercourse 5.0. There is concern that impacts on the vegetation along the watercourse have not been evaluated.
  - An impact assessment for tree and vegetation removal will be included with the evaluation matrix, appropriate to a preliminary design stage. **Note that impacts to vegetation along WC 5.0 and 6.0 will be the same for all seven alternatives as they cross at the same location and are the same width. Also, beyond WC 5.0 and 6.0, the tree impacts will be along hedgerows, Hawthorn Deciduous Shrub Thicket, and Oak-Hardwood Deciduous Forest. For the deciduous forest (which was not included in the Secondary Plan NHS), the amount of habitat lost is the same for all seven alternatives, so it has no bearing on the ranking of alternatives. Note that a tree inventory was not conducted as part of the Block 1 BSS so the number and species (along with size, health, etc.) of individual trees being lost to each alternative is not known. A tree survey should be completed as part of detailed design for the preferred alternative.**

### Natural Heritage: Aquatic

- Based on information provided in Appendix A (Table 1), a small pond has been identified within the former Alectra lands. It has been identified that this pond should be assessed for aquatic features. There is concern that this assessment has not been included within the evaluation.
  - The pond was assessed by D&B staff on June 24, 2019 and categorized as mineral marsh and open aquatic; the size was less than 0.5 ha (0.028 ha) so the feature is not to be included as NHS. It will be considered in the revised alternative evaluation as options 4a and 4b involve removing this feature.
  - **In previous comments (May 22, 2019), there was concern that a small pond on the former Alectra lands was not included within the evaluation. Natural Heritage Planning staff is satisfied that an impact assessment for tree and vegetation removal will be included within the evaluation.**

### Natural Heritage: Vegetation

- There are trees that would need to be removed to facilitate all proposed alternative alignments. The impacts of the removal of these trees have not been discussed, and how different alternatives would have different impacts. In addition, vegetation is associated with Watercourse 5.0. There is concern that impacts on the vegetation along the watercourse have not been evaluated.
  - An impact assessment for tree and vegetation removal will be included with the evaluation matrix, appropriate to a preliminary design stage. **Note that impacts to vegetation along WC 5.0 and 6.0 will be the same for all seven alternatives as they cross at the same location and are the same width. Also, beyond WC 5.0 and 6.0, the tree impacts will be along hedgerows, Hawthorn Deciduous Shrub Thicket, and Oak-Hardwood Deciduous Forest. For the deciduous forest (which was not included in the Secondary Plan NHS), the amount of habitat lost is the same for all seven alternatives, so it has no bearing on the ranking of alternatives. Note that a tree inventory was not conducted as part of the Block 1 BSS so the number and species (along with size, health, etc.) of individual trees being lost to each alternative is not known. A tree survey should be completed as part of detailed design for the preferred alternative.**
### Emergency Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>City of Hamilton: Received – June 10, 2019</th>
<th>Wood’s Response: Sent - August 12, 2019</th>
<th>City of Hamilton: Received – September 6 and 16, 2019</th>
<th>Wood’s Final Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>One of the future uses of the Alectra property, is the City’s intent to place an EMS station within its lands. Any taking away of Alectra lands which would result in impacts to the future EMS function, would therefore give a possibly different rating than it presently has. EMS station presence would improve any option where the road does not take away former Alectra lands/impede its functional use.</td>
<td>The evaluation will reflect the fact that an EMS is planned at the former Alectra site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>We applaud the provided detail of land area provided as to required land taking, to accurately identify how much land would be taken from all lands impacted by the proposed road.</td>
<td>Noted. Thank you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>We also ask that another alternative should be added or worded which explains why the precise following of the Fruitland-Winona Secondary Plan for Gordon Dean Ave. is not possible, for any lands, if that is the case. An alternative which precisely follows the Secondary Plan needs to be included since that is the starting point of Phase 3 – Phases 1 &amp; 2 outlined the location, which we are in the process of fine tuning - usually involving minor changes only. We understand that some changes were implemented as a result of City request for change of intersection of Gordon Dean and mid-block West-East collector. City staff believe that the Wood team has carried out all the necessary work to provide all required information, but this needs to be expressed in the documentation as well, so that the decision making can be transparent and easily understood by all.</td>
<td>The memo associated with the evaluation table will be updated to include a review of the Phase 1 and 2 alternatives. A summary of the discussions with the City and the justification will be included.</td>
<td>Impacts to Non-residential Lands – please provide values (we recognize that they’re provided in the summary table). Currently, lands indicate that there is slightly more land (0.04ha) required for Alternative 1, but one more dwelling to purchase for Alternatives 4a &amp; 4b. The description of both “poor” and “medium” impact provided is the same “acquisition required” .more details are required for your conclusion of their rankings. City staff recognize that more detail is provided in the “FINAL Response to City Comments”, but those details, incorporating our comments, should be indicated to substantiate the ranking claim to the public at the PIC. We also believe that it is currently inaccurate.</td>
<td>Further detail requested relevant to the cost associated with Option 4a and 4b are provided in the table; however, this “FINAL Response to City Comments” table will also be included in the appendix of the final ESR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Evaluation of Acquisition of Non-participating Lands is incorrect in judging Options 3a &amp; 3b to be excellent. Material loss of civic property is apparent if a City property were affected, and ideally all land transactions would be first carried out on a willing buyer and willing seller highest and best use value basis. The City is not willing to sell at this time, since it has purchased the land for specific civic use purposes and intends to use the entire purchased property for uses other than a road. The land required from ALL properties, should be evaluated equitably.</td>
<td>The Project Team was unaware of the purposes of the former Alectra lands, however we recognize the City as an important stakeholder and understand the value of civic property. As mentioned in comment 19, this category has been updated and reevaluated to include impact to the former Alectra lands.</td>
<td>Please define rankings / provide background and details. For information pertaining to impacts on public lands the market value would be different than residual if the zoning is different. This needs to be provided in detail.</td>
<td>Further detail regarding impact on land is provided in the ESR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>The Category of “Acquisition of Non-participating Lands” is incorrect as far as EA Act, and Municipal Engineers Association’s Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Document (Last amended in 2015) is concerned. The evaluation under the MCIA document needs to consider impacts to all properties. It is recognized that the land owners within Block 1 have approached land owners adjacent to Alectra lands and they were not willing to sell/potentially making implementation difficult. This was not shown in the evaluation, and if implementation needs to be a category that is included in the evaluation, then unwillingness to sell from those land owners and the City should be indicated for all property owners.</td>
<td>The existing evaluation included a category for the Ease of Implementation, which took into consideration the number of properties impacted and the possible expropriation required. The category “Acquisition of Non-participating Lands” has been renamed to “Impacts of Non-participating Lands” and the criteria has been altered to include the following options: Poor Significant impact and acquisition required Good Some impact but no acquisition required Excellent No impacts and no acquisition required.</td>
<td>This will take into account the amount (in hectares) of land impacted and will also consider the impact on the former Alectra lands.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The Category of “Acquisition of Non-participating Lands” is incorrect as far as EA Act, and Municipal Engineers Association’s Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Document (Last amended in 2015) is concerned. The evaluation under the MCIA document needs to consider impacts to all properties. It is recognized that the land owners within Block 1 have approached land owners adjacent to Alectra lands and they would all have greater impacts on Alectra properties than alternative 1.</td>
<td>Further, impact to business/institutions should be marked as poor, for categories 2-4, since they would all have greater impacts on Alectra properties than alternative 1.</td>
<td>This category will be updated appropriately, as requested to take into consideration the impact on the former Alectra land.</td>
<td>Socio-Economic Impacts: claims that impacts on business of Options 1 &amp; 4 as “Good” – City staff disagree. Option 1 and 4 are deemed ‘good’ because there is no business displacement. However, the Project Team recognizes the impact on the former Alectra Lands. This impact is minor and will occur at the edge of the Alectra property. In comparison, Options 2a – 3b are determined to be “poor” because there is a significant displacement of lands north of the former Alectra lands and will impact business structure, which has commercial value.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Category of “Acquisition of Non-participating Lands” is incorrect as far as EA Act, and Municipal Engineers Association’s Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Document (Last amended in 2015) is concerned. The evaluation under the MCIA document needs to consider impacts to all properties. It is recognized that the land owners within Block 1 have approached land owners adjacent to Alectra lands and they were not willing to sell/potentially making implementation difficult. This was not shown in the evaluation, and if implementation needs to be a category that is included in the evaluation, then unwillingness to sell from those land owners and the City should be indicated for all property owners. |

The existing evaluation included a category for the Ease of Implementation, which took into consideration the number of properties impacted and the possible expropriation required. The category “Acquisition of Non-participating Lands” has been renamed to “Impacts of Non-participating Lands” and the criteria has been altered to include the following options:

- Poor: Significant impact and acquisition required
- Good: Some impact but no acquisition required
- Excellent: No impacts and no acquisition required

This will take into account the amount (in hectares) of land impacted and will also consider the impact on the former Alectra lands.

Further, impact to business/institutions should be marked as poor, for categories 2-4, since they would all have greater impacts on Alectra properties than alternative 1.

This category will be updated appropriately, as requested to take into consideration the impact on the former Alectra land.

Socio-Economic Impacts: claims that impacts on business of Options 1 & 4 as “Good” – City staff disagree. Option 1 and 4 are deemed ‘good’ because there is no business displacement. However, the Project Team recognizes the impact on the former Alectra Lands. This impact is minor and will occur at the edge of the Alectra property. In comparison, Options 2a – 3b are determined to be “poor” because there is a significant displacement of lands north of the former Alectra lands and will impact business structure, which has commercial value.
## Noise Level Impacts

### Item # | City of Hamilton: Received – June 10, 2019 | Wood’s Response: Sent - August 12, 2019 | City of Hamilton: Received – September 6 and 16, 2019 | Wood’s Final Response
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
28 | Please provide the analytical basis, for this evaluation. This impact was considered during the Fruitland Road Phases 1 & 2 EA process and the Fruitland-Winona Secondary Plan’s policies. Based on previous discussions on this project, it was our understanding that precise noise levels would be determined and applied at Subdivision Application level. Perhaps this can be included here/in the evaluation/ESR. | The noise study will be completed during the draft plan stage. More detailed assessments will be completed during detailed design. Mitigative noise levels analyses – bottom of pg. 13 – insufficient level of detail provided in the evaluation. Should indicate what is stated in the Response to City Comments document. Comment No. 22 – Noise Level Impacts – needs to be better reflected in the evaluation – Tech Memo/PIC panels. | As mentioned in Wood August response, a noise study will be undertaken during the draft plan stage. Further information will be available during detailed design. |

## Community / Recreational Features Impacts

### Item # | City of Hamilton: Received – June 10, 2019 | Wood’s Response: Sent - August 12, 2019 | City of Hamilton: Received – September 6 and 16, 2019 | Wood’s Final Response
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
29 | City staff recommend that this be separated into two categories. One is Community, the other Recreational. | The categories will be separated into community and recreational, as suggested. Access to Community Services – Why is there a difference between alternatives? Please provide an explanation - details. | As per the detailed evaluation of alternatives (Appendix A), the difference in alternatives is due to the following: Route 1: Direct access to potential community features located on former Alectra lands. (Excellent) Route 2a-3b: Displacing significant portion of lands north of former Alectra lands will remove some potential community features. (Poor) Route 1: Direct access to potential community features located on former Alectra lands. (Excellent) |

## Community Uses

### Item # | City of Hamilton: Received – June 10, 2019 | Wood’s Response: Sent - August 12, 2019 | City of Hamilton: Received – September 6 and 16, 2019 | Wood’s Final Response
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
30 | City bought the Alectra property for the following Community Uses: A move of a Public Works yard from another Stoney Creek location, an EMS station, and an expansion of the existing Cemetery to the east of the property. With this category in place, and the amount of space needed, the Alectra lands were purchased (just finalized in mid-April 2019), for the purpose of utilizing it for various Public Works and EMS uses. Until the purchase was complete and negotiations were ongoing the information was confidential, therefore could not be disclosed to the public. Now that the transaction is complete, City staff believe that any impacts on this property will have large impacts/cost to the Community. Financially and in services that it would provide for a long time to come. This makes Option 1 the least likely to cause impacts to the former Alectra lands, and therefore of the greatest benefit of the options provided, to the Community. | The Project Team will re-evaluate the alternatives based on the potential community benefits the former Alectra lands are anticipated to provide. | |

### Item # | City of Hamilton: Received – June 10, 2019 | Wood’s Response: Sent - August 12, 2019 | City of Hamilton: Received – September 6 and 16, 2019 | Wood’s Final Response
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
31 | We request that the EA evaluation re-introduce an option which does not take the N-W corner of former Alectra lands out/impacts its function. | The Project Team will re-evaluate the alignment options to consider an alignment that avoids the north-west corner of the former Alectra lands. | |

## Recreational

### Item # | City of Hamilton: Received – June 10, 2019 | Wood’s Response: Sent - August 12, 2019 | City of Hamilton: Received – September 6 and 16, 2019 | Wood’s Final Response
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
32 | Wood staff’s earlier questions about impacts to the planned Community Park, as a result of changes to the Gordon Dean Ave. intersection with the proposed East-West Corridor will be answered when the future unit numbers from subdivision plans are known and confirmed/approved. Once approved, park dedication will be re-evaluated and re-determined, as per standard practice. Right now, staff have no concerns and we are to proceed with the understanding that this is to be determined. | Noted. | Recreational Features Impacts? - More details required. Context is not well understood/explained. How is “recreation” defined? |

## Urban Design

### Item # | City of Hamilton: Received – June 10, 2019 | Wood’s Response: Sent - August 12, 2019 | City of Hamilton: Received – September 6 and 16, 2019 | Wood’s Final Response
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
33 | Please provide the facts that this evaluation is based on. None were provided in the Memo. Please remove from the evaluation/provide a general preambule statement which would explain that all options are to be considered the same, if that is the case. F - W Secondary Plan calls for Urban Design to be considered. A Phase 3 & 4 EA requires functional design to provide cross sections, which will include some level of detail in its evaluation and/or as part of the Environmental Study Report Recommendations/Next Steps. | Removed from analysis as the ESR will address this element as part of its recommendations and next steps. | As per the detailed evaluation of alternatives (Appendix A), recreational features are defined as the future community centre and recreational facility, identified in the Block 1 Plan. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>City of Hamilton: Received – June 10, 2019</th>
<th>Wood’s Response: Sent - August 12, 2019</th>
<th>City of Hamilton: Received – September 6 and 16, 2019</th>
<th>Wood’s Final Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Costs are not the only sub-category to be considered. It is incorrect to state that the only option that has a poor rating is Route 4a, and 4b, with the Memo being understood to be based on the assumption that it’s based on entirely impacts only to the land owners who bought into the Block 1 55 process. The evaluation should be based on accurate real property assessments and/or other factors, as appropriate, equitably for all alternatives. City staff are happy to assist with review of such evaluations, when provided.</td>
<td>Noted. We will reassess based on accurate real estate assessments.</td>
<td>Cost claims for Alternative 1 versus Alternatives 4 &amp; a b – ARE THEY equivalent if the road size is the same, and there is a difference of 2 versus 1 house. An EA process needs to provide a more precise facts/information in the evaluation to provide the correct preferred alternative.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Business impacts should not be rated as good, when there are potential impacts to a business/industrial property - former Alectra lands, City Yard, in question. Such impacts to this type of property, whether City owned or not, would have long term implications to the City/tax payer. So, we would recommend that for economic evaluation a three-pronged approach could be taken. Short term, medium- and long-term impacts to provide for better precision and accuracy of evaluation.</td>
<td>The Project Team reassessed the capital costs by developing detailed infrastructure costs for each alternative. Land acquisition costs are not included in the overall costs but are described quantitatively. As a result of recent discussions with the City, the Project Team has a better understanding of the costs associated with purchasing the former Alectra lands from the City given their planned future uses. This is reflected in the second iteration of the evaluation. A comparison of short-term, medium-term and long-term impacts across all of the alternatives proved to be too cumbersome without adding significant value to the overall evaluation.</td>
<td>The final ESR will include a detailed costing estimate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Short term would include current land value and construction costs, medium term would consider phasing of construction/implementation. Development of areas north of the proposed West-East Collector would allow for return on investment without having to build the entire length of Gordon Dean Ave. at the same time. Occupancy of Alectra Lands is also possible.</td>
<td>Transit Supportive Development – need to provide a drawing and alternatives to the layout – road ROW – interim versus full build out with and without future RT (it is not certain what form of Rapid Transit will be there so just Rapid Transit is sufficient) – just like we are doing for Barton EA. Suggest the same strategy - curbs/underground infrastructure to be placed only once with other forms of transportation all available sooner, and full ROW available now – as a cost saving measure and ease of implementation of transit sooner rather than later. An example of interim use of additional asphalt may be parking/electric vehicle parking/car share parking, etc. Having said that, City staff will not be providing the cross-section specifics or evaluation – that is for your team to do. We wanted to also make sure that when connected to Barton and Highway 8 there will be more detail in a future Roadway Development.</td>
<td>The final ESR will include information related to transit supportive development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Long term impacts evaluation should include benefits to the tax payers based on the long-term municipal benefit and significant ability for adaptive reuse of the property in question for many municipal purposes. The long-term economic implications of land such as former Alectra lands far supersede those of residential benefits. There is tax benefit on all properties long term, but business use also provides employment. This is one of the reasons why the studies leading up to Gordon Dean Ave Phases 3 B &amp; 4 EA have avoided impacting Alectra lands. The long-term implications should also include the consideration of the necessity of Rapid Transit and Truck Route use for the future road.</td>
<td>Medium Term - Phasing - it could be correlated with the needs of development along the Southern portion of Gordon Dean – South of East-West corridor. Alectra Lands will be occupied, and Public Works can function fully with two access points from Highway 8.</td>
<td>Since Barton St. EA and Highway 8 EA is both being completed by Wood and by the same Transportation Engineer, Wood will ensure that the transportation design is consistent throughout this area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the intent of this category to cover for climate change category required of EA projects? Please elaborate/provide direction for “incorporate innovative products/practices”. In light of the City of Hamilton’s Council’s declaration of Climate Change Emergency in March 2019, all specific developer input/ideas are welcome. This stage of the EA process allows for some detail - Functional Design. Please provide this in your revisited cross-section and write up at ESR.</td>
<td>The preliminary design and the ESR will provide further detail regarding any climate change measures and practices. The current criterion is similar to the one used to evaluate the alternatives for the Barton St. EA.</td>
<td>Category 5: Sustainability. We do not see the level of detail here which would show WHICH impacts will be the same for all alternatives. (We recognize that they were explained in greater detail in the Response to City Comments spreadsheet - why aren’t they included in the full evaluation process? They need to be). It is mentioned in comments, that the level of detail would be akin to that which will be presented for Barton and Fifty Road EA – Phase 3. It is Not the same. We will be expecting a greater level of detail at our next Barton and Fifty Road EA PIC at Phase 3 PIC – we are expecting to have alternative ROW lay outs and their evaluations. There are variances in the potential layouts, and the consideration of longer term Rapid Transit Corridor.</td>
<td>The final ESR will include more detail and will include the ROW layouts as well. The final design will consider the long-term rapid transit corridor. Cross-sections were included at PIC #2 and all legal obligations as per the MCEA document for Phase 3 was fulfilled.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TP115082 | April 2020**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>City of Hamilton: Received – June 10, 2019</th>
<th>Wood’s Response: Sent - August 12, 2019</th>
<th>City of Hamilton: Received – September 6 and 16, 2019</th>
<th>Wood’s Final Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Other than the provided drawings (without cross sections), and without further detail, the claims stating that all are “good” are not considered substantiated. More details are needed. Long term - e.g., at updated ESR stage, the TIS and/or other transportation specifics need to be provided for input/comment and reference in this evaluation, for fulsome detailed comments from City staff long term.</td>
<td>Noted. Further details will be included in the ESR. A safety assessment is currently being completed by Wood and will be included in the ESR and detailed in the evaluation.</td>
<td>The Updated TIS was not discussed in the Tech Memo, although asked for originally, and we know it has a bearing on this process – so it’s expected to be included in the ESR but available for the public/staff for comment before project completion, if asked for.</td>
<td>The Updated TIS will be included in the final ESR. Road ROW width and interim and ultimate cross sections are all provided in the final ESR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>City staff disagree with the implementation evaluation, since the only reference to expropriation within the Fruitland-Winona Secondary Plan is in reference to park land, not a road. Please see the Fruitland-Winona Secondary Plan in UHOP, section 7.4.17.5 policy, which clearly states as follows: 7.4.17.5 The following policy shall apply to the lands designated as Community Park located on the south side of Barton Street, east of Collector Road &quot;A&quot;: 4) The City shall acquire lands for the Community Park in accordance with any Council approved acquisition policies, plans, strategies and By-laws. Notwithstanding the foregoing, however, the City shall not acquire lands for the Community Park by means of expropriation. For your convenience please see the link to the UHOP as stated: [<a href="https://d1fjl8tm7ib3.cloudfront.net/sites/default/files/mediabrowser/2015-01/15/urbanhamiltonofficialplan-volume2">https://d1fjl8tm7ib3.cloudfront.net/sites/default/files/mediabrowser/2015-01/15/urbanhamiltonofficialplan-volume2</a> chapter07_stoneycreeksecondaryplans_rac2018.pdf](<a href="https://d1fjl8tm7ib3.cloudfront.net/sites/default/files/mediabrowser/2015-01/15/urbanhamiltonofficialplan-volume2">https://d1fjl8tm7ib3.cloudfront.net/sites/default/files/mediabrowser/2015-01/15/urbanhamiltonofficialplan-volume2</a> chapter07_stoneycreeksecondaryplans_rac2018.pdf) We have also provided separately the links (City website), to the copies of Planning Committee of Council Meeting Minutes of April 15, 2014, and City Council Minutes from April 23, 2014, to illustrate this point as well.</td>
<td>Noted. The Project Team will reassess the Ease of Implementation category based on this information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>City of Hamilton: Received – June 10, 2019</th>
<th>Wood’s Response: Sent - August 12, 2019</th>
<th>City of Hamilton: Received – September 6 and 16, 2019</th>
<th>Wood’s Final Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Please note that the discussion regarding “expropriation” within the document is incorrect. City would not be a willing seller of former Alectra land due to long term community plans in this location, accessible currently from Highway 8, and other costly domino effects resulting from inability to use the Alectra as its future Public works yard, extended cemetery, and EMS station, etc.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
<td>Overall evaluation Table: Governance cont’d: Why are Routes 1 and Route 4 deemed to have the same /expropriation impacts? Suggest removing the term “expropriation” out of the evaluation and just mention “land acquisition” in the formal evaluation. Expropriation is the final option if the road is built by the City and there is no willing seller and willing buyer. We anticipate that the developers will be building this road – not the City. Based on what we have discussed with the Wood/landowners’ team in the past, expropriation is not the only alternative for Route 4 a &amp; b.</td>
<td>Route 1 and 4 are deemed to have the same acquisition impacts as they will not be impacting the former Alectra Lands. Noted. We have removed the term expropriation from the evaluation. It is determined that developers will be constructing the north portion of the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Confidential contractual obligations do not permit disclosure of specific impacts if the former Alectra Lands are functionally impacted in any way. Characteristically, staff know that the consequences of non-completion of purchase of lands being sold/vacated by operations yard which is planned to relocate to former Alectra</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>City of Hamilton: Received – June 10, 2019</td>
<td>Wood’s Response: Sent - August 12, 2019</td>
<td>City of Hamilton: Received – September 6 and 16, 2019</td>
<td>Wood’s Final Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>lands, will have significant financial impact to the City, and the tax payers potentially in the millions of dollars.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporate Innovative products/practices – would be sufficient as a TO DO in the ESR and provide a list of possibilities just like we are doing for Barton EA – no matter what we built it’s ALL going to need to consider innovation, sustainability and climate change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Functional Impact in Real Estate terms means impacts to the property which prevent intended use of it. For example, taking away a portion of the north-west corner of the former Alectra property would result in an inability of the cemetery to offer full services at this location. Impacts to a future EMS station (mid-property) would require a purchase of land somewhere else instead of placement along these lands. Impacts to a building/accessibility to the yard/buildings within the entire property would render a domino effect and loss of time from its functionality. The existing building on the former Alectra property is in the planning process of being occupied/Public Works Yard in the process of being moved ASAP - fall 2019. At the same time, if the impacts can be minimized, i.e. the ROW can incorporate existing tree line, which would both mitigate natural heritage impacts from the EA perspective, and the ROW can minimally impact the rest of the property if that is the outcome of the evaluation.