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HIGHWAY 400 PLANNING AND PRELIMINARY DESIGN STUDY
From 1.0 km South of Highway 89 Northerly 30 km to the Junction of Highway 11
County of Simcoe
G.W.P. 30-95-00

PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE
ROUND #1 SUMMARY REPORT

MAY 2001
1.0 INTRODUCTION

Public Information Centres were held regarding improvements to address traffic operation, capacity and safety needs along the Highway 400 from 1.0 km South of Highway 89 Northerly 30 km to the Junction of Highway 11. The Information Centres provided the public an opportunity to review and discuss the project with representatives of the Project Team.

The information centres were held on:

**Tuesday May 22nd, 2001**
5:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
Stroud Community Centre
7883 Yonge St. (Stroud)

**Wednesday May 23rd, 2001**
5:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
Innisfil Secondary School
95 Little Avenue (Barrie)

Representatives of Cole, Sherman & Associates and the Ministry of Transportation staffed the Public Information Centres.

2.0 PURPOSE

The purpose of the Public Information Centres (PICs) was to introduce the study, present the alternatives under consideration including: mainline widening, and interchange improvements. The PICs also provided the public an opportunity to review and comment on the following:

1. Project Limits
2. Study Schedule
3. Class Environmental Assessment Process
4. Study Purpose and Problem Statement
5. Existing Conditions
6. Planning Alternatives
7. Proposed Evaluation Method and Criteria
8. Mainline Widening Alternatives
9. Interchange Alternatives

3.0 PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

Prior to the PIC, the following measures were carried out in order to make details of the information centre known to study area residents and interested members of the public:

1. An Ontario Government Notice (Notice of Public Information Centre) was placed in the following newspapers:
   - Toronto Star – Wednesday May 16th, 2001
   - Barrie Examiner/Advance – Wednesday May 16th, 2001
   - Alliston Herald – Friday May 18th, 2001
   (see Appendix A for notice).

2. Letters dated May 8th, 2001 were directly sent to owners and tenants abutting the Highway 400 corridor throughout the project limits as well as to those people on the Project Team’s mailing list, including government agencies and ministries, municipalities, interest groups, and individuals who requested to be added to the mailing list. (see Appendix A for letters).

4.0 PRE PIC MEETINGS

Municipal Team Meeting

A Municipal Team meeting was held on May 16th, 2001 at Barrie City Hall. Representatives from the City of Barrie, Township of Springwater, Township of Innisfil as well as MTO and CSA attended the meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to present the existing deficiencies, the need for improvements, and alternatives for improvements to the Highway 400 mainline and interchanges.

Comments raised at this meeting include the following:
- Construction of the interim design improvements for the Innisfil Beach Road Interchange will not likely begin this year.
- For the Innisfil Beach Road Interchange, consideration should be given to providing an additional commuter parking lot on the west-side to accommodate the GO Bus route serving this interchange.
- The Holiday Inn located on Fairview Road is planning an addition on the south-side of its existing building.
- Rose Street is utilized as an emergency detour route when Highway 400 north of the Bayfield Street Interchange is closed.

External Team Meeting

An External Team Meeting was offered prior to the Public Information Centre on Tuesday May 22nd, 2001 from 4:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. at the Stroud Community Centre. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss project needs, alternatives under consideration and issues concerning the Highway 400 corridor. No significant issues or concerns were raised at the meeting.

5.0 DISPLAY MATERIAL

The following display material was presented at the Public Information Centre (see Appendix C):
- Welcome to the PIC / Purpose of the PIC;
- Study Area;
- Background;
- Environmental Assessment Process;
- Overview of the Class EA Process;
- Study Schedule;
- Regional Transportation Needs;
6.0 ATTENDANCE/SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

A total of 191 members of the public chose to sign the visitor’s register for the Public Information Centre (71 members attended the May 22nd PIC in Stroud and 126 members attended the May 23rd PIC in Barrie).

In addition to verbal comments, the Project Team encouraged visitors to express, in writing, all concerns or comments they had regarding the information presented. To date, one hundred and twenty (120) written comments have been received as follows:

- May 22nd - Stroud PIC: 25
- May 23rd - Barrie PIC: 42
- Mailed-in: 16
- Via E-mail: 37
- Total: 120

The following summarizes the comments, issues and concerns raised at the PIC:

- Noise levels / noise pollution
- Need for noise barriers at residential areas
- Construction of a by-pass / parallel route corridor to Highway 400 at Barrie is a more desirable alternative
- Oppose widening of Highway 400 to 10 / 12 lanes (widenings not necessary)
- Impacts to property / expropriation
- Need for commuter rail service / restoration of GO transit to alleviate traffic along Highway 400
- Vehicle emissions / air quality / air pollution
- Support widening of Highway 400
- Aesthetic / visual impacts / need for landscaping
- Provision for highway illumination / potential light trespass
- Need to improve local transit service / infrastructure in Barrie
- Consideration to construction of an interchange at Tenth Line / between Innissfil Beach Rd. and Molson Park Drive
- More than 8 lanes on Highway 400 is unnecessary
- Impacts to property value
- Need for barrier wall for safety in the vicinity of the O.P.P. building

Additional comments included:
- An Express / Collector system is beneficial
- Bayfield bridge over Highway 400 needs to be widened (due to traffic congestion)
- Highway drainage / wells / storm water quality
- Median barrier is preferred over a grass median
- Access during construction / construction disruption
- Widening Highway 400 will only attract more traffic / expansion not sustainable
- Interchange modifications and capacity improvements needed at Dunlop St. interchange
- Impact to O.P.P. building
- Impacts to businesses
- Consideration to retaining existing Hwy 400 for northbound and construction of a new facility for southbound traffic
- Litter along the Highway 400 corridor
- Dead-ending Rose St. is desirable
- A continuous right-turn from Highway 400 north to Fairview Ave. is needed
- Pedestrian crossing at Essa Road should be on the south side
- A 10-lane cross section is ideal
- Cost to taxpayers
- Need to correct sag at Highway 400 between Essa Rd. and Tiffin St.
- Impact to historical trail at Sunnyside Road
- Dead-ending Rose St. is desirable
- Concern with exit from Highway 400 to Molson Park Dr.
- Improvements to 5th Line and 10th Line are needed
- Need for 8-laning Highway 400
- Need to extend Byrne Drive further north
- Reconsider proposed Molson Park Drive interchange to minimize impact to commercial parking at south-east quadrant
- Construct a fly-over at Toronto Street
- Congestion on local streets (need for City of Barrie to address...)
- Concerned with ramp radii at Essa Road interchange
- Long-term planning for the Highway 400 corridor is needed
- Capacity improvements are necessary for tourism expansion in the City of Barrie
- Northbound highway 400 ramp to Essa Road should be four lanes
- Interchange improvements needed at Bayfield Ave.
- Consideration to construction of an interchange at St. Vincent St.
- Need for an effective corridor to Collingwood
- More information needed on sources of data collection and capacity projections
- Pedestrian options for Essa Road are too costly to be independent of the bridge widening
- Impacts to the Crown Hill area associated with improvements to the Highway 93 interchange
- Ramp closures during construction
- Impact to pedestrian trail at Bayfield Ave. / Highway 400 ramp intersection
- A realignment of Duckworth St. and Cundles Rd. will have damaging consequences on proposed commercial development
- Impacts to Little Lake wetland/complex
- Vibration impacts to sensitive receivers / properties
- Ramps should be constructed on Highway 400 at Anne St
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- Widen Highway 400 from Toronto to King City only
- Concern with transition from 6 to 10 / 12 lanes
- Widening of Highway 400 should commence in the south and proceed northward
- Concerned with potential for accidents with a wider highway.

In addition to the above noted comments, thirteen requests for information were submitted to the Project Team.

Preference of Interchange Alternatives

The following outlines the public preferences of the alternatives presented as noted in the comments submitted:

Highway #9
- Alternative 1 – Parclo A Interchange
- Alternative 2 – Parclo B Interchange
- Intinfill Beach Road
- Alternative 1 – Parclo A Interchange
- Alternative 2 – Parclo B Interchange
- Alternative 3 – Diamond (NB) Parclo A (SB) Interchange
- Moline Park Drive
- Alternative 1 – Operational Improvements
- Alternative 2 – Diamond (SB) / Parclo B (NB) Interchange
- Ease Road
- Alternative 1 – Parclo A Interchange
- Alternative 2 – Partial Parclo A Interchange
- Dunlop Street
- Alternative 1 – Parclo B Interchange
- Alternative 2 – Parclo A Interchange
- Bayfield Street
- Alternative 1 – Parclo A (SB) / Diamond (NB) Interchange
- Alternative 2 – Diamond
- Alternative 3 – Parclo A Interchange
- Duckworth Street
- Alternative 1 – Parclo A Interchange
- Alternative 2 – Parclo A (SB) / Diamond (NB) Interchange
- Alternative 3 – Parclo A Interchange w/ realignment
- Alternative 4 – Parclo B Interchange w/ realignment
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News Ad / Brochure and Notice Letters
ONTARIO GOVERNMENT NOTICE
NOTICE OF PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE
HIGHWAY 400 PLANNING STUDY
FROM 1 KM SOUTH OF HIGHWAY 89
NORTHEAST 30 KM TO THE JUNCTION OF HIGHWAY 11
COUNTY OF SIMCOE
G.W.P. 30-95-00

THE STUDY:
Cole, Sherman & Associates Ltd. has been retained by the Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO) to undertake a Preliminary Design Study to examine improvements to Highway 400 from 1 km south of Highway 89 northeasterly 30 km to the junction of Highway 11 in the County of Simcoe.

The purpose of this study is to determine the nature of improvements required to address traffic operation, capacity and safety needs for this section of the Highway 400 corridor. The need for drainage, illumination, roadside safety, structural and interchange improvements will also be examined as part of this project. Reasonable alternatives to address the required improvements will be identified and evaluated to determine the most appropriate solution.

THE PROCESS:
This study will follow the approved planning process for a Group B project under the Class Environmental Assessment for Provincial Transportation Facilities (2000). The opportunity for public input will be provided throughout the course of the project. A Transportation Environmental Study Report (TCSR) will be available for review and comment upon completion of the study.

PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRES:
The list of two rounds of Public Information Centres have been arranged for the public to provide input and discuss the project with representatives of the Project Team. This Information Centre will focus on the identification of project needs and alternatives within the project limits. Alternatives for widening Highway 400 (including an express – collector system through Barrie) and possible alternative interchange configurations will be presented.

Information Centres will be held as follows:

Tuesday May 22nd, 2001
5:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
Stroud Community Centre
7883 Yonge St. (Stroud)

Wednesday May 23rd, 2001
5:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
Innisdale Secondary School
95 Little Avenue (Barrie)

You are encouraged to attend the Information Centres and to provide us with your views and concerns so that they can be addressed early in the study.

A second Public Information Centre (PIC) will be held in Summer 2001 at which time the evaluation of alternatives and technically preferred alternative will be presented. A further notice will be published regarding the second PIC.

COMMENTS:
Comments and information regarding this project are being collected to assist the Ministry of Transportation in meeting the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. This material will be examined on file for use during the project and may be included in project documentation. Information collected will be used in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record.

For further information, or to be added to the mailing list, please contact:

Mr. Leo Kosauchuk, P.Eng.
Senior Project Manager
Cole, Sherman & Associates Ltd.
75 Commerce Valley Drive East,
Thornhill, Ontario, L3T 7N9
Fax: (905) 882-4395
Tel: (905) 882-3549
Email: leo_kosauchuk@nscoorp.com

Mr. Michael Brzika
Senior Environmental Planner
Cole, Sherman & Associates Ltd.
75 Commerce Valley Drive East,
Thornhill, Ontario, L3T 7N9
Fax: (905) 882-4395
Tel: (905) 882-3549
Email: mbrzika@nscoorp.com

Visit us at: http://Highway400.planningstudy.on.ca

EXTERNAL (GOV/MUNICIPAL) LETTER

May 8, 2001
Out Ref: CN29900147

Dear [Name]:

Re: Highway 400 Planning Study
From 1.0 km South of Highway 89 Northeasterly 30 km to Junction of Highway 11

Preliminary Design / Class Environmental Assessment, Group B Project
G.W.P. 30-95-00

Cole, Sherman & Associates Ltd. has been retained by the Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO) to undertake a Preliminary Design Study to examine improvements to Highway 400 from 1 km south of Highway 89 northeasterly 30 km to the junction of Highway 11 in the County of Simcoe (refer to the attached key map).

The purpose of this letter is to notify your office of the upcoming External Team Meeting for the above noted study.

The purpose of this study is to determine the nature of improvements required to address traffic operation, capacity and safety needs for this section of the Highway 400 corridor. The need for drainage, illumination, roadside safety, structural and interchange improvements will also be examined as part of this project. Reasonable alternatives to address the required improvements will be identified and evaluated to determine the most appropriate solution.

This study will follow the approved planning process for a Group B project under the Class Environmental Assessment for Provincial Transportation Facilities (2000). The opportunity for public input will be provided throughout the course of the project. A Transportation Environmental Study Report (TCSR) will be available for review and comment upon completion of the study.

The first of two rounds of Public Information Centres have been arranged for the public to provide input and discuss the project with representatives of the Project Team. This Information Centre will focus on the identification of project needs and alternatives within the project limits. Alternatives for widening Highway 400 (including an express – collector system through Barrie) and possible alternative interchange configurations will be presented.

An External Team Meeting has been arranged in advance of the Information Centre to discuss project needs, reasonable alternatives and issues concerning the Highway 400 corridor.

The External Team Meeting will be held as follows:

Tuesday May 22nd, 2001
4:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
Stroud Community Centre
7883 Yonge St. (Stroud)

Following the External Team Meeting, a Public Information Centre will be held.

You are encouraged to attend the External Team Meeting and to provide us with your views and concerns so that they can be addressed early in the study.
EXTERNAL (GOV/MUNICIPAL) LETTER

A second Public Information Centre (PIC) will be held in Summer 2001 at which time the evaluation of alternatives and technically preferred alternative will be presented. A further notice will be published regarding the second PIC.

Comments and information regarding this study are being collected to assist the Ministry of Transportation in meeting the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. This material will be maintained on file for use during the study and may be included in study documentation.

Should you require further information please feel free to contact the undersigned.

Yours very truly,

COLE, SHERMAN & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

Len Kozechuk, P. Eng.
Senior Project Manager

cc: Michael Vyse - MTO
Joel Foster - MTO

Att.

PUBLIC LETTER

May 8, 2001
Our Ref.: CN29900147

Dear [Name]:

Re: Highway 400 Planning Study
From: L.0 km South of Highway 89 Northerly 50 km to Junction of Highway 11
Preliminary Design / Class Environmental Assessment, Group ‘B’ Project
GW.P. 35-55.00

Cole, Sherman & Associates Ltd. has been retained by the Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO) to undertake a Preliminary Design Study to examine improvements to Highway 400 from 1 km south of Highway 89 northerly 50 km to the junction of Highway 11 in the County of Simcoe (refer to the attached key map).

The purpose of this study is to determine the nature of improvements required to address traffic operational, capacity and safety needs for this section of the Highway 400 corridor. The need for drainage, illumination, roadside safety, structural and interchange improvements will also be examined as part of this project. Reasonable alternatives to address the required improvements will be identified and evaluated to determine the most appropriate solution.

This study will follow the approved planning process for a Group B project under the Class Environmental Assessment for Provincial Transportation Facilities (1999). The opportunity for public input will be provided throughout the course of the project. A Transportation Environmental Study Report (TESR) will be available for review and comment upon completion of the study.

The first of two rounds of Public Information Centres has been arranged for the public to provide input and discuss the project with representatives of the Project Team. This Information Centre will focus on the identification of project needs and reasonable alternatives within the project limits. Alternatives for widening Highway 400 (including an express - collector system through Barrie) and possible alternative interchange configurations will be presented.

Information Centres will be held as follows:

Tuesday May 22nd, 2001
5:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
Stroud Community Centre
7883 Yonge St. (Stroud)

Wednesday May 23rd, 2001
5:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
Innisdale Secondary School
95 Little Avenue (Barrie)

You are encouraged to attend the Information Centres and to provide us with your views and concerns so that they can be addressed early in the study.
PUBLIC LETTER

A second Public Information Centre (PIC) will be held in Summer 2001 at which time the evaluation of alternatives and technically preferred alternative will be presented. A further notice will be published regarding the second PIC.

Comments and information regarding this study are being collected to assist the Ministry of Transportation in meeting the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. This material will be maintained on file for use during the study and may be included in study documentation.

Should you require further information please feel free to contact the undersigned.

Yours very truly,

COLE, SHERMAN & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

Len Kozachuk, P.Eng.
Senior Project Manager

cc: Michael Vye - MTO
    Joel Foster - MTO

Att.
1. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

The Ministry of Transportation (MTO) has initiated a Planning and Preliminary Design Study to examine possible improvements required to address the existing and projected future (2011) traffic operation, capacity and safety needs associated with the Highway 400 corridor.

The need for drainage, illumination, roadside safety, structural and interchange improvements will also be examined as part of the study. Reasonable alternatives to address the required improvements will be identified and evaluated to determine the most appropriate solution.

2. STUDY PROCESS

This study is following the approved planning process for a Group B project under the Class Environmental Assessment for Provincial Transportation Facilities (2000). The opportunity for public input will be provided throughout the course of the project. A Transportation Environmental Study Report (TESR) will be available for review and comment upon completion of the study.

3. PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRES

The first of two rounds of Public Information Centres have been arranged for the public to provide input and discuss the project with representatives of the Project Team. This Information Centre will focus on the identification of project needs and reasonable alternatives within the project limits. Alternatives for widening Highway 400 (including an express – collector system through Barrie) and alternative interchange configurations for all interchange locations within the project limits will be presented.

You are encouraged to attend the Information Centres and to provide us with your views and concerns so that they can be addressed as the study progresses.

Information Centres will be held as follows:

Tuesday May 22nd, 2001
5:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
Stroud Community Centre
7883 Yonge St. (Stroud)

and

Wednesday May 23rd, 2001
5:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
Innisdale Secondary School
95 Little Avenue (Barrie)

A second Public Information Centre (PIC) will be held in Summer 2001 at which time the evaluation of alternatives and technically preferred alternative will be presented. A further notice will be published regarding the second PIC.

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

For further information, or to be added to the mailing list, please contact:

Mr. Leonard Kozachuk, P. Eng.
Senior Project Manager
URS Cole, Sherman & Associates Ltd.
75 Commerce Valley Drive East
Thornhill, Ontario, L3T 7N9
Tel.: (905) 882-3540
Fax: (905) 882-4399
Email: len_kozachuk@urscorp.com
“Ms. Ray Valais
Rural Planner
Central and Northern Ontario Region
Ministry of Agriculture Food and Rural Affairs
RR 3, 95 Dundas Street
Bradford, Ontario
KOK 1H0”
Mr. Valais

“Ms. Ruth Debicki, Planner
Ministry of Northern Development and Mines
Level A-3 Willet Green Miller Centre
553 Ramsey Lake Rd
6th Floor
Sudbury, Ontario
P3E 6B5”
Ms. Debicki

“Ms. Ann Fraser
Business Development Consultant
Ministry of Economic Development and Trade
Midhurst District Office
2284 Nursery Road
Midhurst, Ontario
LOL 1X0”
Ms. Fraser

“Ms. Ruth Alves, Administrative Officer
Health Services Division
Ministry of Health
Hepburn Block, 10th Floor, 80 Grosvenor Street
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1R3”
Ms. Alves

“Ms. Heather Brown, Environmental Planner
Environmental Services and Approvals
Hydro One Networks Inc.
483 Bay Street, 6th Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M5G 2P5”
Mrs. Brown

“Ms. Helen Howes, Director
Corporate and Environmental Affairs
Ontario Power Generation
700 University Avenue
Toronto, Ontario
M5G 1X6”
Ms. Howes

“Ms. Eve Wyatt
Manager - Corporate Planning, Project Development
GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 6000
Toronto, Ontario

Ms. Wyatt

“Mr. Wayne Freechette, Police Chief
Barrie City Police
295 Sperling Drive, P.O. Box 188
Barrie, Ontario
LAM 4T2”
Mr. Freechette

“Mr. Mark Neelin, Inspector
Barrie Police Service
295 Sperling Drive, P.O. Box 188
Barrie, Ontario
LAM 4T2”
Mr. Neelin

“Staff Sergeant L. J. (Len) Hassberger
Barrie Detachment
Ontario Provincial Police
20 Rose Street
Barrie, Ontario
LAM 2T2”
Sergeant Hassberger

“Mr. Wayne Wilson, CAO
Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority
R.R. 1
Angus, Ontario
LOM 1B0”
Mr. Wilson

“Mr. Tom Hogenhuck, Conservation Engineer
Watershed Management
Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority
P.O. Box 282, 120 Bayview Parkway
Newmarket, Ontario
L3Y 4X1”
Mr. Hogenhuck

“Ms. Karen Dibble
Planning Technician
Simcoe Muskoka Catholic District School Board
46 Alliance Blvd.
Barrie, Ontario
LAM 5K3”
Ms. Dibble

“Mr. David Few
Manager of Property and Planning
Simcoe County District School Board
1170 Highway 26
Midhurst, Ontario
LOL 1X0”
Mr. Few

“Mr. Jerry McNeill
Service Centre Maintenance Officer
Ministry of Transportation
Maintenance Officer

Mr. McNeill
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Garden City Tower, 2nd Floor
301 St. Paul St.
St. Catharines, Ontario
L2R 7R4

Mr. McNeill
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Name

"Ms. Helen MacRae, Clerk
County of Simcoe
1110 Highway 26
Midhurst, Ontario
L0L 1X0"

Ms. MacRae

"Mr. Ian Bender
Director of Planning
County of Simcoe
1110 Highway 26
Midhurst, Ontario
L0L 1X0"

Ms. Bender

"Mr. Bill Brown, P. Eng.
County Engineer
Road and Engineering
County of Simcoe
1110 Highway 26
Midhurst, Ontario
L0L 1X0"

Mr. Brown

"Mr. John Craig, Clerk
City of Barrie
70 Collier Street
Barrie, Ontario
L4N 4T5"

Mr. Craig

"Mr. James Taylor
Director of Planning
City of Barrie
70 Collier Street
Barrie, Ontario
L4N 4T5"

Mr. Taylor

"Ms. Rick Newlove
Manager of Planning and Policy Services
Municipal Works Department:
City of Barrie
70 Collier Street, Box 400
Barrie, Ontario
L4N 4T5"

Mr. Newlove

"Mr. Ronald D. Hickey
Fire Chief
City of Barrie
70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400
Barrie, Ontario
L4N 4T5"

Mr. Hickey

"Mr. Paul Landry, Clerk
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Town of Innisfil
2147 Innisfil Beach Road
P.O. Box 5000
Stroud, Ontario
L0L 2M0

*Mr. Wayne Young
Manager of Operational Services
Town of Innisfil
2183 Innisfil Beach Road
Innisfil, Ontario
L0N 1A3

Mr. Landry

*Mr. Gavin Watson
Engineering Technologist
Town of Innisfil
2183 Innisfil Beach Road
Innisfil, Ontario
L0N 1A3

Mr. Young

*Chief Scott Griffith
Fire Department
Innisfil Fire and Rescue Service
790 Innisfil Beach Road
P.O. Box 5000
Innisfil, Ontario
L0N 2C3

Chief Griffith

*Ms. Patricia Middlebrook
Clerk and Manager of Administration
Town of New Tecumseth
Box 910, 10 Wellington Street
Alliston, Ontario
L0R 1A1

Ms. Middlebrook

*Mr. Stephen Naylor
Manager of Planning
Town of New Tecumseth
Box 910, 10 Wellington Street
Alliston, Ontario
L0R 1A1

Mr. Naylor

*Mr. George DeGroot
Director of Public Works
Town of New Tecumseth
Box 910, 10 Wellington Street
Alliston, Ontario
L0R 1A1

Mr. DeGroot

*Mrs. Juana Dempster-Evans
Town of Bradford West Gwillimbury
Box 160, 61 Holland Street E.

Bradford, Ontario
LZ9 2A8

Mrs. Dempster-Evans

*Mr. Ron Knesewh
Superintendent of Public Works
Town of Bradford West Gwillimbury
Box 419,
Bradford, Ontario
LZ9 2A8

Mr. Knesewh

*Mr. Eric Hodgkin, Town Planner
Town of Bradford West Gwillimbury
Box 160, 61 Holland Street E.
Bradford, Ontario
LZ9 2A8

Mr. Hodgkin

*Ms. Brenda Sigouin, Clerk
Township of Essa
Box 10
Angus, Ontario
L0M 1B0

Ms. Sigouin

*Ms. Colleen Phillips
Manager of Planning & Development
Township of Essa
5786 County Road 21
Utopia, Essa Township, Ontario
L0M 1T0

Ms. Phillips

*Mr. Greg Murphy
Manager of Public Works and Parks
Township of Essa
5786 County Road 21
Utopia, Ontario
L0M 1T0

Mr. Murphy

*Ms. Eleanor Rath, Clerk
Township of Springwater
1110 Highway 25
Midhurst, Ontario
L0L 1X0

Mr. Rath

*Ms. Elaine Clamencroff
Planning Coordinator
Township of Springwater
1110 Highway 26
Midhurst, Ontario
L0L 1X0

Ms. Clamencroff

*Mr. Donald Priest
Superintendent of Public Works
Township of Springwater
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1110 Highway 26
Midhurst, Ontario
LOL 1X0*

"Ms. Vicki Robertson
Township of Oro Medonte
Box 100
Oro, Ontario
LOL 2X0"*  
Mr. Priest  
Ms. Robertson

"Mr. Keith Mathieson
Manager of Public Works
Township of Oro Medonte
Box 100
Oro, Ontario
LOL 2X0"*  
Mr. Mathieson  
Mr. Leigh

"Ms. Andrea Leigh, Planner
Township of Oro Medonte
Box 100
Oro, Ontario
LOL 2X0"*  
Mr. Leigh  
Mr. Green

"Ms. Judi Brosse
Director of Long Range Planning
Planning and Economic Development
District of Muskoka
70 Pine Street
Bracebridge, Ontario
P1L 1N3*
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Name

"Ms. Kristin Dibble
Property & Agreements Officer
Simcoe Muskoka Catholic District School Board
Plant and Planning Department
46 Alliance Blvd.
Barrie, Ontario
LAM 5K3"*  
Ms. Dibble

"Mrs. Wendy Moore, Executive Director
Federation of Ontario Cottagers
239 McKenzie Drive
Toronto, Ontario
M4G 1T7"*  
Mrs. Moore

"Mr. Jim Crosscombe, President
Ontario Cycling Association
1185 Eglinton, Avenue E., Suite 408
North York, Ontario
M3C 3C6"*  
Mr. Crosscombe

"Mr. Ron Purchase, General Manager
Ontario Federation of Snowmobiler Clubs
106 Saunders Road, Unit 12
Barrie, Ontario
L4N 9A8"*  
Mr. Purchase

"Ms. Sybil Goriuk, CAO
Greater Barrie Chamber of Commerce
89 Dunlop St. E., Suite 201
Barrie, Ontario
LAM 1A7"*  
Ms. Goriuk

"Mr. Don Stevenson
Ontario Federation of Agriculture
110 Highway 26
Midhurst, Ontario
LOL 1X0"*  
Mr. Stevenson

"Ms. Peggy Wong
Partner
The Resource Management Consulting Group
6 Oakridge Drive
Barrie, Ontario
LAM 3N7"*  
Mr. Wong

"Mr. Jack Irwin
Manager of Real Estate
Petro Canada
3275 Rebecca Street
Oakville, Ontario
L6L 6N5"*  
Mr. Irwin
**APPENDIX B**

**Minutes of Meeting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>MUNICIPAL TEAM MEETING NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 400 Planning Study</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 1 km South of Highway 89 to the Junction at Highway 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.W.P. 30-95-00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT No.</th>
<th>DATE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CN29900147</td>
<td>May 16th, 2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION:</th>
<th>TIME:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barrie City Hall – Georgian Room – 2nd Floor</td>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESENT:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rick Newlove</td>
<td>City of Barrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Priest</td>
<td>Township of Springwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavin Watson</td>
<td>Town of Innisfil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Vyse</td>
<td>MTO, Project Manager, Planning &amp; Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terence Mitchell</td>
<td>MTO, Planning &amp; Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len Kozachuk</td>
<td>URS Cole, Sherman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Hum</td>
<td>URS Cole, Sherman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PURPOSE:**
Presentation of Reasonable Alternatives to Municipal Team

Len Kozachuk distributed an information package to the attendees and delivered a 30 minute presentation that included the following: identifying the existing deficiencies, the need for improvements, alternatives for improvements to the Highway 400 mainline and interchanges.

Comments from this review included the following:

- Construction of the interim design improvements for the Innisfil Beach Road Interchange will not likely begin this year.
- For the Innisfil Beach Road Interchange, consideration should be given to providing an additional commuter parking lot on the west-side to accommodate the GO Bus route serving this interchange.
- The Holiday Inn located on Fairview Road is planning an addition on the south-side of its existing building.
- Rose Street is utilized as an emergency detour route when Highway 400 north of the Bayfield Street Interchange is closed.

URS Cole Sherman will present the alternatives to the public at PIC#1 on May 22nd and 23rd, 2001.

Submitted by: Matthew Hum, P. Eng.
APPENDIX C

Displays / Information Package

HIGHWAY 400 PLANNING STUDY
FROM 1 KM SOUTH OF HIGHWAY 89
NORTHERLY 30 KM TO THE JUNCTION OF HIGHWAY 11
G.W.P. 30-95-00

Preliminary Design
Class Environmental Assessment, Group ‘B’

Public Information Centre #1

May 2001
Welcome to the First Round of Public Information Centres

for the

HIGHWAY 400 PLANNING STUDY
FROM 1 KM SOUTH OF HIGHWAY 89
NORTHERLY 30 KM TO THE JUNCTION OF HIGHWAY 11
G.W.P. 30-95-00

Please Sign In

Members of the Project Team are available to discuss and answer any questions you may have.

Purpose of this Public Information Centre

The purpose of this Information Centre is to update you on the progress of the project and obtain comments so your input can be considered as this project progresses. Major elements presented today include:

- Project Limits
- Study Schedule
- Class Environmental Assessment Process
- Study Purpose and Problem Statement
- Existing Conditions
- Planning Alternatives
- Proposed Evaluation Method and Criteria
- What's Next

The Project Team encourages you to fill out a comment sheet recording your comments and concerns.

© Ontario Ministry of Transportation

HIGHWAY 400 PLANNING STUDY
FROM 1 KM SOUTH OF HIGHWAY 89
TO THE JUNCTION OF HIGHWAY 11

© URS CORPORATION

HIGHWAY 400 PLANNING STUDY
FROM 1 KM SOUTH OF HIGHWAY 89
TO THE JUNCTION OF HIGHWAY 11
The Ministry of Transportation (MTO) has initiated a Planning and Preliminary Design Study to examine possible improvements required to address traffic operation, capacity and safety needs associated with the Highway 400 corridor. The need for drainage, illumination, roadside safety, structural and interchange improvements will also be examined as part of the study. Reasonable alternatives to address the required improvements will be identified and evaluated to determine the most appropriate solution.

The purpose of this study is to:

- Determine the existing and projected future (2011) traffic on Highway 400;
- Identify the capacity and operational deficiencies;
- Evaluate and select alternatives to address existing deficiencies; and,
- Submit a Transportation Environmental Study Report for environmental approval in order to proceed with the detail design and construction process.

The initial Notice of Study Commencement was published in the following newspapers and dates:

- Toronto Star - Wednesday November 8th, 2000 (URS Cole, Sherman & Associates)
- Barrie Advance - Wednesday November 8th, 2000 (URS Cole, Sherman & Associates)
- Barrie Examiner - Friday November 10th, 2000 (URS Cole, Sherman & Associates)
- Alliston Herald - Friday November 10th, 2000 (URS Cole, Sherman & Associates)

Environmental Assessment Process

This study is following MTO's "Class Environmental Assessment for Provincial Transportation Facilities" (Class EA), which was approved under the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act in Fall 1999. The Class EA defines groups of projects and activities, and the associated environmental assessment process requirements which MTO has committed to following for each group of projects. Provided that this process is followed, projects and activities included under the Class EA do not require formal review and approval under the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act.

This project is following the Class EA process for Group 'B' projects. The steps involved in the Class EA process are shown in the next display.

The purpose of the Public Information Centre is to update you on the progress of the project and to obtain comments on the project limits, study schedule, Class EA process, study process and problem statement, existing conditions, planning alternatives, and the proposed evaluation method and criteria.

The next steps that follow this Public Information Centre are:

- Review the comments received from the Information Centre and respond to any questions
- Evaluate interchange and widening alternatives
- Select a preferred alternative
- Hold the second Public Information Centre to present the study findings
- Refine the preferred alternative and prepare preliminary design plan of the proposed highway widening including the interchanges
- Identify environmental impacts and develop mitigation measures to minimize the identified impacts
- Prepare a Transportation Environmental Study Report (TESR) and file for public review
Overview of the Class EA Process

HIGHWAY 400 PLANNING STUDY
FROM 1 KM SOUTH OF HIGHWAY 89 TO THE JUNCTION OF HIGHWAY 11

Study Schedule / Class EA Process

The following chart outlines the major tasks to be completed in the next few months.
Need and Justification

The purpose of this study is to examine the nature of improvements needed to address existing and future traffic operating capacity and the need for drainage, illumination, roadside safety, structural and interchange improvements.

Highway 400 Mainline:

Currently the section of Highway 400 within the project limits experiences congestion during peak travel periods. In addition, roadside safety, illumination and drainage features require improvement to reflect current ministry standards.

Due to the anticipated future development within the City of Barrie and surrounding area, corridor operations are expected to deteriorate rapidly. As traffic volumes continue to increase, congestion on Highway 400 will worsen. This will lead to increased driver frustration, potential for collisions, trip delays and associated waste of energy resources, increased cost of moving goods and significant diversion of traffic to other adjacent roadways.

Traffic volumes are projected to exceed the existing capacity of a 6-lane freeway in certain sections as early as 2001.

Highway 400 Interchanges:

All interchanges within the project limits have traffic operations issues which warrant improvements.

Traffic volumes at all interchange ramps will exceed capacity by 2011. This can result in queuing onto Highway 400 mainline, which will also negatively effect traffic operations and safety.

The following display boards describe the existing and future conditions at interchanges within the project limits.

Regional Transportation Needs

This area map shows the transportation needs in a regional perspective:

- Recreation and population / employment growth in the north.
- Industrial and population / employment growth pressures in the south
Existing / Future Operational Conditions At Highway 89 Interchange

By 2009, ramp junction will operate poorly during peak travel period, resulting in significant speed reduction on freeway.

Ramp junction over capacity by 2009, which will affect freeway operations (i.e. reduction in operating speeds, ramp queuing and increased congestion).

Highway 400 Design Hourly Volume exceeds 4-lane capacity by 2009.

All approach volumes exceed intersection capacity, resulting in excessive delay for all approaches, which may result in queuing and affect operation of ramp.

By 2006, ramp junction will operate poorly during peak travel period, resulting in significant speed reduction on freeway.

Ramp junction over capacity by 2006, which will affect freeway operations (i.e. reduction in operating speeds, ramp queuing and increased congestion).

Highway 400 Design Hourly Volume exceeds 4-lane capacity by 2006.

Collision rate from 1996-1999 was 2.7 Provincial A-Rating was 0.70
• 1 fatal collision
• 24 rear end collisions
• 1 left contact single vehicle collision
• 23 side swipe collisions

By 2006, ramp junction will operate poorly during peak travel period, resulting in significant speed reduction on freeway.

Ramp junction over capacity by 2006, which will affect freeway operations (i.e. reduction in operating speeds, ramp queuing and increased congestion).

Highway 400 Design Hourly Volume exceeds 4-lane capacity by 2006.

Collision rate from 1996-1999 was 2.8 Provincial A-Rating was 0.70
• 18 rear end collisions
• 25 left contact single vehicle collisions
• 24 side swipe collisions

Current / Future Operational Conditions At Innisfil Beach Road Interchange

By 2006, ramp junction will operate poorly during peak travel period, resulting in excessive delay for all approaches, which may result in queuing and affect operation of ramp.

Ramp junction over capacity by 2006, which will affect freeway operations (i.e. reduction in operating speeds, ramp queuing and increased congestion).

Ramp geometry does not meet current standards.

Ramp geometry does not meet current standards.

All approach volumes exceed intersection capacity, resulting in excessive delay for all approaches, which may result in queuing and affect operation of ramp.

By 2008, ramp junction will operate poorly during peak travel period, resulting in significant speed reduction on freeway.

Ramp junction over capacity by 2008, which will affect freeway operations (i.e. reduction in operating speeds, ramp queuing and increased congestion).

Highway 400 Design Hourly Volume exceeds 4-lane capacity by 2008.

Collision rate from 1996-1999 was 2.8 Provincial A-Rating was 0.70
• 18 rear end collisions
• 25 left contact single vehicle collisions
• 24 side swipe collisions
Widening Requirements

The timing of projected capacity deficiencies is summarized below.

Highway 400 Planning Study
From 1 Km South of Highway 89 to Highway 11 Junction

Existing/Future Operational Conditions At Duckworth Street Interchange
Planning Alternatives

Several planning alternatives were identified and assessed as possible solutions to the identified Highway 400 Corridor capacity-related problems:

- **Do Nothing**: Traffic is expected to continue to increase. To do nothing would result in a further deterioration of the level of service; this in turn would result in an increase in travel time, congestion, collisions, fuel wastage and air pollution. The negative consequences of the “Do Nothing” approach clearly suggest that actions must be taken in order to address the existing and projected deficiencies of Highway 400.

- **Localized Geometric Improvements (Road Based Solutions)**: Geometric improvements would increase traffic operations, but would not address the capacity deficiencies.

- **Traffic Operations Improvements**: The implementation of a traffic management system would inform the driver of problems ahead; and with ramp metering, the use of available highway capacity could be improved by an increase of about 5% to 10% (as observed on the QEW in Mississauga). This will extend the time frame for the improvements but will not eliminate the need.

- **Vehicle Occupancy Increase**: This would involve reducing the number of vehicles along major highways by encouraging carpooling. Again, this will extend the time frame for the improvements but will not eliminate the need.

- **Adjacent Road System Improvements**: Other existing parallel arterial roads will provide only limited diversion for Highway 400 through-traffic due to the distances of these other roads from Highway 400 and the fact that many are already saturated with local traffic. Widening of arterial roads will not provide sufficient additional capacity for through-traffic to be significantly diverted from Highway 400.

Planning Alternatives (continued)

- **Rail and Transit Expansion**: Rail and transit expansion would provide a more competitive choice of travel modes for some users of Highway 400, and thus reduce the traffic volumes somewhat on Highway 400. Specifically, transit expansion within the City of Barrie would reduce some inter-city travel. However, inter-city travel volumes comprise a relatively small percentage of Highway 400 traffic through Barrie and would not address corridor travel demand. Although beneficial to the overall transportation network, these modal improvements would be limited since Highway 400 significantly serves a diverse nature of trips. This alternative alone would not be able to adequately address travel demand throughout the project limits.

- **Combination of Alternatives**: The combination of all of the previously stated alternatives will not sufficiently address projected future travel demand.

- **Freeway Capacity Improvements**: This alternative would provide the needed capacity to improve Highway 400 to an acceptable level of service. It also would provide the opportunity to improve the facility to current Ministry standards. There would be some property impact and limited environmental impact along the corridor.

- **Provincial Highway Network Expansion**: A new parallel highway cannot address the immediate and medium terms capacity deficiencies of the Highway 400 Corridor. The Ministry has undertaken a study to examine the feasibility of expanding the highway network in Simcoe County.

Based on the assessment of alternatives, the preferred alternative is "freeway capacity improvements". The basic feature of the "freeway capacity improvements" is widening Highway 400.
**Evaluation of Planning Alternatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Alternatives</th>
<th>Reduction in Potential for Collisions</th>
<th>Increased Level of Service</th>
<th>Improved Connectivity</th>
<th>Environmental Compatibility</th>
<th>Property Impact</th>
<th>Improvement to the Network</th>
<th>Relative Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De-Networking</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Originations</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localized Road Improvements</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Widening Alternatives**

Projected traffic volumes will exceed the capacity of the existing 6-lane freeway. Widening Highway 400 will be required to accommodate future (2011) travel demand.

Generally, widening about the existing Highway 400 centreline is the preferred method of achieving the required road widening. This method is preferred in part because:

- By splitting the property impacts along the east and west sides of the right-of-way, the overall impacts to adjacent property owners is reduced;
- Such widenings are less disruptive to stage and construct;
- Such widenings are less costly to implement; and,
- Maintaining the existing alignment provides more desirable geometrics.

In areas where property limits and/or physical constraints suggest a shift of the centreline will reduce impacts, alternative methods of widening will be developed. Depending on the extent and significance of the constraint, the following alternatives will be considered:

1. Widening about the existing Highway 400 centreline;
2. Widening to the east;
3. Widening to the west; and,
4. A combination of the above.
Widening Alternatives

Between Highway 89 and Molson Park Drive

Widening alternatives in this section will consider alternative median designs, as follows:

1) Median barrier, and
2) Open (grassed) median.

Widening Through the City of Barrie

To address the projected future capacity deficiencies along Highway 400 through the City of Barrie, as well as operational and maintenance issues in this urban section, the following alternatives will be examined as part of this study:

1) 10-lane cross section (5 lanes per direction);
2) 12-lane Express – Collector system (3 express lanes, 3 distributor lanes per direction).
Interchange Improvements

In addition to mainline improvements, interchanges throughout the project limits are being reviewed to identify alternative improvements which address traffic operation issues.

Conceptual design alternatives for each interchange are shown on the following displays.
Highway 400 Planning Study
Bayfield Street Interchange Alternatives
G.W.P. 30-95-00

ALTERNATIVE 1 - Parclo A (SB)/Diamond (NB) Interchange

ALTERNATIVE 2 - Diamond Interchange

ALTERNATIVE 3 - Parclo A Interchange

Highway 400 Planning Study
Bayfield Street Interchange Alternatives
G.W.P. 30-95-00
Evaluation Process and Criteria

Evaluation criteria proposed to be used in the evaluation of median, highway interchange and service road alternatives are provided as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENT</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Natural Environment     | - Effect on Fish and Aquatic Habitat  
                          - Effect on Terrestrial Habitat and Vegetation  
                          - Effect on Wetlands  
                          - Effect on Greenways and Open Space Linkages  
                          - Effect on Groundwater  
                          - Effect on Naturally Significant Areas  
                          - Effect on Agricultural Lands (soils) |
| Social Environment      | - Aesthetics  
                          - Noise  
                          - Community Effects (residential, institutional, recreational and community features, and out-of-way travel) |
| Economic Environment    | - Effects on Commercial / Industrial uses  
                          - Effect on Agricultural Operations  
                          - Property Waste and Contamination |
| Cultural Environment    | - Effect on Archaeological Resources  
                          - Effect on Heritage Resources |
| Transportation          | - Traffic Operations  
                          - Traffic Safety  
                          - Construction Impacts  
                          - Cost |

What's Next

After this Information Centre, the following will be carried out:

- Review the comments received and respond to any questions.
- Continue to consult with the public and external agencies for input in the assessment of the proposed highway cross-sections and the interchange improvements.
- Refine alternatives based on comments received.
- Analysis and evaluation of design alternatives.
- Hold the Second Public Information Centres to present study findings.
- Develop preliminary design plan of the proposed highway widening including the interchange improvements.
- Identify environmental impacts and develop mitigation to minimize identified impacts.

Following the second Public Information Centre, a Transportation Environmental Study Report (TESR) will be prepared and placed on the Public Record for the 30-day review period.

Thank you for attending.

Please feel free to ask questions and fill out a comment sheet before you leave.
Freedom of Information and Protection Privacy

Comments and information regarding this study are being collected to assist the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) in meeting the requirements of the Provincial Environmental Assessment Act. This material will be maintained on file for use during the study and may be included in study documentation. With the exception of personal information all comments will become part of the public record.

You are encouraged to contact the MTO Project Team if you have questions or concerns regarding the above information.
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Public Information Centres (PICs) were held regarding improvements to address the existing and projected future (2011) traffic operation, capacity and safety needs associated with the Highway 400 corridor. The need for drainage, illumination, roadside safety, structural and interchange improvements were also examined as part of this project. The PIC provided the public and opportunity to review and discuss the project with representatives of the Project Team.

The Information Centres were held on:

**Tuesday June 25, 2002**
- 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
- 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
- Holiday Inn – Churchill Conference Centre
- 20 Fairview Road, Barrie

**Wednesday June 26, 2002**
- 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
- 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
- Stroud Community Centre
- 7883 Yonge Street, Innisfil

Representatives from URS Cole Sherman and the Ministry of Transportation staffed the meetings.

**2.0 PURPOSE**

The purpose of the PICs was to present the results from the first PICs, present the analysis and evaluation of alternatives, the preferred alternatives, and the proposed mitigation measures.

**3.0 PUBLIC NOTIFICATION**

Prior to the PIC, the following measures were carried out in order to make details of the information centre known to study area residents and interested members of the public:

1. An Ontario Government Notice (Notice of Public Information Centre #2) was placed in the Toronto Star, Barrie Examiner, Barrie Advance, and Innisfil Scope newspapers on June 19, 2002.

2. Invitations letters dated June 5, 2002 were distributed to those on the project mailing list including those individuals who signed up at the first PIC, government agencies, ministries, municipalities and interested groups.

Refer to Appendix A for the news ad and letters.

**4.0 PRE PIC MEETINGS**

**Municipal Team Meeting**

A Municipal Team Meeting was held with the City of Barrie on April 3, 2002 at Barrie City Hall. The purpose of the meeting was to update on the project, review the analysis and evaluation of widening and interchange alternatives, and the timing of construction.

**External Team Meeting**

An External Team meeting was held prior to the second Public Information Centre on June 25, 2002 at the Holiday Inn in the City of Barrie. The objective of this meeting was to provide an opportunity to discuss the analysis and evaluation of alternatives and the preferred mainline and interchange alternatives.

Representatives from the Town of Innisfil, Barrie Agricultural Society, and Simcoe Catholic District School Board attended the External Team Meeting while members from the Town of Bradford West Gwillimbury, City of Barrie, and Township of Oro-Medonte attended the Public Information Centre, which was held immediately after the External Team meeting.

Refer to Appendix B for the Minutes of Meeting.

**5.0 DISPLAY MATERIAL**

The following display material was presented at the PIC (refer to Appendix C):

- Project Limits;
- Background;
- Regional Transportation Needs;
- Project Need and justifications;
- Summary of Technically Preferred Alternatives;
- Class Environmental Assessment Process;
- Study Schedule;
- Widening Requirements;
- Existing and Future Operational Conditions at all the Interchanges;
- Planning Alternatives and Evaluation of Planning Alternatives;
- Summary of Issues and Concerns Raised During the First Public Information Centre;
- Analysis and Evaluation of Widening and Interchange Alternatives;
- Preferred Alternatives;
- Ministry of Transportation Noise Policy, About Noise, Preliminary Noise Assessment;
- Closure of Service Centres;
- Staging of Construction;
- Proposed Highway Illumination;
- Commuter Lot Options and Evaluation; and
- Summary of Potential Environmental Effects, Mitigation Requirements, Commitment to Future Work and Monitoring.

**6.0 ATTENDANCE**

A total of 354 members of the public chose to sign the visitor’s register for the Public Information Centre (298 signatures recorded at the June 25th PIC in Barrie and 56 signatures recorded at the June 26th PIC in Stroud).
In addition to verbal comments, the Project Team encouraged visitors to express, in writing, all concerns or comments they had regarding the information presented. To date, 127 comments have been received as follows:

- June 25th – Barrie PIC 77
- June 25th – Stroud PIC 8
- Mailed-in 17
- E-mail 25
- Total 127

7.0 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

The following summarizes the comments and issues raised at the PIC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS/ISSUES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF OCCURANCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMENTS ON THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Commuter parking lots removed should be replaced appropriately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider a toll route</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An express/collector system is beneficial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concerns with bottleneck affect if widening a section of Highway 400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interchange modifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lower the speed limit, increase traffic safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Synchronize traffic signals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide landscaping around the interchanges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide larger signs and high mast lighting at the interchanges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintain Sunniald Road (road grade)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Realignment of Reive Road will have an impact on site plan approvals for future development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access during construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Noise retrofit barriers installed at residential areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Widening of the highway will increase noise levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More information required on noise study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disruption of OPP sirens redirected into immediate residential area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE WITH ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS (WIDEN HIGHWAY 400)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• By-pass route (i.e. Highway 427, alternative roadways)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More information on the Simcoe County Needs Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider building a causeway/bridge over Kempenfelt Bay over Barrie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE WITH PROBLEM STATEMENT</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Oppose to widening to 10 lanes (traffic does not warrant widening)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Traffic problems are primarily due to cottage/weekend traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Widening will only attract more traffic/expansion not sustainable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Concerned with potential for more accidents with a wider highway

- Other indirect (air quality/illumination/out-of-way travel)

- Vehicle emission, air pollution

- Light trespass on adjacent residences

- Closure of Rose Street access to Bayfield Street is unacceptable

- Impact to pedestrian trail at Bayfield Street

- Maintain bridge crossing at 10th Concession for snowmobile access

DISAGREE WITH ALTERNATIVE METHODS (I.E. ADDITIONAL ROAD CAPACITY VS. RAIL)

- Expand GO Transit (rail/bus services)

- Construct high speed rail system

- Build an express highway above the existing Highway 400

GENERAL PROPERTY IMPACTS

- Fear of expropriation, property value and re-sale

IMPACTS TO NATURAL ENVIRONMENT FEATURES

- Impact on wildlife/ ecology

- Impacts on water systems (drainage, water tables, water quality), Kidd's Creek

- Bereton Field Naturalist Club

IMPACTS TO ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT FEATURES

- Impact on agricultural lands

- Concerns about cost to Barrie taxpayers for highway improvements

SPECIFIC PROPERTY IMPACTS

- Property requirements from adjacent residences and businesses (i.e. Petro-Canada, Keg Restaurant, Cedar Pointe Plaza)

COMMENTS ON CONSULTATION PLAN

- Residents of Barrie should vote on whether this project should continue

- Contact the First Nations

IMPACTS TO CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT FEATURES

- Impact to historical trail at Sunniald Road

- Widening improvements impact the culture and history of the city

In addition to the above comments, 27 requests for site-specific mapping were submitted to the Project Team.
APPENDIX A

News Ad / Brochure / Notice Letters
NOTICE OF PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE

HIGHWAY 400 PLANNING STUDY
FROM 1 KM SOUTH OF HIGHWAY 89 NORTHERLY 53 KM TO THE JUNCTION OF HIGHWAY 11
COUNTY OF SIMCOE (G.W.P. 20-93-00)

THE STUDY:

URS Cole Sherman as承办 of the Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO) is undertaking a Planning and Preliminary Design Study of Highway 400 from 1 km south of Highway 89 northerly 53 km to the junction of Highway 11 in the County of Simcoe. The purpose of this study is to determine the nature of improvements required to address traffic operations, capacity and safety needs for this section of the Highway 400 corridor. The need for drainage, illumination, road widening, noise barriers, and interchange improvements has also been examined as part of this project. Reasonable alternatives to address the required improvements have been developed and evaluated to determine the most appropriate solution.

The technically preferred alternative includes main widening of Highway 400 as follows:

From Highway 89 to East Road - Widens from 6 lanes to 8 lanes (including property protection for up to 10 lanes).  
From East Road to Bayfield Street - Widens from 6 lanes to 10 lanes.  
From Bayfield Street to Junction at Highway 11 - Widens from 6 lanes to 8 lanes.

The improvements also include interchange modifications and improvements, installation of concrete median barrier, construction of noise barriers at perimeter properties, installation of high-level illumination at required locations, and improvements to highway drainage. Changes to the existing shoulder and southbound right-of-way along Highway 400 in the project limits is also proposed in order to satisfy safety and operational requirements.

THE PROCESS:

This study is following the approved planning process for a Group B project under the Class Environmental Assessment for Provincial Transportation Facilities (2000). Opportunities for public input are being provided throughout the course of the project. A Transportation Environmental Study Report (TERS) will be available for review and comment upon completion of the study. A further notice will be published regarding the availability of the TERS for review.

PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRES:

The first round of Public Information Centres (PICs) was held in May 2002 with the focus on the identification of project needs and reasonable alternatives within the project limits. Alternatives for widening Highway 400 (including an express - collector system through Barrie) and possible alternative interchange configurations were presented.

The number of centres will be held in modern style:

Tuesday, June 25, 2002
2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
Holiday Inn - Churchill Conference Centre 20
Fairview Road, Barrie
7883 Yonge Street, Innisfil

You are encouraged to attend the Information Centres and provide us with your views and concerns so that they can be addressed in the study.

CONTACT:

Comments and information regarding this project are being collected to assist the Ministry of Transportation in meeting the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. This material will be maintained on file for use during the project and may be included in project documentation. Information collected will be used in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record.

For further information, or to be added to the mailing list, please contact:

Mr. Kevin J. Rossetti, P.Eng.
Ministry of Transportation  
Southwestern Region  
Planning and Design Section  
3 Floor, 659 Exeter Road  
London, Ontario N6G 1L9  
Tel: (519) 872-6903  
Fax: (519) 872-6900  
Email: Kevin.Rossetti@omo.gov.on.ca

Mr. Lon Kraschuk, P. Eng.
Senior Project Manager  
URS Cole Sherman  
75 Commerce Valley Drive East  
Thornhill, Ontario, L3T 7J9  
Tel: (905) 882-7540  
Fax: (905) 882-4799  
E-mail: lon_kraschuk@urs.com

Mr. Michael Brinka  
Senior Environmental Planner  
URS Cole Sherman  
75 Commerce Valley Drive East  
Thornhill, Ontario, L3T 7J9  
Tel: (905) 882-7540  
Fax: (905) 882-4799  
E-mail: mike_brinka@urs.com

Visit us at: http://Highway400planningstudy.on.ca
EXTERNAL (GOVERNMENT) LETTER

June 5, 2002
Our Ref: CN29900147

Dear [Names]:

Re: Highway 400 Planning Study

From: 1.0 km South of Highway 89 to Northerly 30 km to Junction of Highway 11
Preliminary Design / Class Environmental Assessment, Group 'B' Project
G.W.P. 3.0-95-00

URS Cole Sherman on behalf of the Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO) is undertaking a Planning and Preliminary Design Study to examine improvements to Highway 400 from 1.0 km south of Highway 89 northerly 30 km to the junction of Highway 11 in the County of Simcoe (refer to the attached key map).

The purpose of this study is to determine the nature of improvements required to address traffic operation, capacity and safety needs for this section of the Highway 400 corridor. The need for drainage, illumination, roadside safety, structural and interchange improvements have also been examined as part of this project. Reasonable alternatives to address the required improvements have been developed and evaluated to determine the most appropriate solution.

An External Team Meeting has been arranged to provide the opportunity to review and discuss the evaluation of alternatives and the technically preferred alternatives for improvements to the Highway 400 corridor.

The External Team Meeting will be held on:

Tuesday June 25, 2002
1:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m.
Holiday Inn – Churchill Conference Centre
20 Fairview Road, Barrie

You are encouraged to attend the External Team Meeting and to provide us with your views and concerns so that they can be addressed in the study. Please notify the undersigned by June 11, 2002 if you plan to attend the meeting.

Following the External Team Meeting, the first of two scheduled Public Information Centres will be held from 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. and from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.

The preferred alternative includes mainline widening of Highway 400 as follows:

From Highway 89 to Essa Road – Widen from 6 lanes to 8 lanes (including property protection for up to 10 lanes).
From East Road to Bayfield Street – Widen from 6 lanes to 10 lanes.
From Bayfield Street to Junction at Highway 11 – Widen from 6 lanes to 8 lanes.

The improvements also include installation of concrete median barrier, interchange reconfigurations and improvements, construction of noise barriers at warranted locations, installation of high-mast illumination at required locations, and improvements to highway drainage. Closure of the existing northbound and southbound rest areas along Highway 400 in the project limits is also proposed in order to satisfy safety and operational requirements.

This study is following the approved planning process for a Group B project under the Class Environmental Assessment for Provincial Transportation Facilities (2000). The study process consists of five major components including: (1) a review of the Transportation Needs Assessment; (2) generate, evaluate and select the preferred planning alternative; (3) generate and assess preliminary design alternative; (4) evaluate and select preferred preliminary design alternative; and (5) develop preferred preliminary design.

Opportunities for public input are being provided throughout the course of the project.

Comments received will be used to review the evaluation of alternatives and determine any additional mitigation requirements. The results and any follow-up to the PIC will be documented in the Transportation Environmental Study Report (TESR). The TESR will be made available for review for a mandatory 30-day period. Notice of the availability of the TESR for review will be placed in local newspapers and sent directly to individuals on the mailing list.

Prior to completion of the review period for the TESR, any individual who has outstanding concerns may request that the project be "bumped-up" to an individual environmental assessment requiring a formal review and approval process. Once the review process for the TESR is completed, and concerns have been addressed, the project may proceed to the design and construction stages.

Design and Construction Reports (DCRs) may be prepared for portions of the project to document the design and construction details including any necessary follow-up mitigating approaches to address public concerns. The DCRs will be made available for public information as necessary but are not eligible for "bump-up".

Comments and information regarding this study are being collected to assist the Ministry of Transportation in meeting the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. This material will be maintained on file for use during the study and may be included in study documentation.

Should you require further information please feel free to contact the undersigned.

Yours very truly,

URS COLE, SHERMAN & ASSOCIATES LTD.

Len Kozachuk, P. Eng.
Senior Project Manager

cc: K. Boudreau, Project Engineer – MTO Southwest Region, Planning & Design
    J. Foster, Environmental Planner – MTO Southwest Region, Planning & Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Armstrong</td>
<td>Mr. Bill Armstrong, Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Regional Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24th Floor, 659 Exeter Road,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N4E 1L3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ian Mitchell, P.Eng.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barrie/Owen Sound District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of the Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1520 - 20th Street East, P.O. Box 967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owen Sound, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N4K 6H6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ken Rovinelli, Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development and Contract Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management Board Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>777 Bay Street, 15th Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toronto, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSG 2E5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. John MacDonald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage Operations Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Citizenship, Cultural and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400 University Avenue, 4th Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toronto, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTA 2J5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. Diana Jardine, Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan Administration Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atttn: Diane McArthur Rogers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>777 Bay Street, 14th Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toronto, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSG 2E5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Kathy Woeller, District Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midhurst District Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2284 Nursery Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midhurst, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOL 1X5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Bill Taylor, Associate Negotiator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiations Branch, Thunder Bay Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ontario Native Affairs Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>421 S. James Street, Suite 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thunder Bay, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P7E 2V6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Ray Valaria, Rural Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central and Northern Ontario Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture Food and Rural Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RR 3, 95 Dundas Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brighton, Ontario</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 5, 2002
Our Ref: CN29900147

Ms. Kristin Dibble
Property & Agreements Officer
Simcoe Muskoka Catholic District School Board
Plant and Planning Department
46 Alliance Blvd.
Barrie, Ontario L4M 5K3

Dear Ms. Dibble:

Re: Highway 400 Planning Study
From 1.0 km south of Highway 89 Northerly 30 km to Junction of Highway 11
Preliminary Design / Class Environmental Assessment, Group 'B' Project
GW.P. 30-95-00

URS Cole Sherman on behalf of the Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO) is undertaking a Planning and Preliminary Design Study to examine improvements to Highway 400 from 1 km south of Highway 89 northerly 30 km to the junction of Highway 11 in the County of Simcoe (refer to the attached key map).

The purpose of this study is to determine the nature of improvements required to address traffic operation, capacity and safety needs for this section of the Highway 400 corridor. The need for drainage, illumination, roadside safety, structural and interchange improvements have also been examined as part of this project. Reasonable alternatives to address the required improvements have been developed and evaluated to determine the most appropriate solution.

The first round of Public Information Centres (PICs) was held in May 2001 with the focus on the identification of project needs and reasonable alternatives within the project limits. Alternatives for widening Highway 400 (including an express – collector system through Barrie) and possible alternative interchange configurations were presented.

The second round of Public Information Centres has now been arranged to allow the public to review and provide comments on the evaluation of alternatives and the technically preferred alternatives for improvements to this section of the Highway 400 corridor.

The Information Centre will be held as follows:

Tuesday June 25, 2002
2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
Holiday Inn – Churchill Conference Centre
20 Fairview Road, Barrie

Wednesday June 26, 2002
2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
Stroud Community Centre
2880 Yonge Street, Innisfil

You are encouraged to attend the Information Centre and to provide us with your views and concerns so that they can be addressed in the study.

The preferred alternative includes mainline widening of Highway 400 as follows:

From Highway 89 to Essa Road – Widen from 6 lanes to 8 lanes (including property protection for up to 10 lanes).

From Essa Road to Bayfield Street – Widen from 6 lanes to 10 lanes.
From Bayfield Street to Junction at Highway 11 – Widen from 6 lanes to 8 lanes.

The improvements also include installation of concrete median barrier, interchange reconfigurations and improvements, construction of noise barriers at warranted locations, installation of high-mast illumination at required locations, and improvements to highway drainage. Closure of the existing northbound and southbound rest areas along Highway 400 in the project limits is also proposed in order to satisfy safety and operational requirements.

This study is following the approved planning process for a Group B project under the Class Environmental Assessment for Provincial Transportation Facilities (2000). The study process consists of five major components including: (1) a review of the Transportation Needs Assessment; (2) generate, evaluate and select the preferred planning alternative; (3) generate and assess preliminary design alternative; (4) evaluate and select preferred preliminary design alternative; and (5) develop preferred preliminary design. Opportunities for public input are being provided throughout the course of the project.

Comments received will be used to review the evaluation of alternatives and determine any additional mitigation requirements. The results and any follow-up to the PIC will be documented in the Transportation Environmental Study Report (TESR). The TESR will be made available for review for a mandatory 30-day period. Notice of the availability of the TESR for review will be placed in local newspapers and sent directly to individuals on the mailing list.

Prior to completion of the review period for the TESR, any individual who has outstanding concerns may request that the project be “bumped-up” to an individual environmental assessment requiring a formal review and approval process. Once the review process for the TESR is completed, and concerns have been addressed, the project may proceed to the design and construction stages.

Design and Construction Reports (DCRs) may be prepared for portions of the project to document the design and construction details in any necessary follow-up mitigating approaches to address public concerns. The DCRs will be made available for public information as necessary but are not eligible for “bump-up”.

Comments and information regarding this study are being collected to assist the Ministry of Transportation in meeting the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. This material will be maintained on file for use during the study and may be included in study documentation.

Should you require further information please feel free to contact the undersigned.

Yours very truly,

URS COLE. SHERMAN & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

Len Kozuchuk, P. Eng.
Senior Project Manager
INTEREST GROUP LETTER

cc: K. Boudreau, Project Engineer – MTO Southwest Region, Planning & Design
J. Foster, Environmental Planner – MTO Southwest Region, Planning & Design
Att.

Hwy. 400 – Highway 89 Northerly to the Junction at Highway 11 Interest Group List
(Ref No. CN29900147)

Address

*Ms. Kristin Dibble
Property & Agreements Officer
Simcoe Muskoka Catholic District School Board
Plant and Planning Department
46 Alliance Blvd.
Barrie, Ontario
L4M 5K3"

"Mrs. Wendy Moore, Executive Director
Federation of Ontario Cyclists
239 McRae Drive
Toronto, Ontario
M9G 1T7"

"Mr. Jim Crosscombe, President
Ontario Cycling Association
1185 Eglinton, Avenue E., Suite 408
North York, Ontario
M3C 3C8"

"Mr. Ron Purchace, General Manager
Ontario Federation of Snowmobile Clubs
106 Saunders Road, Unit 12
Barrie, Ontario
L4N 9A8"

"Ms. Sybilla Gonik, CAO
Greater Barrie Chamber of Commerce
89 Dunlop St. E., Suite 201
Barrie, Ontario
L4M 1A9"

"Mr. Don Stevenson
Ontario Federation of Agriculture
110 Highway 26
Midhurst, Ontario
L0L 1X0"

"Ms. Peggie Wong
Partner
The Resource Management Consulting Group
6 Oakridge Drive
Barrie, Ontario
L4N 5N7"

"Mr. Jack Irwin
Manager of Real Estate
Petro Canada
3275 Rebecca Street
Oakville, Ontario
L6L 6N5"

"Mr. John La Brie, Director
Physical Resources
Georgian College
One Georgian Drive
Barrie, Ontario
L4M 3X9"

Name

Ms. Dibble
Mrs. Moore
Mr. Crosscombe
Mr. Purchase
Ms. Gonik
Ms. Stevenson
Ms. Wong
Mr. Irwin
Mr. La Brie
June 5, 2002
Our Ref: CN29960147

Ms. Helen MacRae, Clerk
County of Simcoe
1110 Highway 26
Midhurst, Ontario
LOL 1X0

Dear Ms. MacRae:

Re: Highway 400 Planning Study

From 1.0 km South of Highway 89 Northerly 30 km to Junction of Highway 11
Preliminary Design / Class Environmental Assessment, Group ‘B’ Project
GW.P. 30-95-00

URS Cole Sherman on behalf of the Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO) is undertaking a Planning and Preliminary Design Study to examine improvements to Highway 400 from 1 km south of Highway 89 northerly 30 km to the junction of Highway 11 in the County of Simcoe (refer to the attached key map).

The purpose of this study is to determine the nature of improvements required to address traffic operation, capacity and safety needs for this section of the Highway 400 corridor. The need for drainage, illumination, roadside safety, structural and interchange improvements have also been examined as part of this project. Reasonable alternatives to address the required improvements have been developed and evaluated to determine the most appropriate solution.

An External Team Meeting has been arranged to provide the opportunity to review and discuss the evaluation of alternatives and the technically preferred alternatives for improvements to the Highway 400 corridor.

The External Team Meeting will be held on:
Tuesday June 25, 2002
1:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m.
Holiday Inn – Churchill Conference Centre
20 Fairview Road, Barrie

You are encouraged to attend the External Team Meeting and to provide us with your views and concerns so that they can be addressed in the study. Please notify the undersigned by June 11, 2002 if you plan to attend the meeting.

Following the External Team Meeting, the first of two scheduled Public Information Centres will be held from 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. and from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.

The preferred alternative includes mainline widening of Highway 400 as follows:

From Highway 89 to Essa Road – Widen from 6 lanes to 8 lanes (including property protection for up to 10 lanes).

From Essa Road to Bayfield Street – Widen from 6 lanes to 10 lanes.
From Bayfield Street to Junction at Highway 11 – Widen from 6 lanes to 8 lanes.

The improvements also include installation of concrete median barrier, interchange reconfigurations and improvements, construction of noise barriers at warranted locations, installation of high-mast illumination at required locations, and improvements to highway drainage. Closure of the existing northbound and southbound rest areas along Highway 400 in the project limits is also proposed in order to satisfy safety and operational requirements.

This study is following the approved planning process for a Group B project under the Class Environmental Assessment for Provincial Transportation Facilities (2000). The study process consists of five major components including: (1) a review of the Transportation Needs Assessment; (2) generate, evaluate and select the preferred planning alternative; (3) generate and assess preliminary design alternative; (4) evaluate and select preferred preliminary design alternative; and (5) develop preferred preliminary design. Opportunities for public input are being provided throughout the course of the project.

Comments received will be used to review the evaluation of alternatives and determine any additional mitigation requirements. The results and any follow-up to the PIC will be documented in the Transportation Environmental Study Report (TESR). The TESR will be made available for review for a mandatory 30-day period. Notice of the availability of the TESR for review will be placed in local newspapers and sent directly to individuals on the mailing list.

Prior to completion of the review period for the TESR, any individual who has outstanding concerns may request that the project be “bumped-up” to an individual environmental assessment requiring a formal review and approval process. Once the review process for the TESR is completed, and concerns have been addressed, the project may proceed to the design and construction stages.

Design and Construction Reports (DCRs) may be prepared for portions of the project to document the design and construction details including any necessary follow-up mitigating approaches to address public concerns. The DCRs will be made available for public information as necessary but are not eligible for “bump-up”.

Comments and information regarding this study are being collected to assist the Ministry of Transportation in meeting the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. This material will be maintained on file for use during the study and may be included in study documentation.

Should you require further information please feel free to contact the undersigned.

Yours very truly,

URS COLE SHERMAN & ASSOCIATES LTD.

Len Kozachuk, P. Eng.
Senior Project Manager

cc: K. Boudreau, Project Engineer – MTO Southwest Region, Planning & Design
J. Foster, Environmental Planner – MTO Southwest Region, Planning & Design

Att.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mr. Helen MacRae, Clerk  | *Mr. Helen MacRae, Clerk  
County of Simcoe  
1110 Highway 26  
Midhurst, Ontario  
L0L 1X0*               |
| Ms. MacRae                |                                                                         |
| Mr. Ian Bender, Director  | *Mr. Ian Bender, Director of Planning  
County of Simcoe  
1110 Highway 26  
Midhurst, Ontario  
L0L 1X0*               |
| Mr. Bender                |                                                                         |
County Engineer  
Road and Engineering  
County of Simcoe  
1110 Highway 26  
Midhurst, Ontario  
L0L 1X0*               |
| Mr. Brown                 |                                                                         |
| Mr. John Craig, Clerk     | *Mr. John Craig, Clerk  
City of Barrie  
70 Collier Street  
Barrie, Ontario  
LM4 4T5*               |
| Mr. Craig                 |                                                                         |
| Mr. James Taylor, Director| *Mr. James Taylor, Director of Planning  
City of Barrie  
70 Collier Street  
Barrie, Ontario  
LM4 4T5*               |
| Mr. Taylor                |                                                                         |
| Mr. Rick Newlove, Manager | *Mr. Rick Newlove, Manager of Planning and Policy Services  
Municipal Works Department  
City of Barrie  
70 Collier Street, Box 400  
Barrie, Ontario  
LM4 4T5*               |
| Mr. Newlove               |                                                                         |
| Mr. Ronald D. Hickey, Fire| *Mr. Ronald D. Hickey, Fire Chief  
City of Barrie  
70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400  
Barrie, Ontario  
LM4 4T5*               |
| Mr. Hickey                |                                                                         |
| Mr. Paul Landry, Clerk    | *Mr. Paul Landry, Clerk  
Town of Innisfil  
2147 Innisfil Beach Road  
P.O. Box 5000  
Stroud, Ontario  
L0L 2M0*                |
| Mr. Landry                |                                                                         |
| Mr. Wayne Young, Manager  | *Mr. Wayne Young, Manager of Operational Services  
Town of Innisfil               |
| Mr. Young                 | *Mr. Gowan Watson, Engineering Technologist  
Town of Innisfil  
2183 Innisfil Beach Road  
Innisfil, Ontario  
L9S 1A3*                |
| Mr. Watson                | *Chief Scott Griffith, Fire Department  
Innisfil Fire and Rescue Service  
780 Innisfil Beach Road, P.O. Box 5000  
Innisfil, Ontario  
L9S 2C5*                |
| Chief Griffith            | *Ms. Patricia Middlebrook, Clerk and Manager of Administration  
Town of New Tecumseth  
Box 910, 10 Wellington Street  
Alliston, Ontario  
L9R 1A1*                |
| Ms. Middlebrook           | *Mr. Stephen Naylor, Manager of Planning  
Town of New Tecumseth  
Box 910, 10 Wellington Street  
Alliston, Ontario  
L9R 1A1*                |
| Mr. Naylor                | *Mr. George DeGroot, Director of Public Works  
Town of New Tecumseth  
Box 910, 10 Wellington Street  
Alliston, Ontario  
L9R 1A1*                |
| Mr. DeGroot               | *Mrs. Juanita Dempster-Evans, Town of Bradford West Gwillimbury  
Box 160, 61 Holland Street E.  
Bradford, Ontario  
LIZ 2A9*                |
| Mrs. Dempster-Evans       | *Mr. Ron Kneeshaw, Superintendent of Public Works  
Town of Bradford West Gwillimbury  
Box 419, Bradford, Ontario  
LIZ 2A9*                |
| Mr. Kneeshaw              | *Mr. Eric Hodgin, Town Planner  
Town of Bradford West Gwillimbury  
Box 160, 61 Holland Street E.  
Bradford, Ontario  
LIZ 2A9*                |
| Mr. Hodgin                | *Ms. Brenda Signuein, Clerk  
Township of Essa  
Box 10                 |
Hwy. 400 – Highway 89 Northerly to the Junction at Highway 11 Municipal List  
(Ref. No. CN29900147)

Angu, Ontario  
L6M 1B2  
"Ms. Colleen Phillips  
Manager of Planning & Development  
Township of Essa  
5786 County Road 21  
Utopia, Essa Township, Ontario  
L6M 1T9"

"Mr. Greg Murphy  
Manager of Public Works and Parks  
Township of Essa  
5786 County Road 21  
Utopia, Ontario  
L6M 1T9"

"Ms. Eleanor Rath, Clerk  
Township of Springwater  
1110 Highway 26  
Midhurst, Ontario  
L0L 1X0"

"Ms. Elaine Clairmoreff  
Planning Coordinator  
Township of Springwater  
1110 Highway 26  
Midhurst, Ontario  
L0L 1X0"

"Mr. Donald Priest  
Superintendent of Public Works  
Township of Springwater  
1110 Highway 26  
Midhurst, Ontario  
L0L 1X0"

"Ms. Vicki Robertson  
Township of Oro Medonte  
Box 100  
Oro, Ontario  
L0L 2X0"

"Mr. Keith Mathieson  
Manager of Public Works  
Township of Oro Medonte  
Box 100  
Oro, Ontario  
L0L 2X0"

"Ms. Andrea Leigh, Planner  
Township of Oro Medonte  
Box 100  
Oro, Ontario  
L0L 2X0"

"Ms. Judi Brouse  
Director of Long Range Planning  
Planning and Economic Development  
District of Muskoka  
70 Pine Street  
Bracebridge, Ontario  
P1L 1N0"

Ms. Sigouin

Ms. Phillips

Mr. Murphy

Ms. Rath

Ms. Clairmoreff

Mr. Priest

Ms. Robertson

Mr. Mathieson

Ms. Leigh
PUBLIC LETTER

June 5, 2002
Our Ref: CN29900147

Dear Sir / Madam:

Re: Highway 400 Planning Study
From 1.0 km South of Highway 89 Northerly 30 km to Junction of Highway 11
Preliminary Design / Class Environmental Assessment, Group ‘B’ Project
GW.P. 30-95-00

URS Cole Sherman on behalf of the Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO) is undertaking a Planning and Preliminary Design Study to examine improvements to Highway 400 from 1 km south of Highway 89 northerly 30 km to the junction of Highway 11 in the County of Simcoe (refer to the attached key map).

The purpose of this study is to determine the nature of improvements required to address traffic operation, capacity and safety needs for this section of the Highway 400 corridor. The need for drainage, illumination, roadside safety, structural and interchange improvements have also been examined as part of this project. Reasonable alternatives to address the required improvements have been developed and evaluated to determine the most appropriate solution.

The first round of Public Information Centres (PICs) was held in May 2001 with the focus on the identification of project needs and reasonable alternatives within the project limits. Alternatives for widening Highway 400 (including an express – collector system through Barrie) and possible alternative interchange configurations were presented.

The second round of Public Information Centres has now been arranged to allow the public to review and provide comments on the evaluation of alternatives and the technically preferred alternatives for improvements to this section of the Highway 400 corridor.

The Information Centre will be held as follows:

Tuesday June 25, 2002
2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
Holiday Inn – Churchill Conference Centre
20 Fairview Road, Barrie

Wednesday June 26, 2002
2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
Stroud Community Centre
7883 Yonge Street, Innisfil

You are encouraged to attend the Information Centre and to provide us with your views and concerns so that they can be addressed in the study.

The preferred alternative includes主线 widening of Highway 400 as follows:

From Highway 89 to Essa Road – Widen from 6 lanes to 8 lanes (including property protection for up to 10 lanes).

From Essa Road to Bayfield Street – Widen from 6 lanes to 10 lanes.
From Bayfield Street to Junction at Highway 11 – Widen from 6 lanes to 8 lanes.

The improvements also include installation of concrete median barrier, interchange reconfigurations and improvements, construction of noise barriers at warranted locations, installation of high-mast illumination at required locations, and improvements to highway drainage. Closure of the existing northbound and southbound rest areas along Highway 400 in the project limits is also proposed in order to satisfy safety and operational requirements.

This study is following the approved planning process for a Group B project under the Class Environmental Assessment for Provincial Transportation Facilities (2000). The study process consists of five major components including: (1) a review of the Transportation Needs Assessment; (2) generate, evaluate and select the preferred planning alternative; (3) generate and assess preliminary design alternative; (4) evaluate and select preferred preliminary design alternative; and (5) develop preferred preliminary design. Opportunities for public input are being provided throughout the course of the project.

Comments received will be used to review the evaluation of alternatives and determine any additional mitigation requirements. The results and any follow-up to the PIC will be documented in the Transportation Environmental Study Report (TESR). The TESR will be made available for review for a mandatory 30-day period. Notice of the availability of the TESR for review will be placed in local newspapers and sent directly to individuals on the mailing list.

Prior to completion of the review period for the TESR, any individual who has outstanding concerns may request that the project be "bumped-up" to an individual environmental assessment requiring a formal review and approval process. Once the review process for the TESR is completed, and concerns have been addressed, the project may proceed to the design and construction stages.

Design and Construction Reports (DCRs) may be prepared for portions of the project to document the design and construction details including any necessary follow-up mitigating approaches to address public concerns. The DCRs will be made available for public information as necessary but are not eligible for "bump-up".

Comments and information regarding this study are being collected to assist the Ministry of Transportation in meeting the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. This material will be maintained on file for use during the study and may be included in study documentation.

Should you require further information please feel free to contact the undersigned.

Yours very truly,

URS COLE, SHERMAN & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

Len Kozachuk, P. Eng
Senior Project Manager

cc: K. Boudreau, Project Engineer – MTO Southwest Region, Planning & Design
J. Foster, Environmental Planner – MTO Southwest Region, Planning & Design

Att.
Address
“Mr. Ralph Bond
B.A. Consulting Group
45 St. Clair Avenue West, Suite 300
Toronto, ON
M4V 1K9”
Mr. Bond
“Mr. Ralph Holt
50 Hemford Crescent
Toronto, Ontario
M5B 2S5”
Mr. Holt
“Mr. Russell Godwin
Northwest Atlantic Canada Inc.
15 Lemmill Road
Toronto, Ontario
M3B 2T3”
Ms. Godwin
“Ms. Jessie Rowe
38 Burton Avenue
Barrie, Ontario
L4N 2R4”
Ms. Rowe
“Mr. John Ayliffe
3345 Line 4
Cookstown, Ontario
L0L 1L0”
Mr. Ayliffe
“Mr. Jacob Huyer
336 Yonge Street, Unit 346
Barrie, Ontario
L4N 4C8”
Mr. Huyer
“Mr. Paul Thompson
R.R. 1
Hillsdale, Ontario
L0L 1V0”
Mr. Thompson
“Canpro Investment
Bayfield Mall
Attention: Ralph Chesterman
320 Bayfield Street
Barrie, Ontario
L4M 3C1”
Mr. Chesterman
“Mr. John Cancilla
102 Violet Street
Barrie, Ontario
L4N 9M8”
Mr. Cancilla
“Sam Cancilla
27 Shoreview Drive
Barrie, Ontario
L4M 1G2”
Mr. Cancilla

Hyv. 400 – Highway 89 Northerly to the Junction at Highway 11 Public List (Ref No. CN29900147)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address Details</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Heran</td>
<td>156 Lamar St.</td>
<td>Maple</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>L6A 1A6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Delgobbo</td>
<td>117 Chieftain Cres.</td>
<td>Barrie</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>L4N 6J2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Stewart</td>
<td>34 Columbia Road</td>
<td>Barrie</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>L4N 8C7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Jackson</td>
<td>519 Grove Street East</td>
<td>Barrie</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>L4M 3Z3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Johnston</td>
<td>556 Leacock Drive</td>
<td>Barrie</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>L4M 7B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. McGee</td>
<td>17 Pratt Road</td>
<td>Barrie</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>L4M 2K9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Burnstead</td>
<td>45 Shirley Ave.</td>
<td>Barrie</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>L4N 1M8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayla Demiray</td>
<td>33 Hodgson Dr.</td>
<td>Barrie</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>L4N 7Z2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hodgson</td>
<td>42 Patricia Avenue</td>
<td>Barrie</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>L4M 5S6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. McNeice</td>
<td>63 Ottaway Avenue</td>
<td>Barrie</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>L4M 2X1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.M. Barz</td>
<td>42 Ottaway Ave.</td>
<td>Barrie</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>L4M 2W9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Petty</td>
<td>98 Lillian Crescent</td>
<td>Barrie</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>L4N 5H7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Willis</td>
<td>111 Chieftain Cres.</td>
<td>Barrie</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>L4N 6J2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Jackson</td>
<td>34 Columbia Road</td>
<td>Barrie</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>L4N 8C7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Burnstead</td>
<td>519 Grove Street East</td>
<td>Barrie</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>L4M 3Z3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayla Demiray</td>
<td>45 Shirley Ave.</td>
<td>Barrie</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>L4N 1M8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. McGee</td>
<td>17 Pratt Road</td>
<td>Barrie</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>L4M 2K9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Knezeck</td>
<td>17 Pratt Road</td>
<td>Barrie</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>L4M 2K9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Johnston</td>
<td>556 Leacock Drive</td>
<td>Barrie</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>L4M 7B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dougan</td>
<td>40 King Street West, Suite 4400</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>M5H 3Y4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Claudia Eiselt</td>
<td>119 Cheltenham Road</td>
<td>Barrie</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>L4M 6S6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Profit</td>
<td>4 Fitzroy Terrace</td>
<td>Barrie</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>L4N 22J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Holiday Inn
29 Fairview Road
Barrie, Ontario
L4M 4P3

“Mr. Clayton Groh
30 Ottawa Ave.
Barrie, Ontario
L4M 2W7”

“Mr. Peter Osmond
Development Institute in Collingwood
P.O. Box 576, Station Main
Collingwood, Ontario
L9W 4E8”

“Hope Park
259 Bayfield Street
Barrie, ON
L4M 3B8”

“Mr. Robert McTavish
168 Charles Street
Milton Ontario
L9T 2G9”

“Canadian Tire Corporation Limited
Attention: Mr. David J. Drake
2180 Yonge Street, P.O. Box 770, Station K
Toronto, Ontario
M4P 2V8”

“Ms. Shea Dalby
273 Tiffin Street, Suite 102
Barrie, Ontario
L4N 2N3”

“Brillioner Investments Limited
Jerome Eldon Limited
Alamo Investments Limited
9675 Yonge Street, 2nd Floor
Richmond Hill, Ontario
L4C 1V7”

“Ms. Daphne Walton
5 Bellevue Cres.
Barrie, Ontario
L4M 2S9”

“Mr. Jacob Huyer
336 Young Street, Unit 346
Barrie Ontario
L4N 4C8”

“Mr. Paul Thompson
RR1
Hilldale, Ontario
L0L 1V0”

“Campbell Investment
Attention: Mr. Raymond Stewart
Bayfield Mall, 320 Bayfield Street
Barrie Ontario
L4M 3C1”

“Ms. Ruth Davis
29 Patricia Avenue
Barrie, Ontario
N4M 3J6”

“Mr. M. R. P. Latour
21 Clairmont Crescent, RR 1
Orillia, Ontario
L3V 6H1”

“Mr. Tim Arnott
B.A. Group
45 St. Clair West
Toronto, Ontario
M4V 1K9”

“Mr. Paul Scargall
Worden Land & Gervais Ltd.
Scotia Plaza, 40 King Street W.
Toronto, Ontario
M5H 3Y4”

“Mr. Graham Davis
Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority
120 Bayview Parkway, Box 282
Newmarket, Ontario
L3Y 4X1”

“Weston Consulting Group Inc.
Attention: Mr. Mark Emery
201 Millway Ave., Unit 19
Vaughan, Ontario
L4K 5K8”

“Ms. Jan Robertson
81 Wellington Street West
Barrie, Ontario
L4N 1K8”

“Ms. Lillian Guolla
45 Jane Crescent
Barrie, Ontario
L4N 3T9”

“Mr. Jacob Huyer
336 Yonge Street, Unit 346
Barrie, Ontario
L4N 4C8”
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APPENDIX B
Minutes of Meeting
MINUTES OF MEETING

PROJECT: Highway 400 Planning Study – Hwy 89 to Jct Hwy 11 – WP 30-95-00
PROJECT No. CN29900147
DATE: April 3, 2002
LOCATION: Barrie City Hall – 3rd Floor Boardroom
TIME: 1:30 p.m.
PURPOSE: Project Status Update with Barrie Senior Staff

PRESENT:
Pete Lee - City of Barrie, City Administrator
Rick Newlove - City of Barrie, Acting Director of Engineering
Wendell McArthur - City of Barrie, Acting Director of Engineering
Richard Forward - City of Barrie, Senior Project Manager
Bill Gilbert - City of Barrie, Senior Engineer
George Kaveckas - City of Barrie, Traffic, Transit & Parking Manager
Al Lacey - Read, Voorhees & Associates Limited
Kevin Boudreau - MTO, Project Engineer
Len Kozachuk - URS Cole Sherman, Consultant Project Manager

Items Description

Following introductions of all in attendance, Kevin Boudreau briefly reviewed project limits and status: The Project Team is in the process of identifying the preferred alternatives for mainline and interchanges. Once the OPSEU strike is resolved, MTO intends to work towards presenting the preferred alternatives through internal meetings and meetings with various agencies, the Municipal Team and area Councils. As well, two Public Information Centres (PICs) will be scheduled to present the findings for comment.

Kevin also noted that Duckworth Street has been the subject of much discussion between the City and the Project Team. The City’s views on the Ministry’s position, as expressed in recent correspondence, will be discussed at this meeting.

Len Kozachuk briefly reviewed the alternatives considered for mainline widening. Through Barrie, a core-distributor system has been evaluated, along with a 10-lane widening.

Len also discussed the rationale, and some of the advantages and disadvantages apparent in the short list of alternative configurations evaluated at each of the interchanges in Barrie.

Comments were received during the discussion:

- The City is looking to extend Harvie Road easterly across Highway 400 and connect to Big Bay Point Road. The City feels it may be advantageous to have at least limited access available at this new crossing, to serve as an alternative to Essa Road both during and after construction of the Essa Road interchange improvements.

MTO will consider noting the City’s plans for the future road crossing on the PIC displays. MTO will advise City shortly.

- The City can accept Alternative 1 at Duckworth Street. The City is satisfied that, with the widening of Duckworth through the interchange, the proposed reconfigured intersection of Duckworth/Cundale will operate at acceptable levels in future. The city also recognizes that traffic operation issues on Duckworth/Cundale extend beyond the Highway 400 interchange area.

- Understanding the timing of the construction of the Highway 400 improvements is crucial for Barrie’s capital expenditure planning. MTO does not have a set timetable for implementing any of the improvements in the Highway 400 Planning Study.

- The City places a high priority on improvements to the Dunlop Street interchange. Through its review of the implementation of the possible improvements, Cole, Sherman would suggest the City consider completing whatever Municipal EA’s it can in advance of the MTO construction, to reduce the likelihood of delays to implementation. In particular, the City should consider advancing the Anne Street widening and the Harvie Road extension.

- The City will advise MTO if Barrie Council would prefer a presentation either prior to or following the PICs.

Submitted by: L. Kozachuk

Distribution:
K. Boudreau - MTO
J. Foster - MTO
R. Newlove - City of Barrie
APPENDIX C
Displays / Information Package
Welcome to the Second Round of Public Information Centres for the

HIGHWAY 400 PLANNING STUDY
FROM 1 KM SOUTH OF HIGHWAY 89
NORTHERLY 30 KM TO THE JUNCTION OF HIGHWAY 11
G.W.P. 30-95-00

Preliminary Design
Class Environmental Assessment, Group ‘B’

Public Information Centre #2

June 2002

Members of the Project Team are available to discuss and answer any questions you may have.

Purpose of this Public Information Centre

The purpose of this Information Centre is to present the results from the first Public Information Centre and to present the evaluation of alternatives and the technically preferred alternatives. Major elements presented today include:

- Project Limits
- Study Schedule
- Class Environmental Assessment Process
- Study Purpose and Problem Statement
- Summary of Issues and Concerns Raised During the First Public Information Centre
- Analysis and Evaluation of Alternatives
- Technically Preferred Alternatives
- What’s Next

The Project Team encourages you to fill out a comment sheet recording your comments and concerns.
Background

The Ministry of Transportation (MTO) initiated a Planning and Preliminary Design Study to identify improvements required to address traffic operation, capacity and safety needs associated with the Highway 400 corridor. The need for drainage, illumination, roadside safety, structural and interchange improvements were also examined as part of the study. Reasonable alternatives to address the required improvements were developed and evaluated to determine the most appropriate solution.

The objectives of this study are to:

- Determine the existing and projected future (2011) traffic on Highway 400;
- Identify the capacity and operational needs;
- Evaluate and select alternatives to address identified needs; and,
- Submit a Transportation Environmental Study Report as required under the approved Class Environmental Assessment for Provincial Transportation Facilities (2000) prior to proceeding with the detail design and construction process.
Regional Transportation Needs

This area map shows the transportation needs in a regional perspective:

- Recreation and population / employment growth in the north
- Industrial and population / employment growth pressures in the south

Project Need and Justification

The purpose of this study was to determine the nature of improvements required to address existing and future traffic operating capacity and safety needs, as well as the need for drainage, illumination, roadside safety, structural and interchange improvements.

Highway 400 Mainline:

Currently the section of Highway 400 within the project limits experiences congestion during peak travel periods. In addition, roadside safety, illumination and drainage features require improvement to meet current ministry standards.

Due to the anticipated future development within the City of Barrie and surrounding area, traffic operations in the Highway 400 corridor are expected to deteriorate rapidly. Sections on Highway 400 are operating poorly during peak travel periods. As traffic volumes continue to increase, congestion on Highway 400 will worsen. This will lead to increased driver frustration, potential for collisions, trip delays and the associated waste of energy resources, increased cost of moving goods and significant diversion of traffic to other adjacent roadways.

Highway 400 Interchanges:

All interchanges within the project limits have traffic operations issues that warrant improvements.

Traffic volumes at all interchange ramps will exceed capacity by 2011. This could result in queuing onto Highway 400 mainline, which would also negatively affect traffic operations and safety.

Display boards describe the existing and future conditions at interchanges within the project limits, are included in this presentation.
Summary of the Technically Preferred Alternatives

The following lists the technically preferred alternatives and recommended improvements to Highway 400 within the study limits:

**Highway 400 Technically Preferred Mainline Alternative**
- From Highway 89 to Essa Road – Widen to the west from 6 lanes to 8 with property protection for 10 lanes, with concrete median barrier
- From Essa Road to Bayfield Street – Widen about the centreline from 6 lanes to 10 lanes, with concrete median barrier
- From Bayfield Street to Junction at Highway 11 – Widen about the existing centreline from 6 lanes to 8 lanes, with concrete median barrier

**Highway 400 Technically Preferred Interchange Alternatives**
- Highway 89 – Parcels A Interchange
- Innisfil Beach Road – Parcels A Interchange
- Molson Park Drive – Operational Improvements
- Essa Road – Parcels A Interchange
- Dunlop Street – Parcels B Interchange
- Bayfield Street – Parcels A (SB) / Diamond (NB) Interchange
- Duckworth Street – Parcels A Interchange

All of the above interchanges will be constructed to allow for potential 10 lane widening.

In addition to the mainline and interchange modifications, the following improvements to Highway 400 are recommended:
- Provide concrete median barrier throughout
- Construct new noise barriers at warranted locations
- Install “high-mast” illumination north of Molson Park Drive to Duckworth Street and improve illumination at all interchanges
- Replace the median sewer and improve the culverts and drainage as necessary
- New pavement on the existing section of Highway 400

Environmental Assessment Process

This study is following MTO’s “Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) for Provincial Transportation Facilities”, which was approved under the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act in Fall 1999. The Class EA defines groups of projects and activities, and the associated environmental assessment process requirements which MTO has committed to following for each group of project. Provided that this process is followed, projects and activities included under the Class EA do not require formal review and approval under the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act.

This project is following the Class EA process for Group ‘B’ projects. The steps involved in the Class EA process are shown in the next display.

The purpose of this Public Information Centre is to update you on the progress of the project and to obtain comments on the technically preferred alternatives and the proposed mitigation measures. Comments received will be used to review the evaluation of alternatives and determine any additional mitigation requirements.

The results and any follow-up to the PIC will be documented in the Transportation Environmental Study Report (TESR). The TESR will be made available for review for a mandatory 30-day period. Notice of the availability of the TESR for review will be placed in local newspapers and sent directly to individuals on the mailing list.

Prior to completion of the review period for the TESR, any individual who has outstanding concerns may request that the project be “bumped-up” to an individual environmental assessment requiring a formal review and approval process. Once the review process for the TESR is completed, and concerns have been addressed, the project may proceed to the design and construction stages.

Design and Construction Reports (DCRs) may be prepared for portions of the project to document the design and construction details including any necessary follow-up mitigating approaches to address public concerns. The DCRs will be made available for public information as necessary but are not eligible for “bump-up”.
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- Evaluate and Select Preferred Preliminary Design Alternative
- Develop Preferred Preliminary Design Alternative

Environmental Protection in Preliminary Design

DETAILED DESIGN
- Environmental Protection in Detail Design

CONSTRUCTION
- Environmental Protection in Construction
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From 1 km South of Highway 89
To the Junction of Highway 11

Study Schedule / Class EA Process

The following chart outlines the major tasks to be completed in the next few months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection / Issue Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate and Evaluate Alternatives to the Undertaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate Interchange and Widening Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Round of Public Information Centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate Interchange and Widening Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technically Preferred Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Round of Public Information Centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refinement to the Technically Preferred Alternative and Prepare Preliminary Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File TESR for Public Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ontario
Ministry of Transportation

Highway 400 Planning Study
From 1 km South of Highway 89
To the Junction of Highway 11

Urs
Ciba Sherman
Based on the assessment of alternatives, the preferred alternative is “freeway capacity improvements”. The basic feature of the “freeway capacity improvements” is widening Highway 400.

Part of the recommendations of this study indicate that, assuming that the planning design and construction of a proposed new transportation corridor takes 8-10 years, the immediate and medium term capacity deficiencies of the Featherly 400 corridor in Simcoe County can be widened to 10 lanes as traffic warrants or if the proposed new transportation corridor does not receive approval.

### Evaluation of Planning Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Do Nothing</th>
<th>Localized Geometric Improvements</th>
<th>Traffic Operations Improvements</th>
<th>Vehicle Occupancy Increase</th>
<th>Adjacent Road System Improvements</th>
<th>Rail and Transit Expansion</th>
<th>Freeway Capacity Improvements (Highway 400)</th>
<th>Provincial Highway Network Expansion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Potential for Collisions</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Level of Service</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Geometrics</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Compatibility</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to the Provincial Highway Network</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Cost</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>very high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:

- ✓: Significant Benefit
- ✗: Significant Disadvantage
- ✗: Minor Benefit
- ✗: Minor Disadvantage

Freeway Capacity Improvements offers the optimal combination of significant benefits to transportation and low impacts to property and the environment as compared to the other alternatives. Based on the assessment of alternatives, the preferred alternative is “freeway capacity improvements”. The basic feature of the “freeway capacity improvements” is widening Highway 400.
Summary of Issues and Concerns Raised at the First Public Information Centre

The purpose of the first Public Information Centre (PIC) was to introduce the study, present the alternatives under consideration including the mainline widening and interchange improvements. A total of 191 members of the public attended the PIC and a total of 120 written comments were received. The following table summarizes the major issues and concerns raised by the public and how these matters are being addressed in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noise levels and noise pollution, a need for noise barriers at residential areas</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Refer to the Noise Displays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose widening of Highway 400 to 10 / 12 lanes (widening is not necessary)</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Widening of Highway 400 is required to address the projected future capacity deficiencies along Highway 400. The technically preferred alternative for widening the Highway 400 mainline identifies the number of additional lanes required to meet the future travel demand to 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for commuter rail service/restoration of GO Transit to alleviate traffic along Highway 400</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Rail and transit expansion would provide a more competitive choice of travel modes for some users of Highway 400, and thus reduce the traffic volumes somewhat on Highway 400. However, the improvements would be limited since the Highway 400 significantly serves a diverse nature of trips. Commuter rail service would reduce but not eliminate the need for highway widening improvements in the Highway 400 corridor within the planning horizon for this project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Ontario**

Ministry of Transportation

**URS**

Goicoechea
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Summary of Issues and Concerns Raised at the First Public Information Centre (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle emissions/air quality/air pollution</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>- Whenever traffic volumes exceed 100,000 (average annual daily traffic), under certain conditions, some residents living in the immediate vicinity of a highway may experience an atmosphere that does not meet the provincial ambient air quality criteria 100% of the time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Degradation in air quality due to additional traffic on the highway depends on the distance from the highway. For areas beyond 1 km from the highway the effect is insignificant. For areas within 100 metres, the effect is almost proportional to traffic volume. The actual ambient air quality conditions at a given location, at any given time, may vary depending on other factors such as atmospheric conditions and topography.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- While greater traffic volumes potentially may result in further affects to air quality, there are a number of ameliorating factors. Federal agencies are helping to reduce the effects of rising traffic volumes by regularly tightening standards. Thanks to new federal vehicle emission and fuel quality standards, emissions per vehicle kilometre are dropping, and they will drop even more strongly beyond 2004. The Drive Clean Program, which is currently being expanded to the whole province, will have a positive effect on overall vehicle emission levels. The first phase of the program, according to the Ontario Ministry of Environment and Energy, reduced emissions by approximately 10%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Ontario**
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### Summary of Issues and Concerns Raised at the First Public Information Centre (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic/visual impacts/need for landscaping</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Landscaping will be employed for the project limits to mitigate impacts. Landscape plans will be developed during the detailed design phase of the project. An inventory of existing vegetation has been conducted and significant trees and shrubs will be retained where possible. Requirements for barriers for tree protection will be determined during detail design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for highway illumination/potential light trespass on properties adjacent to the highway</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Highway illumination is required on urban sections of Highway 400 (i.e. north of Molson Park Drive to Duckworth Street) as well as at all the interchanges, in accordance with Ministry Standards. Where necessary methods to reduce light trespass on adjacent properties such as shielding will be incorporated in the detail design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway drainage/ wells/ storm water quality</td>
<td>MNR / Public</td>
<td>A preliminary hydrogeological review was undertaken to determine the hydrogeology of the study area, groundwater recharge and discharge impact areas and to identify water well interference locations. Potential impacts to specific wells will be examined during detail design. Storm water quality and quantity issues are being considered as part of this study and an appropriate plan for the technically preferred alternative will be developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A realignment of Duckworth Street and Cundles Road will have damaging consequences on proposed commercial development</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>The technically preferred alternative for the Duckworth Street interchange does not include realignment of Duckworth Street/Cundles Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access during construction/ construction disruption</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Implementing the improvements to Highway 400 will disrupt traffic during construction. Contingency plans will be developed during detail design in consultation with the local community to address the local and regional emergency services access during construction. Although some disturbances during construction are inevitable, mitigation measures will be implemented to minimize nuisance impacts (i.e. minimizing construction traffic). Refer to the “Staging of Construction” display board for further details on construction disruptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts to businesses</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Potential impacts to businesses have been considered in the evaluation of project options and in developing a technically preferred design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact to historical trail at Summidaile Road</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>The historical trail at Summidaile Road will be retained and appropriate mitigation measures will be employed to minimize impacts to the features within the project limits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact to pedestrian trail at Bayfield Avenue Highway 400 ramp intersection</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Pedestrian access to Bayfield Street from Rose Street will be maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts to Little Lake wetland complex</td>
<td>MNR / Public</td>
<td>There will be no direct impacts to the Little Lake Wetland Complex as a result of this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibration impacts to sensitive receivers properties</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Vibration impacts to adjacent properties are not anticipated as a result of this project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation Process

The evaluation of alternatives considered both the impacts generated by the alternative, and the relative importance of the impacts. Each factor in the evaluation (i.e. Natural, Social, Economic, Cultural, Transportation and Cost) contributes a relative level of significance to the decision making process.

Based on the range of issues involved and the nature of the problems, a level of significance was assigned for each factor within the study section. Levels of significance were determined based on consultation and input received from government ministries, agencies, local municipalities and the general public as well as site specific study area conditions in each of the study sections.

Significant net impacts were focused on in the selection of the preferred alternatives. Differences in impacts between alternatives were compared considering both the magnitude and the relative significance of the impact. The rationale for the selection of the preferred alternative improvement is documented and presented here today.

Widening Alternatives

Projected traffic volumes will exceed the capacity of the existing 6-lane freeway. Widening Highway 400 will be required to accommodate future (2011) travel demand.

Generally, widening about the existing Highway 400 centrel ine is the preferred method of achieving the required road widening. This method is preferred in part because:

- By splitting the property impacts along the east and west sides of the right-of-way, the overall impacts to adjacent property owners is reduced;
- Such widenings are less disruptive to stage and construct;
- Such widenings are less costly to implement; and,
- Maintaining the existing alignment provides more desirable geometrics.

In areas where property limits and/or physical constraints suggest a shift of the centrel ine will reduce impacts, alternative methods of widening will be developed. Depending on the extent and significance of the constraint, the following alternatives will be considered:

1.) Widening about the existing Highway 400 centrel ine;
2.) Widening to the east;
3.) Widening to the west; and,
4.) A combination of the above.
Summary Evaluation of Mainline Highway 400 Alternatives (Highway 89 to Essa Road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>RELATIVE LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>ALT 1</th>
<th>ALT 2</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NATURAL ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alternative 2 has a lower degree of impact on the fish habitat crossings and also offers a storm water management system that results in less impacts to surrounding properties and natural features. Alternative 2 impacts a groundwater discharge area just north of Highway 89. The impact however is not significant and can be reduced through design refinements. THEREFORE, ALTERNATIVE 2 IS SLIGHTLY PREFERRED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Both alternatives result in similar low impacts to the social environment. Alternative 2, however, has fewer aesthetic impacts and will not impact adjacent service roads. THEREFORE, ALTERNATIVE 2 IS PREFERRED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Both alternatives result in low impacts to the economic environment. Alternative 1, however, results in slightly greater impacts to agricultural land and operations. THEREFORE, ALTERNATIVE 2 IS PREFERRED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Both alternatives result in similar low impacts to the cultural environment. THEREFORE, BOTH ALTERNATIVES ARE EQUALLY PREFERRED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION &amp; ENGINEERING &amp; COST</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Both alternatives are equal in terms of maintenance, traffic operations, consistency and staging. Alternative 2, however, offers more favourable drainage characteristics at a lower cost. THEREFORE, ALTERNATIVE 2 IS SLIGHTLY PREFERRED.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION:

Although Alternative 2 has greater impacts to environmental features west of the highway, overall the impacts are lower than Alternative 1, which impacts environmental features on both sides of the highway. Alternative 2 results in lower overall impacts and is less costly to construct as well as offers similar technical advantages as Alternative 1.

OVERALL, ALTERNATIVE 2 IS SELECTED AS THE PREFERRED.

* Ranking of factors based on consultation and input received from government ministries, agencies, local municipalities and the general public as well as site specific study area condition. A package detailing the full evaluation of the Mainline Highway 400 Alternatives can be obtained from a Project Team Representative.
Widening Alternatives

Widening Through the City of Barrie

To address the projected future capacity deficiencies along Highway 400 through the City of Barrie, as well as operational and maintenance issues in this urban section, the following alternatives will be examined as part of this study:

10-Lane Cross Section (5 lanes per direction)

12-Lane Express – Collector System (3 express lanes, 3 collector lanes per direction)
### Summary Evaluation of Core-Collector vs. Mainline Widening Highway 400 Alternatives
(North of Molson Park Drive to South of Duckworth Street)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR/Indicator</th>
<th>Alternative 1 10 lane widening</th>
<th>Alternative 2 12 lane C/D System</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATURAL ENVIRONMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on Aquatic Habitat</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Both alternatives require the widening of 7 crossings that have fish habitat. Alternative 2 is wider and therefore results in additional impacts at these crossings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on Terrestrial Habitat</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Given the urban nature of the area, both alternatives result in similar low impacts to terrestrial features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on Wetlands</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Both alternatives have the same footprint in the vicinity of the Little Lake Wetland (FLS) and result in similar low impacts to this feature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCI-ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on Noise</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative 2 results in a maximum increase of approximately 4 dBA in noise receivers whereas Alternative 1 results in a maximum increase of 2 dBA. Sound level change of 3 dBA is perceivable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on Residences</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative 1 results in the displacement of 4 residences whereas Alternative 2 results in the displacement of 14 residences. It is noted that these impacts could be reduced through the use of retaining walls. Retaining walls would add to the cost of the alternatives. Alternative 2 would carry higher retaining wall costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on Community Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neither alternative effect community features (e.g., school, parks recreation centres etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on Businesses</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative 1 does not displace businesses whereas Alternative 2 results in the displacement of 4 businesses. It is noted that these impacts could be reduced through the use of retaining walls. Retaining walls would add to the cost of Alternative 2. Alternative 2 provides limited opportunity for through traffic to exit in Barrie potentially impacting businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on Agricultural Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neither alternative affects agricultural operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Impacts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional property is required along approximately 20% of the length of Alternative 1, whereas Alternative 2 requires additional property along 90% of the length. It is noted that these percentages generally represent partial property takings and exclude the property impacts associated with the interchanges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on Heritage Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neither alternative affects heritage features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on areas with Archaeological Potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative 1 requires slightly less land with a high potential for archaeological resources and is therefore preferred.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TECHNICAL CONSIDERATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR/Indicator</th>
<th>Alternative 1 10 lane widening</th>
<th>Alternative 2 12 lane C/D System</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Through Traffic Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>With the 10-lane scenario, acceptable level of service achieved during weekday peak travel periods. Queuing on ramps could reduce operating speeds; this impact can be reduced through interchange improvements (e.g. sub-collector) but there may be increased property impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Traffic Operations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under the C/D system, through traffic achieves good level of service. Queuing on ramps could reduce operating speeds in distributor, but core lanes would be unaffected. During weekend peak travel periods, through traffic operations are acceptable with both alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident Management</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under the C/D system, local traffic achieves acceptable level of service. Queuing on ramps could reduce operating speeds in distributor; interchange improvements could help reduce the impacts to the distributor lanes but there may be increased property impacts. During weekend peak travel periods, the alternatives have similar levels of traffic operations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ontario**
Ministry of Transportation

**URS**

**HIGHWAY 400 PLANNING STUDY**
From 1 KM South of Highway 89 to the Junction of Highway 11
### Summary Evaluation of Core-Collector vs. Mainline
### Widening Highway 400 Alternatives
### (North of Molson Park Drive to South of Duckworth Street) Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR/Indicator</th>
<th>Alternative 1 18 lane widening</th>
<th>Alternative 2 12 lane CD System</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TECHNICAL CONSIDERATIONS (Continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow Removal</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>With Alternative 1, all snow is cleared to the right shoulder by snowplows moving in echelons. With Alternative 2, snow in core lanes requires removal, which is an additional operation requiring additional equipment to be used and results in further disruptions to traffic. Alternative 1 is strongly preferred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Rehabilitation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under the 10-lane scenario, lane closures/restrictions impact all traffic in the bound being worked on; work on Lane 3 has greatest impact, this may require a reduction to two lanes. Scheduling such operations during non-busy periods can reduce the impacts. With the CD System, lane closures/restrictions impact either core or distributer, leaving other set of lanes to bypass the operation. Work on Lane 2 of distributor has greatest impact as this may require reduction of distributor to one lane. Scheduling such operations during non-busy periods can reduce the impacts. Alternative 2 has less impact to traffic during rehab operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Maintenance Operations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No significant difference between the alternatives in dealing with emergency maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Access</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>With the 10-laning scenario, access available to all lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Staging</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Both alternatives have similar staging requirements and impacts. However, Alternative 1 provides greater flexibility in staging the improvements in that it provides for staged implementation (i.e. Ability to widen from 6 to 8 lanes, then 8 to 10 lanes) as traffic demand warrants. No such flexibility with Alternative 2, which, as a result, would generally be underutilized in the short to medium terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility with Future Transportation Network</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative 1 is more consistent with the long-term vision for the provincial road network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>The construction of the CD system is estimated to cost approximately 25% more than 10-laning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUMMARY OF EVALUATION:

Alternative 1 results in fewer impacts to the natural, social, economic and cultural environments than Alternative 2 primarily because of the smaller footprint associated with the construction of Alternative 1.

From a technical considerations perspective, Alternative 2 provides for better operations for through traffic during weekday PM peak travel periods; however, through traffic makes up only 30% of the total traffic volume during such times. Although Alternative 2 provides for better operations for through traffic, operations with Alternative 1 are acceptable during weekday PM peak travel periods and comparable to Alternative 2 during other times.

Alternative 2 would have less impacts to traffic during rehabilitation operations, but would require more complex snow removal operations, which would have greater traffic impacts than Alternative 1. Given that snow removal operations would occur more frequently than rehabilitation (generally required every 15 years), the impacts of snow removal operations are considered to be of greater significance than those resulting from rehabilitation operations.

In other technical aspects, Alternative 1 is considered to operate equal to or better than Alternative 2. Alternative 1 provides greater flexibility for future expansion of the transportation network and has a lower construction cost estimate.

The lower impacts to the natural, social, economic and cultural environments, as well as the more favourable technical considerations associated with Alternative 1 are considered to be more important than the advantages associated with Alternative 2 for through traffic operations and pavement rehabilitation operations.

**ALTERNATIVE 1 IS THEREFORE PREFERRED.**

Note: This evaluation does not include the impacts associated with interchanges. Interchange impacts will increase the direct natural social and economic impacts of the alternatives. Alternative 2 will result in higher direct interchange impacts because more property is required to accommodate the larger cross-section.
## Summary Evaluation of Highway 89
### Interchange Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th><em>RELATIVE LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</em></th>
<th>ALT 1</th>
<th>ALT 2</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nevertheless, both alternatives impact the same low level. Therefore, ALTERNATIVE 2 is slightly preferred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Both alternatives result in the same low impacts to the social environment. Therefore, BOTH ALTERNATIVES ARE EQUALLY PREFERRED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Both alternatives result in relatively low impacts to the economic environment. Alternative 2 results in slightly more impacts to agricultural land and more impacts to business operations. Therefore, ALTERNATIVE 1 IS PREFERRED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Both alternatives have similar low impacts to the cultural environment. Therefore, BOTH ALTERNATIVES ARE EQUALLY PREFERRED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 TRANSPORTATION &amp; ENGINEERING &amp; COST</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alternative 1 provides more favourable traffic operations than Alternative 2. Further, Alternative 1 is equal to Alternative 2 in the other transportation and engineering factors, and carries similar construction costs. Therefore, ALTERNATIVE 1 IS PREFERRED.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of Evaluation:
Alternatives 1 and 2 have similar impacts to the social and cultural environments. The measurable differences between Alternatives 1 and 2 relate to the number of coldwater stream crossing impacts, the number of businesses displaced, and the traffic operations provided. Although Alternative 1 impacts more coldwater streams, the overall impacts are of low significance. The more favourable traffic operations provided by Alternative 1 and the lower business displacement impacts are considered to be more important than the differences in impacts to coldwater streams. Therefore, ALTERNATIVE 1 IS PREFERRED.
### Summary Evaluation of Innisfil Beach Road Interchange Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Relative Level of Significance</th>
<th>ALT 1</th>
<th>ALT 2</th>
<th>ALT 3</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NATURAL ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are no significant impacts to the natural environment for any alternatives. A small loss of forested land is expected for all alternatives, however Alternatives 2 and 3 will affect less forested area than Alternative 1. Alternative 3 has less potential for surface water impacts since it has a lower increase in pavement area. Therefore, Alternative 3 is slightly preferred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All alternatives impact the aesthetic quality of the existing landscape and result in minor impacts to sensitive viewer groups. All alternatives result in low noise impacts to residences adjacent to the highway. The potential low impact to the approved commercial/industrial development for all alternatives are considered minor. Therefore, all alternatives are equally preferred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall, Alternative 3 has the least impact to existing businesses where as Alternative 2 has the greatest disruption impacts to commercial property. Therefore, Alternative 3 is preferred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All alternatives result in similar low impacts to the cultural environment. Therefore, all alternatives are equally preferred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION &amp; ENGINEERING &amp; COST</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The benefits of the superior traffic operations offered by Alternative 1 outweigh the lower costs and construction impacts of the other alternatives. While all alternatives are adequate to serve future traffic demands, Alternative 1 is most favourable from an overall traffic operation perspective as it provides the highest capacity, eliminates left turns from Innisfil Beach Road and reduces the possibility of wrong-way moves. Therefore, Alternative 1 is preferred.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Evaluation:**

Alternative 1 ranks highest under transportation and engineering, as it provides better overall traffic operations. The impacts of Alternative 1 to the natural, social and economic environments are low and can be reduced through refining the design; the differences in transportation and engineering cannot. The benefit of superior traffic operations outweighs the slightly higher environmental impacts.

Therefore, **Alternative 1 is preferred.**

---

* Ranking of factors based on consultation and input received from government ministries, agencies, local municipalities and the general public as well as site specific study area conditions. A package detailing the full evaluation of the Innisfil Beach Road Interchange Alternatives can be obtained from a Project Team Representative.
## Summary Evaluation of Molson Park Drive Interchange Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>RELATIVE LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>ALT 1</th>
<th>ALT 2</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟡</td>
<td>Neither alternative results in significant impacts to the natural environment. THEREFORE, BOTH ALTERNATIVES ARE EQUALLY PREFERRED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟡</td>
<td>Both alternatives result in similar low impacts to the social environment. Alternative 2 will provide a slight improvement to community mobility from Highway 400 because of the free-flow movement provided by the new ramps. THEREFORE, ALTERNATIVE 1 IS SLIGHTLY PREFERRED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟡</td>
<td>Both alternatives result in relatively low impacts to the economic environment. Alternative 1 results in the least amount of impacts to businesses and commercial property, and avoids the Molson Park property. THEREFORE, ALTERNATIVE 1 IS PREFERRED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟡</td>
<td>Neither alternative impacts known cultural resources. THEREFORE, BOTH ALTERNATIVES ARE EQUALLY PREFERRED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 TRANSPORTATION &amp; ENGINEERING &amp; COST</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟡</td>
<td>Alternative 1 provides slightly better traffic operations and can be implemented with less construction impacts and at a lower cost. THEREFORE, ALTERNATIVE 1 IS PREFERRED.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Evaluation:**
Alternative 2 provides minimal transportation and engineering benefits and results in greater impacts to developed lands around the interchange. Alternative 1 provides acceptable traffic operations and has minimum impacts to the interchange area. THEREFORE, ALTERNATIVE 1 IS PREFERRED.

* Ranking of factors based on consultation and input received from government ministries, agencies, local municipalities and the general public as well as site specific study area condition.
A package detailing the full evaluation of the Molson Park Drive interchange Alternatives can be obtained from a Project Team Representative.
Summary Evaluation of Essa Road Interchange Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>* RELATIVE LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>ALT 1</th>
<th>ALT 2</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Both alternatives result in low impacts to two warmerwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>aquatic habitats, however the impacts are not considered significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THEREFORE, BOTH ALTERNATIVES ARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EQUALLY PREFERRED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Both alternatives result in similar low impacts to the social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THEREFORE, BOTH ALTERNATIVES ARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EQUALLY PREFERRED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Both alternatives result in the same low impacts to the economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THEREFORE, BOTH ALTERNATIVES ARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EQUALLY PREFERRED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neither alternative impacts known cultural resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THEREFORE, BOTH ALTERNATIVES ARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EQUALLY PREFERRED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 TRANSPORTATION &amp; ENGINEERING</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Both alternatives are similar from a transportation, engineering and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; COST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cost perspective. Alternative 1, however, allows for free flow access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to Highway 400 southbound while Alternative 2 does not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THEREFORE, ALTERNATIVE 1 IS PREFERRED.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION:

Overall, both alternatives result in relatively the same low impacts to the natural, social, economic and cultural environments. Alternative 2 does not offer as many transportation benefits as Alternative 1 since it requires a left turn lane for W-S movement.

THEREFORE, ALTERNATIVE 1 IS SLIGHTLY PREFERRED.

- Ranking of factors based on consultation and input received from government ministries, agencies, local municipalities and the general public as well as specific study area condition.
- A package detailing the full evaluation of the Essa Road Interchange Alternatives can be obtained from a Project Team Representative.
## Summary Evaluation of Dunlop Street Interchange Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>RELATIVE LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>ALT 1</th>
<th>ALT 2</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>Alternative 2 has greater impacts to fish habitat, upland forest, surface water impacts to Dyment’s Creek, and impacts to the tributaries of Bunker’s Creek. <strong>THEREFORE, ALTERNATIVE 1 IS PREFERRED.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>Alternative 1 results in greater impacts to residences and results in slightly greater noise impacts to residences and is therefore less preferred. <strong>THEREFORE, ALTERNATIVE 2 IS PREFERRED.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>Overall, Alternative 2 results in higher impacts to the economic environment because more businesses will be displaced, additional property is required to accommodate the new interchange and business access along Dyment Road will be reduced. <strong>THEREFORE, ALTERNATIVE 1 IS PREFERRED.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>Both alternatives result in similar impacts to cultural features. <strong>THEREFORE, BOTH ALTERNATIVES ARE EQUALLY PREFERRED.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 TRANSPORTATION &amp; ENGINEERING &amp; COST</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>Alternative 2 is less disruptive to traffic during construction. The lower cost and greater benefits to traffic operations associated with Alternative 1 are considered to be more important. The benefits of Alternative 1 to traffic operations include improved traffic flow on Dunlop Street, resulting in lower potential for ramp traffic queuing onto Highway 400. <strong>THEREFORE, ALTERNATIVE 1 IS PREFERRED.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUMMARY OF EVALUATION:

Both alternatives result in similar low impacts to the natural and cultural environments. Alternative 1 impacts a number of residences on Henry Street. However, Alternative 1 has less impacts to commercial properties, has more transportation benefits such as improved traffic flow on Dunlop Street, resulting in lower potential for ramp traffic queuing onto Highway 400, and lower construction costs. Alternative 1 was considered to have the lowest overall impacts and provides more transportation benefits. **THEREFORE, ALTERNATIVE 1 IS PREFERRED.**

* Ranking of factors based on consultation and input received from government ministries, agencies, local municipalities and the general public as well as site specific study area condition. A package detailing the full evaluation of the Dunlop Street Interchange Alternatives can be obtained from a Project Team Representative.*

---
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Summary Evaluation of Bayfield Street Interchange Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>RELATIVE LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>ALT 1</th>
<th>ALT 2</th>
<th>ALT 3</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Environment</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>There are no significant differences between the alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Environment</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All alternatives result in relatively low aesthetic impacts to the existing vegetation cover and to sensitive visitor groups. Alternative 3 has higher impacts than the other alternatives. All alternatives result in impacts to community mobility because of the out-of-way travel for local communities due to the closure of Rose Street, however Alternative 3 will have slightly greater impacts because of the additional road improvements including two cul-de-sacs and realignment of Coulter Street. All alternatives will have a minor impact on the OPP Station property but will not significantly affect operations. Alternative 3 will displace the YMCA facility. THEREFORE, ALTERNATIVES 1 &amp; 2 ARE EQUALLY PREFERRED OVER ALTERNATIVE 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Environment</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alternative 1 results in less impact to commercial property and fewer impacts to business access along Bayfield Street. THEREFORE, ALTERNATIVE 1 PREFERRED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Environment</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All of the alternatives impact known built heritage features (bridge overpass). THEREFORE, ALL ALTERNATIVES ARE EQUALLY PREFERRED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation &amp; Engineering &amp; Cost</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Although Alternative 2 has the least construction impacts and a lower cost than Alternative 3, Alternative 2 negatively affects traffic operations on Bayfield Street as it eliminates the free flow loop ramp to Highway 400 southbound. Alternative 1 maintains the free flow loop ramp to Highway 400 southbound, so Alternative 1 is preferred over Alternative 2. While Alternative 3 is more expensive than Alternative 2, it provides more favourable traffic operations as this alternative provides three free flow ramps to Highway 400. The more favourable traffic operations of Alternative 3 are considered of more importance than the cost advantage of Alternative 2. THEREFORE, ALTERNATIVE 3 IS SLIGHTLY PREFERRED.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Evaluation:**

While Alternative 3 provides more favourable transportation and engineering benefits, Alternative 3 results in the greatest social and economic impacts. The social and economic environments are considered to have a high level of significance and the impacts of Alternatives 2 and 3 are too great and cannot be overcome with refinement of design. Although the transportation and engineering benefits are lower for Alternative 1, traffic operations will not be compromised, as this alternative will adequately serve existing and future traffic demands. Alternative 1 results in the least impact to commercial property and provides favourable transportation and engineering benefits.

**Therefore, Alternative 1 is Preferred.**

- Most Preferred
- Least Preferred

*Ranking of factors based on consultation and input received from government ministries, agencies, local municipalities and the general public as well as site specific/ study area condition. A package detailing the full evaluation of the Bayfield Street interchange Alternatives can be obtained from a Project Team Representative.
HIGHWAY 400 PLANNING STUDY
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## Summary Evaluation of Duckworth Street Interchange Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>ALT 1</th>
<th>ALT 2</th>
<th>ALT 3</th>
<th>ALT 4</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Environment</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>All alternatives result in similar low impacts to the natural environment. All alternatives result in minor impacts to forest cover, but Alternatives 3 and 4 will have a slightly greater impact on upland forest cover. THEREFORE, ALTERNATIVES 1 AND 2 ARE SLIGHTLY PREFERRED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Environment</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>All alternatives have low noise impacts and no impacts to residential property. Alternatives 3 and 4 have the greatest impact to community features and future land uses. Between Alternatives 1 and 2, Alternative 1 has lower impacts since it does not impact the Georgian College property. THEREFORE, ALTERNATIVE 1 IS PREFERRED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Environment</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All alternatives result in low impacts to the cultural environment. All alternatives impact the proposed commercial development of the “Building Box”, although Alternatives 3 and 4 impacts more property. THEREFORE, ALTERNATIVES 1 AND 2 ARE EQUALLY PREFERRED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation &amp; Engineering &amp; Cost</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Alternative 1 results in no impacts to the cultural environment whereas Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 results in low impacts to land with archaeological potential. THEREFORE, ALTERNATIVE 1 IS PREFERRED.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY OF EVALUATION:**

Alternative 1 is preferred overall since it results in the least amount of impacts to the natural, social and economic environments, has the least cost and property requirements, and offers acceptable transportation benefits. THEREFORE, ALTERNATIVE 1 IS PREFERRED.

---

* Ranking of factors based on consultation and input received from government ministries, agencies, local municipalities and the general public as well as the specific study area condition. A package detailing the full evaluation of the Duckworth Street Interchange Alternatives can be obtained from a Project Team Representative.
MTO Noise Policy

Noise Barrier Retrofit Program

The Ontario Government released a policy statement on February 8, 1977 regarding noise associated with major freeways. Subdivisions, located adjacent to freeways, which were approved prior to this date, are eligible for consideration under MTO's "Retrofit Noise Barrier Program". After this date developers were required to design new residential areas in an acoustically sensitive manner in accordance with government guidelines and in consultation with the affected municipality.

In the case of the Highway 400 corridor through Barrie, the locations shown on the adjacent plan have been identified for construction of noise barriers under the Retrofit Program. These locations were deferred when the Highway 400 project was announced. Other locations within the Barrie area, which technically qualify under the program but do not currently meet all criteria for construction, are also shown on the plan. To qualify for construction sites must be cost effective meaning that a barrier must achieve a significant level of noise reduction for a reasonable number of qualified residences.

Impacts of Highway Expansion

When highways are expanded the Ministry must determine the expected change in sound levels attributable to the widening. This is done by comparing future noise conditions without the highway expansion with future noise conditions with the expansion. Where the expansion results in a significant increase in sound (greater than 5 decibels) the Ministry must investigate the feasibility of noise reduction measures such as barriers. Noise control measures where applicable must be cost effective and achieve a minimum average sound level reduction of 5 decibels.

Factors in the assessment which determine the noise levels for adjacent homes include the distance from the highway, highway gradients, local elevations and contours, ground cover between the highway and the homes, traffic volumes, percentage of trucks and vehicle speeds.

The results of the noise assessment for the Highway 400 project are summarized on display panels in this presentation.

About Noise

The Ministry realizes that noise levels associated with a highway can be annoying to adjacent residents. For purposes of analysis, noise levels are measured in dBA (decibels in the A scale). "Decibels" indicates sound level, while the "A scale" relates to the hearing range of the human ear.

The following chart indicates approximate dBA levels associated with some common noises/activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sound Level in Decibels (dBA)</th>
<th>Average Human Perception</th>
<th>Typical Source (Measured at operator/listener distance from source)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>AVERAGE HUMAN EYE PAIN THRESHOLD</td>
<td>Shotgun blast, jet plane at takeoff, exploding fireworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>UNCOMFORTABLY LOUD</td>
<td>Rock music (amplified), hockey game crowd, severe thunder, Pneumatic jackhammer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>EXTREMELY LOUD</td>
<td>Power lawn mower, farm tractor, interior of subway train, motorcycle, snowmobile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminary Noise Assessment

Background

A noise analysis has been carried out for the proposed improvements to Highway 400. The purpose of this analysis was to determine the following:

- Future Noise Conditions without improvements
- Future Noise Conditions with improvements

Factors used in the noise assessment include highway grades, local elevations and contours, ground cover (absorption), traffic volumes (Summer Average Daily Traffic) and percentage of trucks and vehicle speeds.

Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>MEASURED NOISE LEVEL</th>
<th>SELECTED INCREASE ASSOCIATED WITH IMPROVEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainline Highway 400</td>
<td>59-75 dBA</td>
<td>1-3 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 89</td>
<td>66-68 dBA</td>
<td>1 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innisfil Beach Road</td>
<td>61-63 dBA</td>
<td>1 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molson Park Drive</td>
<td>No noise sensitive receivers in the vicinity of the interchange</td>
<td>No increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essa Road</td>
<td>61-73 dBA</td>
<td>1 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durnlop Street</td>
<td>64-71 dBA</td>
<td>2 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayfield Street</td>
<td>59-74 dBA</td>
<td>4 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dockworth Street</td>
<td>59-75 dBA</td>
<td>2 dBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A change in noise levels less than 3 dBA is not perceptible to humans.

Closure of Service Centres

There are two Service Centres within the Project Limits:

- At the Highway 89 interchange; and
- North of Molson Park Drive (accessible by northbound Highway 400 only)

Both service centres will be closed to accommodate the technically preferred improvements.

1.) Highway 89 Interchange

This service centre will be closed to accommodate the technically preferred alternative for improvements to the interchange.

2.) Northbound Service Centre

This service centre will be closed to avoid traffic operational issues related to the service centre entrance ramp on Highway 400 to the Essa Road exit ramp.

The services provided at these centres are generally available at the areas around the interchanges along the highway.
Staging of Construction

Construction of the proposed improvements to Highway 400 will be carried out under a series of contracts. It is anticipated that the duration of the construction will extend over several seasons.

To accommodate the structural and pavement rehabilitation, the following restrictions were assumed:

- Night work may be required at certain locations
- Temporary lane closures and temporary road closures at underpasses
- Lane restrictions and temporary lane closures on crossing roads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporary Road Closures (e.g. nightly)</th>
<th>Complete Road Closures (e.g. 1 construction season)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway 89 at Highway 400</td>
<td>6th Line at Highway 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Line at Highway 400</td>
<td>10th Line at Highway 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innisfil Beach Road at Highway 400</td>
<td>Sunnidale Road at Highway 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erou Road at Highway 400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffin Street at Highway 400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunlop Street at Highway 400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Street at Highway 400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayfield Street at Highway 400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duckworth Street at Highway 400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Details of Construction Staging will be developed and presented for public review during later design stages.

It is anticipated that the series of contracts will be timed in a manner whereby adjacent contracts are not implemented simultaneously (e.g. Dunlop St. and Anne St. improvements will not be implemented at the same time). This will provide reasonable alternate routes to minimize out-of-way travel.

Proposed Highway Illumination

High mast illumination is proposed along Highway 400 north of Molson Park Drive as well as at all interchanges. Adjacent to residential areas, appropriate shielding will be mounted over the luminaries to avoid light trespass outside the highway right-of-way. Details of this shielding will be determined in detail design.

Typical High Mast Lighting Installation (Mainline)
Commuter Lot Options/Evaluation

The Ministry of Transportation recognizes the transportation system benefits that can be achieved through increasing vehicle occupancy. In this regard, opportunities for locating commuter parking lots in proximity to interchanges were considered in this study.

The Commuter Parking Lots (CPLs) provide a safe opportunity for people to carpool, thereby reducing the number of vehicles on highways and urban streets. CPLs also encourage ridesharing, thereby increasing energy efficiency.

Commuter parking lots were considered where:

- An existing commuter parking lot was displaced by proposed improvements at the interchange;
- An existing commuter parking is known to be inadequate in terms of the number of spaces it currently provides; or
- There was sufficient vacant/undeveloped land in the vicinity of the interchange with suitable access to accommodate a commuter parking lot.

Commuter Parking Lot sites were investigated at the following interchanges:

- Highway 89;
- Molson Park Drive; and
- Essa Road.

The results of this evaluation are summarized at this Information Centre.

Note: The Commuter Parking Lot locations are presented for information only. MTO is not seeking approval for the right to acquire private property or construction of any Commuter Parking Lots as part of this study.
Highway 89 Commuter Lot Evaluation

ALTERNATIVES 1 AND 2 ARE EQUALLY PREFERRED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALTERNATIVE 1 (NORTHEAST QUADRANT)</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE 2 (NORTHWEST QUADRANT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimal noise impacts</td>
<td>Avoids property impacts on businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoids property impacts to agricultural operations</td>
<td>Potential for future expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No potential areas of archaeological significance identified within vicinity of proposed commuter parking lot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Although commuter parking lots are generally beneficial to overall traffic operations, such benefits do not justify the displacement of businesses. Alternative 3 would displace Motel 400, while the other alternatives do not displace businesses. Alternative 3, therefore, is not technically preferred.

The viability of Alternative 4 would be contingent on an agreement between Cookstown Outlet Mall and the Ministry of Transportation. As such, there is uncertainty with respect to impacts to property, businesses and capacity. In addition, the location of Alternative 4 is less convenient than the others, as access to and from this location must be made via a private entrance. Alternative 4, therefore, is not technically preferred.

Alternative 2 does not impact any businesses, however, Alternative 2 is located on lands that are presently used for agricultural operations. This alternative has potential for expansion, however it is noted that an expansion will increase impacts to agricultural lands. Alternative 1 results in greater partial property takings, which are not expected to have significant effect on the operations of those businesses. This alternative does not have potential for expansion. Alternatives 1 and 2 are considered to have similar impacts.

Note: The Commuter Parking Lot locations are presented for information only. MTO is not seeking approval for the right to acquire private property or construction of any Commuter Parking Lots as part of this study.
Molson Park Drive Commuter Lot Evaluation

ALTERNATIVE 1 IS PREFERRED.

ALTERNATIVE 1 (FORMER BEER STORE SITE)
- Does not have property impacts on existing businesses
- Can provide direct access from Molson Park Drive
- Avoids the intersection at Molson Park Drive and Barrie View Drive
- Potential for future expansion can be addressed

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Alternative 1 offers better access from Molson Park Drive as it is located away from the interchange and the Barrie View Drive intersection, which operates poorly during peak travel periods. Also, Alternative 1 will not impact businesses, while Alternative 2 may potentially reduce the number of parking spaces available in the Barrie Power Centre. The viability of Alternative 2 would be contingent on an agreement between Barrie Power Centre and the Ministry of Transportation. Without such an agreement there is uncertainty with respect the extent of impacts to property and businesses as well as parking capacity.

There is a proposal being generated to redevelop the Molson Park Lands to include commercial and light industrial uses. Incorporating a Commuter Parking Lot into this redevelopment will need to be negotiated with the landowner and MTO. Incorporating a Commuter Parking Lot in a new development is considered to be more advantageous, as both the MTO and the landowner can better address Commuter Parking Lot requirements in a new development.

Note: The Commuter Parking Lot locations are presented for information only. MTO is not seeking approval for the right to acquire private property or construction of any Commuter Parking Lots as part of this study.

Ontario Ministry of Transportation

HIGHWAY 400 PLANNING STUDY
FROM 1 KM SOUTH OF HIGHWAY 89 TO THE JUNCTION OF HIGHWAY 11

URS
Cale Sherman

Ontario Ministry of Transportation
**Essa Road Commuter Lot Evaluation**

**ALTERNATIVES 2 AND 3 ARE EQUALLY PREFERRED.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALTERNATIVE 2 (NORTHEAST QUADRANT)</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE 3 (SOUTHWEST QUADRANT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No significant impacts to aquatic and terrestrial habitats, groundwater, wetlands and has good potential for stormwater management</td>
<td>No significant impacts to aquatic and terrestrial habitats, groundwater, wetlands and has good potential for stormwater management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impacts on community features, businesses or agricultural operations</td>
<td>No significant impacts to aquatic and terrestrial habitats, groundwater, wetlands and has good potential for stormwater management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No noise impacts</td>
<td>No impacts on community features, businesses or agricultural operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impacts on heritage features or areas of archaeological potential</td>
<td>No noise impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct access to/from Essa Road</td>
<td>No impacts on heritage features or areas of archaeological potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides the highest capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EVALUATION SUMMARY**

Alternative 1 will occupy lands with high potential for development (former Barrie Raceway site), while Alternatives 2 and 3 will be located within the existing Ministry of Transportation right-of-way, on lands that are unlikely to be developed. Alternative 1 is least technically preferred.

Alternative 2 has only a slight advantage over Alternative 3 in terms of capacity and effect on businesses. Alternative 3 may require a partial property taking from Zehrs. The impacts of both alternatives will require further refinement and investigation during later design stages.

---

**Note:** The Commuter Parking Lot locations are presented for information only. MTO is not seeking approval for the right to acquire private property or construction of any Commuter Parking Lots as part of this study.

---

**Summary of Potential Environmental Effects, Mitigation Requirements, Commitments to Future Work and Monitoring**

- **Impact on property:** Compensation will be provided for temporary and permanent property requirements and is based on the owner’s property appraised value.
- **Highway Noise:** No significant increase in noise levels, which would require mitigation, are anticipated as a result of the widening.
- **Stormwater Management (SWM):** Proposed improvements to the highway will result in a 10% increase in pavement area. Requirements for Greenbelt and wetlands will be addressed during preliminary design.
- **Sediment and Erosion Control:** Potential erosion sensitive areas and consideration of design options such as limiting embankment height and slope were addressed during preliminary design.
- **Protection and Restoration of Vegetation:** Significant trees and shrubs will be retained where possible. Landscaping will be designed to maximize green space outside of the restricted area.
- **Fisheries and Fish Habitat:** No significant fisheries impacts are anticipated.
| Potential Interference with Groundwater / Wells | Where a potential for interference is identified, design refinements will be developed where appropriate and monitoring of the water supply during construction may be necessary. | The potential to cause interference with well water supply and groundwater recharge/discharge areas will be assessed during the detail design stage. Generally, this will only occur where there are major excavations in close proximity to shallow sources of groundwater. |
| Relocation of Utilities | Some utility relocation will be required as a result of this project. On-going discussions with utility companies will be maintained to eliminate or reduce service disruptions during construction. | MTO to liaise with utility companies through the design and construction stage, as appropriate. |
| Light Trespass from Highway Illumination | Incorporate methods to avoid/reduce light trespass during the design stages. | Methods to reduce light trespass onto adjacent properties will be identified in the preliminary design. Possible methods to reduce trespass, including shielding, will be incorporated in the detail design. |
| Impact on Commuter Parking Lots | The proposed design identifies alternative parking lot locations where existing commuter parking lots are impacted by ramp improvements. In addition, the proposed design identifies opportunities for locating parking lots in the vicinity of interchanges, where possible. | MTO will continue to identify opportunities for locating parking lots in the vicinity of interchanges along the Highway 400 as demand warrants. |
| Effects of Snow Drifting | Measures to reduce the effects of snow drifting may require additional property at certain areas along Highway 400 corridor. These areas have been identified on the plans presented at this Public Information Centre. | MTO will continue to investigate options for implementing snow drifting countermeasures through later design stages. |

**Summary of Potential Environmental Effects, Mitigation Requirements, Commitments to Future Work and Monitoring (Continued)**

| Impact on Archaeological Resources | It has been determined that the existing right-of-way is considered free of archaeological concern. There is potential for the identification of pre-contact and historic archaeological resources within the lands beyond the existing highway right-of-way. | Lands beyond the existing right-of-way will be subject to a Stage 2 archaeological assessment. Additional lands beyond the limits of construction required for temporary construction will be subject to archaeological assessment prior to construction. The appropriate agencies/authorities will be notified in the event that deeply buried archaeological or human remains are encountered during construction activities. |
| Impacts to Heritage Resources (Heritage Structures over Highway 400) | Retaining the Cost of Arms panels for use on the new structure is the preferred mitigative approach. The proposed interchange configuration will impact a farm complex with potential cultural landscape significance. | The option to retain the Cost of Arms panels will be examined during detail design in consultation with appropriate government agencies. A landscape plan will be developed during the detail design phase of this project. |
| Impacts to Highway and Local Traffic | Staging and traffic management measures to reduce impacts to traffic during construction have been identified. | MTO to continue to review and improve traffic management and construction staging concepts during design and construction stages. |
What's Next

After this Information Centre, the following will be carried out:

- Review the comments received and respond to any questions
- Continue to consult with the public and external agencies for input in the refinements to the technically preferred alternatives and proposed mitigation measures
- Prepare the Transportation Environmental Study Report (TESR) and place it on the Public Record for the 30-day review period in Fall 2002. A notice will be published at that time

Thank you for attending.

Please feel free to ask questions and fill out a comment sheet before you leave.

Freedom of Information and Protection Privacy

Comments and information regarding this study are being collected to assist the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) in meeting the requirements of the Provincial Environmental Assessment Act. This material will be maintained on file for use during the study and may be included in study documentation. With the exception of personal information all comments will become part of the public record.

You are encouraged to contact the MTO Project Team if you have questions or concerns regarding the above information.
APPENDIX D

MAPPING OF NOISE SENSITIVE AREAS
HIGHWAY 400 PLANNING STUDY
1km South of Highway 89 to Junction at Highway 11
G.W.P. 30-95-00
HIGHWAY 400 PLANNING STUDY
1km South of Highway 89 to Junction at
Highway 11
G.W.P. 30-95-00
Plan reflects proposed interim improvements, including realignment of Industrial Park Road and relocation of panoramatic parking lot, to be under separate contract.