

SUMMARY OF THE SECOND PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE

FOR THE

PROPOSED THIRD CROSSING OF THE CATARAQUI RIVER

MARCH 3, 2010

Prepared by



**SUMMARY OF THE SECOND PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE
FOR THE
PROPOSED THIRD CROSSING OF THE CATARAQUI RIVER
March 3, 2010**

Overview of Public Information Centre

The Second Public Information Centre provided a PowerPoint presentation reviewing the EA and presenting the preferred corridor location and type of crossing.

At 7:00 pm, J.L. Richards and Associates Ltd. presented their findings. Following an overview of the EA purpose and activities to date, the presenters provided background on traffic counts which indicated that additional capacity across the Cataraqui River is necessary to address existing operational deficiencies and to accommodate projected growth in Kingston.

The presenters then addressed Terrestrial and Marine, Cultural and Heritage, Rideau Canal, Ecological, Geo-environmental, and Geotechnical assessments. Based on these assessments, each of the six possible crossing locations was evaluated. Based on this evaluation, Area 2 (Option 2) Bridge; Area 4 (Option 4A) Bridge and Area 4 (Option 4B) bridge were short-listed for further evaluation. All other possible crossings were deemed inappropriate based on the assessments.

An evaluation matrix was developed for the three short-listed areas that included 6 main criteria groups with relative weightings attached and 7 to 9 sub-criteria under each of the main criteria, also with relative weightings attached. When the criteria and weightings were applied, the areas ranked as follows:

1. Area 4 (Option 4A) Bridge
2. Area 4 (Option 4B) Bridge
3. Area 2 (Option 2) Bridge

When the top two areas were evaluated further using the EA criteria weighting, Area 4 (Option 4A) Bridge at John Counter Boulevard and Gore Road was the preferred option.

At this point in the EA, the consulting team identified no technical or environmental issues that would prevent the construction of a bridge at this location. Following this Public Information Centre, comments from residents will be summarized and presented to the consulting team for review. On April 20, 2010, the EA report will be presented to Kingston City Council. At that time, City Council will decide whether to proceed with Stage 2 of the EA.

At the end of the session, attendees were asked to fill in their comment sheet or return them to the City of Kingston by March 12, 2010.

Public Information Centre Notification Details

Advertising for the Environmental Assessment was placed in local newspapers and on the City's website on the following dates:

- Public Notice was posted on City's website – Feb 23
- Public Notice emailed to list serve mailing list – Feb 23
- Paid Whig Ad – Feb 23
- Paid Whig Ad – March 2
- Councillor Foster's personal email distribution list – Feb 21

Attendance

Signed attendance at the Public Information Centre was 73.

City of Kingston staff included:

Denis Leger, Commissioner of Corporate Services
Speros Kanellos, Project Director
Mark VanBuren, Director of Engineering
John Sawarna, Project Manager
Sharon Fitch, Project Assistant

The Project Team members in attendance included:

Guy Cormier, J.L. Richards & Associates Limited
Wes Paetkau, J.L. Richards & Associates Limited
Adam Hardy, J.L. Richards & Associates Limited
Mike Troop, J.L. Richards & Associates Limited
Bryan Petzold, Associated Engineering Ltd.
Mary Alice Snetsinger, Ecological Services
Michelle Lavictoire, Bowfin Consulting
Howard Williamson, Williamson Consulting Inc.

Open House Schedule

The Public Information Centre was held at the La Salle Secondary School from 7:00 p.m. until 9:00 p.m. The Public Information Centre was organized to provide a PowerPoint presentation on the EA followed by a question and answer session.

A summary of additional comments provided are listed below with the number in brackets indicating the number of times a similar comment was received:

1. Was the information provided at today's Public Information Centre useful?

- Excellent report, with logical recommendations, well done
- I agree wholeheartedly with the proposed option 4A
- Very clearly presented (2)
- Environmental Assessment appears to be extremely thorough, however it was apparent that many attendees questioned the need for a bridge at all
- Overhead/projector hard to see
- As far as it went—it left out much detail but did raise other questions
- Elevations for a tunnel at Option 4 need to be explored further and better displayed
- I don't doubt it was looked into, but would like to see a large elevation detail
- Could have been more
- Several slides could be visually better. Impossible to see details (not helped by handouts—also maps small scale) (2)
- It failed to answer most of my questions. The information package from someone (a retired person) that went to the meeting
- Could not go to the meeting, much more information and cost of upkeep and operating costs
- Sorry unable to attend, but I do not feel able to say that the information is sufficient to come to a decision

2. Was the venue for today's Public Information Centre appropriate?

- At least ½ the audience was 50+, the acoustics are terrible (2)
- I get it
- Better parking signs would have been appreciated
- This affects the west-end taxpayers as well. Should both have at least 3 meetings
- By having any public meeting about the bridge in the east end you are sending a message that the bridge is an east end issue. Will not all Kingstonians be affected by the cost of building this unnecessary third crossing
- Shouldn't they all be encouraged to voice their opinions

3. Was the date and time of today's Public Information Centre convenient for you?

- There is not a perfect time, but for most early evening is probably best
- There should have been more than 1 meeting. If we are going to spend that much money there should be ample dates for questions. It made me think you/the city do not want questions
- Sorry not enough notice for one, on a busy weekend when my husband is away for work and my children have me on the run is not convenient for me
- Could not go

4. Were your questions answered by project team members to your satisfaction?

- The questions were better than the answers
- In terms that they performed and produced the information that was requested of them
- Team members seemed well informed, remained calm and understood the concerns of questioners
- I would say that many of the questions were not really relevant
- I didn't ask a question, the presenters could have answered more forcefully especially when the "questions" stated that there was no problem at the present time
- The questions asked more often were motivated by special interests people and did not reflect common interests
- Only some questions were useful and they were answered o.k. (not eloquently)
- Not much provided on how new bridge will be friendly for cyclists and pedestrians. Still seems to be a car oriented project
- More information about the projected increase in the number of cars crossing the causeway would be useful
- What efforts have been made through public transit to reduce the number of cars
- Mixed income families should be encouraged to live in Kingston east—could lead to improved transit
- They did not have answers to several
- No, because I could not make the sole meeting (3)
- No questions; others addressed my concerns
- Not enough time

5. Are you satisfied with the EA and the preferred corridor location and type of crossing (a bridge versus a tunnel)?

- I think that the planning process was clearly explained and very thorough
- It is interesting that such a detailed study comes up with the "obvious" answer as was proposed in the 1980 and nearly built
- The preferred corridor has been before the public since the 1970s
- Tunnel would be less obtrusive, far more costly
- I assume the crossing will be a "causeway" bridge on piers
- How about a water taxi or water bus between the 2 areas (downtown)
- Similar to Vancouver from North shore downtown
- People have the option of walking on the water bus
- Bridge is like a railway crossing, it stops traffic
- A tunnel doesn't interfere with traffic and can carry sewer, hydro and water lines for easy maintenance—also eliminates painting that bridge
- We need to examine the crossing in terms of where the community is now, not 2004
- Realign 4B to eliminate "T" intersection
- The public needs a better description of how the bridge will connect to routes on each side of the crossing

- I disagree that 4A is preferable to 4B
- I do not agree with the weightings in the evaluation matrix—why is the cost of the bridge part of the environmental assessment, shouldn't that be part of the final selection criteria
- It didn't convince me a 3rd crossing is required, nor that 4A is the best choice
- Generally not in favour of new crossing as a means of accommodating increases in cars
- Upgrades to LaSalle Causeway would be desirable to improve bike and pedestrian passage
- It appeared that many of the objectors were residents of Point St. Mark who purchased their property after the City and Pittsburgh councils declared this to be the future crossing, what right have they to complain
- Nowhere does it say how many, if any, people would use the bridge. The best option is synchronize the lights on the causeway, put a 3rd lane to the RMC turn and build a north exit from the Base to Gore Rd. If I need to go downtown, I need the causeway, to go to the west end I can use the free 401
- Why would a bridge that takes one right into the traffic jammed Montreal and John Counter help anyone out
- Anyone who works downtown (Queens, hospitality) is still going to use the 401
- When talking to one person who thought it may be a good idea, questioned if she would pay a toll to use when three free crossings exist, she admitted she wouldn't use it at all
- Not enough information on other locations
- How necessary is it. You have not done enough to ease so called bottleneck on causeway
- While I feel they have studied Option 4 thoroughly, I believe the other options are full of generalities and very short on details. In particular, the “need” aspect of the project is not given enough emphasis
- At this time, given the cost and sustainability issues much more emphasis must be given to increasing public transit, park and ride lots, etc., and to increasing traffic flow capabilities on the LaSalle causeway
- We have a chance to invest in public transit or continued investment in wasteful transportation projects
- Someday when a third crossing is warranted, I support the construction of a bridge in the preferred corridor location

6. Are you satisfied with the public consultation activities that have been carried out for this Environmental Assessment?

- 1st consultation I've been able to attend
- Now that the option has been identified requires more discussion
- No evidence that any points raised by public are fed into the reports, it's all for show
- Questions should be much shorter as this is important
- It was a generally a good and useful event

- The bottom line is we do need another crossing and it must/will happen before we face huge traffic concerns
- 3rd crossing information very difficult to find on the City's website, couldn't find the current report at all
- This is the first time we've presented the preferred option, we haven't assessed what the public's view is on said preferred option
- Tonight's event wasn't consultation it was notification
- More information about the environmental benefits of reduced car use is essential—how many people are travelling between the same two points every weekday
- Could something have been done to attract those who will benefit from the new crossing to attend these meetings
- Citizens have been given many opportunities to comment and speak
- Given the challenge in costs of 4A and 4B would it not be cheaper to move the library than to build 4B—only reason is to lessen noise
- Way, way way too short!!!
- Seems like people are trying to hide something from us. Why was it not pointed out that the 401 is being widened to 6 lanes. That with the bridge would give us 11 lanes over the river in 8 kms. Vancouver and Montreal don't have that many that close
- As far as I know there was one public consultation on a weekend. Great, the time when most families are busy with activities
- Why not try 2-3 meetings with at least one on a weekend when busy families may be able to make it
- Oh that's right, you want as few of us there as possible. You only want senior citizens that are afraid to use the 401 there
- Not knowledgeable enough to comment
- Yes, but the time to submit a response is too short. It should be at least two weeks preferably three weeks
- As far as it went

Please provide any additional comments about this Environmental Assessment

- EA purpose (2) a--retain the status quo or do nothing—was this dealt with?
- Noise impact on residents and air quality impacts why build in residential neighbourhood?
- Why was the new townhouse construction approved by the City-River Homes Development—whole new neighbourhood that will be affected by this
- Go forward to the next stage when detail will be worked out Option 4A—go
- Imagine the worst case scenario—our children will be paying taxes for decades and paying to get to the west end
- There is so much subjectivity in the material—in the procedures that is it unsatisfactory/laughable and vagueness
- The probability is that the several costs noted will be gross underestimates—is that not the Kingston way?

- There is a plan to permit a residential development of up to 1,000 units North of Hwy 2 between CFB and Grouse wood. Please assure that another crossing is started before the development is started or traffic congestion will be ferocious
- Has any disaster considerations been included?
- What if an occurrence injured 5-50 people? What would the transport considerations be?
- I had a personal injury and re-thought my choice of hospitals when I rounded the corner at #2 and #15 and there was traffic back-up
- I am a SLC civil engineer and would love to help out anyway I can
- Interested in hearing of mitigation measures re heritage issues with Pittsburgh library designated property if crossing with either two or four lanes
- There are more innovative methods of moving people across the river—why not get creative and help our tourist attractions
- The research should clarify traffic counts and flow-rates, what variables apply when different methodologies and different engineering firms survey the same matter and get different numbers--if you don't explain this, people will think the dice is loaded, this looks bad
- Not in favour of a crossing in areas 2-5 because it would divert traffic away from downtown and towards the new shopping area at Division and 401
- A vibrant downtown is essential to meet stated sustainability goals, we live east along highway 2 and the downtown is our anchor for activities and resources
- Kingston East has the opportunity to develop in keeping with sustainability goals, let's try and reduce reliance on cars and urban sprawl, let's not turn Highway 15 into another Gardiners Road
- After attending the World Café and PIC, I am convinced that moving to an EA now before a much better situation report would be an error in many ways
- Situation report of March 3 like a very detailed defence of a 'desired' outcome that is not very well defended
- Strong impression that the reasons for short-listing areas was tactically selected
- The seven stop-lights installed between the T-junction of Highway 2 and Highway 15 and that at the southern off-ramp of Highway 401 to Highway 15 was not mentioned as an impediment to smooth traffic flow at all times
- Rush hour or not, a single car turning right triggers a stop light that holds up traffic on Highway 15
- On Sunday March 7 at 2:30 PM a single car coming out of Deerfield Apartments that turned right triggered the lights to red on Highway 15, by the time the lights turned green again for Highway 15, there were 15 cars stopped
- At rush hour, the 'christmas tree' between and including the lights at Matheson Gate entrance to CFB and those at the Gore Road intersection – can produce traffic back up beyond the Rose Abbey intersection and halt traffic trying to turn left onto Highway 15 from Highway 2 on a green arrow
- Please do not put another light a the new road into St. Lawrence Park
- Page 1 slide 2—EA Purpose, unless by implication in para 2.d, there is nothing to reflect the option for a connector beside Highway 401. This would be a separate road paralleling 401 that connects Highway 15 and Montreal Road, and which

vehicles on Highway 401 could not access unless they left Highway 401 for Highway 15 or Montreal Road

- Page 13 slide 1: area 6, the slide makes no reference to any option that is at, but not a part of, a widening of Highway 401
- The five reasons for not short-listing Area 6 all reflect the transportation environment. Nothing about the strengths or weaknesses of a road or road bridge at that location in terms of any other 'environment'
- Page 15 slide 1: Evaluation matrix, this matrix can doom the possibility of any broad-based agreement on a specific crossing site
- Why was the matrix not placed and therefore considered before selecting the short list, had it been it would be more obvious that Area 6 was not put on short-list for five reasons all of which are transportation environment issues—which account for only 25% on the evaluation matrix
- Area 6 could have been supported for selection to the short-list for all of the aquatic natural environment (say 60%) cultural heritage environment (100%) economic environment (say 50%) social environment (75%- or 100% if long term disruption of crossing construction at any downtown site is acknowledged) and terrestrial natural environment (60%)... if the Area 6 crossing is separate from the 401
- Page 15 slide 2: Summary of Evaluation Matrix, as demonstrated from comments from the audience, this table is a magnet for criticism and a source of arguments against the short list and the manner in which it was selected
- By titling the table "post-mitigation", many assumptions must have been made; so many that it is inevitable many, if not most, and possibly all, will prove inaccurate, or worse
- It would be interesting to pretend that Area 6 was on a short list and evaluate it
- Recommend a strategic foresight exercise on 'Kingston's crossings'; a meeting with provincial traffic authorities. The reason: to discuss possible and rational options for cooperation. Does the province intend to widen Highway 401 across the river valley? If so, is there any way that project and the construction of a separate but parallel Kingston road south of the 401 could be co-created?
- Although not part of the assessment, I was surprised to hear there are no plans to extend the crossing beyond Hwy 15
- The original concept was to extend the Gore Rd east—using the backs of the farms abutting on Hwy 2 and the Middle Rd to Joyceville Side Rd
- The aim was to divert traffic off that, have them become rural residential roads—Hwy 2 east to the Middle Rd
- We do not need a bridge. We cannot afford a bridge
- It has never, other than when the 401 is closed, taken me more than 15 minutes to get from Johnson and Ontario to Gore and Hwy #15
- If the causeway is so inconvenient more people would take the 401, if they are not, then there is not a problem
- If they use the 401, problem solved
- Why build and affect the environment when the 401 exists is being expanded and is free to Kingston

- I was shocked and outraged that the MTO does not want us to use the 401 to cross the city. It disgusts me that they would try to discourage its use after we have paid for it. Hundreds of thousands of Torontonians use the 401 everyday
- How do we know our comments will be read, recorded and considered and not just ignored
- Traffic is worse in the west end
- This would be a luxury we cannot afford
- Stating it meets the City's Transit Plan is not a valid reason for a bridge, by environmental standards. Many, many people think the plan is wrong
- Get better traffic flow by synchronizing the lights on Hwy # 15, causeway, Hwy #2, Ontario St. Queens has offered many many times to do this for free, city keeps saying no. No affect on the environment therefore best option
- The bridge cannot enhance the value of the Rideau Canal area! It will be an eyesore
- How can you build anything and not have a net loss of aquatic area. It sounds impossible to me
- If you build on land or river bottom there has to be a net loss therefore this whole report's accuracy and validity is brought into question
- I couldn't be more upset with this misuse of my taxes
- Does the City of Kingston not have enough of a drain on their funds? Sick and tired of driving thru knee deep puddles on our roads. Sewage that is dumped into Lake Ontario every time we have a big rain fall
- The article about the public meeting in the paper made me laugh with frustration. One of the stated reasons for the third crossing was because Kingston doesn't own any of the existing crossings. Great! We don't have to pay for them
- Why would any city be willing to take on building and maintaining anything that is already being provided by others
- Third reason was for quicker access to the big box stores, that is no wrong on so many levels
- Third reason was for emergency vehicles –other big cities have worked out a warning system so they can clear the bridge as soon as a call comes in
- In conclusion, the bridge is an unnecessary proposition therefore the environmental assessment is also unnecessary. Please stop wasting my money
- When crossing causeway in rush hour eastbound, once you pass the light at the ferry, traffic flow is fine
- Having lived in big cities, you don't know what heavy traffic is
- If bridge goes ahead, make it a toll bridge so people who are afraid to go 401 and object to slight delays on Hwy 2 can be the ones to pay for it
- Look into emergency vehicles taking preference (by controlling traffic lights) in crossing the causeway.
- P.S. I'm a 69 year old female and have no problem going west from Pittsburgh Township
- Area 1—it is extremely negligent not to include the analysis of traffic flow at the west end of the causeway instead of just saying "it is there." Shameful to say "it is not feasible to widen the existing bridge." If confederation bridge is possible then an improvement at the causeway is possible

- Area 6—the arguments against this option are particularly disturbing. Why is the province widening 401 if not to accommodate local traffic. Transit/cycling/walking are secondary in the big scheme of things. Emergency and municipal services bring up the issue of city wide traffic flow with the need to identify that east end congestion is the worst situation. My experience is that stretches of Princess St., King St. W., and Bath Rd. are worse than the causeway
- Summary—I believe area 4 is feasible but cannot conclude that this is the best solution without more details of other options. To do this I would appreciate if you could let me know how to get information about city-wide traffic flow problems
- Back in the 1960s, there were discussions about a 3rd crossing, but since the 401 was not then part of Kingston and the Kingston Mills road crossing is restricted to 15 tonnes single lane—not sure where the 2nd crossing is
- The 100 feet of mud on the bottom of the river is a show stopper
- With dump tailings on the south side and unknown quantity of toxic chemical from the tannery on the north side and an apparent proposal to place a huge amount of fill into an alignment between Counter Blvd. and Gore Road—can only imagine where all that contaminated muck is going to have to go
- There will either be some new islands emerging or there will be a huge undertaking to take it all away
- Dump barges and dredges were used on a large scale during the Seaway but that is out of the questions these days
- Driving pilings for a bridge supports in that depth of unstable bottom will have uncertain results
- Building a cofferdam or suspension spans would be out of the question and require mud pumping on a grand scale
- It might be possible to build or back fill in the shallows along either side of Belle Island with a short bridge over to a landing in the area just south of the old military hospital, but only if other concerns can be resolved
- I think you call it Area 2, but it needs to overlap with Area 3 and that option was not presented
- City planners have made many mistakes including the dump on the approach to Belle Island; rebuilding the concrete eastern span of the causeway bridge to something less than the standard height of the Rideau Canal bridges which are generally 27 feet or more
- Had the bridge been built to conform, there would be less need to lift the Bascule bridge these days
- People forget that the Bascule bridge stuck in the open position for a number of days in the 1970s and it may get stuck again
- The Navigational Waters Protection Act comes into play any time there is an overhead restriction over the navigable waterway being planned
- Cataraqui River is not under control of the Rideau Canal Authorities in respect to height restrictions, but is governed by the NWPA
- There is some commercial navigation on the Cataraqui River—there is an overnight passenger vessel called the Kawartha Voyageur that transits the entire Rideau system several times every year. It is too high and long for the lock and bridge arrangements, but through a set of ingenious hydraulic systems it is able to

raise the bow section and lower the wheelhouse to within the nominal requirements

- The operators of this vessel would have a great interest in being kept informed about any plans to bridge the Cataraqui River; they can be contacted at Ontario Waterway Cruises, P.O. Box 6 Orillia Ontario L3V 6H9. I am sending them a copy of your slide presentation. The contacts are John and Marc Ackert at (705) 327-5304
- Feel there is little support for a 3rd crossing
- Lived in Kingston East for 25 years, have not experienced any serious Hwy 2/Causeway traffic problems
- Yes, if going to work at rush hour there are some traffic problems, but that is true anywhere
- When people choose to live in Pittsburgh district, they do so with the understanding that their traffic options are the Causeway or the Highway
- The Gore Rd John Counter option will be landing the bridge on the City side, roughly two blocks south of Hwy 401, creating even more traffic problems!
- The answer to the small traffic problem inconvenience is to further improve Hwy 15 and increase the capacity of Hwy 401 to Division St.
- Also, an improvement to the LaSalle Causeway by adding a separate cyclist lane on the north side of the bridge
- Explore an emergency ferry crossing at the causeway or with traffic regulation to accommodate ambulance and emergency vehicles
- Taken aback by the statement in the report on page 13 Area 6—Hwy 401 is for regional and provincial traffic –seems to me that taxpayers paid for this Highway!
- Suggest you send out an information gathering request to every home in Pittsburgh District to find out what needs are, what routes they take and at what hours and ask for their input to improve their route
- Far too many mega-million dollar projects are being approved by a very few people
- Some of these people have obvious agendas and the taxpayers are being left with the fallout
- Council needs to walk up Princess Street and count the number of vacant stores. They need to be addressing NEEDS, NOT WANTS in these troubled times
- The 3rd crossing is pre-mature and will never be an ideal solution