



CITY OF BRANTFORD MASTER SERVICING PLAN TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN ENVISIONING OUR CITY:2041

**June 9, 2020 & June 30, 2020 – Virtual Public Information Centre (PIC)
Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) Document – Transportation Master Plan (TMP)
Posted on July 28, 2020**

1 Introduction

The Transportation Master Plan (TMP) is one of several studies being undertaken by the City of Brantford to help identify the City's long-term growth needs. The goal of the TMP is to develop strategies for the management of transportation demand, truck route management, transit improvements and the active transportation network, including walking and cycling networks, up to 2041. The Study will also identify the individual projects required to complement these strategies, and prioritize these projects based on need and required timing.

The objective of this document is to answer questions submitted by the public, prior to July 21st, in response to the Virtual PIC originally posted on June 9th, 2020 and Virtual PIC Questions and Answers originally posted July 30th. This document is the third and final step of the Virtual PIC process.

2 Frequently Asked Questions

Numerous questions and comments have been submitted to the Project Team throughout the first Virtual Public Information Centre process. The questions and comments received up to July 21st, 2020 have been responded to and grouped into various themes in the sections below.

2.1	Analysis.....	2
2.2	Clarity	6
2.3	Methodology.....	9
2.4	Scope	9
2.5	Other	12

2.1 Analysis

2.1.1 Shouldn't widening WGP north of Hwy 403 to Powerline Rd be needed in conjunction with the WGP extension north of Powerline Road?

Slide 38 of the PIC material, entitled “2041 Preliminary Recommended Plan – Performance”, indicates that the 4 lane cross section of WGP will be adequate to the service the forecast demand to 2041. The corridor should be protected for a potential widening to 6-lanes as volume demand may warrant beyond the 2041 horizon of the TMP.

2.1.2 Are any improvements identified for Park Road North?

No lane capacity improvements are proposed for Park Road North south of Powerline Road. Local intersection improvements will be required to optimize travel flow and accommodate changes in other road cross section (example: at Powerline Road and Park Road North). North of Powerline Road, a realignment of Park Road North will be required as it intersects with the future WGP. This realignment and intersection will be subject of a future Environmental Assessment Study for the WGP Extension.

2.1.3 Slide 8: Please explain more thoroughly how the traffic impact of up to 500 cars/hour is taking off the pressure from Brant Ave., Colborne and Clarence. Will it be 4%? 50%? It states a limited number of people will be using this 84 million dollar road.

The statements on Slide 8 do not align with the question posed. Slide 16 summarizes the analysis for Brant Avenue. Traffic forecasts for the 2041 conditions indicate that it will be operating at some 6% over capacity. Analysis of the origins and destination of these peak hour demands suggests that of the vehicles using Brant Avenue in this condition, approximately 500 (approximately 25%) of the corridor volume) of them are traveling from northwest Brantford to southwest Brantford which would be better served by OPRE. These 500 vehicles are not the only vehicles that are forecast to use the OPRE, just this that would divert from Brant Avenue.

2.1.4 TMP Slide 11: Is it too early to consider the effects of COVID-19 or a future pandemic on transit ridership? I assume no effects have been included in the ridership numbers in the TMP.

Yes, it would be premature to speculate on the impacts of future transit ridership as a result of Covid-19. The long term impacts of the pandemic and associated restrictions are not known and will not be known for some time. This analysis was conducted prior to the Covid-19 outbreak in Canada and as such, no potential Covid-19 effects have been included. In looking 20 years into the future, the assumption is that there will always checks and balances, and shifts in outlooks. The goal of the long term analysis is to flatten the impacts of such shifts and set reasonable targets that meet the long term community vision.

2.1.5 TMP Slides 13 & 14 Comparing Slides 13 & 14, the construction of the Oak Park Road Extension does not appear to have any effect on the overcapacity issues on Veterans Memorial Parkway and Clarence Street. Please comment.

The Oak Park Road Extension is expected to divert between 300-500 vehicles from the Paris Rd/ Brant Ave corridor and the Lorne Bridge (slide 16). With respect to the Veterans Memorial Parkway and Clarence Street, based on trip distribution patterns of vehicles using Veterans Memorial Parkway and Clarence Street (shown on slides 23 & 28 of the PIC material), the Oak Park Road Extension will have little to no impact on the future volumes on either Veterans Memorial Parkway or Clarence Street.

2.1.6 TMP Slides 14 & 29: With the construction of the Oak Park Road Extension, a new area of overcapacity appears on Colborne St. W., between County Road 7 (Pleasant Ridge Road) and D'Aubigny Road. Is construction of the OPRE simply going to result in moving traffic congestion from one part of the city to another?

The role of Oak Park Road extension is to serve a specific future demand that would and should be diverted from a current corridor that is not capable of serving that demand. Over capacity demand in the existing corridor (Paris Road and Brant Street, and on Lorne Bridge) results in neighbourhood infiltration that local roads are not designed to accommodate. Yes, the extension results in some additional pressure points but these pressure points can be mitigated. The section of Colborne St. W., between County Road 7 (Pleasant Ridge Road) and D'Aubigny Road currently has a 3 lane cross section (2 lanes westbound and 1 lane eastbound). It will require a road widening to match the existing 4 lane cross section east of D'Aubigny Road. This road widening is included in the 'Recommended Plan'.

2.1.7 TMP Slides 16, 20, 21 24, 26 & 29: The V/C ratios shown on these slides are those of the forecast 2041 “Do Minimal” traffic volumes. Could the consultant include additional V/C ratios using the forecast volumes in which the only alternative strategy is the construction of the Oak Park Road Extension (no TDM, TSM or road widening)? This would directly show the benefit of the OPRE to reducing the overcapacity on these roads. On Slides 20 and 23, the diagrams are very small and the V/C numbers are illegible. Could these numbers be enlarged?

The Do Minimal scenario reflects a 2041 condition with no additional TDM, TSM or road widenings. The aforementioned slides identify the travel demands and patterns of the problem areas and corridors and provide commentary on the potential for various alternatives to address that problem. As we are looking at a system wide plan to address city wide issues, the 2041 network assessment tests the alternatives in a system context. The volumes in the 2041 Preferred Plan assessment show significant demand on the Oak Park Road confirming its significant role in the future network. Testing the extension in isolation would only result in additional demand for the facility. With respect to font sizes, these will be improved and provided in the next steps of the project.

2.1.8 I have read a number of articles recently regarding a phenomenon called “induced demand” which “refers to the idea that increasing roadway capacity encourages more people to drive, thus failing to improve congestion”. With this in mind, is it possible that the construction of the Oak Park Road Extension will only reduce traffic congestion on the city streets in question for a few years after which time we find that congestion reappears on those same streets?

Existing corridors are shown not to be able to accommodate future forecasts. The Oak Park Road Extension is required to serve specific future demands between West Brant and NW Brantford/Highway 403. The need and role of this infrastructure has been determined both on the basis of no TDM, TSM or road widening as well as with target TDM and TSM levels. As the demand has been consciously set to match aggressive policy goals for limiting the demand for automobile infrastructure, there will be limited room for induced growth of auto demand in the future due to the implementation of the Oak Park Road Extension. Even with the addition of the Oak Park Road Extension, very high volume demand is still expected on Brant Ave and the Lorne Bridge and as such induced demand is not considered applicable to this condition.

2.1.9 The TMP makes assumptions about the transportation decision making of residents commuting from the West Brant area to the East (i.e., assuming people will travel West to then go East). Please comment on how this is known.

The transportation analysis relies on existing traffic data (vehicle volume counts), recent travel behaviour survey for the community (2016 Transportation Tomorrow survey which provide trip purpose, origin-destination, and travel mode information for the GTA and surrounding area, including Brantford), and forecast land use information. This information is used in the City's transportation planning tools to forecast travel behaviour and magnitude of trips for the city broken down into discrete traffic analysis zones. This allows the project team to develop an understanding of the origin and destination of trips forecast for 2041.

2.1.10 How can the committee consider the 2016 travel study as current trends and be valid for a 10 year project starting in 2023? By the time the year 2028 the road is to be approximately half done, which will mean the current trends are 11 years old. The Master plan committee and developers need to be realistic and financially transparent about the costs to build the OPRE to avoid the same issue as Gretzky arena. All Builders put in unexpected costs to their budget plans, the City will need to be very clear on their overages budget and ask the constituents for extra funding, not expect we will be ok with just using our taxes to fix an unforeseen expense.

On the issue of the 2016 travel study, it is the most recent travel behaviour information available and has not changed significantly in Brantford over the last several iterations of the data collection.

The 2016 travel behaviour is used as an initial base to understand the travel relationships between areas. As the population and employment forecasts are allocated the 2041 scenario, the trip making is adjusted to reflect new growth levels and new area to area interactions.

On the issue of the capital cost, the TMP team is working with the City to identify reasonable costs for

the strategic plan. These costs will be enhanced and refined as part of the Oak Park Road Extension EA study process.

2.1.11 In the Oak Park Road Extension Feasibility Study Final Report, there is no discussion regarding connections with Brant County that could be more fiscally responsible than the alternatives considered. Could you comment on why the city has not engaged with the Brant County to facilitate mutually beneficial solutions?

The TMP Project Team has engaged with County of Brant regarding the problems and opportunities, and the assessment of the alternatives. The Project Team will continue to engage the County through to the completion of the Study. Further, the City has recently initiated the Oak Park Road Extension Environmental Assessment study which will include the County as a key stakeholder. The EA will confirm the requirements of the project, develop an implementation plan, and prepare preliminary designs for the proposed infrastructure. In addition, the City is working with County on a Joint Strategic Transportation Plan to review cross boundary and joint transportation issues.

The project web site is as follows: <https://www.brantford.ca/en/your-government/oak-park-road-extension.aspx>

2.1.12 The proposed plan discusses how about 900 cars per peak hour will be reduced from Brant Ave, Colborne Street, and VMP combined and that commute time will decrease by about 5 minutes for those commuting. Can you explain how these numbers warrant the expense of the proposed plan?

The specific outcome related to travel time noted here is not a specific TMP outcome. Generally speaking, however, travel time savings of a group of users expanded to annual benefits over many years can be significant. In combination with the environmental benefits of reduced idling (from reduced delay) and shorter travel distances (more direct routes), as well as improving the overall safety of the network (reduced collisions, less neighborhood infiltration) are also key to understanding the benefits of the investment.

2.1.13 When highway 53 is expanded from 3 to 4 lanes from D' Aubigny there will need to be consideration to have separate signals like at Elgin and Clarence to avoid accidents. This major intersection on a hill will turn into West St. as there has been many accidents already, with poor sightlines and speeding traffic.

Comment noted.

2.1.14 The public notice in the Brantford Expositor on June 11 uses ambiguous language regarding the bridge that will be required to complete this proposed plan: "TMP (2014) recommends the extension include a four-lane arterial road with a crossing over the Grand River". Mention of a bridge is also not clear in other editions of the proposed plan. A bridge will impact the cost of the proposed plan substantially. Please comment on how the "crossing" (i.e., bridge) will be accounted for in "today's dollars" (not past projections of the bridge cost). To be transparent with taxpayers, clarification of the cost of BOTH the road and crossing (bridge) is necessary.

In the next phase of the TMP update, costs for the Recommended Plan, including various programs, service, and infrastructure, will be prepared using today's 2020 dollars using current planning and engineering benchmark unit costs. The Recommended Plan will be prioritized into discrete time periods in order to provide guidance to the 10-Year Capital Program. Further more detailed construction costs will be established as part of the on going Environmental Assessment Study. (<https://www.brantford.ca/en/your-government/oak-park-road-extension.aspx>)

2.1.15 Suggest extending CR18 westbound to connect to Shellard Lane. This is intended to facilitate Ward 1 traffic to use CR18 and access Hwy 403 on the northeast.

The proposed Conklin Rd extension to CR18 towards the southeast would provide this connection and role.

2.1.16 How many cars would be eliminated from Brant Ave if no right turn was allowed onto St Paul Ave and no left turn allowed from Palace, Richmond, Henrietta, and St James onto Albion. There are faster ways to access St. Paul now but don't seem apparent to drivers.

The project team will undertake additional analysis to identify the requested numbers.

2.1.17 What is the percentage individually of traffic now on Hardy road from Tollgate, Paris Road and Ava Road?

The project team will undertake additional analysis to identify the requested numbers.

2.1.18 With regard to the Tutela Heights area improvements:

- Will the proposed new road widenings in the Draft OP will be included in the finalized Transportation Master Plan?
- What are the short-term plans for Birkett Lane and Erie Ave regarding traffic flow improvements, turning lane improvements etc.?
- Is the 20.0m ROW widening for Birkett Lane scheduled to still occur or has the City decided that the 24.0m ROW widening is better suited to accommodate the City's needs?
- What are the short-term plans for Conklin Rd?
- Is there a planned ROW road widening in the near future for Conklin Rd?

The Transportation Master Plan does not identify any future improvement requirement for the existing section of Conklin Road. The specific ROWs for the roads are to be identified by the Official Plan. This comment has been provided to O.P. team.

2.2 Clarity

2.2.1 TMP Slide 13: Comparing Slide 8 to Slide 13, the overcapacity on Hardy Road has been eliminated due to TDM. Is this correct?

Yes. TDM does result in reduced volume forecasts on Hardy Rd. The impact of this reduction appears magnified due to the change from 'At or above capacity' to 'Approaching capacity'. In

practice, the effects of TDM on Hardy Road are much more modest as Hardy Road is just over capacity in the 'Do Minimal' network and is just under capacity in the 'TDM' network.

2.2.2 Slide 13-14 If the committee is working with Brant County council to look at other effective transportation flow alternatives such as County Road 18, why build the OPRE, which will make commuters travel West to head East, make a left turn on a one lane road, and travel another 10 minutes to improve the commute time by 5 mins. How do you know the 500 cars/hour commuters from Shellard lane will travel to NW industrial for employment when using a 2016 travel plan? How many people moved to Shellard Lane to work in the North West industrial area as suggested in the recent replies to the master plan input session? The plan is to have the OPRE be developed over many years but with every 4 years possible council changes how can council confirm the OPRE will continue on and not be a road to no where?

The analysis does not suggest that travel demand market for OPRE is primarily to and from the East. The analysis shows that there is a capacity issue on Brant Ave, the order of magnitude of which is primarily driven by trips to/from south-west Brantford from/to the future north-west industrial area and to/from points west of Brantford.

The 2016 travel behaviour is used as an initial base to understand the travel relationships between areas. As the population and employment forecasts are allocated the 2041 scenario, the trip making is adjusted to reflect new growth levels and new area to area interactions.

The network recommendations for 2041 are based on the policy positions outlined in the Official Plan which is endorsed by Council. These plans are reviewed at regular intervals and adjusted to reflect recent or new policy initiatives.

2.2.3 Slide 26 talks about Hardy Rd and removing traffic of 300-500 cars. Would the new interchange at Oak Park and 403 not be considered the best route into the industrial park instead of travelling on Hardy Road? Those traveling now to work in the Industrial Park will probably use the 403 and get off at the new interchange at Oak Park road since the left turn issues will be resolved. The Master Plan is encouraging West Brant including Hardy Road to use public transit to get downtown. By increasing public transit why would a 4 lane over pass road need to be built? Make it the last resort to drive when the residents should be proud to use public transit that is efficient for traffic, environmentally friendly and cost effective to both patrons and city.

The 300-500 vehicles are those vehicles forecast in the Do Minimal conditions, to also be travelling along the congested Brant Avenue corridor. Using Highway 403 does not address the north-south issue connecting southwest area to the northwest area.

The future analysis already assumes a significant improvement in transit ridership. This transit ridership does not address the network deficiencies alone.

2.2.4 There is no indication of the progression of the TMP (i.e., at which end construction will begin). Are we to take the "Oak Park Road & Highway 403 interchange upgrade" as an indication of the intended direction?

The future outcome of the TMP is a Recommended Plan for service and infrastructure. This will include an implementation plan identifying the priorities, timing, and general costs for the individual projects. These steps will be undertaken subsequent to the confirmation of the current Recommended Plan. The upgrades to the Oak Park Road interchange are being conducted as a result of the planned growth in the NW Business Park. This need is independent of the potential future Oak Park Road Extension. The next step for the Oak Park Road Extension, the EA, has been initiated by the City. (<https://www.brantford.ca/en/your-government/oak-park-road-extension.aspx>)

2.2.5 The Plans show an arterial/collector road connection in the Expansion Lands north of Powerline Road (east of King George Road) extending north through the existing natural area. On what land parcel is this road proposed?

The alignment of this connection is conceptual at this time. Specific alignments of these development roadways will be the subject of future development submissions.

2.2.6 Within the Expansion Lands there is a proposed collector road travelling parallel to Powerline Road with proposed connections southerly to Powerline Road. How will this road be funded and, given multiple landowners, how will coordination be addressed to ensure that the road is completed in a timely and complete manner?

The timing and design elements of this roadway, and other connections required to support development, will be the subject of future EA's or Draft Plans of Subdivision as development progresses.

2.2.7 The 2041 Preliminary Recommend Plan shows only one potential connection northerly to extend through the natural area to provide access to future lands located outside of the urban boundary. However, Schedule 11 does not illustrate this same roadway as part of the Bike and Trails Network. There is a proposed off-road trail system within the natural area (east-west), shouldn't this connection also be shown?

This comment is noted. The noted roadway extension northerly is conceptual and the subject of further development related study. At such time as the roadway need and alignment is confirmed, it would be important to provide active transportation in this corridor.

2.2.8 According to Slide 37 "2041 Preliminary Recommended Plan", new roads have a conceptual alignment subject to future Feasibility Study or Environmental Assessment. We trust that 'conceptual alignment' is also true to the new loop road on the Sorbara Lands. We expect that the character, design, and alignment of the new public road is subject to further discussion and will be reviewed as part of any future development application.

This is correct. The alignment of the loop road is conceptual. This road is proposed as a collector road, the character, design, and alignment of the new public road would be subject to further study as part of the development application process.

2.3 Methodology

2.3.1 Will you be modifying your plans now that the Ontario government has lowered the population projections for our area?

With regard to the updated population and employment projections, the TMP team is working with the Official Plan team to understand the implications of the Growth Plan Amendment on the Master Servicing Plan and Transportation Master Plan.

The Technical Report prepared by Hemson Consulting for the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing extends the Brantford forecasts with relatively minor additional growth through to the new planning horizon in 2051. The 2041 TMP horizon reflects a population of 163,000 residents and employment of 79,000 jobs, the new reference forecast for 2051 is now for a population of 165,000 and employment of 80,000. The recommended reference scenario for 2041 in the technical report maintains the 2041 TMP forecasts.

As the 2041 scenario is meant to reflect a long term buildout, the difference between the current 2041 and the new 2051 reference scenario (2,000 pop and 1,000 emp) is not considered significant. Therefore, the long term network conditions and requirements as assessed for the TMP are still considered to be appropriate.

2.4 Scope

2.4.1 What will happen at the entrance to Brant Park?

The City recently initiated an Environmental Assessment study which will assess alternative alignments and designs for the proposed Oak Park Road extension. This will include details related to the entrance to Brant Park. Please monitor the city's website for study notices and information. (<https://www.brantford.ca/en/your-government/environmental-assessment-projects.aspx>)

2.4.2 When this proposed OPRE is started where will the City begin.... we expect you to consider the bridge component of the plan before beginning construction?

The planning, design and construction plan will be developed as part of future works and is not within the scope of the TMP. The OPRE EA study will address most of these issues, while the detailed design will finalize the construction costs and phasing. Please monitor the city's website for study notices and information. (<https://www.brantford.ca/en/your-government/environmental-assessment-projects.aspx>)

2.4.3 To build community engagement regarding this OPRE why would the Ward One councillors not take the time to come and speak with those most effected?

As this is an issue for the OPRE EA study team, these comments have been shared with them.

2.4.4 Please clarify that the new plan has 3 bridges crossing the river in succession, if the walking bridge is kept! Has there been any consideration to the impact this will have when there is another ice jam

As this is an issue for the 3 Bridges EA study team, these comments have been shared with them.

2.4.5 Slide 30 talks about walking trails. Currently, the bridge appears in some plan documents but is not included in all. Which proposal is the City considering from the Parson's report?

A walking trail connection is to be provided across the river. The OPRE EA will identify the appropriate on road infrastructure to accommodate pedestrian and cycling

2.4.6 When the master plan is presented with the proposed budget please take time to break down the cost for the bridge separately.

The capital cost estimates for the TMP will consider and identify the bridge component.

2.4.7 To be financially accountable how can this road proceed when the economic impact from COVID-19 will need to be addressed to build the local economy first.

The effects of COVID (short-term or long-term) cannot be known at this time. The TMP is a long term (20 year plan) based on projections of population and employment and the resulting interactions between them. It is understood that there are ups and downs in any long term economic forecast but the ultimate goal is to achieve and accommodate the policy growth plan.

2.4.8 Is compensation for the residents living along the proposed OPRE to address the variety of impacts this project will have (e.g., environmental damage, noise, etc.) being considered?

The TMP is considering the impacts noted in the evaluation of the alternatives. The specific impacts of the implementation of a project will be the scope of the Environmental Assessment, as will be the identification of any mitigation and compensation potentials.

2.4.9 Are cost estimates available for the recommended alternatives?

As part of the project next steps, cost estimates for the Recommended Plan will be developed using current planning and engineering unit cost benchmarks.

2.4.10 The Master Plans Review identifies a number of improvements with existing infrastructure (roads, water, sanitary), while there is no discussion related to any programs planned either through the 10 Year Capital Program and/or the Development Charge By-law/Development Charge Background Study that would provide for the identified improvements. Can this be provided?

As part of the project next steps, cost estimates for the Recommended Plan will be developed using current planning and engineering unit cost benchmarks. An Implementation Plan identifying the Plan priorities will be developed to inform both the 10-yr Capital Program and the Development Charges process.

2.4.11 Given the impact of COVID-19 and other pressing government cuts and priorities on the city's budget (e.g., cuts to transfers from the Provincial government for healthcare, fulsomely addressing homelessness), how is the proposed plan being funded? Or even the top priority?

The cost and potential funding for the Recommended Plan will be prepared as part of the project's next steps. Ultimately, the decisions related to the spending of fiscal budgets are made by Council on the recommendation of City departments, and not an outcome of the TMP.

2.4.12 The Master Plans Review identifies a significant amount of new infrastructure required; however, it does not discuss how these improvements would be funded? A discussion on funding should be provided.

A high level discussion related to finding will be included as part of the development of the Implementation Plan in the project's next steps.

2.4.13 Would like to see the bikeway on Powerline Road to be extended eastward to WGP, or Memorial Dr at least.

Schedule 11 of the Official Plan identifies an on-road cycling facility along the full length of Powerline road through the future urban area. On-road means within the road right of way, which could take the form of a cycle lane, cycle track, or multi-use path, or a combination thereof. The exact implementation would be subject to future study and detailed design.

2.4.14 Many progressive communities (ROW, Niagara, Hamilton) are choosing to utilize roundabouts extensively. On page 9 of the posted slide presentation you discuss TSM and provide several examples – signal coordination, auxiliary turning lands, turn restrictions. I was very surprised that roundabouts were not highlighted as a major TSM tool. I know you are well aware of the benefits but I think the slide show posted on the city website, a roundabout was only mentioned once as a possibility. In an Oct. 11, 2019 article in the Brantford Expositor, the Transportation Association of Canada indicated that 20 year life cycle cost of a roundabout was \$5.3 million whereas a traditional signalized intersection was 9.3 million. It was mentioned in the Q&A that as a next step you will be putting together costing. For all the benefits of roundabouts, which include improved traffic flow, I think that they should be an important part of the TMP at this time, but from the slide presentation, I really can't say that they are. We don't do TMP's very often and I can't imagine how costing can be put together unless you indicate on your 2041 Preliminary Recommend Plan (slide 37) exactly where roundabouts are an option. As an example, I think that they should be used across the Powerline Rd. from Paris Rd to Wayne Gretzky.

With regard to the implementation of roundabouts as traffic control, the TMP is a strategic network needs assessment. The actual decision related to need for and implementation of traffic control measures is not appropriate at this level. Generally speaking, we agree that roundabouts should and would be considered as TSM measures. The objective of the TMP is to identify the potential strategies and the policies, as well as provide direction to the planning and design process, that would need to be in place to provide the opportunity to implement such TSM measures.

We note that the costs for implementing the network recommendations are strategic benchmark costs. While there is a difference in the capital, construction, and maintenance costs of different measures (i.e. signalization versus roundabouts), more precise costing would be undertaken during subsequent planning and design phases (secondary plan, preliminary design, and detail design phases).

That said, the TMP will be identifying candidate sites for roundabout implementation as part of a strategic assessment based on transportation policy goals and objectives.

2.4.15 If the Oak Park Road extension is constructed, it will be built over a section of the S.C. Johnson Trail, from the Brant Park entrance driveway to the Grand River. Will a temporary trail be constructed adjacent to the new roadway for the duration of the project, allowing people to continue to use the trail, or will the trail simply be cut off and dead ended at each end? Has a traffic count ever been done, counting the number of hikers, runners and cyclists that use this section of the trail?

This detail in the construction and implementation will be undertaken as part of the next level studies, including the Oak Park Road Extension.

2.5 Other

2.5.1 TMP Slide 8: The “Oak Park Road & Highway 403 interchange upgrade” is currently under construction at a cost of \$6.75 million, with completion expected by the end of 2020. One could conclude from this that the City is determined to construct the Oak Park Road Extension regardless of any objections by the citizens of Brantford. Could you please comment?

The upgrades to the Oak Park Road interchange are being conducted as a result of the planned growth in the NW Business Park. This need is independent of the potential future Oak Park Road Extension.

2.5.2 Based on discussions with councillors, the perspectives of residents living in the Ava Road area are being valued over other Brantford residents. Could you comment on this?

The problems, opportunities, and alternatives are being considered in the context of a multi-criteria evaluation and finding the best fit solutions that meet the needs of the entire community and City. No single stakeholder / stakeholder group is being valued above others.

2.5.3 Glad to hear the City is in communication with Brant County, are you speaking with Six Nations and other surrounding communities to help not dump on them a City made problem?

The TMP project team is communication with Six Nations and the County.

2.5.4 Slide 23 How can you say this will affect property values in the county but not consider those 25 plus homes from the Glendale, Kinnard and Kerr Shaver neighbourhood?

No such statement is made in the TMP presentation material.

2.5.5 Where is the money coming from, when the city mayor claiming they may have to increase property taxes and certain services and asking the government for money, which the government is going to be handing out..? Is the city going to use some of this money for this project and waste it on a project going no where ,just to please a few people and make a name for themselves. #2 we the tax payers have a right to oppose such a project which we are not being heard. #3 the cost of the bridge alone will be more then the cost of the road work, and disrupt the wild life etc. #4 It's a big NO to this project disrupting a neighbor hood for a few people who don't live in this area and could care less ,It's not in there back yard and have to contend with all the disruption. and noise. A concerned Oakhill tax payer.

The cost and potential funding for the Recommended Plan will be prepared / identified as part of the project's next steps. Ultimately, the decisions related to the spending of fiscal budgets are made by Council on the recommendation of City departments, and not an outcome of the TMP.

2.5.6 Some of the long term residents of the Glendale Rd and Kinnard Cul de sacs were told that their properties would one day have a two lane roadway running behind their properties. We checked with City Hall a few times over the years to try and stay updated on any news regarding the same. We were told that it likely wouldn't happen in our lifetimes. Now we are seeing in the Parsons report that it may become a four lane elevated roadway overlooking our properties. This will feel like we are living under the Gardiner Expressway in Toronto. We should have never been allowed to build our houses this close to this potential corridor. We feel that this roadway does not belong in the greenbelt space that is behind our homes. There has to be a better solution then building a roadway over top of people's properties. Will we be compensated for reduced property values? Who would ever want to buy our homes? When this goes before the City Council each member should honestly ask themselves that if this was in their backyards would they be in favour of it? My opinion is that no property owner, in any location, would approve this truck route / arterial road abutting their property. It's time to go back to the drawing board and come up with an alternative that doesn't gut one of the nicest green spaces in our beloved City.

These comments have been received and will be forwarded to the Oak Park Road Extension EA project team.