

East Boundary Road Corridor Study
Dundas Street at South Boundary Road to Townline Road at Avenue Road / Gore Road
City of Cambridge / Township of North Dumfries / Puslinch Township
Public Consultation Centre No. 1 – April 3, 2014
Written Public Comments Received and Project Team Responses

Name	Comments and Concerns	Project Team Response
Gerry and Mary Durocher	We are writing to you with regard to the East Boundary Corridor Proposal. It was advised that we email or fill out the sheets at the recent meeting which my wife and I attended. We realize that when a project such as this is proposed, there will never be a solution that will please everyone...such is the nature of the beast, however when considering the factors we think it is important to keep a few things in mind. First of all when considering a project like this you have identified (and rightfully so), the following factors; displacement or affect on residents, the environment, cost and the influence on outside agencies such as Hydro and the CPR. It is quite obvious that in considering the solution each of these factors have to be considered for obvious reasons.	• Impact on existing residents is one of many important factors that need to be addressed when selecting the most appropriate route; as well as impacts on current farmland. • Impact on future development potential will also be considered in the final evaluations. • Another important consideration in the route alternative evaluations is to minimize land purchase costs and/or impact to remaining land (e.g. dissecting residential or farmland), including what mitigating measure can be taken. • Detailed natural environment evaluations are being undertaken to determine exactly what the impacts of each alternative alignment would be on the natural environment e.g. wildlife, wildlife habitat, etc. Routes may be refined depending on the natural environment impacts.

Gerry and Mary Durocher – continued	We all have our own agendas and we will all be anxious to make points in favour of our own living situation but sometimes we need to look at the facts as well. It is always much easier to make decisions based on a proposed area when that area is one in which those making the assessment are not directly affected, because they do not live in the area in question. We realize by the process that you have considered the factors in question (environment, people, outside agencies etc.), however we feel that consideration must be given first to those who ultimately will be funding this project i.e. the people (taxpayer). It would only stand to reason that the route selected should impact the fewest residences possible as these are the taxpayers that have in most cases invested their lives into the properties that they now find could be compromised in a dramatic way. Upon review of the alternatives it would appear quite obviously that Route "C" would satisfy this criterion. The extension of Townline Road through virtual farm land until it meets the proposed South Boundary Road has the least impact on people who own	
--	--	--

Gerry and Mary Durocher – continued	property in the study area. It does not affect the Hydro corridor (cost savings), it makes use of the extension of Townline rather than start a road back near the round-a-bout on Townline (cost savings with shorter new road), stays far enough away from the city for future development, yet is closer to the city than Route A affecting less wild life. The affect on the environment under all proposals seems to be virtually the same. We realize that you do not have an easy task ahead and we all know that the proposal is needed. One just has to be on Franklin or Hwy #24 at 5:00 to realize that planning has been neglected. We would urge you to please consider the people, those that love this city, who pay the taxes to run this city and who lives will be severely impacted if the route chosen is in their sites.	
Joseph Muller – Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport (MTCS)	I was unable to attend the first PIC for the above project, and am wondering whether the presentation material will be posted online or can be made available to me digitally for our review. Thank-you for your assistance, and I look forward to hearing from you.	A link to the Project Information Sheet on the Region's website was provided: https://www.regionofwaterloo.ca/en/living-here/resources/Documents/Future-Construction/DC_07299_InfoSheet.pdf

	Please consider the following. 1. The closer the road is to the city the more convenient to gain access. The further away from the city mean less traffic will use it. The Breslau bypass is a good example, traffic did not use it until the speed limit was lowered in the village and rose on the bypass. This forced traffic to use it. The old route in the village was shorter. The most westerly two routes should be considered as the best two options. 2. All the proposed routes will have to cross mill creek, Moffat creek, and the rail line. New bridges will be required at all proposed routes. The rail line on Shellard road will need a grade separation because the present level crossing is not suitable for the increased traffic flow. therefore all routes are equal in this matter. 3. The city of Cambridge has a problem with route B, Because of a proposed development in this area. Did they not know a road was proposed on the east side for the last 47 years. This sounds like mismanagement or maybe bad planning, or could this be a way to move the road to another municipality. This dates back to before Cambridge had any land east of Franklin Blvd, and before any plans were filed for development. 4.	1. The East Boundary Road (EBR) is expected to serve multiple functions, rather than solely a “bypass”. Existing Franklin Boulevard volumes are congested during daily peak hours and are expected to become even more congested. The EBR will provide an alternative for regular traffic, as well as trucks using Highway 24 and Highway 8 that may not have to travel through downtown Cambridge or on the already congested Franklin Boulevard in order to reach Highway 401 or destinations south of Cambridge. 2. Use of existing creek crossings, even though existing bridges will still have to be upgraded significantly, are preferred by some of the approving agencies unless it can be proven that “no net loss” to the natural environment can be achieved. Rail grade separations are only required when a combination of rail traffic and road vehicle crossing reach a required volume. Although it is anticipated that a grade separation will be required eventually, the East Boundary Road may initially be constructed as a level crossing with provisions for a future grade separation. 3. Studies for an EBR date back to the 1960s and the Region of Waterloo Official Plan showed a potential “East Boundary Road” utilizing Shellard Sideroad (Route A). Planning for the current developments in Cambridge was based to some degree on Route A. Route B, although through both existing and proposed development areas, may utilize an approved Moffat Creek crossing location and existing/proposed roads. 4. All routes are being evaluated with respect to land impacts, along with several other issues including natural
--	---	---

	Route A, AC1, is unacceptable because of all the homes on Shellard road, Some of these homes are in the multi-million dollar range. Route C, CA1, CA2, CA3, are not acceptable because of homes on Shellard road, and splitting farms in half, dead ending roads, and removing houses. The township of north Dumfries has no fire station on the east side of Cambridge. The township contracts the city of Cambridge to cover this area. All fire dept calls are charged to the ND township, the same for Puslinch twp. The city benefits from the bypass that is forced on the two twps, and we get to pay for 911 calls to the city. 5. Route B, D, are the only routes that should be considered. These two routes do not affect other municipalities. If the city needs a bypass build it in the city, Do not shove it off on other municipalities. To the best of my knowledge no homes have to be removed or farms split in half on route B and D. All the land in this area is for development, and will be divided into lots for homes and industry.	environment, cultural heritage, etc. With respect to fire protection, planning for future developments will take into account jurisdictional issues such as township/city boundaries and emergency services. 5. Routes B and D attempt coordination with existing approved road and the Hydro One corridor respectively. Discussions are being held with Hydro One regarding the possibility of utilizing their corridor.
John Bos	Thank-you for the opportunity to comment on the East Boundary Road	The East Boundary Road is required to provide access to all development, as well as for some vehicles to more

	Environmental Assessment and the proposed routes. We are a farm family and owners of the development project at 1261 Dundas. We have a number of concerns that we would like to address: • The choice for the region to consider a boundary road of this proportion would greatly affect progress and development of our proposed development project. It would also considerably reduce the housing footprint. • The future residents of this community would be negatively affected by noise, pollution and the visual presence of a major highway. • The need in Cambridge for housing and family communities should be of utmost importance when considering a major bypass road. • The City of Cambridge is investing heavily into the development of this community and in order to justify this investment, housing is a very necessary part of this plan. The families involved in this development would sincerely request	efficiently access areas to the south and north. • A road is required to access the future developments. Noise and pollution will be addressed as part of this Class EA process. • The road will be used in part for access to proposed new developments and communities. • Housing will require access, which will be accommodated on a “regional” level by the East Boundary Road. • Routes A and C which are “further east” are being evaluated with respect to all the issues, of which these comments will be included.
--	--	--

	that the Region would consider a bypass that goes around this proposed development and future developments in this area. Understanding that there are no easy solutions in this difficult area, we would ask that you seriously consider that the East Boundary Road travel farther eastward, toward the Cambridge and North Dumfries municipal boundary, instead of West through this development area.	
No Name	Your 46 years behind I think we need another 45 years of studies Side walks Signs Bugs Fire everyone involved Put in the LRT on Route D and have the Region fund it	The project is following the Class EA process. Construction is not required to be complete for several years from a traffic need perspective, but finalizing a route will allow the planning of future development to proceed and the East Boundary Road to be built when it is required.
Tamara Hetherington	Check your heritage designations Hurry up. Get this done before the Leafs win the Stanley Cup (not another 48	All heritage designations will be checked against the appropriate heritage registries, including any updates that may have occurred since the original investigation was completed.

	years) Hydroline is logical choice then by pass enviro. area amend new rec complex Pedestrian/bike access for an active community Environment “CHL 02” has designated home on it so check the other too.	Hydro One is being contacted regarding utilizing their corridor Active transportation facilities (e.g. sidewalk and cycling facilities) will be provided along the East Boundary Road corridor.
Jeremy Hetherington	Yes – project should be moved ahead of Franklin Blvd. “Roundabouts” AC-1/CA-3 – Both options should be eliminated from consideration Route B or C to start get through Moffat Creek Area. Then B/D or C Property values Get Going	There are no funds currently budgeted for the construction of the East Boundary Road in the Region’s 10-Year Transportation Capital Program (TCP). The EA must be complete prior to detailed design, and subsequently construction, being added to the TCP as a project complete with funding. All routes are being evaluated including AC-1/CA-3. Property impacts are one of the evaluation criteria.
Brenda Van Ryswyk	I highly prefer “Route B” due to the lower environmental impacts and least sprawl into current rural area. (no matter the “intent” roads always do lead to development) Second choice would be “A” except for the last section where I prefer A-C1 Future development repercussions one the road is in those rural lands will be	The impact of Route B, and other preliminary design/alignment alternatives, on the natural environment is still being evaluated. Development around the final road alignment will be governed by planning policies, procedures, and guidelines. The East Boundary Road will also provide an alternate route for vehicles currently traveling through other routes within Cambridge. All natural environment features are being evaluated for this project.

	looked at as development potential (if they are not already) but some consideration should be given to containing urban sprawl as a result of road expansion (and far far down the road in the future) 1)Reducing negative impacts on existing natural heritage features – not only wetlands but woodlands as well and consider open land as well (meadows, pollinators, grassland & birds) but these can relatively easily be created from underdeveloped land. 2)Reducing sprawl into rural lands 3)Reducing adding total new road constructions or bridge! If possible “Route C” bisects not only significant wetlands but also a large woodlot. This would have significant effects on the amount of interior habitat present (the woodlots were not shown as “significant” on the map but they should be, and interior habitat is especially significant.	The route with the least overall impact on all of the evaluation criteria, including societal, heritage, transportation, etc., will be considered the preferred (alignment) alternative.
Irene Adach	Least amount of disturbance to existing residents Least amount of disturbance to environment	• Property, existing access, and natural environment impacts are important evaluation criteria when evaluating the routes. • Impacts on other roads will be investigated as the study

	Using Route B, C, or D would create more traffic on Avenue which can barely handle the traffic it has now. Since increasing Townline to 4 lanes to Saginaw has already increased the traffic on Avenue dramatically.	progresses.
Jon Cooper	Utilize the results determined from the study that was virtually completed prior to being put on hold by the Hwy 24 bypass. Why re-analyze what has already been worked through There is a definite need for this road. However, the process is one of the largest wastes I have witnessed directly. It has been such a short time since the last review, it should simply pickup where it left off. With no capital to budget the road for 10 years, does it even have sense to look at this now if policy causes a restart from the beginning every few years.	• The Highway 24 bypass (provincial Highway) would serve a different function than an East Boundary Road. • Finalization of this study provides the Region of Waterloo with an approved defined corridor for the East Boundary Road and will allow future development to proceed and the road constructed when it is needed.
Brad Whitcombe	No No (Social Impact) - Protection from residents on existing routes	• Property impacts are important evaluation criteria. • Staff from Puslinch Township and Wellington County are on the project team for this study. • Impacts on the Mill Creek watershed are being studied and are part of the evaluation criteria.

	- Avoid if possible impact on Puslinch Twp residents. (the route through Puslinch brings another 2 jurisdictions (Puslinch, Wellington) into the process) - Protection and mitigation of impacts on the Mill Creek subwatershed.	
Councillor Wayne Stokley, Puslinch	The proposed northern extension goes through Puslinch. This area known as the Mill Creek Wetland Complex corridor is Provincially significant. Instead of developing a new road through this area why not use the existing Townline Rd and Gore Rd to connect to Shellard Rd. Townline Rd has been upgraded lately and the addition of a roundabout at the intersection of Townline Rd and Gore Rd could help the transition.	• Impacts on the Mill Creek Wetland Complex are being studied and are an important evaluation criterion. • Utilizing Gore Road could be considered; however it creates a significant “jog” in the road that would present some issues with traffic flow and maneuverability. • Roundabouts will be considered for this project as the study progresses.
No Name	- Route needs to be selected so no development can commence - Route A – has too many drive ways, houses and entrances - Route D – is not environmentally sensitive - Route B – brings traffic to close to residential area Just pick the route so we can get on with the process. Route C preferred	Once an alignment is finalized development can occur “around” the proposed route. Environmental impacts are being documented and evaluated for all routes. Impacts of property and residential areas are part of the overall evaluation criteria being considered.

No Name	- Road needed now - Area needs to grow around road Start road soon or city will outgrow this plan like Franklin road and Townline Road. Route B too close to city already to built up. Route C looks like it would be best choice. Route A has to many houses/driveways near homes. Route D – has water lands and should be preserved.	An alignment is being finalized so development can occur around the proposed route. For future development, construction of the East Boundary Road may be a condition prior to development proceeding. The Class EA process will assess the impacts of each alternative route across all evaluation criteria.
No Name	Build asap, Select Route asap Choose the route so it can get built faster. Route A has too many houses Route D has environmentally sensitive areas. Route B close to houses & residential areas. Preferred Route C. Best option Select the route quickly Route C is straight, clean, good connections, train tracks.	The Class EA process is intended to consider all evaluation criteria, such that the route with the least or most acceptable / “mitigatable” impacts is chosen. Impacts to property and residential areas are one evaluation factor being considered.

Concerned Neighbour	Route A affects already developed/residential area. Route C seems like the best route. Quickest solution without obstacles. 1. Most expedient route (C seems best) 2. Least number of existing homes affected. 3. Most direct finished route. No more delays with endless studies! Pick a route and commit to it now to get on with the process.	Impacts to property and residential areas are one evaluation factor being considered. The Class EA process is an consultative process which allows all stakeholders – the public and interested parties – to review and comment on the project and the intent is to look consider all evaluation criteria, such that the route with the least or most acceptable / “mitigatable” impacts is chosen.
Janice Bell	Just decide and let many people get on with their lives. None are better Route D seems to impact least amount of people.	The Class EA process is an consultative process which allows all stakeholders – the public and interested parties – to review and comment on the project and the intent is to look consider all evaluation criteria, such that the route with the least or most acceptable / “mitigatable” impacts is chosen. Impacts on the Hydro One corridor will be discussed with Hydro One and considered as part of the evaluation of the routes.
Penny Warner	Very delicate area around Millcreek by Townline. Any roadway through the North corner of North Dumfries would be disruptive to the wildlife and the historically natural setting for locals. Current roads through it should be used as much as possible. Valley setting in that area also creates a natural funnel	Impacts on the natural and social (i.e. noise) environment are two important evaluation criteria being considered when assessing the various routes. Impacts to property and residential areas are one evaluation criterion being considered. The East Boundary Road will connect Highway 8 (Dundas Street South) to Highway 401 (via Townline Road) and may increase

	for noise as housing there has already complained about industry noise from Savage Drive area. Links to current roads from the new will increase traffic coming into town from there. Using the North west route over the Mill Creek will minimize impact. Crossing from that north portion of Route A to the hydro line Route D will avoid most of the wetlands impact along Shellard and would minimize impact on local housing and country atmosphere. Not sure how the existing traffic at the new intersections of the roads it crosses would increase flow on the existing roads. I fear Hwy #8 would become even busier if its easy for trucks etc. to exit there and head to Ancaster/Hamilton industrial areas without having to use the 403 further down or the Hwy #6. -Effects on sensitive wetlands Destruction of country areas by feeding increased traffic onto current roads / noise also. Effect on local housing on roads linking to new highway by future promotion of development of business attracted to the new business growth opportunity.	truck traffic on Highway 8. This is being evaluated as part of the study as the various alternative routes are examined.
--	--	---

Pieter Koudijs	Although this new road will divert a lot of traffic from coming through the middle of Cambridge, the residents along it will be affected. If a road with the least amount of driveways onto it could be built than allocating the land for it should be done as soon as possible. I like the proposed corridor D the best, as it follows the hydro corridor. Also the road requires a bridge at Millcreek. As many raised sections of road or bridges would help the wild life to pass under the road without interference from people. This new road should be a limited access road. There are significant venues in the northend that would be severely affected by a road going through it. Should be as close as possible to the city of Cambridge. The road allowance for the east boundary corridor should have been allocated 25 years ago so that the least amount of residential sections and suburb would be affected.	Impacts to property and residential areas are one evaluation criterion being considered. Impacts on the Hydro One corridor will be discussed with Hydro One and considered as part of the evaluation of the routes. Wildlife passages are a consideration in the natural environment evaluation. It is desirable that new Region roads have limited accesses; however the use of existing roads (with existing accesses) have many benefits often including less cost and less intrusion on existing natural environment areas. Access, and impacts to existing properties, and on the natural environment are some of the many factors that will be considered as part of this Class EA. Determining the route for the East Boundary Road will allow new development to proceed and take into account the location of the road.
Amil Shaver Jr.	Any 4 lane road should have limited access to avoid another like Hwy #6 south of the 401 hwy. By definition there us a route should not be on a roadway	It is desirable that new Region roads have limited accesses, however the use of existing roads (with existing accesses) have many benefits often including less cost and least intrusion on existing natural environment areas. Access, and impacts of

	that has multiple residences. The Hydro corridor seems to be a copied route running behind the 400 area along the Hydro route residential developments is discouraged. C.P. rail cross in Mill Creek cross will be important 1. Directness of route 2. Away from build-up area to limit noise pollution and gas fume pollution 3. Limited access to the road The longer it takes to determine the best route the more costly it will be.	existing properties, and on the natural environment are some of the many factors that must be considered as part of a Class EA. The stated factors are all important factors being used when evaluating all alternative routes. Alignment is being finalized so development can occur around the proposed route.
Tamara Johnson	Despite options presented – there is considerable impact to wildlife & at risk species. While species may “adopt” with proposed routes through marsh area will bring heavy traffic – likely to kill them off before they adapt (route a) The ponds on Shellard & Mill Creek seeing new duck populations in last 2-3 years. Sensitivity of landfill routes (route c) what is impact of that land breaking down to fast & contaminating drinking water. Route B seems to have least amount of	All routes will have some impact on the natural environment, and this study will determine which route has the least or most acceptable / “mitigatable” impacts. Impacts on existing ponds and Mill Creek are being evaluated. Road construction will consider removing any contaminated soil that may impact road construction. However, road construction should not impact any issues related to any potential contamination from the landfill, which is engineered to contain contamination. All routes are being examined with respect to various impacts including residential and wetland impacts. Any properties required for construction of the road will either be purchased by the Region, or obtained from developers as part of

	residential & wet land impact. Who bears the cost of houses/properties that will have to be destroyed for this? Why focus development in south Cambridge to up pressure. Why not focus around 401 where pressure reduced? Cost – most “cost-effective” option in terms of ranking criteria 1,2,3,4 – are there score criteria being developed to assist in route selection. 1. Impact on existing & at risk wildlife 2. Impact on wetlands & drinking water many residents on well water 3. Least impact on nature & existing properties. Why did you allow upper development on Shellard if this was a proposed route? Up costs to repurchase properties.	development conditions. Construction of the East Boundary Road could allow development to proceed within the entire study area in conjunction with local and specific Official Plan requirements. All the stated criteria are being considered when evaluating the various alternative routes, including costs.
Shirley Hetherington	Please update your maps. Please identify P.S.W's. There are several lots created in N.D. that are not shown. This is a City of Cambridge problem. Why destroy the charm of North Dumfries with this monster road? Cut through lands that are 'For Sale'	Drawings will be reviewed with respect to property fabric and location of Provincially Significant Wetlands (PSWs). The East Boundary Road is meant to serve Regional traffic including City of Cambridge and Township of North Dumfries traffic. A potential route for the East Boundary Road has been shown in the North Dumfries Official Plan for several years.

	along city boundary – south and north of Clyde Road. - Division of community - The road will become a great social divider - Road access on Shellard Road – how? - some “fifty” accesses - You should be on the City side – along city limit and would be less of a community divider - The “water-ways” my property bordered on the north by the CP tracks, on the east by Shellard Road and on the south Clyde Road – Reg#27, on the west by the City boundary – this property all drains through culverts under SP tracks to Millcreek stream. Please identify P.S.W.’s on your map. A-C1 goes through prime agricultural land (Lot J conc.10) and Millcreek P.S.W. CA 3 cuts through 3 newly created residential lots, including Heritage designated stone house circa 1865 and continues through prime agricultural land.	Property/land and social impacts are being considered as part of the evaluation process. Private access onto the East Boundary Road is a factor being evaluated. Impacts on heritage properties and private properties are also factors being evaluated for each route.
Bob Miller	Put people ahead of costs.	Route D utilizes the Hydro One corridor and may evaluate well

	- Option “D” affects, far fewer people than “A” or “B” - A new (or rebuilt) rail crossing and bridge would be req’d for all options therefore build new – the crossing (rail) and bridge on Shellard would have to be rebuilt therefore look at option “D” as least disruptive – it could be built with minimal interference and disruption. Shellard road has 56 driveways from Morrison to the Gore Road and new hydro lines being installed (now) and maple trees that are tapped for sap annually. People over money Hydro corridor is a natural route – if towers didn’t adversely affect habitat and wild life Roadway shouldn’t be any different noise is an important factor. Hydro towers don’t have ears.... People on Shellard Do!! 1. Consideration for residents best interest 2. New bridge and rail crossing’s can be built with latest technology and components (20 years from	for the transportation (operations) criteria; however, other evaluation factors, such as the natural environment, must also be considered. Discussions must be held and approval provided from the railways and Transport Canada regarding the location and number of rail crossings. Therefore utilization of the existing crossing must still be considered at this point of the project. Impacts and traffic issues with respect to private accesses, as well as impacts on trees and utilities, will all be considered when evaluating the various routes. The Hydro One corridor was built several years ago, and operational issues resulting from constructing the road near the towers must be considered. Impact on residents is an important evaluation criterion. The latest technology and applicable legislation, to suit the actual conditions and requirements, will be used when constructing a new or upgraded rail crossing. Routes C & D also affect farmland as well as components of the natural environment. All evaluation criteria must be considered when determining a preferred alternative.
--	---	--

	now) 3. Least disruption to residents must be considered. Route “C” and “D” are least disruptive owner or farm req’d for “D” – Mr Art Brewer favors this option (ask him). *Negative impacts on residents is forever cost is a one time impact!!	
Anne Miller	I fully agree with the statement in the second paragraph. A decision on setting lands aside is long overdue. Route A – 50+ driveways along Shellard Rd. requiring access should cancel this option assuming a roadway of meters wide costs to expropriate a number of short frontage homes at market value would escalate costs. Limited access & service roads not feasible. Route B,C &D – at the north end are too close to Grandy Lane Route D is preferred using the Hydro corridor with an easterly turn at the CPR rail to avoid Grandy Lane housing then turning north. Route B – southern end – doesn’t appear logical when applying Criteria 4 The public should be informed of the weighting given to each of the criteria	Each alternative route would require property acquisition. Cost of property acquisition and impacts to private property are factors that will be evaluated for all routes. At the next PCC, the evaluation and weightings for each route will be available for review. Natural environment, including wetlands etc., are an important evaluation factor. The East Boundary Road route is being established so that unapproved developments can plan their infrastructure, roads etc. taking into account the East Boundary Road. The weighting of the evaluation criteria will take into account how each criteria is being applied. Hydro One has very specific requirements for their property and discussions will be held with them regarding requirements to allow utilizing all or part of their property for the East Boundary Road. The traffic analysis will take into account not only existing and projected local traffic, but also traffic from the south (Hamilton and Brantford) which may use the East Boundary Road to travel “through” Cambridge.

	especially #P2&3 The wetlands need great respect for several reasons: habitat, water sources, construction issues e.g. Townline Rd at Cedarbrook. Criteria 1, 2 & 3 are most important first to establish possible routes. Then criteria 4 & 5 should be applied. Development properties – plans (unless currently firm) should flex around the designated route. Over the roadway is designated development follows. Traffic Capacity: use will escalate markedly with Brandtford to 401 improved access. Hydro Corridor: least impact on Criteria 2, 3 & 4 – uses already designated land. Next PCC, please provide mapping indicating all current housing along proposed alternative routes.	All existing housing and known property lines will be shown on the drawings.
Chris Spraauman	As most of the trips will be to/from the south/west end of Cambridge, routes B&D are the two routes which will have the least environmental impacts – less times driven. The number of times needed to be drive is more the further east the road has to go. This needs to be taken into account.	Length of road will be taken into account from a cost and air emission standpoint. Length of road also has a bearing on the natural environment depending on the particular route and whether it can avoid natural environment areas. In addition, the length and location of the road will be a consideration in the traffic analysis with respect to its suitability or attractiveness to drivers and active transportation users (pedestrians and

	Keeping the road closer to the city will also reduce environmental impact to animals/wildlife in the area east of the town – there are significant deer migration in the areas that Route C is being proposed for. A 4-lane road will be the end of the wildlife for this area. Are roundabouts really the right answer for Franklin blvd. and are there ways that we can make better use of existing infrastructure rather than building new infrastructure? This road is a significant cost for taxpayers. The most important criteria should be the impact to the local community and the environmental impacts of the road. There are already impacts from the existing roads and railroad in this area. The cost of upkeep and future expenditures need to be kept in mind and be part of the evaluation criteria. This is another road where the Region will already be pressed for money for all the capital infrastructure projects happening in the next 10-20 yrs.	cyclists). Natural environment issues are evaluated for each particular route and area since there are some sensitive natural environmental within the Study Area. The requirement of an East Boundary Road is required in addition to increases in Franklin Boulevard capacity in order to address future development, increased traffic driving through Cambridge, and to reduce congestion on other existing roads in Cambridge. All evaluation criteria will be weighted to address the overall project needs. Capital (initial construction) and operating (i.e. maintenance and upkeep) costs will be incorporated into the project costs and are somewhat dependent on the length of road. Construction timing will depend somewhat on development timing. Funds for the detailed design and construction of this project have not been included in the Region's 10-Year Capital Road forecast and construction will only occur when funds are budgeted and the Class EA has been completed.
Suzi Moore	Perhaps the Region should focus on improving the efficiency of Franklin Blvd.- allowing it to be the key N-S route given the infrastructure, services and	The requirement of an East Boundary Road is required in addition to increases in Franklin Boulevard capacity in order to address future development, increased traffic driving through Cambridge, and to reduce congestion on other existing roads in

	road itself is already in existence. Are roundabouts truly the most effective answer for such a key road? Which new technologies can we apply to existing roads which will solve traffic-flow problems and avoid the need for new roads? I feel that the environmental impact needs to be heavily considered. This area includes the Beverly Swamp, Moffat Creek and Grand River. It is home to a significant diversity of species some of which are at risk. A road would negatively impact the area, likely irreversibly. 1. Impact (disruption) to local community and natural environment 2. Environmental Impact My first choice for the EBC would be as per 8.1 "Do Nothing" and find solutions using other existing roads & new technologies. Failing that my preference would be for route B, then D to minimize environmental impact.	Cambridge. Natural environment is a key evaluation criterion when choosing a route for the East Boundary Road. Any impacts to the natural environment will be mitigated to the satisfaction of the governing agencies such as the Ministry of Natural Resources, Grand River Conservation Authority, etc. Disruption and impacts to the local community and natural environment are key evaluation criteria when evaluating the various routes. With the Do-Nothing alternative, congestion will increase and proposed development on the East side of Cambridge would not be able to proceed.
Siegfried Suckert	- How to minimize impact of build to existing home owners and traffic. - Rights and concerns of Cambridge. Home owners (tax payers) should outweigh those of investors,	Impacts to existing property owners are an important evaluation criterion when evaluating each route. Air emissions, as a function of road length and grades, will be evaluated when analysing each route.

	speculators and developers. - How best to reduce carbon footprint of traffic flow between the 401 and south east Cambridge - As this roadway will ultimately become an expressway between the south of Cambridge and the 401, it is imperative that this traffic is moved as quickly and efficiently through the city as possible. (Route “D”). - Which is the most cost effective route to build? - What will ultimately be the public’s primary use of the new East Boundary road? i.e. an expressway from south side of Cambridge to the 401 - Which route has the least environmental impact to build and operate? - Minimize noise pollution throughout route. - Minimize air pollution throughout route - Minimize carbon footprint throughout route during both the build and future use. - Utilizing lands of the existing hydro corridor and adjacent to east landfill boundary is efficient and effective way to build and less impact on home owners and the environment. - A roadway meandering through the city	In addition to length of new road, impacts to all property owners, natural environment, etc. other criteria will also be evaluated. The East Boundary Road will be a “typical” Region Road with intersections at other major roads, as opposed to an “expressway”. Costs, users, and environmental impacts are all part of the criteria used to evaluate each road. Noise generated by a new road will be evaluated based on the Region’s Noise Guidelines and steps taken to mitigate noise generated by traffic on the new road. Hydro One has very specific requirements for their property and discussions will be held with them regarding requirements to allow utilizing all or part of their property for the East Boundary Road. The actual route alignment will be based on minimizing or mitigating impacts to the social (e.g. public, property owners, etc.), natural (e.g. wildlife, habitat, etc.), and cultural heritage (e.g. built heritage resources, etc.) environments, while at the same time minimizing costs and maximizing transportation operations, as much as possible.
--	--	--

	like a river will only create more cost, resistance and environmental waste. - I understand that you cannot stop progress and as a city evolves things beyond our control change. But what we can control is the magnitude of the impact of these decisions.	
Roy Maraffino	Yes there are 2 suggested routes that run beside my property and through my neighbours property. Not at this time, there are some routes that seem to have the least effect on residents of the community. I would hope the homes of families would have priority over anything else. Distance from Dwellings. - Noise pollution - Distance of road from residents houses/property - Effect on safety I would like to be kept up to date with any solutions and/or decisions being made in the future.	Impacts to private properties will be evaluated and mitigated as part of the Class EA process. Impacts to private properties are an important criterion when evaluating the various alternatives. Property impacts, noise impacts, and safety are all evaluation criteria being applied to all routes.
Linda & Vasco DaSilva	Don't keep approving new construction without proper infrastructure. The need was established back to the 1960's why keep expanding beyond your barriers. - Franklin & 24 should be addressed first	The requirement of an East Boundary Road is required in addition to increases in Franklin Boulevard capacity in order to address future development, increased traffic driving through Cambridge, and to reduce congestion on other existing roads in Cambridge.

	before further expansion into dwindling green spaces. - People are not going way out of their way East to just head back west into KW area – Rapid Transit into Cambridge south east. Not just between Kit. & Waterloo. That is not Regional but city based. Would reduce some of the congestion. Room for trucks within city – industrial area vs country side. The impact on the residents of Shellard Rd., Clyde, etc. should be considered.. The environment!!! North Dumfries & Puslinch and east Cambridge sensitive areas. Keep the road within city of Cambridge boundary. There is space along the Hydrolines then connect to Townline. Stay away from wetlands, disturb as few existing home as possible not a little piece of their lands. Take nothing or all of it (ours included) I don't see the need for an East Boundary Road if the 401 goes ahead with their extension. The country side is not the ideal place for transport traffic, they are delivering good to facilities within the city. Keep the traffic closer to	Franklin Boulevard is being improved, and Highway 24 through Cambridge is widened in most areas to the limits of the existing road allowance. Even if Franklin Blvd and Hwy 24 are improved/widened there is still a need for an East Boundary Road to address existing traffic volumes and future traffic from proposed developments. Not all traffic on the East Boundary Road will have a desired destination of Kitchener-Waterloo. The East Boundary Road will connect to Townline Road in the north, which connects to Highway 401 and provides access to Highway 401 both westbound and eastbound. Rapid Transit (trains) are planned to eventually connect to Cambridge, with initial plans to utilize adapted Bus Rapid Transit (aBRT) between Cambridge and Kitchener. The East Boundary Road will provide an opportunity for heavy trucks to bypass the urban area of Cambridge. Impact on private properties is an important criteria when evaluation all alternative routes. The natural environment, including environmentally sensitive areas, is an important criterion when evaluating all alternatives. Additional discussions are being held with Hydro One regarding use of their Hydro Corridor. All alternatives will avoid wetlands and/or mitigate impacts, as required. Property requirements will be negotiated with each individual property owner. The East Boundary Road will carry traffic north and south through Cambridge, while Highway 401 serves a somewhat different purpose and carries traffic east-west through the province. Traffic delivering goods within the City will still have
--	---	---

	their destination. Don't make it someone else's problem. Please keep all residents well informed. Where is there room on Townline for bike trails. Trails in the middles of road as depicted in the drawings.	alternative routes to reach their destination. The proposed road allowance for the East Boundary Road will provide active transportation (pedestrian and cyclist) facilities. Notifications of future PCCs and other opportunities for comment will be advertised and mail-outs sent to residents.
Maria & John S Correia	Pollution on Shellard Rd. if new road goes through, noise levels will increase. Effects of increased pollution to environment and wildlife in our area. Use Hydro Corridor (probably the Route D might be the best option) Do you realize how many driveways go along Shellard Side Road? Too many for a new busy road! Our properties will lose value. When we built our home almost 13 years ago, it was because of the quite atmosphere, and to experience the beauty of nature and wildlife in our area. Don't destroy our beautiful land. Pollution Noise levels Destroying owners privacy and properties	Noise from traffic will increase based on increased traffic. A noise study will be conducted based on Region of Waterloo Noise Guidelines. Noise attenuation will be installed, if required. However, noise modeling is based on projected noise levels in the rear outdoor living area and typically do not require noise attenuation if the road is at the front of the lot. Additional discussions are being held with Hydro One regarding use of their Hydro Corridor. The number of driveways and property impacts are an important criterion when evaluating all routes. Impacts on the natural environment are important criteria when evaluating all alternatives.

	Wildlife Nature Environment Please let the property owners of Shellard Side Road enjoy our peace, quiet and beautiful environment with amazing wildlife to share with our grandchildren.	
Joan Reeve	The route for this East Boundary Road needs to be where it will have the least impact (noise, pollution, etc.) on small residential properties. (Route C or D) The route for the “424” Highway needs to be determined by the Province before the “EBR” is established as this could result in a sufficient cost saving to the Region. A West Boundary Road from Hwy 24 South to 401 NW of Cambridge “424” Highway east of Cambridge More roundabouts to keep traffic flowing The CPR railways tracks & Mill Creek are the closest proximity to each other directly south of Townline Rd, therefore one large overpass could be constructed over both to connect Townline Rd at the south end. It was mentioned at the meeting on April	Impacts on the natural environment, noise impacts and property impacts are all important criteria when evaluating alternatives. The East Boundary Road will serve a different purpose than a provincial Highway 424. The East Boundary Road will be required regardless of whether or where Highway 424 is built. The need for a “West Boundary Road” has been studied in previous studies, and the East Boundary Road was determined to be the preferred solution to deal with north-south traffic through Cambridge. Roundabouts will be a consideration for intersections as part of this project. Cost and feasibility of structures over the CPR tracks and Mill Creek are important evaluation criteria. The width of Mill Creek and length of the structure must also be considered. Shellard Road, or Route A, was identified in previous studies as it already has creek crossings and much of the existing road allowance is already “clear”. In general, this is thought to have the least impacts on the natural environment. Given the higher volume traffic and potential changes to the vertical road profile, it is correct that little of the existing road base on Shellard Road

	3rd that Shellard Road would be a good route to use because the road base/structure was already there, however when the Townline Rd as redone 2 years ago all the road base was removed & new stone, gravel, dirt, etc. hauled in to make the base fit for heavy traffic. Your Evaluation Criteria covers every aspect, however I would like to see small residential properties be given a high priority i.e. there are 58 driveways accessing Shellard Road – let's keep the EBR west of these properties (Route C or D) like what is planned for the SBR by not using Myers Road. Natural, Social, Heritage/Archaeological/Cultural Environment & Traffic Safety are the most important criteria to me. Traffic capacity & operations will be better served by the "424" which will eliminate, I would say, 75% of the traffic now using Shellard Road. As for costs, the City of Cambridge should have got on with the project in the 1970's which would have resulted in an enormous saving, but that didn't happen which will now result in tremendous costs. As my driveway access onto the north	will be able to be re-used. Impact on residential properties is an important criterion in evaluation all alternative routes. Natural, Social, Heritage/Archaeological/Cultural Environment, Traffic Operations, and Cost are all important criteria when evaluating the various routes. The East Boundary Road will be a Regional Road which will also serve traffic other than "Cambridge traffic"; including traffic going through or bypassing the main part of Cambridge.
--	---	---

	end of Shellard Road, I don't want the EBR going thru my property for the following reasons: My home built in 1846, is designated as "heritage". It has been in the family since 1870's & my son has every intention to take it over when I pass on. .58 acre along the front of my property has bee designated as "PSW" Provincially Significant Wetlands by the Ministry of Natural Resources. I have 300 fish in my pond, snapping turtles & in several occasions have seen the Jefferson salamander on my property; also numerous birds, geese, blue herons, etc. Noise, heavy transport traffic, pollution, etc. (purchased this property in 1979 away from all the above.) Note: This has been a City of Cambridge problem since 1960 & now they want the Township of Puslinch to help solve their problem. Let's keep the EBR in Cambridge/N.Dumfries. Note: Having said all of the forgoing, perhaps the best solution would be for the Region of Waterloo to annex this small triangle of Puslinch Twp land into	
--	--	--

	the city of Cambridge. I will then sell my 19 acres of property to a developer & move to a quire area.	
Frank Marchio – Lakeview Homes	We attended the April 3rd Public Consultation meeting related to the Region's East Boundary Road Environmental Assessment and wish to provide our comments on the preliminary route alternatives that were presented. There were a total of four (4) preliminary route options presented for the East Boundary Road and it was noted that three of the four routes (Routes B,C and D) all rely on a new Mill Creek crossing to be construction which would have considerable financial and environmental implications. Route "D" would have additional environmental impacts on the core areas of the Moffat Creek PSW. Our concerns with Route "B" are shared by the City of Cambridge in that it would separate the future community use lands from its catchment population areas on the north side of Moffat Creek and other development lands in the SE Galt community. Routes "C" and "D" would share the same impacts and divide the SE Galt community further to the east. Development in the SE Galt was always	Development and land use planning are two important criteria being used to evaluate all routes, along with natural environment, heritage/archaeological, cost, (traffic) safety, etc. The use of Route A also has impacts on existing residences, which must also be considered. A revision to the Study Area will be considered, but it is unlikely given that additional impacts or issues may arise that necessitate revision to some of the routes. Extending Shellard Road further south to Highway 8 as part of this study will be considered by the Project Team, but is likely beyond the scope of this study. While Route A was indicated in the ROP it is also noted in the ROP that the EBR is subject to a full Environmental Assessment. The ROP is not the place to determine exact location for a new Regional road that is what the Class EA process is for and why we are proceeding with a Class EA to establish this corridor.

	intended to be an integrated community centred around the community use lands and the proposed arterial road crossings would create barriers to achieving this form of community planning. One of the key merits of Route “A” as presented in the PIC #1 handout material is its consistency with both the recently approved Regional Official Plan and City of Cambridge Official Plan, which have both been through extensive public process. The Route “A” alignment would also best preserve the environmental and residential development integrity of the SE Galt Community. We do however express some concerns or issues you should consider with the consideration of Route “A” as a possible option. This route would have both financial and environmental benefits only if it make sus of existing road infrastructure such as Ripplewood Road and Shellard Road. We also request that you investigate the potential of extending the Shellard Road allowance southerly to intersect with Highway 8 (Dundas Street) as a refinement and/or possible improvement to the Route “A” option. Along with considerable financial and environmental	
--	--	--

	advantages, we believe this alternative to the Route “A” option would strongly assist in achieving the integrated community planning and development the City of Cambridge expects for the SE Galt community. A final comment relates to our land holdings located in the SE Galt. We note that none of the four proposed route alternative would impact the development lands know as Lakeview – Phase 1 which are located south of Ripplewood Road and east of Vanier Drive. We respectfully request that the Region refine the Study Area to exclude these lands so that our planning applications for draft plan of subdivision can be processed by the City and Region.	
Lindsay Ford – Waterloo Catholic District School Board (WCDSB)	Staff at the Waterloo Catholic District School Board has reviewed the material presented at the Public Consultation Centre #1 for the East Boundary Road EA in Cambridge and has the following comments. Specifically, the Waterloo Catholic School Board strongly objects to the proposed Route B alignment. The Waterloo Catholic School Board has entered into joint venture and partnership discussions with the City of	Impacts on land use and developments (including schools) are important criteria when evaluating the alternative routes. The East Boundary Road could provide specific pedestrian crossings at high pedestrian movement areas, if required. In addition, cycling facilities are being provided within the road allowance, including multi-use trails. Safe pedestrian access can be provided across the East Boundary Road, similar to all Regional Roads in an urban environment. There are numerous locations where schools are located adjacent to Regional Roads including the recently constructed school, Moffat Creek located on Myers Rd.

	Cambridge, the Waterloo region District School Board, and Cambridge Libraries for a joint school and community campus within the Southeast Galt area of Cambridge. The City of Cambridge has purchased approximately 6.5 acres for a Catholic elementary school (junior kindergarten to grade 8). Discussions on this project have been underway for more than 8 years. The location of this community campus will be directly and negatively impacted by the Route B alignment of the East Boundary Road. Traffic Capacity, Operations and Safety – How does the alternative serve the expected vehicular, transit, pedestrian and cycling traffic needs? Route B directly abuts the proposed community campus and separates it from neighbouring residential areas. The community campus is proposed to include two elementary schools and public library. All of these uses are accessed by a high volume of pedestrians, specifically young children. Route B would require the crossing of a major arterial road to get to school. WCDSB has significant safety concerns regarding the ability of young children to safely cross this road and would likely be	Pedestrians will still be able to utilize the active transportation facilities as well as other intersection and trail connections to the East Boundary Road to access schools. The East Boundary Road is not intended to be the eastern limit of development in Cambridge. Details of the Accommodation Review and the impact of the East Boundary Road location can be reviewed by the East Boundary Road project team for inclusion into the evaluation of all routes. The East Boundary Road Project Team is interested in reviewing the WCDSB's analysis of how the East Boundary Road location (specifically Route B) impacts the proposed location of a school. A meeting can be held with WCDSB staff to review whether the location of an arterial road closer to a proposed school will impact whether or not it is still needed. The location of the East Boundary Road utilizing Shellard Road, although shown on the Official Plan as a potential location, still has to be confirmed by a Class EA study as mandated by the Province and Federal Government. While Route A was indicated in the ROP it is also noted in the ROP that the EBR is subject to a full Class Environmental Assessment. The ROP is not the place to determine exact location for a new Regional road, which is what the Class EA process is for and why we are proceeding with a Class EA to establish a corridor.
--	--	---

	forced to bus students to school. Social Environment – What impacts will the alternative have on the local community? Will the alternative fragment land and/or limit development opportunities? Route B would separate the community from the adjacent residential area making the site unviable for a school. Ideally, elementary schools are placed in the middle of residential areas in order to maximize the number of students able to walk to school. This is beneficial for health and environmental reasons as well as to reduce transportation costs. The ability for students to walk is already challenged by the size of community campus. WCDSB has the expectation that a portion of students would be able to walk to this school and with primarily relying on the residential area proposed between the community campus and Dundas Street for this purpose. The location of Route B would eliminate the possibility of students being able to walk to this school and make the site unviable as an elementary school. The Route B alignment also raises questions regarding the ability of	
--	---	--

	development to expand further east within the southeast Galt community toward the Urban Area Boundary designated in the Regional Official Plan. It is unclear whether the east boundary road would be the edge of development. If so, the WCDSB would have further concerns regarding the viability of this location for an elementary school. In 2013, WCDSB completed an accommodation review of five of its elementary schools in the southeast area of Cambridge. The accommodation review and its decisions assumed that the alignment for the east boundary road shown in regional and municipal official plans (Route A) was more or less accurate. This review was a year and a half long community consultation process that resulted in a decision to close two schools, build additions to three schools, and build a new Catholic elementary school on the lands currently owned by the City in the southeast Galt community. The entire accommodation solution requires approximately \$20m in investment within the south end of Cambridge and is scheduled to be implemented in three phases with the	
--	---	--

	final phase being the construction of an elementary school on the community campus on the southeast Galt community. The first two phases are entirely dependent upon a new school at this particular location. The Ministry has recently announced funding for phase one which will commence design and construction shortly. If a new school is not built within the southeast Galt community then the entire three-phased plan would need to change. This would require an abrupt halt in construction plans for phase 1, another extensive public consultation process, disruption to the entire Catholic community in the south end of Cambridge, reversal of decisions to close schools, and investments in infrastructure to service the Catholic community in a different manner. This would be unnecessarily disruptive and really not at this point in time. The Waterloo Catholic District School Board requests that Route B be eliminated from the potential options as soon as possible. Should you have any questions or	
--	---	--

	require any information from us, please 	
Shawn G. Callon – Waterloo Region District School Board (WRDSB)	Having reviewed the information presented at the Region's recent Public Consultation Centre (PCC#1) for the East Boundary Road Class Environmental Assessment, Planning staff of the Waterloo Regional District School Board (the Board) wishes to express its concerns regarding the negative impacts of Routes B, C and D. The Waterloo Region District School Board was an active participant in the development of the Southeast Galt Community Plan as early as 1992, and with formal City of Cambridge Council direction on the Plan, from 1996 to 1999. Throughout this period the catholic and public school boards, the City, library staff and various other agencies and partners committed to a process that would see the development of a cohesive, accessible, pedestrian-friendly community that was well-equipped to meet the needs of over 12,000 residents. Some of the community design objectives in the SE Galt Community	Although noted on the Official Plan as a possible Route for the East Boundary Road, Route A has not been confirmed by a Class Environmental Assessment as mandated by the Province and Federal Government. While Route A was indicated in the ROP, it is also noted in the ROP that the EBR is subject to a Class Environmental Assessment. The ROP is not the place to determine exact location for a new Regional road, which is what the Class EA process is for and why we are proceeding with a Class EA to establish the corridor. Impacts on land use and developments (including schools) are important criteria when evaluating the alternative routes. The East Boundary Road could provide specific pedestrian crossings at high pedestrian movement areas, if required. In addition, active transportation (i.e. pedestrian and cycling) facilities are being provided within the road allowance. Safe pedestrian access can be provided across the East Boundary Road, similar to all Regional Roads in an urban environment. There are numerous locations where schools are located adjacent to Regional Roads including the recently constructed school, Moffat Creek located on Myers Road. Pedestrians will still be able to utilize active transportation (i.e. pedestrian and cyclist) facilities, as well as other intersection and trail connections to the East Boundary Road to access schools.

	Plan process included: • Establishing a functional integration between schools, parks, and the existing and proposed space system; • Locating community facilities in convenient central locations which maximize the opportunity for development of joint use facilities, maximize pedestrian access, utilizing opportunities for the creation of community focal points and minimize the need for school busing; • Developing a road network which distributes traffic over the community thereby offsetting the need for major internal collector roads; • Providing for the future alignment of the north-south arterial as defined in the Cambridge Area Transportation Study (CATS); • Providing for a compact development form, making efficient use of existing and planned services and infrastructure. In 1997, our focus was largely on linking the community north of Moffat Creek	Route A utilizes an already established corridor (Wesley Boulevard) for a collector Road and provides for pedestrian and cycling facilities. The East Boundary Road Project Team is interested in reviewing the WRDSB's analysis of how the East Boundary Road location, specifically Route B, impacts the proposed location of a school. A meeting can be held with WRDSB staff to review whether the location of an arterial road closer to a proposed school will impact whether or not it is still needed. The East Boundary Road Project Team is also interested in reviewing the analysis of the "detrimental" impacts the East Boundary Road will have on the location of proposed schools.
--	--	---

	with that to the south. That link's significant advantages included: access to proposed school sites, transit and school bus routing, reduced fire and emergency service response times, and better relationships with other public infrastructure such as parks, and libraries. A critical Moffat Creek crossing was evaluated as one of 5 collector road options for the area. After several rejections of the crossing by the Region's Ecological and Environmental Advisory Committee (EEAC), and, due to the significant public service concern, a solution that was sensitive to the affected areas' riparian and wildlife movement issues was found. The chose bridge crossing was supported by the Region, the City, the Waterloo Catholic and Waterloo Region District School Boards, the GRCA and other agencies. By the fall of 1998, the final Community Plan was unfolding. It identified the critical crossing of Moffat Creek and a conceptual representation of the community facilities needed to serve both its north and south sides. Various agencies, including the school boards, established thresholds for	
--	--	--

	service based on walk-in traffic from each of the identified residential districts. At the time, development of the Community Plan was also influenced by the CATS, which anticipated a future connection from Shellard Road to Highway No. 8. The identified northerly limit of this connection formed the southerly boundary of Neighbourhood 3 in the Plan, which is represented as Route Alignment “A”. The limit was “... established in consideration of: the CATS Review Task Force recommendation to utilize the existing road alignments wherever possible (Ripplewood Road); the location of existing residences on Ripplewood Road, Vanier Drive, Davies Street and Dundas Street, natural constraints identified through the Moffat Creek Watershed Study including Provincially significant wetlands; and the ultimate goal of connecting the proposed south boundary road.... and Shellard Road/Townline road on the east-side of the City of Cambridge. The defined south area of the Plan, identified as Neighbourhoods 2 and 3, required the strategic placement of a joint school and community site that was	
--	--	--

	broadly accessible. This culminated in the City's pre-purchase of a multi-use campus that would strategically service the area. For the Waterloo Region District School Board, the Community Plan identified 2 elementary school locations (one north of Moffat Creek and the joint campus, central to neighbourhoods 2 and 3). The larger pre-purchased campus, located south of Moffat Creek was intended to accommodate a catholic and public elementary school as well as a library and other community facilities. While it was anticipated that additional studies would further guild the final Community Plan, there was no contemplation of the material and detrimental impact of the proposed road alignments in the East Boundary Corridor Study (see Appendix A). Particularly disconcerting is the alignment of Route B which compromises not only the multi-use campus, but also the hard-fought creek crossings and the overall integrity of the Southeast Galt Community Plan. This large capacity roadway effectively bisects a community that, from its inception, was intended to be lined via a	
--	--	--

	collection level road (extension of Wesley Blvd.). The planned collector was intended to provide for all forms of transportation, including the active transportation (walking, cycling, etc.) desired of the community and school boards. While it is commendable that these multiple forms of transportation are also promoted in the proposed routing profile, changing the collector to a major arterial road has significant impacts on the intended use of this roadway, including vehicular speed, transportation of goods and materials, traffic volume, number of driveway access and safe pedestrian crossings between neighbourhoods. It also suggests a second crossing of Moffat Creek, which as a single crossing was already considered to be negatively impacting the sensitive wetland area. For this Board, Route B has the potential to compromise both identified school sites in the Southeast Galt Community Plan. The route as shown falls alongside the easterly edge of the proposed northerly elementary school campus. If this route contemplates an additional westerly connection to neighbourhood 1, it may threaten the identified school/park	
--	--	--

	facilities for that area, leaving few alternatives for school site development north of Moffat Creek. South of the creek, the alignment takes critical frontage from what was expected to be a pedestrian-friendly, accessible, multi-use campus. Routes C and D have similar consequences in that they sever proposed neighbourhoods 2 and 3. The consequence of this division could be significant to the Board in that neighbourhood 3 may require independent service, either the indefinite bussing of students or the construction of additional school accommodation. The Board opposes the intentional isolation of such areas where it compromises the planned service of students. Of the 4 alternatives presented, the Waterloo Regional District School Board finds that in terms of protecting the integrity of the Southeast Galt Community Plan, only Route A is acceptable. It is our opinion that Routes B, C and D do not meet the previously identified needs of the Southeast Galt Community nor do they appear to meet the policies of the Province as identified on the	
--	---	--

	attached Appendix B.	
Shirley	Please note that the building at 1062 Clyde Road is a Designated Building. I noticed on your website regarding the East Boundary Road this building is referred to as CHL-02 and is only listed as a heritage property.	The heritage designation of 1062 Clyde Road has been updated.
Pam Slotegraaf	I am wondering if there are minutes of the April 3 rd meeting as held at the Holy Spirit Catholic church regarding this study? If so, could you forward the same to me?	No minutes were taken as the public consultation centre (PCC); the PCC was a drop-in format. The material presented at the PCC is available on our website. A link to the Project Information Sheet on the Region's website was provided: https://www.regionofwaterloo.ca/en/living-here/resources/Documents/Future-Construction/DC_07299_InfoSheet.pdf
Peter Rivers	Sorry I was so long getting this information back to you regarding the East Boundary road proposals in Cambridge Ontario, East of the regional landfill site. After viewing the proposed routes, my preference would be for "D" as my primary choice and "C" as my secondary choice for routes. Utilizing the existing hydro line corridor makes a lot of sense to me, as it is already high ground and it can meet up to Mill Creek from an elevated position above the creek.	Natural (wildlife, wildlife habitat, etc.) and Social (i.e. property impacts) Environment are key criteria being used to evaluate all route alternatives.

	My name is Peter Rivers and I live at 1507 Clyde Road, Cambridge. Ours is a farm property with a barn full of swallows in the summer months, as well as bats and other wildlife throughout the year.	
Bob and Ann Miller	Hi Shannon, we are the Millers at 1298 Shellard Rd. We live on a 12 acre woodlot and regularly see Red tail hawks, deer, and recently a coyote looking for lunch. Wild Turkeys visit and we had a nesting Owl but it has not returned. We have a large variety of birds from Woodpeckers to Hummingbirds and everything in between. We had a nesting pair of Geese and Wood Ducks on one of our ponds again this year and Blue Herons drop in from time to time. We have the usual garter snakes, frogs and toads and of great interest we recently found a Salamander which was black with blue spots and our research indicates it may be a Jefferson Salamander which we are told is considered somewhat rare in this area. Raccoons and possums are regular visitors and we accept all such visitors with interest and we do not destroy any creatures on our property. We obviously would be concerned and opposed to any By-Pass that interfered	Email reply sent by Dave Hallman, MTE Consultants Inc.: Thank you Bob and Ann for your information and observations of the various wildlife species. My apologies for a response taking so long and thank you very much for your patience. Our natural environment sub-consultants, Savanta, have kept a record of your comments and they also will form part of the public record for this study. Incidental observations of various species are important to the project at this point in the study. An actual visit to your property is not required at this time, but may be more appropriate as the routes are refined. With respect to Jefferson Salamanders, there are many other salamander species that are very similar to Jefferson Salamanders. The only way to determine if a certain species is a Jefferson Salamander is by genetic testing. As I understand it, Savanta has observed or trapped hundreds of salamanders as part of their investigation for this study. In addition they have completed genetic testing on the many of the trapped species and all genetic testing turned up negative i.e. no Jefferson Salamanders were found. Once again, as the study progresses and if additional observations and/or testing is required we will contact you to arrange a visit if necessary.

	with such a diverse and compatible collection of wildlife. If you would like to visit our home and property please do not hesitate to contact us. Thank you for your interest.	Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned if you have any questions. Dave
Chris Spraakman	I am writing to you with additional details to be included/considered in your environmental assessment for the East Boundary Road corridor study taking place now. I live at 1119 Clyde Road in North Dumfries (near to Clyde and Shellard) and would like to identify that we have many Animals/birds species on our property that we see regularly. These are: 1) Bats 2) Blue birds, Barn swallows, and many other birds. 3) Turtles 4) Frogs 5) Coyotes 6) Deer	Email reply sent by Dave Hallman, MTE Consultants Inc.: Good evening Chris. My apologies for a final response to your email message taking this long and thank you for your patience. I do have a record of sending you a response during the summer but I also indicated I would get back to you with some additional details. Thank you for taking the time to advise MTE's natural environment sub-consultants (Savanta) of the various species you have observed on your property. A large part of the natural environment review for this study is an overview process of the existing and potential habitat of various species. Specific observations and information such as you provided must also be considered in context with observations of the entire study area. Your information will assist in the aspect of the "overview" portion of the study and observations of the various species. On a "larger scale", your email will also form part of the public record for the study. Thanks again for your patience and please do not hesitate to give me a call, as any further enquiries should go through myself (or Marcos Kroker of the Region). It is proposed to have another Public Consultation Centre in the new year and details of the

	7) Misc. small animals	overall study including the natural environment review will be available for review. Dave"
--	------------------------	---

East Boundary Road Corridor Study
Dundas Street at South Boundary Road to Townline Road at Avenue Road / Gore Road
City of Cambridge / Township of North Dumfries / Puslinch Township
Public Consultation Centre No. 2 – December 9, 2015
Written Public Comments Received and Project Team Responses

Name	Comments	Project team response
Trevor Annett	Question 4: What are the 3 most important criteria that you feel should be considered when the alternatives are being analyzed? Answer: Remaining clear of Shellard Road. Question 5: Are there any other general comments you have on this project? Answer: The preferred route is where it should be. I like this route.	• Comments have been included in the public record and the resident was added to the project mailing list, as requested.
Steve and Dale Hahn	Checked yes to be placed on the project mailing list.	• Added to the project mailing list, as requested.
James Hilborn	Question 5: Are there any other general comments you have on this project? Answer:	• Project is proceeding as per Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Guidelines, which must be finalized before construction can begin. Given the size of the project, construction funds must also be allocated into

Name	Comments	Project team response
	Get Going!	the Regions Ten Year Transportation Capital Program.
Alex Taylor	Question 5: Are there any other general comments you have on this project? Answer: This road is needed as an alternative to the current through truck route which is the Hespeler Road / Water Street Ainslie Street corridor. As the number of roundabouts on Franklin Boulevard increases, its use for anything other than Access for trucks to industry along its length will decrease. Franklin Boulevard continues to diminish as an appropriate through truck route.	• The East Boundary Road will be designed for truck use.
Jon Cooper	Question 1: Do you think there are any other problems or needs that should be considered and added to the project Problem Statement? Answer: No Question 2:	• Safety, Efficiency, and Social impacts are incorporated into the evaluation criteria. • The Moffat Creek Bridge is estimated to require a 25m single span bridge over a point where the watercourse is only a few metres wide. This will allow for wildlife passage. In addition, there may be a requirement for other smaller culverts which could also allow wildlife passage.

Name	Comments	Project team response
Jon Cooper – continued	Do you have any additional suggestions for possible solutions or alternative alignments to address the problem/needs? Answer: No Question 3: Are there any other Evaluation Criteria that you think should be considered? Answer: No Question 4: What are the 3 most important criteria that you feel should be considered when the alternatives are being analyzed? Answer: Safety, Efficiency, Social Impact. Moffat Creek is a main natural corridor for wildlife. This corridor needs to be maintained with the ability for wildlife to cross under the roadway with a suitably wide bridge to accommodate. Question 5: Are there any other general comments you	Route B, along with all the other alignments will continue to be evaluated based on all of the evaluation criteria. The recommended route will be subject to further detailed discussions with the approving agencies.

Name	Comments	Project team response
	have on this project? Answer: The City should not dismiss Route B assuming social impact problems. A direct corridor to residential and recreational facilities is not a detriment. There could be ways to make it work.	
Unknown	1) Any by pass should be where the traffic is the transport hub is at Highway 401 & 97 – NOT to mention cars! 2) North Dumfries and east Cambridge is residential and agricultural land. 3) You are introducing harmful and poisonous pollution into our clean air, affecting our families, children and our farm crops (our food). 4) You are trading people over cars and trucks, so it takes vehicles five minutes more to reach their destination. So it should be.	• Although a benefit of the East Boundary Road is its function as a bypass for vehicles, it is also required to address future traffic from existing and future developments. The province is also working on a Study for Highway 24 and Highway 6 which will address connections to Highway 401. The East Boundary Road will connect to Townline Road which has an interchange with Highway 401. • Subject to public comments received, and additional discussion with approving agencies, all alignments will be further evaluated by the Project Team with respect to impacts on the overall environment.
Rick and Edith De Graaf	Question 1: Do you think there are any other problems or needs that should be considered and added	• The Project Team Preferred Alternative Route C1 will be subject to additional discussion with approving Agencies to

Name	Comments	Project team response
	to the project Problem Statement? Answer: I'm impressed with the comprehensiveness of the study and the work the study team has done. Question 2: Do you have any additional suggestions for possible solutions or alternative alignments to address the problem/needs? Answer: No. I do like your current preferred C1 routing. It is also my preferred routing. I really like the alignment with Townline Road. Question 4: What are the 3 most important criteria that you feel should be considered when the alternatives are being analyzed? Answer: - Traffic flow away from housing developments - Minimal enviro impact - Efficiency - Fair compensation to property owners	determine concerns with environmental issues. • In areas where property is required for the East Boundary Road, the property owner will be contacted directly by the Region of Waterloo's Land Purchasing Officer during the future detailed design process. Compensation will be provided at fair market value. • Access for farm vehicles where land is being broken up will be considered as the alternatives are further evaluated. Existing access will remain or be mitigated (new access) through detailed design. • Access to properties will be considered as the alternatives are further evaluated. Maintaining an access to properties, especially where accesses currently exist, will be considered as part of the detail design process.

Name	Comments	Project team response
	Question 5: Are there any other general comments you have on this project? Answer: - concerned about the broken up farm land – would equipment underpasses be considered for access? - If B1 is chosen – concerned about my access to Main Street given that the traffic circle would probably use up the land where I access Main Street currently (1440 Main Street E)	
Anthony & Sandra Wojteczko	Question 1: Do you think there are any other problems or needs that should be considered and added to the project Problem Statement? Answer: Traffic Noise Question 2: Do you have any additional suggestions for possible solutions or alternative alignments to address the problem/needs? Answer:	• A preliminary noise analysis following Region of Waterloo Noise Guidelines will be undertaken on the Project Team Recommended alternative to identify potential noise implications on residential properties. A full noise analysis will be undertaken as part of detailed design, prior to construction. • Trees, berms, and sound barriers are potential noise attenuation measures, subject to Region Noise Guideline warrants. • The lighting levels for East Boundary Road will be considered as part of detailed design (i.e. photometric analysis).

Name	Comments	Project team response
	Trees, Berms - sound barriers between road and existing residences. Question 4: What are the 3 most important criteria that you feel should be considered when the alternatives are being analyzed? Answer: - Noise, Light pollution.	
Penny Warner	Question 1: Do you think there are any other problems or needs that should be considered and added to the project Problem Statement? Answer: Concerned about the roads feeding into the bypass. There will most likely be an increase on them of traffic attracted to the bypass. Are there any considerations about the improvements to these roads as well. Highway 8 is already very busy and difficult to get in and out of driveways. Question 2: Do you have any additional suggestions for possible solutions or alternative alignments to address the problem/needs?	• Consideration for improvements will be considered when detailed design of the intersections with the East Boundary Road is complete. Detailed design will be based on existing traffic volumes at the time of construction, as well as forecasted volumes. • A larger study area was considered earlier in this study. In order to perform its function as a Regional Road, the East Boundary Road needs to be situated such that traffic from existing and proposed residential and industrial areas will be attracted to it. The Province is looking at larger scope studies for a Highway 24 bypass (Highway 424) and further east, a new Highway 6. • Alignment east of Shellard Road, although it may have fewer perceived impacts on Moffat Creek, is a much longer route, and would not

Name	Comments	Project team response
Penny Warner – continued	Answer: Suggest that this whole study area is not far enough out of town as the growth 10 years + will make this road location bad. The study seems to be limited by Township/City borders, which makes it very possible that this is a bad location just because its the only choice. Putting the bypass on the east side of Shellard would miss much residential areas and make use of a fairly open crossing area of Mill Creek on Gore Road, and no impact to Moffat Creek. Question 3: Are there any other Evaluation Criteria that you think should be considered? Answer: Impact to residents on feeder roads. Question 4: What are the 3 most important criteria that you feel should be considered when the alternatives are being analyzed? Answer: - Is this location best for the future or should a better location further out be	attract as much traffic resulting in traffic using other existing roads. • Impacts to Moffat Creek and Mill Creek will be subject to future discussions with approving agencies, as well as permitting at the detailed design stage to ensure impacts are minimized in accordance with environmental requirements and legislation.

Name	Comments	Project team response
	considered? - Traffic increases on feeder roads directing people to the bypass - Bringing more traffic + people into sensitive Moffat Creek – Mill Creek wilderness areas will devastate them.	
Brenda Van Ryswyk	Question 1: Do you think there are any other problems or needs that should be considered and added to the project Problem Statement? Answer: The problem Statement mentions “To Facilitate any Proposed Developments” but future “development” should also include Natural Heritage Protection or more accurately the study should “GUIDE any proposed development and mitigate or reduce environmental impacts”. Question 3: Are there any other Evaluation Criteria that you think should be considered? Answer: There was little information available on the environmental features + what studies have been done so far. The map on display	• Under the Class EA Act, all issues must be addressed. Impacts on the natural environment are very important considerations and will be subject to future discussions with approving agencies including permitting and approvals as part of detailed design, prior to construction. As part of this process, additional natural environment study will be completed. • Mitigation measures and future studies will be identified as part of this Class EA study.

Name	Comments	Project team response
Brenda Van Ryswyk – continued	showed very few survey locations. I would hope (and think) more survey work has been done. Info needed on where wildlife is rather than only the PSW's & "SIG" woodlots – some wooded areas seemed left out. Why? Question 4: What are the 3 most important criteria that you feel should be considered when the alternatives are being analyzed? Answer: 1. Reduce the environmental impact both directly and indirectly. 2. Planned as to not encourage (or "facilitate") excessive urban sprawl – needs to be part of a bigger plan to protect natural and open spaces while directing smart growth, not sprawl. 3. Be livable for future residents. Question 5: Are there any other general comments you have on this project?	

Name	Comments	Project team response
	Answer: - I need to see the more detailed study before commenting properly; ecologically I highly prefer Route B1, but can see the rational between C1 although I think more mitigation is needed. - There should be no reason to put in a new road north of Gore after the work put into Townline now.	
Joel Pearce	Question 4: What are the 3 most important criteria that you feel should be considered when the alternatives are being analyzed? Answer: - Impact to current land owners - Impact to environment - Overall cost of Project Question 5: Are there any other general comments you have on this project? Answer: I think the proposed route C1 makes the most sense.	o Land owner and natural environment impacts, as well as project costs, are all considered in the evaluation criteria.

Name	Comments	Project team response
Paul Eagles	Question 1: Do you think there are any other problems or needs that should be considered and added to the project Problem Statement? Answer: No. The existing problem statement is reasonable. Question 2: Do you have any additional suggestions for possible solutions or alternative alignments to address the problem/needs? Answer: 1) Keep the Mill Creek bridge as high as possible to facilitate human and wildlife traffic east and west along the Mill Creek forested valley. 2) Incorporate wildlife crossing technology into the road wherever possible. 3) Incorporate foot and bicycle movement on separate lanes beside the main auto / traffic lanes throughout. 4) Ensure long term wildlife movement east and west along Moffat Creek,	• The Mill Creek Bridge design will be subject to agency approvals, which consider both human and wildlife traffic • Wildlife crossing methodologies for both Mill Creek and Moffat Creek will be considered in conjunction with detailed design and agency permits required prior to construction. It is anticipated that the proposed bridge sizes will accommodate wildlife passage. • Active transportation (i.e. pedestrian and cyclist) facilities are being proposed along both sides of the corridor.

Name	Comments	Project team response
Paul Eagles – continued	as well as Mill Creek. Question 3: Are there any other Evaluation Criteria that you think should be considered? Answer: No. Question 4: What are the 3 most important criteria that you feel should be considered when the alternatives are being analyzed? Answer: 1) Natural Environment protection (wetland and forests) Question 5: Are there any other general comments you have on this project? Answer: No.	
Jack Pearce	Question 1: Do you think there are any other problems or needs that should be considered and added to the project Problem Statement?	• Cost, disruption to existing homeowners, and “directness” of route are all considered in the evaluation criteria.

Name	Comments	Project team response
Jack Pearce – continued	Answer: Not with preferred Route C1. Question 2: Do you have any additional suggestions for possible solutions or alternative alignments to address the problem/needs? Answer: No. Question 3: Are there any other Evaluation Criteria that you think should be considered? Answer: No. Question 4: What are the 3 most important criteria that you feel should be considered when the alternatives are being analyzed? Answer: - Cost - Disruption to existing homeowners - Most direct route	

Name	Comments	Project team response
	Question 5: Are there any other general comments you have on this project? Answer: I think the preferred route has been well thought out.	
John Doherty – Gowlings WLG	We represent Jeffrey John Grimm and 1404966 Ontario Limited ("1404966") in this matter. Mr. Grimm is a director and President of 1404966. 1404966 is the owner of property located at PT LT 1, CON 11, NORTH DUMFRIES AS IN 1457288; CAMBRIDGE ("Grimm Property Block"). The Grimm Property Block is municipally known as 975 Clyde Road. We are providing Mr. Grimm's comments on the East Boundary Road Study (East Boundary Road Class Environmental Assessment) further to your correspondence with Mr. Chris Pidgeon of GSP Group. Mr. Grimm is opposed to Preferred Route C1 as this is the only route which will completely bisect the Grimm Property	• Route C1 will be further analyzed with respect to shifting the route with respect to the Grimm property to mitigate a bisecting impact. • Detailed Design and Construction elements of the project cannot be added to the 10-Year Transportation Capital Program until Class EA/Study approval has been received. • Subject to public comments received, and additional discussion with approving agencies, all alignments will be further evaluated by the Project Team.

Name	Comments	Project team response
John Doherty – Gowlings WLG – continued	Block. Route C1 is designed in such a manner that there will be significant economic harm to Mr. Grimm and 1404966. At present, the Grimm Property Block is completely sterilized from a planning perspective as a result of the Region's plans to construct a road connection on the east side of Cambridge between the south end of the City to Highway 401, which plans have their origins as far back as the 1960s if not earlier. This harm will continue in light of the significant delays anticipated in this project. We note that the East Boundary Road is currently not scheduled for construction in the Region of Waterloo's current Ten Year Transportation Capital Program. Accordingly, such development scheme is highly prejudicial to Mr. Grimm and 1404966. It is Mr. Grimm's position that Proposed Route B1 should be accepted by the Region, instead of Preferred Route C1, for the following comparative reasons, among others to be provided as necessary:	

Name	Comments	Project team response
John Doherty – Gowlings WLG – continued	1) Route B1 is the shortest route and results in fewer air emissions than Route C1; 2) Route B1 requires 450m less road to be located in existing woodlands; 3) Route B1 requires 100m less road crossing through existing wetland areas; 4) Route B1 requires no farm fields to be split, whereas Route C1 requires up to at least 10 farm fields, including the Grimm Property Block, to be split; 5) We note that while Route B1 is the "least preferred" by School Boards, route C1 still requires that "some adjustments will have to be made to School Boards current planning for school locations and territories as it is further west than 'eastern' Official Plan Alignment for which they based their planning."	

Name	Comments	Project team response
John Doherty – Gowlings WLG – continued	6) Route B1 provides for a traffic forecast of 8,520, whereas Route C1 only allows for a forecast of 7,131 (a net loss of 1,389). Accordingly, Route B1 is the more efficient option. 7) Route B1 is more conducive than Route C1 for attracting Active Transportation and Public Transit Users owing to its shorter total length and its closer proximity to existing and planned developments when compared to Route C1. Route B1 provides the best access for these developments. 8) Route B1 contains significantly less risk of disturbing sites with archaeological/heritage/ cultural value as it contains almost half the amount of land where Stage 2 Archaeological Test Pit surveying is recommended (i.e. B1: 1800m of proposed road; C1: 3300m of proposed road). Moreover, Route B1 only contains 1 listed or identified property potentially impacted by such concerns whereas Route C1 contains 3 such properties. 9) Route B1 involves the lowest construction costs of all the routes	

Name	Comments	Project team response
	considered. In accordance with the foregoing, Mr. Grimm objects to Preferred Route C1 as this route not only produces the most significant adverse impacts on the Grimm Property Block, but it is clearly inferior to Route B1 from a policy and planning perspective. If the Region is unwilling to accept Route B1 in its current form, Mr. Grimm would like the Region to consider whether modifications to Preferred Route C1 can be carried out which minimize the adverse impacts noted above, in particular, by designing the route around the Grimm Property Block rather than crossing directly through the middle of it. We request that we be added to the mailing list for this project and that we receive notice of any decision from any approval authority concerning this matter.	
Ann & Bob Miller	Question 1: Do you think there are any other problems or needs that should be considered and added	• The natural environment is an evaluation criterion. Additional discussions will be held with approving agencies to further define the

Name	Comments	Project team response
Ann & Bob Miller – continued	to the project Problem Statement? Answer: We think you have considered all the required criteria. Question 2: Do you have any additional suggestions for possible solutions or alternative alignments to address the problem/needs? Answer: No! We think it is important that steps be taken by all concerned in Region, Twp, City, etc. to finalize Route C-1 so we don't have to repeat this process in 10 years. Question 3: Are there any other Evaluation Criteria that you think should be considered? Answer: No. Question 4: What are the 3 most important criteria that you feel should be considered when the alternatives are being analyzed?	impacts on the natural environment. As part of detailed design permitting must be obtained with approving agencies, which ensure that the project follows all natural environment regulations and requirements.

Name	Comments	Project team response
	Answer: - People affected - Environmental protection - Ease of access and usefulness of finished roadway Question 5: Are there any other general comments you have on this project? Answer: Agree with partial closure of Shellard Rd. Move forward with Route C as preferred route.	
Fred Taylor and Christine Stone	Question 1: Do you think there are any other problems or needs that should be considered and added to the project Problem Statement? Answer: Yes. At the meeting it was stated that Alternatives in the Township of North Dumfries (e.g., A1 and A2) were not feasible due the lack of approval from the Township but no details were provided.	• Alternatives A1 and A2 were evaluated and not considered “preferred” based on additional length (higher costs) and its distance from existing residents and proposed developments, compared to the other alternatives. In addition, an East Boundary Road connection further north along Townline Road would yield a longer road with additional natural environment area impacts beyond the Region’s jurisdiction (i.e. Township of Puslinch/County of Wellington).

Name	Comments	Project team response
Fred Taylor and Christine Stone – continued	This lack of approval was not provided in any of the documents provided. Further explanation and justification of why these alternatives are not feasible and could be overcome should be provided for public input. Why were these alternatives even considered if they were not feasible? These alternatives should be revisited. If the boundary road is 10+ years into the future then alternatives which are farther east should be considered since it will allow more future expansion to the east without crossing through sensitive lands and avoid future road construction when the time and cost for it could be avoided. The much discussed Highway 424 was not mentioned in the documents or at the meeting. The impact of this should be included in the evaluation. If Highway 424 occurs will the boundary road even be needed? The alternative costs indicate that the alternatives all have similar orders of magnitude of cost. It is highly unlikely that the cost for Alternative A1 is not the least	• The East Boundary Road must connect to Townline Road at or near its southern terminus. To the south, East Boundary Road must also be somewhat east near existing and proposed residential areas in order that vehicles and active transportation (i.e. pedestrians and cyclists) will use it; as opposed to other existing roads thereby increasing congestion on existing roads. • The Province is looking at larger scope studies for a Highway 24 bypass (Highway 424) and even further east, a new Highway 6. These Roads provide a different or higher level function than the East Boundary Road. The East Boundary Road is required regardless of future Provincial Highway system needs. • If Shellard Road is utilized as part of the East Boundary Road, it will have to be completely reconstructed and widened, including into significant areas of swamp/wetlands/wildlife habitat. Route A1 is also significantly longer than the more western routes. As a result there would not be significant savings, if any, by utilizing Shellard Road and a lengthy bisecting impact to a natural environment area. • Impacts to wells, etc. due to construction will

Name	Comments	Project team response
Fred Taylor and Christine Stone – continued	cost by a wide margin since the majority if this routing runs along an existing road (Shellard Road) versus the other alternatives The preferred alignment (and most of the other alignments being considered) is directly adjacent to our property line, barn and residence. There will be noise, dust, fumes, vibrations, construction, structural, impacts to drinking water wells and other impacts to our property from this project. There also are other properties that will directly impacted by this project in a similar fashion. The construction and operation of a major regional road directly adjacent to a residential property will cause long term impacts. These impacts cannot be satisfactorily mitigated to prevent unacceptable impacts to our and other properties and residents (e.g, will not be able to comply with provincial and local noise regulation and by-law requirements). The alignment should be reevaluated to provide significant buffer zones from existing residential properties to the road. The preferred alignment does	be subject to further studies and discussions with approving agencies which will also require that permitting be obtained that follow all regulations and guidelines prior to construction. Pre- and post-construction surveys, etc. are one mitigating measure for future consideration. • The alignment south of Townline Road will be investigated to review if it can be moved further east slightly and still tie into Townline Road at or near its southern terminus. • Pre-construction surveys of nearby existing properties and buildings will be undertaken by the Region of Waterloo prior to construction. The process followed provides a record of pre-construction conditions. If during or following construction it appears that damages may have been caused by construction, the identified damage is compared to the pre-construction condition and remedied as required. • Proximity of the road to existing residences is a consideration as part of the evaluation. • The “Do Nothing” alternative has been evaluated and does not address the project problem/opportunity statement. • The East Boundary Road will accommodate future development from areas east and west

Name	Comments	Project team response
Fred Taylor and Christine Stone – continued	not currently provide sufficient buffer zones to mitigate impacts. For example there is currently significant traffic on Avenue Road that causes noise impacts to and littering on our property. A new road on the east side and adjacent to our property with even more traffic will cause significant impacts to our property and us. Question 2: Do you have any additional suggestions for possible solutions or alternative alignments to address the problem/needs? Answer Comprehensive pre-construction surveys of existing properties and buildings along the alignment should be conducted to document conditions prior to construction. Significant earth moving and construction projects adjacent to properties and buildings can cause substantial structural and other issues (e.g., foundation cracks, settlement and decreased well water quality). The pre-construction surveys should include	of the proposed alignment. Impacts to the natural environment will be subject to further discussions with approving agencies and will require permits from these agencies to ensure the design follows required guidelines and legislation. As part of these permits, compensation for lost trees as mitigation, such as new planting, could be considered.

Name	Comments	Project team response
Fred Taylor and Christine Stone – continued	detailed inspections, photographs and videos of existing properties and buildings (e.g., foundations, walls, floors etc.) to document baseline conditions prior to construction. Similar post construction surveys should be conducted to provide comparable evaluations to confirm (hopefully) that impacts have not occurred. If impacts are observed than these will need to be addressed to return the property/buildings to pre-construction conditions. Question 3: Are there any other Evaluation Criteria that you think should be considered? Answer The evaluation criteria are very general and capture the key required items. What is missing is specific evaluations of individual properties along the alignment that will be impacted. We and other property owners should not agree to the proposed alignment until these property specific evaluations are completed in a reasonably professional manner and to our satisfaction	

Name	Comments	Project team response
Fred Taylor and Christine Stone – continued	Question 4: What are the 3 most important criteria that you feel should be considered when the alternatives are being analyzed? Answer Social environment, natural environment, and costs. Question 5: Are there any other general comments you have on this project? Answer The project will significantly impact the natural environment. There are significant habitats, wetlands, watercourses, and extensive birds and mammals in the project area. Route A provides the least impact to the natural environment as it uses an existing road for much of the route. It doesn't make sense for Route A to be the highest cost since it will be in the current road alignment and the existing road can just be expanded and upgraded. Route A should be reevaluated as the preferred alternative.	

Name	Comments	Project team response
Fred Taylor and Christine Stone – continued	While an East Boundary Road has been in the works for decades it will be 10 to 15 or even more years until it is actually built. Therefore, we believe that the Study Limit and the selection of a preferred alignment that is so close to Townline Road is short sighted and does not allow for future development east of Townline Road. Development also is limited in the sensitive wetland, watercourse and other areas located to the west of the proposed alignment. Consideration to move the proposed alignment to the eastern side of the Study Limit or even further east should be considered. This also would provide a reduced number of properties that have existing residents that will be affected. \$50Million is a lot of money. A cost benefit analysis should be conducted in comparison to other worthy projects that would be more beneficial to the community. For example, for +/- \$5 million Gore Road and Shellard Road could be upgraded and provide an East Boundary Road for 10 plus years into the future. Why should we pay for a large road expansion that is not currently needed and is shortsighted for future regional	

Name	Comments	Project team response
	development.	
Brad Spruin	First of all, I would like to thank both of you, and the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, for taking the time to provide an in-depth overview of the East Boundary Road proposals. After going through the documents and studies provided, I strongly agree with the “preferred proposal” of Route C1, for the following reasons: 1) The proposal has the least impact on the wetlands areas The has been of longstanding importance to the area, and will only grow as the residential community builds around it; The highway will provide a much needed transportation route with the growing community, but should not be done at the expense of wildlife or the environment 2) Most cost effective option Not only do the proposed Routes A and A1, have the most negative impact on the Wetlands, but they are the most expensive	• The natural environment is an evaluation criterion. Additional discussions will be held with approving agencies to further define the impacts on the natural environment. • As part of detailed design permitting must be obtained with approving agencies, which ensure that the project follows all natural environment regulations and requirements.

Name	Comments	Project team response
Brad Spruin – continued	Why spend more to hurt the landscape we have cultivated and preserved for so long 3) Is most reflective of what the community/area has historically aspired to One of the main reasons we moved to this area was because of the natural environment that had been preserved so well; which we ourselves have preserved Our property includes protected wetlands, and because of this we have had to follow strict guidelines For instance we recently added an extension to our home and worked with the Grand River Conservation Authority to ensure our project did not affect the protected areas on our property and we are not allowed to ever pave our driveway as it runs through the wetlands. Therefore, the A route would contradict everything the area has strived to achieve, and would be duplicit with what we personally have had to compromise on.	
John Lamontagne	I'm a resident on the border line of Cambridge & North Dumfries Shellard RD	• Subject to public comments received, and additional discussion with approving agencies,

Name	Comments	Project team response
John Lamontagne – continued	1372 is my residence after looking at the appendix key plan, and from past experiences the shorter distance between two point is a straight line. I would suggest the municipal boundary through the grand river conservation bridge over mill creek over pass the rail road clover leaf or roundabout Clyde rd bridge over head the swamp. roundabout Main str. leave the farm land untouched and also a lot less of infrastructure to contend with the dumpsite might be in the way cannot see it on the map. I will not be at the meeting. leave the decision into your capable hands..... Thank you for your reply .the reason for the comments are that the appropriation of the farm land can be very costly first of all, the regional boundary is mostly of no used low laying area not suited for agriculture. To create a road over head today is much simpler then it was in the past with prefabricated Bridge spans and pillars and very little harm to the system below for the lively hood of the wild species. The west proposal would be very costly with all the	the alignment alternatives will be further evaluated by the Project Team including impacts on farmland, residences, creeks, etc. .

Name	Comments	Project team response
	bends and curves and ditches. The East side the land could be a expensive issues again thanks.	
Paul Puopolo	I attended the Public Consultation Meeting #2 on Wednesday, December 9th, 2015 at the Cambridge Golf Club, regarding Class EA Assessment Study for the East Boundary Road. At the meeting, we reviewed the various handouts, videos and boards and based on these, the preferred route C, has no effect on the Bosdale lands. On behalf of Bosdale, we are in full support of the project team identifying route C1 as the preferred alternative route and the reason we support the route are well documented in your report. As we mentioned in the previous correspondence, Alternative B1, should not be supported due to: 1) The major impact that the route would have on the existing residential community and its social fabric; 2) The major costs of purchasing part of the Bosdale lands and due to its valuable residential land development prices;	• Subject to public comments received, and additional discussion with approving agencies, the alignments will be further evaluated by the Project Team including impacts on existing and residential communities, farmland, residences, and impacts to these developments.

Name	Comments	Project team response
Paul Puopolo – continued	3) It would create a disjointed community plan, which would have a major effect on our Draft Plan; 4) It would make the recreational/education/ community centre not as viable; 5) It would affect the potential of the 2 schools in the area. We suggest to the project team that they recommend C-1 route to the Region of Waterloo Public Works Committee, and also keep us informed of any further decisions, as it relates to this matter so that we can make the necessary representation. Finally, it is important that a timely decision is made by March / April 2016 to Regional Council , which would allow the City of Cambridge to proceed with their recreational/community centre, permit the school boards to move forward with their two schools and allow Bosdale to move forward with their residential Draft Plan of Subdivision.	
Robert K. Glass	We met last night at the public consultation in regards to the proposed	• The East Boundary Road must connect to Townline Road near or at its current southern

Name	Comments	Project team response
Robert K. Glass – continued	route for the Cambridge East Boundary Road. I appreciate you taking the time to speak with me. As I expressed at the time I have concerns in regards to the proposed Route C1. I own and live at 15 Scottfarm Walk. The proposed route runs directly behind my property creating potential issues related to noise pollution, emissions pollution, and safety concerns. In addition Route C1 would destroy the forested area directly behind my property thereby harming wildlife populations and giving rise to a number of other environmental concerns. I also feel many of the issues created by the proposed Route C1 would effectively result in devaluation of my property. You had mentioned during our discussion the possibility of pushing the C1 roundabout located at Townline and Avenue (and subsequent section of roadway running behind my property) further to the east thus minimizing some of the issues I have raised above. While I would prefer a solution such as Route A1, which would pull traffic further away from the city and allow for greater development	terminus. • Moving the East Boundary Road somewhat further east near Townline Road will be reviewed. • A preliminary noise analysis following Region of Waterloo Noise Guidelines will be undertaken on the Project Team Recommended alternative to identify potential noise implications on residential properties. A full noise analysis will be undertaken as part of detailed design, prior to construction. • Impacts to the natural environment such as wildlife will be subject to further discussions with approving agencies and will require permitting from these agencies to ensure the design follows required guidelines and legislation. As part of these permits, compensation for lost trees, such as new planting, could be considered.

Name	Comments	Project team response
	opportunities over a longer time frame, at the least I would hope that consideration is given to moving the preferred Route C1 further east so as not to encroach on my property or my neighbour's properties. Please keep me informed via email at this email address as the project develops. Again, thank you for your time last night and for your consideration of my concerns and recommendations.	
Jim Peebles	I currently live in Deerpath estates and my back yard fence is just a few feet from town line road. The noise level there is already barely tolerable due to the motorcycles, and over enthusiastic auto drivers. Any plan to increase traffic in this area causes grave concern. Am anxious to know the plan and noise abatement solutions.	• A preliminary noise analysis following Region of Waterloo Noise Guidelines will be undertaken on the Project Team Recommended alternative to identify potential noise implications on residential properties. A full noise analysis will be undertaken as part of detailed design, prior to construction. • Trees, berms, and sound barriers are potential noise attenuation measures, subject to Region Noise Guideline warrants.

East Boundary Road Corridor Study
Dundas Street at South Boundary Road to Townline Road at Avenue Road / Gore Road
City of Cambridge / Township of North Dumfries / Puslinch Township
Public Consultation Centre No. 3 – February 1, 2018
Written Public Comments Received and Project Team Responses

Name	Comments	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
Aaron Mann	Question 3 Are there other Evaluation Criteria that you think should be considered? Answer: Flow on and off this roadway. Question 4 What are the 3 most important criteria that you feel should be considered when the alternatives are being analyzed? Answer: Cost, Time, and Aesthetics. Question 5: Are there any other general comments you have on this project? Answer: Once studies are complete expedite the construction.	• A more detailed analysis of traffic on intersecting Regional Roads will be undertaken as part of detailed design, and required improvements will be incorporated. • Cost has been incorporated into the evaluation criteria. • Timing of construction will depend somewhat upon when development proceeds in the area, as well as approved funding through the Region's 10-Year Transportation Capital Program. • Aesthetics will be considered as part of detailed design.

Name	Comments	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
Anonymous	Question 3: Are there other Evaluation Criteria that you think should be considered? Answer: If wetlands are destroyed or impacted, then compensation should be made to re-create or restore wetlands within the same area/sub-watershed. Question 4: What are the 3 most important criteria that you feel should be considered when the alternatives are being analyzed? Answer: Environmental impacts, further development impacts (area around road always has increased development). Question 5: Are there any other general comments you have on this project? Answer: I am in agreement with the current preferred route. It appears to be the best one to accomplish connectivity with the least environmental impacts to this area. I am glad B4 is the preferred route.	• As part of detailed design, impacts on wetlands and other natural environment features will be subject to agency (e.g. Grand River Conservation Authority, Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry, etc.) approval. Often, compensation for impacts to wetlands must be provided as a condition of approval. This compensation can take many forms including, but not limited to, recreating or expanding existing wetlands. • Natural environment impacts are included in the evaluation criteria for this project. One of the key objectives of this study is to establish a corridor for the East Boundary Road such that development can proceed. • Alignment alternative B4 has several advantages; including, based on discussion with MNRF, having the least impact on the natural environment compared to the other alternatives.

Name	Comments	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
Anonymous	Question 3: Are there other Evaluation Criteria that you think should be considered? Answer: We need roads! The congestion is ridiculous. Question 5: Are there any other general comments you have on this project? Answer: Please proceed as quickly as possible! The sooner the better.	• This Class EA (study) is proceeding per Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Guidelines, which must be satisfied before detailed design and construction can begin. • Once the Class EA has been completed, detailed design and construction funds must be approved by Regional Council in the Region's 10-Year Transportation Capital Program. • Prior to construction, detailed design, agency approvals, and property acquisition must be finalized.
Jon Cooper	Question 3: Are there any other Evaluation Criteria that you think should be considered? Answer: Not on the preferred route. On the Shellard Road proposals, laneway access to residential properties on a four lane road will be a significant problem. Question 4: What are the 3 most important criteria that you feel should be considered when the alternatives are being	• Existing private accesses onto the East Boundary Road were a consideration when evaluating the routes from traffic operation, capacity, and safety, as well as property/social impact perspectives. • Environmental impacts, traffic safety and ability to attract traffic are all criteria used to evaluate the various alignments.

Name	Comments	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
Jon Cooper – continued	analyzed? Answer: Minimize environmental impact; maximize utilization for the new road; ensure it is safe. Question 5: Are there any other general comments you have on this project? Answer: No.	
Karen Schnuelle	Question 1: Do you think there are any other problems or needs that should be considered and added to the project Problem Statement? Answer: No. Question 2: Do you have any additional suggestions for possible solutions or alternative alignments to address the problem/needs? Answer: Please ensure to plan to plant trees and other vegetation along entire route to offset air pollution and noise pollution, plus it will provide habitat for	• As part of detailed design, trees in the road allowance will be considered and may be placed in areas that will not present a safety issue for users. • Environmental impacts, shortest route (lower costs, ability to attract traffic, etc.) are evaluation criteria used to consider the alternatives. Multi-use trails for cyclists are recommended to be carried across the bridges. As part of detailed design, the roundabouts will be designed to accommodate cyclists using current standards and practices. • During detailed design, the type of street lighting fixtures will be designed to consider impacts or enhancements to surrounding wildlife and developments.

Name	Comments	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
Karen Schnuelle - continued	animal species. Trees would also provide a safety barrier between multi-use trail users and road. Question 3: Are there any other Evaluation Criteria that you think should be considered? Answer: What has been researched so far is quite comprehensive. Nothing to add. Question 4: What are the 3 most important criteria that you feel should be considered when the alternatives are being analyzed? Answer: Environmental impact; shortest route with efficient traffic flow, such as use of roundabouts; ** safe cycling crossings at roundabouts and bridges. Question 5: Are there any other general comments you have on this project? Answer: Installation of aesthetically pleasing modern looking light fixtures. We also agree with the B4 route as being the most	

Name	Comments	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
Karen Schnuelle - continued	preferred choice.	
Brian Schwantz	Question 2: Do you have any additional suggestions for possible solutions or alternative alignments to address the problem/needs? Answer: Too many environmental areas being impacted. Increased traffic. Question 3: Are there any other Evaluation Criteria that you think should be considered? Answer: The impact of traffic increase. De-value of properties. Question 4: What are the 3 most important criteria that you feel should be considered when the alternatives are being analyzed? Answer: Impact between Waterloo & Wellington counties. Impact Noise and Pollution and wild life. Impact changing quiet neighborhood.	• Based on discussions with the approving agencies (MNRF, GRCA, etc.) and Regional and City Environmental Advisory Committees), the Preferred Alignment Route B4 has the least impacts on the natural environment. • Traffic will be attracted to the new East Boundary Road, and side street connections will be upgraded as required to address forecasted traffic needs during detailed design. • During detailed design a noise study will be undertaken to determine if any noise mitigation is warranted per the Region's Noise Guidelines. • As part of detailed design, approvals must be obtained from the MNRF and GRCA for final details with respect to impacts on the natural environment including wildlife, wildlife habitat, etc. Measures to minimize these impacts as much as possible will be incorporated and subject to approvals from the required agencies.

Name	Comments	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
Debbie Schwantz	Question 1: Do you think there are any other problems or needs that should be considered and added to the project Problem Statement? Answer: We do not need a route between Townline and Highway 401 – traffic can flow down Franklin Boulevard. Question 2: Do you have any additional suggestions for possible solutions or alternative alignments to address the problem/needs? Answer: Look for an alternative solution as there are TOO MANY environmental areas and habitats impacted. We need to SAVE our forests and wetlands. Do a traffic study on the use of Franklin Boulevard as it does not seem that busy and traffic moves through there quickly from one end of Cambridge to the other. Question 3: Are there any other Evaluation Criteria that you think should be considered? Answer:	• Even with the Franklin Boulevard Improvements, the East Boundary Road is needed to address existing and forecasted north-south congestion on Hespeler Road and Franklin Boulevard by providing an additional connection from the south end to Highway 401. In addition, an East Boundary Road will improve access to the Regional road network for residents of the Southeast Cambridge (Galt) Community and provide an alternative for goods movement through downtown Cambridge (Galt). • Based on discussions with the approving agencies (MNRF, GRCA, etc.) and Regional and City Environmental Advisory Committees), the Preferred Alignment Route B4 has the least impacts on the natural environment. • As part of detailed design, approvals must be obtained from the MNRF and GRCA for final details with respect to impacts on the natural environment including wildlife, wildlife habitat, etc. Measures to minimize these impacts as much as possible will be

Name	Comments	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
Debbie Schwantz – continued	The residents opinions. Loss of animal habitat. Increase in noise pollution. Loss of beauty. Changing quiet neighborhoods and de-valuing property. Question 4: What are the 3 most important criteria that you feel should be considered when the alternatives are being analyzed? Answer: IMPACT OF NOISE POLLUTION AND INCREASED TRAFFIC ON RESIDENTS AND WILDLIFE – we are country – not city. LOSS OF HABITAT AND BEAUTY. Is it necessary? Question 5: Are there any other general comments you have on this project? Answer: We do not want the increase in garbage being thrown out. We want our neighborhood to remain as country and NOT a freeway.	incorporated and subject to approvals from the required agencies. • During detailed design a noise study will be undertaken to determine if any noise mitigation is warranted per the Region's Noise Guidelines.

Name	Comments	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
Derek Rau	Question 5: Are there any other general comments you have on this project? Answer: B4 route seems to be logically choice with lower impact on environmental, properties and costs. Can not keep growing without a solution.	Resident added to Project Mailing List, as requested.
Robert & Ann Miller	Question 1: Do you think there are any other problems or needs that should be considered and added to the project Problem Statement? Answer: I feel you have done your job! Thorough, detailed, well structured study and it's time to move forward – no such undertaking can be perfect --- but you have identified an acceptable route. Question 2: Do you have any additional suggestions for possible solutions or alternative alignments to address the problem/needs? Answer: No! Details will arise but that is for engineers and planners to resolve.	Natural Environment, Social Environment, and Cost were 3 of the 5 evaluation criteria used to consider the alternatives. In addition, Heritage/Archaeological/Cultural Impacts and Traffic Capacity/Operations/Safety were the other 2 evaluation criteria.

Name	Comments	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
Robert & Ann Miller – continued	Question 3: Are there any other Evaluation Criteria that you think should be considered? Answer: Not at this time. Question 4: What are the 3 most important criteria that you feel should be considered when the alternatives are being analyzed? Answer: Environmental Impact; Social Impact; and Cost. Question 5: Are there any other general comments you have on this project? Answer: Job Well done. You have considered the appropriate factors and come to the most acceptable route that is available.	
Tina Gelinas	Question 3: Are there any other Evaluation Criteria that you think should be considered?	• The Class EA includes recommendations for intersections of the East Boundary Road with both local/City (i.e. Wesley Boulevard and Avenue Road) and Regional (i.e. Main

Name	Comments	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
Tina Gelinas – continued	Answer: Places to turn around other then Roundabouts? That's allot of grass upkeep!!! Cutting, garbage. Question 5: Are there any other general comments you have on this project? Answer: The proposed route looks to be least intrusive of all the choices.	Street and Clyde Road) roads. The East Boundary Road will improve access to the Regional road network from/to local roads. • Road maintenance, including grass-cutting, is included in the annual operating budget and is updated to reflect new road construction as needed.
John Nimick	Request to be added to the Project Mailing List.	• Resident added to Project Mailing List, as requested.
Scott Haeffling	Request to be added to the Project Mailing List.	• Resident added to Project Mailing List, as requested.
Kim & Peter Wozniak	Question 4: What are the 3 most important criteria that you feel should be considered when the alternatives are being analyzed? Answer: Environmental Impact --- Water specifically maintaining drinking water; Noise.	• The Natural Environment is 1 of 5 evaluation criteria used in consideration of all alternatives. • Through detailed design, hydrogeological study will be completed. In addition, pre-condition surveys before construction, well monitoring during construction, and post-construction surveys following construction are all mitigating measures for consideration.

Name	Comments	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
Waheed Mian	Question 1: Do you think there are any other problems or needs that should be considered and added to the project Problem Statement? Answer: Up-grading Gore Rd from Townline to Shellard, as multi-use trail. Question 2: Do you have any additional suggestions for possible solutions or alternative alignments to address the problem/needs? Answer: No. Question 4: What are the 3 most important criteria that you feel should be considered when the alternatives are being analyzed? Answer: Environment; Cost; Residents concerns. Question 5: Are there any other general comments you have on this project?	Monday, March 5, 2018 email Good afternoon Waheed, Thanks again for your feedback following PCC 3. In reviewing your comment sheet, I've noted an item for follow up. Please be advised that Gore Road from Townline Road to Shellard Road is not included in the East Boundary Road Corridor Study project scope. However, the Region GIS indicates that the noted road segment is within the Township of North Dumfries and, by extension, the Region of Waterloo. As such, it will be included for active transportation facility (e.g. a multi-use trail) consideration through the ongoing Region Transportation Master Plan [Update] (RTMP) Moving Forward. The third and final Public Consultation Centre for Moving Forward will be held this week (info below): Wednesday, March 7, 2018 Cambridge City Hall, Bowman Room, 50 Dickson Street, Cambridge Drop in anytime... presentation at 5:30

Name	Comments	PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE
Waheed Mian – continued	Answer: I think the preferred route is good.	and 7 p.m. Additional Moving Forward information can be found on the Region's website... • The Natural Environment, Cost, and Social Environment (including resident impacts) are 3 of 5 evaluation criteria used in consideration of all alternatives.
Roger Will	Question 1: Do you think there are any other problems or needs that should be considered and added to the project Problem Statement? Answer: Run off & salt killing trees on my land. Garbage blowing on property from Cedar Brook. Concerned about my well water. Access to Puslinch side is contradictory to land uses & zoning. Services should be available. Question 2: Do you have any additional suggestions for possible solutions or alternative alignments to address the problem/needs?	• The Region has a Salt Management Road Design Assessment tool that will be completed during detailed design with the assistance of staff from the Region's Water Services division. • Road drainage will be directed into ditches or storm sewers which will drain into stormwater management facilities for quality and/or quantity control. Any surface water drainage must also be dealt with, typically by culverts, etc., in accordance with approvals from the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) and Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF). • The Project Team Recommended Alternative Route B4 intersection at

Roger Will – continued	Answer: The route should go from Saginaw to Shellard via Puslinch Township. Current and updated study on transportation to reflex future growth plans and expand scope of study. How many tractor trailer & have you done study. Question 4: What are the 3 most important criteria that you feel should be considered when the alternatives are being analyzed? Answer: Less impact on environment; carp breeding area at Mill Creek & proposed route; and Shellard was put their for expansion. Question 5: Are there any other general comments you have on this project? Answer: You need to work with owners on the route.	Townline Road, Avenue Road, and Gore Road is not in proximity to your well. However, during detailed design, potential impacts from construction on groundwater will be reviewed. If mitigating measures are determined to be required, similar to what was done during the proximal Townline Road Improvements project, they will be implemented. • A Transportation Report will be included in the Environmental Study Report (ESR) for this Class EA. Forecasting of traffic, including truck traffic, through the 2031 horizon is included. • The Township of Puslinch is within Wellington County and is outside the Region of Waterloo's jurisdiction. • The Project Team Recommended Alternative Route B4 has been assessed as having the lowest natural environmental impacts of all alternatives. Detailed design and construction will be subject to permitting from the required approval agencies including GRCA, MNRF, etc., as applicable. • The "Shellard Side Road" Alternative alignment, Route A, was considered through this study. However, it rated
--------------------------------------	---	--

		lower than Route B4 in 4 of the 5 evaluation criteria, including Natural Environment. Specifically, the significant length of wetland on either side of Shellard Road would be impacted due to road construction (i.e. the existing road would have to be widened and entirely excavated in order for the new road to meet design standards for the amount of type of traffic forecasted). • Prior to construction, during detailed design, there will be a public meeting to review and comment on the East Boundary Road design.
John	February 7, 2018 Email good morning Mr Hallman.I,m a resident on Shellard Rd ... for 12 years. John and attended meeting regarding those proposals that always required another study this last study is similar to the previous one.the money that will be spent starting from scratch.constructing a new road in my opinion would be a waste.why not look at using a road that is already functional. widen it to the maximum road allowance do the req,d infra stucture to update to the new standard. I also know that they will be a lot of resistance from the residents along Shellard rd with that proposal but the reality is.the new proposal on the book at the	Response to February 7, 2018 Email Good afternoon ... , Thank you very much for your interest in the East Boundary Road study and taking time to provide us with your comments and suggestions. The Project Team will consider your comments along with all the other comments received from the public and agencies as we finalize and recommend the final alternative. Your suggestion of utilizing existing roads was considered through the study. It is similar to Alternative Route A which utilizes a significant portion of Shellard Road. Utilizing

	moment will not have any impact on the traffic situation .the population in this area is getting larger and the traffic heavier and Shellard rd will end up having to be updated regardless so my suggestion is doing at this time might be a cheaper outcome because when a see our taxes dollars being wasted on study after study calculating what I paid in municipal taxes in the last 12 years add up to more than \$75,00.00 and all the other resident have also paid there share. but we see no improvement on our side of North Dumfries ..my humble opinion John.	existing roads is always a key consideration. As you indicated, it often has the potential advantages of lower land purchase, construction, and utilities costs. This was all considered, but there are also a number of disadvantages to using a route that follows Shellard Road or a similar route to the east. Many of these are outlined in the PCC No. 3 Information Package and/or the Display Boards, and several are summarized below: ✓ As you likely know, there are significant wetlands along Shellard Road, that not only have significant and sensitive vegetation and wildlife habitat, but also a high probability of peat deposits that would have to be removed. A prime consideration of any alignment study is to minimize impacts to the natural environment. ✓ Even though Shellard Road is an existing road, it has a road allowance width of approximately 20 m (66 feet), whereas the new East Boundary Road will require a road allowance width of 40-50m (130-165 feet). Not only will significant land still need to be purchased if Shellard Rd is utilized, but the existing road base of Shellard Road will not be sufficient for the
--	--	---

		amount and type of traffic that will be experienced (including heavy truck traffic). In other words, the same amount of road construction will need to be undertaken to provide an adequate road structure if Shellard Road and Morrison Road is utilized. ✓ Since an eastern alignment is longer than a route further west, total construction costs for an eastern alignment will generally be more than a western alignment. ✓ A road to the east, that is further away from the City of Cambridge and longer than a western alignment, will not attract as much traffic – both vehicular and active (pedestrians, cyclists, etc.) – from the populated area, and therefore will not be utilized as effectively as a route further west. ✓ You have suggested tying the East Boundary Road into Dundas Street at Morrison Road. The main reason the preferred alternative B4 is tying into Dundas Street at the future South Boundary Road (connecting to Hwy 24), is that northbound traffic from the Brantford area will have an opportunity
--	--	--

	February 10, 2018 Email good day Mr Armstrong.thank you for your reply.first I do not want to give the impression that I,m trying to convince anyone to take any of my comments as an influence to your decisions the suggestions are only base on my own observation. looking at alternative B4.. as a few flaws the twist and turns in the plan would make very hard to drive a tractor trailer a long flat bed trailer or emergency vehicle to negotiate those sharp bend large and extra large transporters can not navigate trough a road that look like a rabbits trail I do not know the reason for the	to utilize the South Boundary Road, East Boundary Road, and Townline Road to connect to Hwy 401 in a more direct way. Lastly, the PCC No. 3 Information Package and Display Boards are on the Region's website. You can access them by clicking on the following link: http://www.regionofwaterloo.ca/en/gettingAround/resources/7299-EastBoundaryRdInformationSheet.pdf I am hopeful the brief summary above is sufficient; but if it is unclear or you have any other questions, please feel free to contact me or Dave Hallman. Thank you again for your comments and suggestions, which will be considered by the Project Team. Response to February 10, 2018 Email Good morning ... , Thanks again for providing suggestions for consideration in this study. By copy of this email I am consolidating all of your comments and sketched suggestions for inclusion in final reporting.
--	---	--

	layout of this proposal but correction are needed that is why since the roundabout have been introduce on Franklin Blvd. the traffic as increase a great deal on shellard road with cars and also heavy equipment cements truck floats and transports trucks twist and turn are a problems for goods and equipment' transporter .as for the wet land the road would have to be over head. a bridge like construction to allow the wild life and other concerns to be taken care of for the cost I,m not sure if it would feasible ?? for Shellard Rd the road allowance can be over come from Gore road to Old Beverly all the residence are a good distance from Shellard Rd beyond old Beverly is a little more complicated but using Shellard up to close to Old beverly then cut at 45 degree angle westerly to the Cambridge North boundary the south to Hyw 8 Dundas intersect .just a suggestion. when the decision will be made the results will be permanent some pencil in suggestions included with this Email John.	
Teresa	February 8, 2018 Email Hello Mr Armstrong and Mr. Hallman, I was unable to attend the public meeting on February 1, 2018 but I have read the information package posted on the Region of Waterloo website and	Response to February 8, 2018 Email Good afternoon Teresa, Thank you for your interest in the East Boundary Road Class EA and taking the time to provide comments. I believe that a number of your comments are

Teresa – continued	understand that the decision has more or less been made to move forward with the B4 route. I reside at ... Main St, very close to where the new road would cross Main St/hwy 97. Currently we enjoy a very quiet property with what I consider to be a minor amount of traffic noise from Main St. Obviously, my property will get a lot noisier once this road is built, but I accept that this east boundary road is necessary and that you have made the choice that overall has the least impact on the environmental sensitive lands. I do have some questions about the intersection of Main Street and the new road. It is difficult to tell from the maps, but it appears that the new road will intersect Main street immediately beside the property boundary at 1375 Main St. Is that correct or will the road be farther east? I may have just missed this information in the package, but is this road going to be a limited access road? And if so, what will the intersection at Main St look like? Will it be a roundabout, access ramps or traffic lights? Will the residents in this area be allowed to have any input into the intersection design? Also, will we as home owners directly affected by the proximity of this road be given any assurances of noise reduction being installed to safeguard the	generally addressed in the PCC No. 3 Information Package and Display Boards posted on the Region's website. Below is a link to the Detailed Project Information Sheet: http://www.regionofwaterloo.ca/en/gettingAround/resources/7299-EastBoundaryRdInformationSheet.pdf In addition, the following provide specifically address the questions in your email: 1. ".....the new road will intersect Main street immediately beside the property boundary at ... Main St. Is that correct or will the road be farther east?" No. The Preferred Alignment B4 as shown at PCC No. 3 crosses Main Street further west near the southern limit of the Region Landfill site, approximately 300m west of the Hydro One corridor. At PCC No. 2 in 2015, the preferred alignment came close to your property at ... Main Street East (Route C1). However, due to natural environment considerations associated with Route C1 and the Moffat Creek Wetland Complex further south of Main Street, Route B4 was developed and is now the preferred alignment.
----------------------------------	--	--

Teresa – continued	reasonable enjoyment of our residential properties? Is there a process for us to be advised of noise reduction strategies and to have input on the strategies implemented? Thank you for your response.	If we have misinterpreted your property location, please let us know and we can address any other issues. 2. “.....is this road going to be a limited access road?” Yes. As with most new Regional roads the East Boundary Road will have limited access (i.e. raised centre median) and be designated as such. However, any existing roads (such as Main Street) will be connected to the East Boundary Road, and any driveways or laneways that may intersect the new road will either be connected to the East Boundary Road or an alternate access will be provided for the property owner. The Region will not deny an existing access, although it may be in an alternate location. 3. “...what will the intersection at Main St look like? Will it be a roundabout, access ramps or traffic lights? Will the residents in this area be allowed to have any input into the intersection design?” A final decision has not been made on what type of intersection will be constructed. Since roundabouts generally require more property than a signalized intersection, the preliminary
----------------------------------	--	--

Teresa – continued		drawings shown at PCC No. 3 have illustrated roundabouts at the Main Street intersection to illustrate what may be the maximum impacts. However, as part of future design it will be determined whether the intersection will be a roundabout or a signalized intersection. In the future when detailed design is being completed, and the type of intersection is being determined, the Region would be in contact with any property owners where land purchases are required or existing driveways/accesses are impacted. 4. “... will we as home owners directly affected by the proximity of this road be given any assurances of noise reduction being installed to safe guard the reasonable enjoyment of our residential properties? Is there a process for us to be advised of noise reduction strategies and to have input on the strategies implemented?” The Region of Waterloo has a noise policy that applies when any new or widened road is constructed. It requires noise modeling be undertaken, which is based in part on
----------------------------------	--	---

Teresa – continued		the elevation of the road and distance to the outdoor living area of private property. Until the final design is well underway and the exact location of the road and road elevation is finalized, the policy cannot be applied (because the modeling cannot be completed). However during design, efforts will be made to implement road grades and a location that will mitigate noise where possible. When noise modeling is completed, if some type of noise attenuation measures are found to be required, a noise barrier/wall or a berm could be installed. During final design and/or prior to construction, Region practice is to hold a public consultation meeting to review more detailed information and evaluate directly-impacted resident/land owner comments. I trust this addressee your enquiries. Also, as noted, please feel free to visit the Region's website for additional project information. If you have any further questions or concerns, please contact me or Dave Hallman (MTE Project Manager).
----------------------------------	--	---

Robert	February 11, 2018 Email To whom it may concern; I am in support of Route B4. However, I am concerned that the traffic along Highway 8, east and west of Route 4B, will increase, and as a result, there are several points along Highway 8 that will need new traffic mitigation tools to prevent accidents that could result from the increased volume of traffic. There are 3 areas of concern between Branchton Road and Morrison Road. 1) The intersection at Branchton Road and HWY 8, will either need traffic lights or a roundabout. There have been many accidents due to cars turning left from Branchton Road to go west onto HWY 8. 2) While going east on HWY 8 and trying to turn left onto Vanier Drive from HWY 8 there have been several accidents. A left turn lane will prevent further accidents by keeping people from passing on right the shoulder. 3) While making a right onto HWY 8 from Morrison Road there is a dotted line on the road and it should be a solid line to prevent passing along this section of HWY 8. Cars traveling east on HWY 8 have been passing around the same spot where a vehicle coming out of Morrison Road is making a right-hand turn. There have been several collisions at night at this location because of this problem.	Response to February 11, 2018 Email Good morning Robert, Thank you for your interest in this study and providing feedback as follow up to PCC No. 3. Highway 8 (Dundas St S) south/east of Branchton Road is owned by the Ministry of Transportation (Ontario; MTO). As such, we will forward your concerns to the MTO for consideration. Good morning Robert, My apologies, but I had previously incorrectly identified the limit of Regional right-of-way ownership for Dundas St S: However, because the East Boundary Road corridor was not proposed to intersect with Dundas St S (Highway 8) at Branchton Rd, the intersection of Dundas St S (Highway 8) and Branchton Rd was not included in the scope of the East Boundary Road Corridor Study (EA). With that said, I've looked into recent study of the Dundas St S (Highway 8) and Branchton Rd intersection, in an attempt to address your first comment, and can confirm that: • Traffic Impact Studies (TISs) completed in 2014 indicated that, based on 2028 forecasted traffic
---------------	---	---

	Please consider the impact that this new road will have on the volume of traffic along Hwy 8 between Branchton Road and Morrison Road and consider the road improvements mentioned above by forwarding them to MTO. Thank you	volume, traffic signals were unwarranted; and • Our Traffic Engineering group assesses the need for additional control (i.e. traffic signals v. existing stop control) every 5 years. The last assessment was completed in 2014; at that time additional control was not warranted. As such, the next assessment (for additional control) is scheduled for next year, 2019. Your second and third comments will still be forwarded to MTO for their consideration. March 22, 2018 MTO Response to February 11, 2018 Email Dear Mr. ... : Thank you for your email to the Region of Waterloo which in turn has been forwarded to the Ministry of Transportation regarding the need for improvements along Highway 8 from Branchton Road to Morrison Road in Cambridge. The Region of Waterloo have noted that they have provided a response to item 1 in a previous email to you. As noted in our previous response of February 15, 2018, the ministry continues to monitor operations at the intersection of
--	---	---

		Highway 8 and Vanier Drive. Our most recent review, considered traffic volumes, roadway geometry and collision history. Based on this review, the ministry has no immediate plans for improvements at this intersection. The installation of left turn lane will be considered along with other provincial priorities. The ministry references the Ontario Traffic Manual (OTM) for the placement of centerline pavement markings on provincial highways. Based on these guidelines, a review of this section of Highway 8 has been undertaken by ministry staff, taking into consideration roadway geometry, traffic operations, collision history and visibility along the highway. Our results indicate that the centerline pavement markings on Highway 8; that permit passing in the area of Morrison Road; have been applied according to the guidelines. There is an onus on all drivers to make sure the way is clear before making a turn onto any roadway. Thank you for your continued interest in highway safety. Sincerely; ...Traffic Specialist MTO West Region Traffic Section
--	--	--

Fred	January 24, 2018 Email Hi Karl: This says that the east boundary road won't be built until 2031+. Do you know if that's still true? It sounds like if it gets into the 10 year capital budget this year it could be sooner. Thanks Fred	The current Transportation Master Plan (2011) did not plan for the East Boundary Road until after 2031. The Transportation Master Plan is currently being updated and the recommended timing of the East Boundary Road is being reviewed as part of that update. The 2018 Ten-Year Transportation Capital Program does not include funding for the design or construction of the East Boundary Road. Subject to approval of the East Boundary Road Corridor Study Environmental Assessment, the Transportation Master Plan update, and funding for design and construction in a future Ten-Year Transportation Capital Program, it is estimated that design, property acquisition, and various agency approvals would take at least 7 years. It is also probable that construction would be staged over 3 to 4 years. If you would like more information about the East Boundary Road Corridor Study Environmental Assessment, please let me know or contact our project manager, Justin Armstrong, at juarmstrong@regionofwaterloo.ca or (519) 575-4400 x 3164.
--------------------	--	--

Fred – continued	February 8, 2018 Email Good Morning Phil. Thank you for providing some additional information. Justin has been very helpful discussing the project and answering our questions. I think you are saying that the earliest 10 Year Transportation Capital Program that may include the East Boundary Road is 2028? Or are capital programs changed in other interim years, for example when the updated Transportation Master Plan is finalized. What is the anticipated schedule for the final Plan? Thanks Fred	Sincerely, Phil Bauer, P.Eng. Director, Design and Construction Region of Waterloo Response to February 8, 2018 Email Hello, Fred. The 10-Year Transportation Capital Program is updated and subject to Regional Council approval every year. This means that an updated 10-Year Transportation Capital Program covering the years 2019 to 2028 will be presented for Council consideration and approval later in 2018 or early in 2019. The Transportation Master Plan update that is currently underway is currently planned to be completed and presented for Council consideration and approval in 2018. The 10-Year Transportation Capital Program is based on the latest Transportation Master Plan approved by Council. This means that if the current Transportation Master Plan Update is completed and approved early enough in 2018, then it will be used to develop the 2019 Transportation Capital Program.
--------------------------------	--	--

		Transportation Master Plans are typically updated every 5 years or so. I hope this provides the information you requested. If you have further questions, please let me know. Thanks, Phil
--	--	---