

**NOTICE TO READER**

The table below summarizes the comments received on – and City-Project Team responses to – the Preliminary Design Summary Report as well as certain technical submissions included in the Appendices to this Report. In instances where no changes to the Report have been made, explanations and/or cross-references are provided under the ‘Response’ column to applicable Sections of the Report where further information can be found. Revisions made to the Report are similarly cross-referenced to applicable Sections of the Report under the ‘Response’ column.

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Comment	Response
<b>Final Preliminary Design Summary Report and Federal Environmental Impact Assessment</b>				
1	Resident	02-25-17	Concern that the capital cost estimate for the bridge is inaccurate, relative to the capital costs for the Highway 401 bridge.	No changes made to the Report as both bridges are not comparable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 401 bridge has more lanes,</li> <li>• Staging of 401 bridge construction is more complex and costly, and</li> <li>• There is additional cost to demolish the existing 401 bridge.</li> </ul>
2	Resident	02-27-17	Concern the bridge deck and arch will tower above the surface of the Rideau Canal.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revision made to Section 8.7 (p. 131).</li> <li>• No other changes made to the Report as already addressed in Sections 5.1 and 9.1.</li> </ul>
3	Resident	02-27-17	The silhouette of the westerly portion of the bridge will not be below the existing tree line when viewed from the water and on land, since the west side is devoid of trees.	No changes made to the Report as already addressed in Section 9.1.
4	Resident	03-27-17	Kingston benefits from many kilometres of natural waterfront. How can this be taken advantage of for the benefit of all?	No changes made to the Report as already addressed in Section 8.15.
5	Resident	04-16-17	<p>Details are required for the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dredging as the preferred in-water method for access to construction regarding extraction, containment, transport and management of contaminated dredgeate.</li> <li>• Limits of property expropriation to accommodate the project.</li> <li>• What will be the on-shore stormwater management system for the de-icing agent use on the bridge with the proposed fixed automated spray technology (FAST) system? What will it cost?</li> <li>• The design of sound attenuation barriers being effective in reducing associated noise levels.</li> <li>• Rehabilitation and compensation measures for natural and cultural heritage features.</li> <li>• Navigation controls to accommodate the project.</li> </ul>	<p>No changes made to the Report as already addressed in Sections 6.0 and 8.16.</p> <p>No changes made to the Report as already addressed in Section 8.16.4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revision made to Section 8.17 (p. 189).</li> <li>• No other changes made to the Report as FAST to be considered in future project stages.</li> </ul> <p>No changes made to the Report as already addressed in Section 9.1.</p> <p>No changes made to the Report as already addressed in Section 8.15.</p> <p>No changes made to the Report as already addressed in Sections 8.16 and 9.2.</p>
6	Resident	04-17-17	How will pedestrians cross Gore Road to get to the library and dog park?	No changes made to the Report as already addressed in Sections 5.5, 8.10 and 8.11.

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Comment	Response
<b>Final Preliminary Design Summary Report and Federal Environmental Impact Assessment (cont.)</b>				
7	Resident	04-21-17	Concern about the design of sound attenuation barriers being effective in reducing associated noise levels.	No changes made to the Report as already addressed in Section 9.1.
8	Resident	04-21-17	It is a wonder how the concept design as presented in the Environmental Study Report changed so dramatically.  Is there any amount of dredging to take place? Where?  What will the open water impacts be with regard to existing conditions and the uses like the Kingston Rowing Club?  What is the temporary work bridge and how will it be removed?  What is the total in-water pier footprint of the new design?	No changes made to the Report as already addressed in Section 7.0.  No changes made to the Report as already addressed in Sections 6.0, 8.16 and 9.2.  No changes made to the Report as already addressed in Section 9.2.  No changes made to the Report as already addressed in Sections 6.0 and 8.16.  No changes made to the Report as already addressed in Sections 7.1 and 9.2.
9	Resident	04-21-17	The bridge design should consider the use of stainless steel rebar to avoid corrosion and reduce future maintenance and life-cycle costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revision made to Section 8.19 (p. 192).</li> <li>No other changes made to the Report as use of stainless steel rebar to be considered in future project stages.</li> </ul>
10	Developer	05-17-17	Land ownership – public versus private – should be more clearly depicted on associated plan(s).	Revision made to Drawing No. 8.16.1 (p. 159).
11	Resident	05-18-17	Concern there is no traffic light planned for the Ascot Lane-John Counter Boulevard intersection.	No changes made to the Report as already addressed in Sections 5.5, 8.10 and 8.11.
12	Resident	05-18-17	Concern about the potential for short-cutting of traffic through the Point St. Mark neighbourhood.	Revision made to Section 8.11 (p. 140).
13	Resident	05-18-17	Why does the Draft Final Report state that Kingston Transit does not expect to use the bridge?	Revision made to Section 5.5 (p. 101).
14	CRCA	05-19-17	Refer to the 76.3 m elevation in Table 4.8.1 as the regulatory floodplain rather than the CRCA water level. Footnote No. 5 to Table 4.8.1 states, in part, that "... this water level is applied as the Regulatory Limit within the project corridor ..." The 76.3 m elevation is the regulatory floodplain. Clarify the basis upon which the regulated navigable clearance requirement for the Canal is to be measured from the 76.3 m elevation. Refer to the 76.3 m elevation as the regulatory floodplain elevation rather than the CRCA Regulatory Water Level. Clarify that O. Reg. 148/06 is also required for the bridge construction work, in addition to the non-passive fieldwork for the detail design work. Clarify that the CRCA's guidelines for implementing O. Reg. 148/06 generally do not permit filling within the floodplain unless a floodplain storage compensation (cut and fill) is completed to adjust the floodplain boundary. Clarify that the CRCA stated that the placement of fill may be considered within the wave uprush allowance (between 76.0 and 76.3 m) without the need for storage compensation. Remove references to 'limited' filling since, despite the minimal volume involved relative to the magnitude of the project, it is still fill in the floodplain and the CRCA typically requires floodplain compensation for less. A hydrology and hydraulics review should be undertaken to confirm the potential impact on floodplain storage. Change the reference to 'infrequent flood event' to '1:100 year flood event'. Flooding should be included as an extreme weather event that could potentially affect the project, particularly during the construction phase. Clarify that the areas identified as 'significant and contributory woodlands' are included in the policy overlays in the City's Official Plan, rather than the Environmental Protection Area designation.	Revision made to Section 4.8 (p. 70). Revision made to Section 4.8 (p. 70). Revision made to Section 4.10 (p. 71). Revision made to Section 4.10 (p. 71). Revision made to Section 8.16 (p. 184). Revision made to Section 9.2 (p. 204). Revision made to Section 9.2 (p. 204). Revision made to Section 9.2 (p. 205). Revision made to Section 9.2 (p. 205). Revision made to Section 9.2 (p. 205). Revision made to Section 10.1 (p. 227). Revision made to Section 4.1 (p. 31).

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Comment	Response
<b>Final Preliminary Design Summary Report and Federal Environmental Impact Assessment (cont.)</b>				
14	CRCA	05-19-17	Clarify that the Environmental Protection Area designation in the City's Official Plan does not include potentially contaminated lands.	Revision made to Section 4.1 (p. 37).
			Clarify that the Waterfront Master Plan has refined some of the paths and trails identified in the City's Official Plan.	Revision made to Section 4.1 (p. 37).
			Clarify that the profiles of the shoreline habitat are on Drawing 4.2.4, not Drawing 4.2.3.	Revision made to Section 4.2 (p. 48).
			The required grading to support the removal of the existing metal piling and reinstatement of a more natural shoreline on the west shore will need to consider the level spreader stormwater outlet, multi-use path and stormwater dry pond.	Revision made to Section 8.15 (p. 153).
			The proposed in-water compensation works will need to consider potential impacts from the stormwater outlet.	Revision made to Section 8.15 (p. 155).
			Consider assessing the potential effects from the temporary work bridge and dredging on fish and fish habitat.	Revision made to Sections 9.2 and 10.0 (pp. 207; 217).
			Temporary stormwater management controls may be required for the construction laydown areas.	No changes made to the Report as already addressed in Section 10.0.
			Erosion and sediment controls will need to be flexible based on the timing of the project.	Revision made to Sections 8.16 and 10.0 (pp. 158; 217).
			The 'post-development' condition is listed twice.	Revision made to Section 8.14 (p. 144).
15	Resident	05-21-17	The east side landscape design should include a public boat ramp.	Revision made to Sections 8.15 and 8.16 (pp. 154; 157).
16	Resident	05-23-17	The statement in the Environmental Study Report from the Class Environmental Assessment phase that we cannot use the 401 for commuting is false.	No changes made to the Report as already addressed in Section 2.0.
17	Resident	05-23-17	Why is the bridge deck so much higher than the 401 bridge? This must add extra costs and it does not allow boats to travel.	No changes made to the Report as already addressed in Sections 5.1, 8.15 and 9.2.
18	Resident	05-23-17	How much does the 9 m wide observation area along the arch span add to the cost?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Estimated cost is \$950,000, which is already included in Section 8.18.</li> </ul>
19	Resident	05-23-17	How will the City remove the snow from the bridge? What will that cost?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes made to the Report as already addressed in Sections 8.2 and 8.17.</li> <li>Estimated cost is \$12,500 per lane km, which is already included in Section 8.18.</li> </ul>
			How often will have the City have to drain the stormwater management (SWM) ponds? What will that cost?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revision made to Section 8.14 (p. 148).</li> <li>There is no cost to drain the SWM ponds.</li> </ul>
20	Resident	05-23-17	The preliminary design does not allow a fire truck or a tank to be able to turn around in the middle of the bridge. Why is that?	Revision made to Section 8.17 (p. 189).
21	KEAF	05-23-17	Concerns about the management of soils – particularly contaminated soils – and how they would be managed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revision made to Section 9.2 (p. 206).</li> <li>No other changes made to the Report as already addressed in Section 10.0.</li> </ul>
22	City-Team	05-31-17	Clarify that, for seismic design purposes, the bridge will have a classification of an irregular 'Major-Route Bridge' and a Site Class of D based on the site properties.	Revision made to Sections 9.2 and 10.1 (pp. 205; 227).
			Expand upon additional studies that should be conducted during the detailed design stage.	Revision made to Section 11.0 (p. 229).
			Replace and insert fieldwork conditions detail in Drawing 4.5.1.	Revision made to Drawing 4.5.1 (p. 60).
			Increase font size for details shown in Drawing 8.16.1.	Revision made to Drawing 8.16.1 (p. 159).
			Clarify the potential for short-cutting of traffic through the Point St. Mark neighbourhood.	Revision made to Section 8.11 (p. 140).
			Clarify future transit service within the project corridor.	Revision made to Section 5.5 (p. 101).
			Review First Nations mailing list.	Revision made to Section 1.3 (p. 4).
Include dredging figure to be consistent with discussion of other bridge constructability options.	Revision made to Sections 6.2 (p. 103).			

No.	Stakeholder	Date	Comment	Response
<b>Final Preliminary Design Summary Report and Federal Environmental Impact Assessment (cont.)</b>				
22	City-Team	05-31-17	Remove comparative redundancies in highlighting bridge constructability options as this is dealt with in Section 6.5.	Revision made to Sections 6.2, 6.3 and 6.4 (pp. 103; 104).
23	CRCA	05-31-17	Clarify storm event conveyance along the bridge deck.	Revision made to Sections 8.9 and 10.1 (pp. 134; 227).
<b>Natural Environment Assessment Report</b>				
24	CRCA	05-19-17	Various comments regarding O. Reg. 148/06 as well as source references to significant woodlands, valleylands and wetland mapping.	Revision made to Section 2.7 (p. 5).
<b>Natural Heritage Protection and Enhancement Plan Report</b>				
25	CRCA	05-19-17	Clarify that the CRCA does not have a role in the review of project impacts to fish habitat.	Revision made to Section 6.2 (p. 18).
<b>Noise Impact Study Report</b>				
26	Developer	05-17-17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nighttime noise levels must also be considered for Outdoor Living Areas, in addition to daytime noise levels.</li> <li>• Noise attenuation should be installed along the full length of Noise Receptor NR 15 for the duration of the project.</li> <li>• Construction noise needs to be attenuated and restricted to certain hours.</li> </ul>	Response letter prepared for developer.