APPENDIX A – STUDY DESIGN
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1.0 Study Introduction

The County of Peterborough has initiated this Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) for the planning of the reconstruction of County Road 20 (Selwyn Road) from County Road 18 to County Road 23. The existing condition of County Road 20 is surface treated with a narrow rural cross section and substandard shoulder width, and substandard vertical and horizontal curves. The Study will consider a range of cross-section, intersection, drainage, and cycling facility improvements for the roadway corridor. Phasing of the reconstruction will be considered in the design, including interim rehabilitation alternatives.

This report, the initial public document for the Municipal Class EA, presents a description of the work plan, alternatives, consultation plan and overall study process. It will define the key activities required to complete the study and outline the EA planning process. The draft Study Design will be circulated at the initiation of the study to various agencies and to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and will be available to the general public on the County’s website.

1.1 Study Area

The Study Area is located in the County of Peterborough, as illustrated in Figure 1. Environmental inventories will be focused within this Study Area, in areas where construction is anticipated.
2.0 Study Approach

This Study will be completed as a Municipal Schedule C EA Study. The final document will be an Environmental Study Report (ESR).

This project will address all requirements under the Municipal Class EA by establishing the need and justification for the project, considering all reasonable alternatives with acceptable effects on the natural, social and cultural environments, and proactively involving the public in defining a Recommended Plan. Should the project trigger federal approvals, the documentation will include the planning process and recommended mitigation measures to satisfy federal requirements in principle.

2.1 Guiding Principles

The study approach will involve the following Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) guiding principles for EA studies:

- Consider all reasonable alternatives;
- Provide a comprehensive assessment of the environment;
- Utilize a systematic and traceable evaluation of net effects;
- Undertake a comprehensive public consultation program; and
- Provide a clear and concise documentation of the decision-making process and the public consultation program.

2.2 Environmental Assessment Act Requirements

The Study will follow the Class EA process meeting the requirements of the Municipal Class EA (MEA October 2000 as amended in 2007, 2011 and 2015). The study is being initiated as a Municipal Schedule C study, based on the range of anticipated effects and capital cost of the study.

This project will include two Public Information Centres (PIC’s) during the EA phase and conclude with the preparation of an ESR, followed by a third PIC during the detail design phase. The public will be provided with a 30-day review period of the ESR at the Study conclusion. This Study Design is being made available to the public as a discretionary Step 1.2 of the Municipal Class EA process, as illustrated in Figure 2. The public and agencies will have this early opportunity to comment on the proposed approach.

2.3 EA Phases

The Municipal Class EA Process is illustrated in Figure 2.

The following is the breakdown of tasks, by phase, for a Municipal Schedule C project:

Phase 1: Identify the Problem

- Step 1: Identification and description of the problem or opportunity.
- Step 2: Discretionary public consultation (Draft Study Design available on the County’s website).

Phase 2: Alternative Solutions
Step 1: Identification of alternative solutions to the problem.
Step 2: Identify the study area and a general inventory of the natural, social and cultural environments.
Step 3: Identification of the net positive and negative effects of each alternative solution.
Step 4: Review and validation of alternative solutions.
Step 5: Identification of reasonable design alternatives for the preferred solution.
Step 6: Public consultation at PIC No. 1.
Step 7: Confirmation of design alternatives, finalization of Study Design for work program, and refinements to or addition of design alternatives to be carried forward to Phase 3.
Step 8: Selection of the preferred solution, following the public and agency review.

Phase 3: Alternative Design Concepts for the Preferred Solution
Step 1: Identification of alternative designs.
Step 2: Preparation of a detailed inventory of the social and economic environments.
Step 3: Identification of the potential impacts of the alternative designs.
Step 4: Evaluation of the alternative designs.
Step 5: Selection of preferred design.
Step 6: Public consultation at PIC No. 2.

Phase 4: Environmental Study Report (ESR)
Step 1: Completion of the ESR.
Step 2: 30-day public review period.
Step 3: Filing of the ESR and Notice of Completion.

Phase 5: Implementation
This will be a future phase after this EA Study and will include public consultation at PIC No. 3.
3.0 Study Process

3.1 Public Consultation Approach

The study will use several techniques to proactively involve the public including a Community Café event, three Public Information Centres (PICs) (two during the EA phase and one during detail design) and meetings with external agencies. Meetings will be organized with the stakeholders and may include adjacent land owners, MECP, Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS), Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), Otonabee Region Conservation Authority (ORCA), and other affected agencies. These meetings will be in addition to the progress meetings with the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). These meetings will include representatives from the County of Peterborough and Selwyn Township staff.

The use of separate meetings with interest groups will ensure a high level of communication with the community, about potential issues and alternatives assessed.

Three PIC’s will be held. The first public event will be held as an early Community Café workshop/PIC for the public and stakeholders to attend. This event will present the Draft Study Design, study goals, problem and opportunity statement, environmental inventories, traffic analysis and assessment of Planning Solutions. The second PIC will present the evaluation of alternatives and the Technically Preferred Alternatives for improvements. The third PIC will present the detail design drawings to the public. The PICs will be an integral component of the study - seeking input and comments from the public, stakeholders and Indigenous Peoples.

With respect to public involvement, the work program will have the following key elements:

- Study commencement notice and PIC notices presented in the local newspaper(s).
- Maintaining and updating study mailing lists.
- Submission and review of a Draft and Final Study Design Report (Scoping Document), available on the County’s web site for public review.
- Community Café event to share ideas and propose solutions.
- The PICs will present the project Problem and Opportunity Statement, Draft Study Design (Work Plan), environmental evaluations, assessment of Planning Solutions and the Technically Preferred Alternative (TPA) for the corridor improvements. The consultant and County will be available to answer any questions or concerns during each PIC.

3.2 Indigenous Peoples Engagement

Meetings will also be held with Indigenous Peoples communities (including Curve Lake First Nation, Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation, Williams Treaty First Nation, Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation, Alderville First Nation, Hiawatha First Nation and Metis Nation of Ontario) who are rights holders. These meetings will be held on an as requested basis and be in addition to, and separate from, public meetings and events.

3.3 Work Program

The major elements of the technical work program include the following:

Task 1: Project Start-Up: Upon initiation of the project, the project team will meet to: review study scope; budget and schedule; establish membership, meeting dates and role of the TAC; review the Notice of Study Commencement; and prepare all required agreements. The TAC will provide guidance into the technical elements of the study including the study issues, data collection, weighting of factors, and the evaluation of alternatives.

Task 2: Information Gathering: The collection and organization of the data necessary for the analysis, evaluation and design activities will include:

- Assembly and review of study materials;
- Field reviews to assess aquatic and terrestrial habitat, general SAR inventories, and the collection of photographs to maintain a visual record of existing conditions;
- Collect reports and modelling data/output from the County's TMP and ATMP;
- Review the Official Plan, relevant Official Plan Amendments and Secondary Plans;
- Gather existing natural/social environmental inventories and stormwater reports; and,
- Review of existing and projected traffic volumes and collision data as identified in any area traffic studies and the TMP.

Task 3: Study Design and Value Planning Workshop: This Study Design document will help establish the foundation for all of the remaining environmental planning and public consultation processes. The Study Design allows the early identification of the major issues and concerns, recognizes areas of consensus or agreement, and defines the Problem Statement. The preliminary identification and assessment of Planning Solutions in the Study Area will be presented in this report for public/agency review and comment. Included in this Study Design is the documentation of a broad coarse screening analysis. This analysis is preliminary documentation of the scoping of reasonable and feasible alternatives.

An early Value Planning (VP) Workshop will be will be organized for the TAC to attend. This early workshop will allow open discussion with stakeholders as an event before the study presents any conclusions. A preliminary presentation by the Project Manager on the Problem Statement, study history and draft Study Design will precede the workshop roundtable discussions. In addition, this VP workshop will determine the interim rehabilitation phases of the County Road 20 reconstruction and present alternatives considering performance and value for money. A subsequent TAC meeting will discuss the results of the VP workshop and integration with the alternatives. This will be used as input to finalize the Study Design.

Task 4: Transportation Analysis: The transportation analysis will involve the following key tasks:

- An initial review of the previous traffic modelling activities;
• Documentation of existing profile of road users including all modes of travel (vehicular, bicycles, pedestrians and emergency services);
• Analysis of forecast traffic demands and future projections, and identification of level of service/forecasting and collision analysis for roadway links and intersections (building and documenting on previous forecasts) for land use development;
• Required design criteria required;
• Assessment of performance for each alternative (traffic operation and safety);
• Confirmation of the need and justification for roadway improvements and timing; and
• Identification of interim improvements required in the short term horizon.

Task 5: Community Café/PIC No. 1: The first public event will be held as an early Community Café workshop/ PIC for the public and stakeholders to attend. This format will allow open discussion with stakeholders as an event before the study presents any conclusions. The Community Café/first PIC will present the Problem Statement, Draft Study Design, preliminary analysis of Planning Alternatives, draft property acquisition policy and interim improvements to the public, followed by the workshop roundtable discussions. This will be used as input to finalize the Study Design. Preliminary recommendations for a list of preliminary planning solutions will be presented. A Notice for each PIC will be prepared for the County to place in the local newspaper(s) and on their website and letters will be mailed.

Task 6: Inventory of Natural, Social and Cultural Environments
Social Environment: Areas of investigation will include existing and proposed land uses, land use policies and regulations, aesthetics, recreation facilities, and links with pedestrian and cycling facilities. The community plan of the existing and future land uses will be documented and form the baseline from which alternatives will be measured. This is expected to include dialogue with major land owners in the Study Area.

Natural Habitat Assessment: A desktop review of the natural habitat will be documented in the ESR. An inventory of Species at Risk (SAR) and their habitat will also be completed. The local terrestrial and aquatic environments will be assessed, and fish sampling undertaken if required. A targeted Headwater Drainage Feature (HDF) assessment will also be carried out to ensure a holistic approach to the protection of surrounding wetland areas is maintained. The desktop review, inventory of SAR, and habitat assessments will be documented in the ESR document.

Stage 1 Background Study (Archaeological Assessment): The objectives of a Stage 1 archaeological background study are to develop an inventory of archaeological resources in the proposed area; to determine the presence of any archaeological sites in the area; and, to recommend appropriate strategies for future planning consideration. The data gathered will advise the Project Team of the location, type, and significance of registered archaeological sites for a typical radius of 1 km around the subject property. Reviewing the registered archaeological site database will identify significant heritage resources on or adjacent to the study area, and will summarize the form and extent of previous cultural heritage investigations undertaken within the general project vicinity.

Agricultural Land Uses: The farm activity land uses will be developed using an interactive tool at PIC No. 1. There will be a farm activity map/display on a table where we will ask local farmers to identify issues such as drainage, crop protection, triangular field, tile drainage issues, etc.

Task 7: Technical Investigations
Drainage and Hydrology: The drainage and storm water management design criteria will be confirmed with the County. Hydrologic calculations will be performed to determine the flows for the 5 to 100 year return period rainfall events and to establish the capacities of the existing system. As the various alternatives are developed, the corresponding drainage and storm water design will be developed and detailed in a storm water management plan, sufficient to permit identification of constraints and prepare preliminary cost estimates. The following is a breakdown of the drainage and hydrology work plan:
1. Background information review, field investigations, and documentation of existing conditions.
2. Determination of the design criteria for drainage and stormwater management, and conceptual storm water management plan to deal with any road widening and increases in impervious areas.

Utility Coordination: The Project Team will coordinate the design with utility companies to determine location and if relocation will be required, and a utility composite plan will be prepared.

Illumination: The Project Team will review the condition of all existing electrical systems and roadway lighting to determine materials for salvage or disposal and identify utility constraints and hydro line clearances and power supply locations. Based on the site investigation findings and the proposed roadway improvements, the requirements for temporary/full roadway illumination will be identified. Cost estimates will be completed for the recommended improvements and included in the detailed engineering cost estimates.

Task 8: Development, Analysis and Evaluation of Alternatives: The consideration of all reasonable alternatives is a guiding principle for EA studies. Planning alternatives will be reviewed by the County and a preliminary analysis is presented in this Study Design.

Preliminary Design Alternatives will include but not be limited to the following:
• Cross Section Alternatives
• Intersection Alternatives (conventional signalized, unsignalized or roundabout)
• Stormwater Alternatives
• Cycling Facility Alternatives (Multi-use Path (MUP) or use of shoulders).

This study will use a qualitative assessment and the Technically Preferred Alternative(s) will be presented to the public at PIC No. 2.
Task 9: PIC No. 2: The second PIC will present the qualitative evaluation of alternatives and preliminary preferred design (including both intersections) to the public to elicit input on the recommendations. This meeting will be consistent with our open and objective fresh approach to the study. We will listen before decisions are made. Preliminary recommendations for a basket of solutions will be presented.

Task 10: Preparation of ESR: The preparation of the draft and final report will follow the format and content for an ESR accepted by MECP. The ESR will document the study methodology, findings, public involvement and recommendations. A draft version will be submitted to the County and external review agencies prior to the preparation of the final document. Presentations will be made to County Council and the Township of Selwyn Council. The interim improvements will be included in the ESR document.

Task 11: Public Review of ESR: A Notice of Study Completion will be prepared for the County to place in the local newspaper(s) and on their website. The Consultant will be responsible for mailing letters to the mailing list. The public will be notified of the availability of the ESR for review. Individual letters (or emails) will be sent to persons/organizations on the contact lists which will be maintained throughout the study. The ESR will be made available at several convenient locations for the public review.

Task 12: Preliminary and Detailed Design: A Preliminary Design Report will be prepared for review and approval. Following approval, the Recommended Plan will proceed to Detailed Design and a third PIC to present the interim and final design of the reconstruction.

### 3.4 Study Schedule

A draft schedule for this Study is shown below in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Start-Up Meeting</td>
<td>September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Planning Workshop</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Commencement Notice</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Gathering</td>
<td>October – November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Analysis</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Café/PIC No. 1</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Alternatives</td>
<td>December 2018 to January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and Evaluation of Alternatives</td>
<td>Winter 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Review</td>
<td>March – May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIC No. 2</td>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of ESR</td>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Review of ESR</td>
<td>Spring/Summer 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary and Detail Design</td>
<td>Spring/Summer 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIC No. 3 (during Detail Design)</td>
<td>Spring/Summer 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0 Assessment of Planning Solutions

Alternative Planning Solutions represent alternative ways or methods of addressing the problem to be solved by the project. These reflect different strategies and include the “Do Nothing” approach (maintaining the status quo). Following the assessment of Alternative Planning Solutions, those alternatives judged to address the problem statement will be carried forward to form the Recommended Planning Solution. The recommended planning solution will address the safety of the travelling public, while providing the best overall balance between engineering objectives, life cycle costs, and other environmental, cultural, socio-economic, and land use planning objectives.

4.1 Preliminary Alternative Planning Solutions

In determining the preferred planning alternative for the County, Alternative Planning Solutions were developed and analyzed including:

1) **Do Nothing**, 
2) **Transportation Demand Management**, 
3) **Limit Development**, and 
4) **Provide New or Improved Transportation Infrastructure**.

**The “Do Nothing” Alternative** – The Do Nothing Alternative must be considered, as mandated by the Class EA. It represents a baseline from which other approaches can be compared. This alternative does not provide improvements to vehicular or active transportation. It has no capital cost or environmental effects, and does not support the objectives of the study.

**Transportation Demand Management (TDM)** – This strategy would reduce vehicular demand, and encourage alternative work hours, work at home, more active modes of transportation (cycling and walking) and the use of transit. This alternative is not recommended to be carried forward as a standalone solution, and is considered as a complementary solution to the solution carried forward.

**Limit Land Use Planning** – This strategy would be an approach that would limit any new residential, commercial or industrial development and therefore reduce the generation of new trips. This alternative does not provide a solution for existing delays and safety concerns, on the existing transportation network. In addition, restricting development does not align with the County’s planning objectives.

**Provide New or Improved Transportation Infrastructure** – This strategy would be to reconstruct County Road 20 to improve the infrastructure and support increased demand. This solution is consistent with the County’s Transportation Master Plan (TMP). This solution would include an interim phase of improvements.

4.2 Preliminary Assessment of Planning Solutions

Based on existing and projected traffic demands, the Do Nothing and Limit Land Use Planning alternatives are not recommended to be carried forward. These alternatives do not provide a solution to the existing traffic demand or roadway condition.

TDM is not carried forward as a standalone solution, but will be incorporated with the Provide New or Improved Transportation Infrastructure alternative as a Recommended Solution.

Provide new or improved infrastructure is recommended to be carried forward as the Preferred Planning Solution. This includes an interim phase to designate the road as a “No Truck Route” until reconstruction may occur. The Preliminary Design alternatives are described in Section 5.0.
5.0 Preliminary Design Alternatives

Preliminary design alternatives are site specific design solutions, generated to implement the recommended planning solution. The extensive list of preliminary design alternatives includes:

Roadway Alternatives

Preliminary roadway alternatives have been generated, as illustrated in Figure 3 to Figure 6. The alternatives include:

Alignment Alternatives
- Alternative 1: 2-lane rural cross-section, widening to the west
- Alternative 2: 2-lane rural cross-section, widening on the centre
- Alternative 3: 2-lane rural cross-section, widening to the east
- Alternative 4: 2-lane semi-urban cross-section with MUP

Design Speed Alternatives
- Alternative 0: Existing Design Speed (Posted Speed 80 km/h)
- Alternative 1: Improve vertical and horizontal curves for posted speed of 80 km/h
- Alternative 2: Posted speed 60 km/h with multi-use path
- Alternative 3: Combined posted speed of 60 km/h and 70 km/h with multi-use path

Intersection Alternatives

The County Road 20/County Road 18 intersection is currently a T-intersection. Intersection alternatives at County Road 20/County Road 18 will consider conventional unsignalized (T-intersection, existing conditions), conventional signalized (T-intersection) and a single-lane roundabout, as illustrated in Figure 7.
The County Road 20/County Road 23 intersection is a 4-way stop controlled intersection. Intersection alternatives at County Road 20/County Road 23 will consider conventional unsignalized (existing conditions), conventional signalized and a single-lane roundabout, as illustrated in Figure 8.

Internal intersections (intersections along County Road 20 between County Road 18 and County Road 23) will consider improving the skew angle and/or roundabout alternatives. These intersections are illustrated in Figure 9 to Figure 14.
Figure 11: Centre Line/County Road 20 Intersection Design Alternatives

Figure 12: 10th Line/County Road 20 Intersection Design Alternatives

Figure 13: Birch Island Road/County Road 20 Intersection Design Alternatives

Figure 14: 11th Line/County Road 20 Intersection Design Alternatives
5.1 Coarse Screening of Preliminary Design Alternatives and Design Criteria
The Preliminary Design Alternatives described in the preceding section may be coarse-screened should technical, agency design criteria or economic issues preclude their application for this project. Those carried forward will then be subjected to a quantitative evaluation to rank the combined alternatives. Following the evaluation of alternatives, the Technically Preferred Alternative will be selected and refined to ensure it meets the design criteria.

5.2 Preliminary Design Considerations
The existing conditions in the study area present a variety of issues and constraints including:

**County Road 20/Selwyn Road Issues:**
- Intersection is in a 50 km/h zone but vehicles do not operate at this speed (speed limit or road design is not appropriate)
- Operational improvement alternatives to be reviewed include: slip-around lane (existing); left turn lane; addition of street lights; flashing amber; signals; roundabout; paved shoulders
- Intersection located with a crest curve to the east
- No existing facilities for cyclists/pedestrians
- Recommendation of the ATMP plan is for paved shoulders
- Speed limit transitions to 80 km/h immediately east of intersection
- To the west there is a transition zone into urban Bridgenorth which uses chevrons. Other speed treatments for the transition could be considered for the urban transition

**Selwyn Burritt Mann Memorial Park at CR20/CR23 intersection Southeast Quadrant Issues:**
- Signed to Selwyn Beach (destination for cyclists)
- Signage to “Share the Road” and OPP enforcement of speed – indicative of not considering a “Complete Street” approach to provide space for each mode
- Pavement edge breakup – high maintenance costs can be reduced by the use of paved shoulders
- Safety of horizontal and vertical curvature on north approach to Country Road 18 intersection
- Osprey nest on Bell / Hydro pole
- High volume of heavy trucks (aggregates)
- Tourist destination (Buckhorn and Bobcaygeon) with peak tourist traffic volumes and influx of non-local traffic
- Poor pavement condition - rolling, edge break-up and rutting of travel lanes
- Need for paved shoulders on steep inclines (avoid erosion of shoulders) and superelevated curves on approach to CR18 where increased street flow is eroding low side shoulders
- Bell and aerial Hydro lines within clear zone distance
- Large areas where ditches require clean-out
- Areas with eroding backslopes onto agricultural fields

**County Road 20 Issues:**
- Intersection is in a 50 km/h zone but vehicles do not operate at this speed (speed limit or road design is not appropriate)
- Operational improvement alternatives to be reviewed include: slip-around lane (existing); left turn lane; addition of street lights; flashing amber; signals; roundabout; paved shoulders
- Intersection located with a crest curve to the east
- No existing facilities for cyclists/pedestrians
- Recommendation of the ATMP plan is for paved shoulders
- Speed limit transitions to 80 km/h immediately east of intersection
- To the west there is a transition zone into urban Bridgenorth which uses chevrons. Other speed treatments for the transition could be considered for the urban transition

**Birch Island Selwyn Beach Conversion Area destination**
- Safety of Mudroad/12 Line (it is between reverse horizontal curves and behind a vertical curve to the south)
- Potential for Multi-use Path (MUP) behind hedgerow
- Birch Island Selwyn Beach Conversion Area destination

**Perimeter Road (County Road 20) Issues:**
- Intersection located with a crest curve to the east
- No existing facilities for cyclists/pedestrians
- Recommendation of the ATMP plan is for paved shoulders
- Speed limit transitions to 80 km/h immediately east of intersection
- To the west there is a transition zone into urban Bridgenorth which uses chevrons. Other speed treatments for the transition could be considered for the urban transition

**Visibility of field entrances**
- Need to review ditch outlets
- Areas of narrow right-of-way (66 ft wide) cannot accommodate standard shoulder widths and flat 3:1 foreslopes
- Constraints to widening the platform include mature trees, wetland areas designated as Provincially Significant (Moore Lake and Snelgrove Brook), Moore Creek and tributaries of nearby lakes, headwater drainage features (HDF), Hydro and Bell lines, and cedar rail fences (heritage feature)
- Safety of Pebble Beach Road (view of crest curve to the south)
- Hidden intersections posted at 60 km/h at Long Point/ Holden Road intersection. Alternatives in this section include vertical alignment curve flattening and use of mountable curb and gutter and localized storm drainage to avoid property acquisition
- Skew angles of a cross roads – Holden Road
- Possible improvement of skew angle to be less than 70°
- Potential to provide wider paved shoulders at sideroads to function as slip-around lanes should vehicles stop in the general purpose lane to make a left turn
- Likelihood for Bobolink, Eastern Meadowlark and Least Bittern SAR on adjacent fields
- Recommendation of the ATMP plan is for paved shoulders
- Specimen trees within ditch line / hedgerows
- No daylight triangles at intersections (example Poplar Point Road)
- Historic 66 ft ROW would be considered substandard for a County Road where 26 m or 30 m are modern standards
- Existing 12 ft lanes (3.66 m) and 5 ft shoulders do not accommodate disabled vehicles
- Mature trees within clear zone measured at 7'-6” from travelled lane
- Mature trees negate effectiveness of winter grit/salt with shade impacting ability of salt to melt ice
- School bus drop-off and pick-up
- 10th Line /Smith intersection on a curve
- No room for ditches affects pavement drainage
- Potential for Multi-use Path (MUP) behind hedgerow
- Tourist destination (Buckhorn and Bobcaygeon) with peak tourist traffic volumes and influx of non-local traffic
- Poor pavement condition - rolling, edge break-up and rutting of travel lanes
- Need for paved shoulders on steep inclines (avoid erosion of shoulders) and superelevated curves on approach to CR18 where increased street flow is eroding low side shoulders
- Bell and aerial Hydro lines within clear zone distance
- Large areas where ditches require clean-out
- Areas with eroding backslopes onto agricultural fields

**Safety of Pebble Beach Road (view of crest curve to the south)**
- Hidden intersections posted at 60 km/h at Long Point/ Holden Road intersection. Alternatives in this section include vertical alignment curve flattening and use of mountable curb and gutter and localized storm drainage to avoid property acquisition
- Skew angles of a cross roads – Holden Road
- Possible improvement of skew angle to be less than 70°
- Potential to provide wider paved shoulders at sideroads to function as slip-around lanes should vehicles stop in the general purpose lane to make a left turn
- Likelihood for Bobolink, Eastern Meadowlark and Least Bittern SAR on adjacent fields
- Recommendation of the ATMP plan is for paved shoulders
- Specimen trees within ditch line / hedgerows
- No daylight triangles at intersections (example Poplar Point Road)
- Historic 66 ft ROW would be considered substandard for a County Road where 26 m or 30 m are modern standards
- Existing 12 ft lanes (3.66 m) and 5 ft shoulders do not accommodate disabled vehicles
- Mature trees within clear zone measured at 7'-6" from travelled lane
- Mature trees negate effectiveness of winter grit/salt with shade impacting ability of salt to melt ice
- School bus drop-off and pick-up
- 10th Line /Smith intersection on a curve
- No room for ditches affects pavement drainage
- Potential for Multi-use Path (MUP) behind hedgerow
- Tourist destination (Buckhorn and Bobcaygeon) with peak tourist traffic volumes and influx of non-local traffic
- Poor pavement condition - rolling, edge break-up and rutting of travel lanes
- Need for paved shoulders on steep inclines (avoid erosion of shoulders) and superelevated curves on approach to CR18 where increased street flow is eroding low side shoulders
- Bell and aerial Hydro lines within clear zone distance
- Large areas where ditches require clean-out
- Areas with eroding backslopes onto agricultural fields
Glossary of Terms

- **AADT**  
  Annual Average Daily Traffic – the average 24-hour, two-way traffic per day for the period from January 1st to December 31st.

- **Alignment**  
  The vertical and horizontal position of a road.

- **Alternative**  
  Well-defined and distinct course of action that fulfils a given set of requirements. The EA Act distinguishes between alternatives to the undertaking and alternative methods of carrying out the undertaking.

- **Alternative Planning Solutions**  
  Alternative ways of solving problems or meeting demand (Alternatives to the Undertaking).

- **Alternative Design Concepts**  
  Alternative ways of solving a documented transportation deficiency or taking advantage of an opportunity. (Alternative methods of carrying out the undertaking).

- **Alternative Project**  
  Alternative Planning Solution, see above.

- **ATMP**  
  Active Transportation Master Plan

- **Bump-Up**  
  The act of requesting that an environmental assessment initiated as a class EA be required to follow the individual EA process. The change is a result of a decision by the proponent or by the Minister of Environment to require that an individual environmental assessment be conducted.

- **Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA)**  
  The CEAA applies to projects for which the federal government holds decision-making authority. It is legislation that identifies the responsibilities and procedures for the environmental assessment.

- **Class Environmental Assessment Document**  
  An individual environmental report documenting a planning process which is formally submitted under the EA Act. Once the Class EA document is approved, projects covered by the class can be implemented without having to seek further approvals under the EA Act provided the Class EA process is followed.

- **Corridor**  
  A band of variable width between two locations. In transportation studies a corridor is a defined area where a new or improved transportation facility might be located.

- **Criterion**  
  Explicit feature or consideration used for comparison of alternatives.

- **Cumulative Effects Assessment**  
  Cumulative Effects Assessment assesses the interaction and combination of the residual environmental effects of the project during its construction and operational phases on measures to prevent or lessen the predicted impacts with the same environmental effects from other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects and activities.

- **Detail Design**  
  The final stage in the design process in which the engineering and environmental components of preliminary design are refined and details concerning, for example, property, drainage, utility relocations and quantity estimate requirements are prepared, and contract documents and drawings are produced.

- **DFO**  
  Department of Fisheries and Oceans.

- **EA**  
  Environmental Assessment

- **EA Act**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>An environmental Assessment requiring the submission of a document for approval by the Minister, pursuant to the EA Act and which is neither exempt from the EA Act nor covered by a Class EA approval.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air, land or water;</td>
<td>MECP Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant and animal life, including human life,</td>
<td>Mitigating Measure A measure that is incorporated into a project to reduce, eliminate or ameliorate detrimental environmental effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The social, economic and cultural conditions</td>
<td>Mitigation Taking actions that either remove or alleviate to some degree the negative impacts associated with the implementation of alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that influence the life of humans or a community,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any building structure, machine or other device</td>
<td>Planning Alternatives Planning alternatives are “alternative methods” under the EA Act. Identification of significant transportation engineering opportunities while protecting significant environmental features as much as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or thing made by humans,</td>
<td>Planning Solutions That part of the planning and design process where alternatives to the undertaking and alternative routes are identified and assessed. Also described as “Alternative Project” under the federal EA Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any solid, liquid, gas, odour, heat, sound,</td>
<td>Project A specific undertaking planned and implemented in accordance with the Class EA including all those activities necessary to solve a specific problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vibration or radiation resulting directly or</td>
<td>Proponent A person or agency that carries or proposes to carry out an undertaking, or is the owner or person having charge, management, or control of an undertaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indirectly from human activities, or</td>
<td>Public Includes the general public, interest groups, associates, community groups, and individuals, including property owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any part or combination of the foregoing and the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interrelationships between any two or more of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>them, in or of Ontario.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A change in the existing conditions of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment which may have either beneficial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(positive) or detrimental (negative) effects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESR Environmental Study Report. The final</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>documentation for Schedule C project, defining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the project, consultation process, preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solution and mitigation measures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The outcome of a process that appraises the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advantages and disadvantages of alternatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process involving the identification of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criteria, rating of predicted impacts, assignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of weights to criteria, and aggregation of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weights, rates and criteria to produce an</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ordering of alternatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include federal departments and agencies,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial ministries and agencies, conservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authorities, municipalities, Crown corporations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or other agencies other than MTO.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A category of sub-factors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Arrangement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural plan of the bridge and proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>works including elevations and cross-sectional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>views of the bridge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• **Realignment**  
  Replacement or upgrading of an existing roadway on a new or revised alignment.

• **Recommended Plan**  
  That part of the planning and design process, during which various alternative solutions are examined and evaluated including consideration of environmental effects and mitigation; the recommended design solution is then developed in sufficient detail to ensure that the horizontal and vertical controls are physically compatible with the proposed site, that the requirements of lands and rights-of-way are satisfactorily identified, and that the basic design criteria or features to be contained in the design, have been fully recognized and documented in sufficient graphic detail to ensure their feasibility.

• **Screening**  
  Process of eliminating alternatives from further consideration, which do not meet minimum conditions or categorical requirements.

• **Sub-factor**  
  A single criterion used for the evaluation. Each sub-factor is grouped under one of the factors.

• **Technical Advisory Committee**  
  The Advisory Committee will include the City and Consultant. It will act as the decision-making body for the study recommendations.

• **TMP**  
  Transportation Master Plan

• **Traceability**  
  Characteristics of an evaluation process which enables its development and implementation to be followed with ease.

• **Undertaking**  
  In keeping with the definition of the Environmental Assessment Act, a project or activity subject to an Environmental Assessment.
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1.0 Introduction

The County of Peterborough has initiated a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) for the preliminary design of the reconstruction of County Road 20 (Selwyn Road) from County Road 18 to County Road 23. The existing condition of County Road 20 is surface treated with a narrow rural cross section and substandard shoulder width, and substandard vertical and horizontal curves. The Study will consider a range of cross-section, intersection, drainage, and cycling facility improvements for the roadway corridor. Phasing of the reconstruction will be considered in the design, including interim rehabilitation alternatives.

The Study Area is located in the County of Peterborough, as illustrated in Figure 1.

2.0 Background

This report summarizes the PIC as well as the comments received at the Community Café event.

The first Public Information Centre (PIC)/Community Café event for this project was held as follows:

Date: Thursday, November 30, 2018
PIC Drop-in Time: 6:00 pm – 9:00 pm
Community Café Time: 7:00 pm – 8:30 pm
Location: Lakefield-Smith Community Centre (Niels Pind Room)

Twenty-six (26) people registered at the PIC/Community Café. Each person was encouraged to provide a written response to any issues or concerns.

2.1 Public Information Centre

All members of the public and interest groups were invited to the first PIC to view the presentation material and to discuss the project with the consultant representatives.

The PIC presented the following:
1. Project goals and the Problem and Opportunity Statement;
2. Draft Study Design (Work Plan) for comments;
3. Municipal Class EA Process;
4. Background information and environmental investigations; and
5. Preliminary groups of alternatives for the intersection improvements and cross sections.

Exhibits were placed around the perimeter of the room for attendees to view at their leisure. The exhibits can be found in Appendix A.

Consultant and County staff were available to respond to any inquiries.

2.2 Community Café Process

The Community Café process follows the principles of the “World Café” philosophy; namely, that people want to talk together about issues that matter, and that that as we talk together we are able to collectively achieve greater wisdom. People have the capacity to work together and can collectively be creative and insightful when actively engaged in meaningful conversations. The Community Café is a simple yet effective conversational method for fostering dialogue, accessing collective intelligence and creating innovative possibilities for action. The six Café principles are:

1. Set the context
2. Explore questions that matter
3. Encourage everyone’s contributions
4. Connect diverse perspectives
5. Listen together for insights
6. Share collective discoveries
The CR20 Community Café was an informal event that facilitated conversation by providing participants with a comfortable and welcoming environment. The event was set up with tables, flowers, and background music to evoke a feeling of familiarity and comfort.

The event was organized to create a network of dialogue about issues that matter to the community. Each conversation was chosen to reflect the most important parameters of the project, and to determine the desired goals of the participants. Four topics were provided as discussion points to reflect the actual concerns of the community. A group discussion between participants allowed key ideas and perspectives to be exchanged which provided new insights to the project.

One Café facilitator was stationed at each group table to provide a neutral voice to the discussion. The facilitator encouraged all participants to contribute to the conversation and to remain focused on the topic being discussed.

The Community Café event began with an introductory presentation, which is provided in Appendix B. Following the project introduction, the process and objectives of the Community Café event were explained. The participants then moved to one table to begin discussion on the applicable topic. The four topics that were chosen to be discussed during the event included the following:

1. Context Sensitive Design Approach
2. Road Safety
3. Traffic Operations
4. Property Issues

Each discussion lasted approximately 15 minutes.

3.0 Public and Agency Consultation

One of the key aspects of the project is to provide the public, interested parties, affected agencies and stakeholders with the opportunity for input. In order to ensure this objective is met, a public and agency notification program was undertaken. The program includes a number of communication mechanisms, discussed in the following sections. A draft Study Design Report is available on the County’s website and was available at the PIC for public review.

3.1 Newspaper Notice and Flyers

Notice of the first PIC was advertised in the local newspaper (The Peterborough Examiner) on November 22, 2018. Notices were sent out to the mailing list to agencies, stakeholders and utilities. Notices were also sent out by mail to local residents within the Study Area. A copy of the notice is in Appendix C.

3.2 Agency and Stakeholder Contacts

The combined Notice of Study Commencement and PIC No. 1/Community Café was issued in advance of the event to agencies, stakeholders and interest groups including:

- Allstream Enterprise Solutions
- BEL Rotary
- Bridgenorth Beautification Committee
- Greater Peterborough Chamber of Commerce
- Ontario Federation Of Snowmobile Clubs
- Peterborough & the Kawarthas Tourism
- Peterborough Economic Development
- Peterborough Field Naturalists
- Trans-Canada Pipelines
- Peterborough Victoria Northumberland Clarington Catholic District School Board
- Selwyn Township Fire Department
- Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs
- Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care
- Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
- Ministry of Economic Development and Trade
- Ontario Federation of Agriculture
- Otonabee Region Conservation Authority
- Township of Selwyn
- Peterborough Public Health
- Ministry of Natural Resources, Legal Services Branch
- Ministry of Transportation, Legal Services Branch
- District 2 Kawartha Lakes Snowmobile Club
- Peterborough Cycling Club
- City of Peterborough
- Environment Canada
- Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board
- Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board
- Ontario Provincial Police
- Peterborough County/City Paramedics
- Fisheries and Oceans Canada
3.3 Indigenous Peoples

Indigenous Peoples groups that were contacted include:

- MNO Peterborough and District Wapiti Metis Council
- Ontario Secretariat for Aboriginal Affairs
- Special Claims Branch - INAC
- The Peterborough Metis Council
- Assessment and Historical Research - INAC
- Indian & Northern Affairs Canada
- Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation (Burleigh Falls)
- Metis Nation of Ontario
- Ministry of Indigenous Affairs
- Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nations
- Ontario Secretary of Aboriginal Affairs, Policy and Relationships Branch
- Williams Treaty First Nation
- Alderville First Nations
- Environment and Natural Resources Lands Trusts Services Department of Indian & Northern Affairs
- Hiawatha First Nation
- Metis Nation of Ontario
- Curve Lake First Nation

An offer to meet separately from the event with the communities was extended; however, no community was interested.

4.0 Public Information Centre Comments

A total of three (3) comment sheets were received at the PIC and five (5) additional comment sheets were received during the subsequent comment period. Copies of the comments, excluding personal information, are provided in Appendix D. The results of the comments and discussions are summarized in the following sections.

4.1 Summary of Public Information Centre Comments

The results of the comments received and verbal discussions held at the Public Information Centre are summarized below in Table 1 by general subject matter.

Table 1: Summary of Written Comments
Public Information Centre No. 1
November 30, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Comment Sheet No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support for updates to County Road 20.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for reducing speeds to 60 km/h.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for the “Context Sensitive Design” approach to provide a multi-use path for pedestrians and cyclists.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference to save the trees and rural character of the road.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR20 should be a No Truck Route (allowing local deliveries).</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3, 5, 6, 7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are a high number of accidents on CR20 and safety is a concern for residents.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4, 5, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The road has significantly deteriorated due to heavy truck traffic.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for roadway surface improvements.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for immediate short term improvements to reduce speed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve drainage in flood areas and for salt contamination.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference for minimal property requirements.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for double lines for no passing.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.0 Community Café Topic Discussions

At each table a topic of conversation was provided for discussion. Each topic had several questions associated with the topic, however, the conversation often diverged from the given questions. This allowed for the conversation to flow freely, and created an encouraging environment for everyone at the event to contribute ideas and perspectives. It also provided the participants an opportunity to direct the conversation to questions that are relevant to their actual concerns.

The following pages summarize the ideas and comments expressed during the event and in correspondence received post-meeting (see Appendix D). All of the comments are listed based on the discussion topics of the tables.

The discussion presented in this report represents the opinions of the public and stakeholders. These discussions will be used as input by the Technical Advisory Committee for subsequent steps in developing the alternatives.

Readers of this report are cautioned that the recorded ideas and discussions are unsubstantiated and may or may not be feasible, and require development. They do, however, represent the best effort to identify the issues and alternatives for the project that are consistent with the values of the public/stakeholders in attendance.

5.1 Context Sensitive Design Approach

Key Questions:
1. Can we accept narrow lanes/shoulders with cyclists, pedestrians, equestrian etc. on a separate path?
2. How important are the trees/hedgerows to the character of the roadway?
3. Should affordability be a consideration in reducing the scope of the works?

Comments:
- Selwyn Road is a very busy roadway.
- Selwyn Road operates as a high speed road and residents have difficulty pulling out of driveways at low speeds with low visibility.
- Limited/no space to pull over. (A possibility is to implement “pull over” spaces along the road).
- The road is not built for truck traffic.
- Should have a focus on agricultural traffic/farm equipment.
- Concern that rebuilding the road may not reduce speeds.
- Support for slower speeds with a separated multi-use path (MUP).
- Signage for the Birch Island Conservation Area should be more visible. Trucks often miss the turn and back up on Selwyn Road (very dangerous).
- Suggest lowering the posted speed to even 50 km/h.

5.2 Road Safety

Key Questions:
1. What are the main safety concerns at intersections?
2. Are driving speeds appropriate?
3. How should cycling and walking be accommodated on the corridor?

Comments:
- Holden Road/Long Point Road intersection has poor visibility with a blind hill to the south. Farm equipment pulls out at slow speeds and drivers approaching the intersection are travelling at very high speeds.
- Shoulders should be provided for farm equipment travelling on the corridor.
- The skew angle at 11th Line provides poor visibility and people often pass along this section (even though passing is not permitted).
- A left-turn lane or slip-around lane may be implemented at each intersection location.
- It is a challenge to turn left from Centre Line Smith Road onto Selwyn Road due to high speeds on Selwyn, limited visibility from Centre Line Smith Road and the objects within the daylighting triangle limiting sight distance.
A 4-way stop at Centre Line Smith Road and Selwyn Road was presented but residents are concerned about braking noise. Selwyn Road speeds should be monitored/enforced by police. (It was noted that police enforcement is not a successful long term solution to speed control. Physical changes to the road are required). Radar speed control was suggested (however, too much use of radar in the County reduces its effectiveness to reduce speeds). Summertime on Fridays and weekdays as people travel to/from work are busiest. The vertical and horizontal curves provide short times for drivers to react to people pulling out of driveways. Snow drifting across fields and from the lake is a concern.

5.3 Traffic Operations

Key Questions:
1. Should trucks be on this route?
2. Are the delays long at the intersections?
3. Are drivers passing in locations with insufficient visibility?
4. Are roundabouts appropriate for this corridor?

Comments:
- Should be a No Truck route.
- Long delays at intersections/waiting for people to turn left during the summer.
- Safety is more of a concern than delays at the intersections.
- Roundabouts can increase safety and remove delays from intersections. Property is typically a concern but the CR20/CR23 intersection has a lot of property.
- Passing along Selwyn Road is not permitted due to limited visibility but very often drivers make an illegal passing manoeuvre or tailgate slower drivers.
- A roundabout at CR20/CR18 may influence truckers to slow down and turn onto CR18 rather than continuing straight to CR23.

5.4 Traffic Operations

Key Questions:
1. Are there drainage issues?
2. Are there driveway access issues?
3. What is the farming activity on the road corridor?
4. Are there issues with visibility for school bus pick-up/drop-off?

Comments:
- Flooding at south end of Selwyn Road in the spring as water drains from the farm across the road to the lake.
- Flooding from Poplar Point Road to Westview Point Road.
- Concern for drivers pulling in/out of driveways.
- There are concerns for a widened road ROW impacting front porches that are close to the roadway (such as 1700 Selwyn Road).
- Widening could be taken from one side or a mix of both, dependent on the curvilinear alignment of the road, to reduce property impacts.
- Farm equipment along the road introduces a large speed differential between users. It is unsafe to pass; however, drivers get frustrated and pass unsafely.
- Slower speeds on the road to reduce the speed differential are preferred.
- School bus pick-up/drop-off occurs on Selwyn Road.
6.0 Summary of Comments

The comments from PIC No. 1 were:

1. Several property owners indicated that they would prefer a “Context Sensitive Design” (i.e. lower speeds, separated multi-use path and preserving mature trees) approach if land is required.


3. Support for a “no truck route” that allows only local deliveries.

4. Safety concerns for making left turns in/out of driveways due to high speeds.

5. Safety concerns due to limited sight distance at several intersections.

6. Passing is a concern as there is limited visibility along the corridor.

7. There is a large speed differential between users: farm equipment travel between 20 km/h to 30 km/h versus trucks and local residents between 60 km/h to 100 km/h.

8. Consideration should be made for farm equipment to travel along the road, such as paved shoulders to make for a wider platform.

9. Maintaining the character of the road (trees/hedgerows, narrow road corridor, etc.) is preferred.

10. Property owners who have houses/porches close to the road corridor are opposed to property acquisition.

Appendix A
PIC No. 1 Presentation Boards
Welcome!
County of Peterborough
County Road 20 (Selwyn Road) Reconstruction from County Road 18 to County Road 23 EA Study

Welcome to the first Public Information Centre (PIC) meeting for the County Road 20 (Selwyn Road) Reconstruction from County Road 18 to County Road 23 Environmental Assessment/Preliminary Design and Detail Design Study. Please record your attendance and obtain a comment sheet at the registration desk.

Several background reports are available at the Resource Table. Should you have any questions regarding the materials, background reports or any other aspect of the study, please speak to the County or Consultant team members in attendance.

We encourage your input/feedback on the material being presented on the display boards. Please deposit completed comment sheets in the comment box or mail/e-mail to the address at the bottom of the form by December 14, 2018.

There is an opportunity at any time during the Class EA process for interested persons to provide written input. Any comments received will be collected under the Environmental Assessment Act and, with the exception of personal information, will become part of the public record.

Introduction
The County of Peterborough has initiated an Environmental Assessment (EA), Preliminary Design and Detail Design Study for the County Road 20 (Selwyn Road) Reconstruction from County Road 18 to County Road 23. This Study will complete the Study Design and detailed design phases of the Municipal Class EA process. The Study will include a detailed assessment of the need for the project, development and evaluation of alternatives, and preparation of an Environmental Study Report, which will be used to inform the decision-making process.

Need and Justification
County Road 20 (Selwyn Road) from County Road 18 to County Road 23 is currently a surface treated road with a rural cross section. The road provides the most direct route between Bridgenorth and communities to the northeast, including Buckhorn and Young's Point. The existing road width is narrow and does not meet current County design standards. Additionally, there are several substandard vertical and horizontal curves which have contributed to accidents along this road corridor.

Interim improvements are required to address the geometric deficiencies prior to ultimate reconstruction to County standards.

Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) Process
This project is being completed as a Schedule C Class EA in accordance with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment, 2011 and amended in 2015. A draft Study Design describing the study process has been made available for agency and public comments. It is available at the Resource Table.

Study process is here (PIC No. 1)
Study Design
Posted Online
Fall 2018
Community Café/PIC No. 1
November 2018
PIC No. 2
Spring 2019
PIC No. 3
Summer 2019

The need for this Study has been identified as necessary to address the geometric deficiencies of the existing road. The Study will evaluate alternatives and recommend a design for the project, which will be used to inform the decision-making process.

This Study will complete a detailed assessment of the project, including development and evaluation of alternatives, and preparation of an Environmental Study Report, which will be used to inform the decision-making process.

The Study will be completed within the time frames established under the Environmental Assessment Act and, with the exception of personal information, will become part of the public record.

This Study will be completed as a Schedule C Class EA in accordance with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment, 2011 and amended in 2015. A draft Study Design describing the study process has been made available for agency and public comments. It is available at the Resource Table.
Archaeological Potential Criteria:
1) Proximity to Chemong Lake.
2) Elevated topography.
3) Historic concession road.
4) Early Euro-Canadian settlement.
5) Archaeological site, Gibson Gate (BiGo-15), within one kilometre of the project limits.

Recommendations: Stage 2 Property Survey is recommended.

Traffic and Collisions
Reported 10 collisions in front of 1809 Selwyn Road:
- at least 2 collisions from 2014 to 2016;
- 3 collisions between January and September 2017 (property damage);
- 5 collisions between mid-September and October 20, 2017 (including 1 head-on (fatal), 3 road departures and 1 involving three vehicles (severity unknown)).

Reported 7 road departures in front of 1862 Selwyn Road, all involving drivers going northbound and losing control in the nearby curve:
- 1 road departure during summer 2014 or 2015;
- 4 road departures from 2014 to 2016, all of them in October;
- 2 road departures in fall 2018 (one in late September, one in early November)

Five of the 7 road departures were ended on the west side of the road (i.e. crossing the opposite lane). Details in the table below:
Alternative Planning Solutions

Alternative Planning Solutions represent alternative ways or methods of addressing the problem to be solved by the project.

In determining the preferred planning alternative for the County, Alternative Planning Solutions were developed and analyzed including:

1. Do Nothing;
2. Transportation Demand Management (TDM);
3. Limit Development; and
4. Provide New or Improved Transportation Infrastructure.

Based on existing and projected traffic demands, the Do Nothing and Limit Land Use Planning alternatives are not recommended to be carried forward. These alternatives do not address the existing traffic demand or deficient roadway condition.

TDM is not carried forward as a standalone solution, but will be incorporated with the Provide New or Improved Transportation Infrastructure alternative as a Recommended Solution.

Provide New or Improved Transportation Infrastructure is recommended to be carried forward as the Preferred Planning Solution.

The Assessment of Alternative Planning Solutions is described in the draft Study Design which can be found on the Resource Table.

Value Engineering

The Technical Advisory Committee has undertaken a Value Engineering (VE) review of the project to consider the needs of the project from first principles – focusing on value for money and considering innovative ideas.

The following reflect preliminary ideas for discussion:

- Consider lower design speed of road/differernt character
- Multi-use Path (MUP) of feet from road such as CR38 to Lakefield
- Use special character definition for road type
- Acquire all property required from one side to save trees/character
- Remove trees to improve winter maintenance
- Roundabouts for major intersections
- Build intersections to ultimate and the mainline roadway to a lower design standard
- In areas with no ditches, build subdrains/catchbasins to release to the opposite side of the road
- Interim designation of route as “No Truck Route”
- Curve widening/median strip for substandard curves
- Sign: Passing Lane 10 km
- Slip-around lanes for Township roads

Preliminary Design Alternatives

Preliminary design alternatives are site specific design solutions, generated to implement the recommended planning solution.

The list of preliminary design alternatives includes:

- Cross Section Alternatives:
  - Alternative 1: 2-lane rural cross-section, widening to the west
  - Alternative 2: 2-lane rural cross-section, widening on centre
  - Alternative 3: 2-lane rural cross-section, widening to the east
  - Alternative 4: 2-lane semi-urban cross-section with MUP

- Intersection Alternatives (County Road 20/County Road 18):
  - Unsignalized Slip-around Lane
  - Unsignalized Left Turn Lane
  - Conventional Signalized
  - Roundabout

- Intersection Alternatives (County Road 20/County Road 23):
  - Unsignalized Flashing Red
  - Conventional Signalized
  - Roundabout

These alternatives are illustrated on the following exhibits.
Next Steps

Following this meeting we will:

- Review all PIC No. 1 comments and prepare Summary Report
- Review all Community Café comments and prepare Summary Report
- Modify of Add Preliminary Design Alternatives
- Evaluate Alternatives
- Host PIC No. 2 – Spring 2019
- Finalize the Preliminary Recommended Plans
- File the Environmental Study Report – Spring 2019
- Detail Design – Summer 2019
- PIC No. 3 – Summer 2019

How can you remain involved in the Study?

- Request that your name/e-mail be added to the mailing list
- Provide a completed comment sheet
- Contact the County’s representative or the consultant at any time

Any of our representatives that are present can assist you with the above activities.

Thank you for your participation in tonight’s meeting.

Your input into this study is valuable and appreciated.

Please provide your completed comment form on or before December 14, 2018.

All information is collected in accordance with the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

Appendix B

Community Café Presentation
Project Introduction

- The County of Peterborough initiated this Environmental Assessment (EA) Study for the reconstruction of CR20 from CR18 to CR23.
- The Recommended Plan will include recommendations covering:
  - Cross-section, intersection, drainage and cycling facility improvements
  - Phasing of the reconstruction including interim rehabilitation alternatives

EA Approach

- The study will complete all necessary phases of the Municipal Class EA (Schedule C)
  - Reconstruction of new roads or other linear paved facilities (e.g. HOV lanes) > $2.4 M
Work Program

Phase 1 - Step 1 Data Collection
- Project Start-up
- Information Gathering
- Study Design

Phase 2 - Identify Constraints and Opportunities
- Community Café to identify Constraints and Opportunities
- Public Information Centre to present Alternative Solutions
- Environmental Review
- Development of Corridor and Intersection Improvements
- Development of Interim Improvements

Study Area

Study Design
- A Draft Study Design document was prepared to describe the study’s process and work plan
- The Draft Study Design is available for review on the County’s website:
  www.ptbocounty.ca/construction

Work Program

Phase 3 - Develop Preliminary Design Alternatives
- Cross-Section
- Intersection
- Cycling
- Drainage

Phase 4 – Environmental Study Report
- Preparation of Draft and Final Report
- Documentation of Methodology, Findings and Recommendations
Key Issues

County Road 20/Selwyn Road Issues

- Intersection is in a 50 km/h zone but vehicles do not operate at this speed
- Operational improvement alternatives to be reviewed
- Intersection located with a crest curve to the east
- No existing facilities for cyclists/pedestrians
- Recommendation of the ATMP plan is for paved shoulders
- Posted speed transitions to 80 km/h immediately east of intersection
- To the west there is a transition zone into urban Bridgenorth which uses chevrons

- Pavement edge breakup – high maintenance costs can be reduced by the use of paved shoulders
- Poor pavement condition - rolling, edge break-up and rutting of travel lanes
- Safety of horizontal and vertical curvature on north approach to Country Road 18 intersection
- Osprey nest on Bell / Hydro pole
- High volume of heavy trucks (aggregates)
- Tourist destination (Buckhorn and Bobcaygeon) with peak tourist traffic volumes and influx of non-local traffic

- Areas with eroding backslopes onto agricultural fields
- Visibility of field entrances
- Areas of narrow right-of-way (66 ft wide) cannot accommodate standard shoulder widths and flat 3:1 foreslopes
- Constraints to widening the platform
- Safety of Pebble Beach Road (view of crest curve to the south)
- Hidden intersections posted at 60 km/h at Long Point/Holden Road intersection
County Road 20/Selwyn Road Issues

- Skew angles of a cross roads – Holden Road
- Likelihood for presence of Bobolink, Eastern Meadowlark and Least Bittern SAR on adjacent fields
- Specimen trees within ditch line / hedgerows
- No daylight triangles at intersections (example Poplar Point Road)
- Historic 66 ft (20 m) ROW would be considered substandard for a County Road where 26 m or 30 m are current standards

County Road 20/Selwyn Road Issues

- Mature trees within clear zone measured at 7’-6” from travelled lane
- Mature trees negate effectiveness of winter grit/salt with shade impacting ability of salt to melt ice
- School bus drop-off and pick-up
- 10th Line /Smith intersection on a curve
- No room for ditches affects pavement drainage
- Potential for Multi-use Path (MUP) behind hedgerow
- Birch Island Selwyn Beach Conversion Area destination

Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Start-Up Meeting</td>
<td>September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Planning Workshop</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Commencement Notice</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Gathering</td>
<td>October – November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Analysis</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Cafe/PIC No. 1</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Alternatives</td>
<td>December 2018 to January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and Evaluation of Alternatives</td>
<td>Winter 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Review</td>
<td>March – May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIC No. 2</td>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of ESR</td>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Review of ESR</td>
<td>Spring/Summer 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary and Detail Design</td>
<td>Spring/Summer 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIC No. 3 (during Detail Design)</td>
<td>Spring/Summer 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cross Section Alternatives

Alternative 3

Alternative 4

Community Café

Café Process

- Participants will be divided into small groups to allow conversations and dialogue
- At the conclusion of a discussion period, participants will be asked to change tables and mix between topics
- Participants are free to sit out a session
- A recorder will make notes of the discussion of problems and potential solutions, and invoke questions to generate discussion
Café Approach

- Focus on dialogue between neighbours
- We are here to listen to your values and priorities
- Informal discussion of topics
- Encouraged to doodle sketches
- Build consensus of perspectives
- Discussion will be recorded

Sample Doodle

Small Group Discussions

Tonight's Café Discussion Topics

- Context Sensitive Design Approach
- Road Safety
- Traffic Operations
- Property Issues
Appendix C
Newspaper Notice and Flyer

Notice of Study Commencement
County of Peterborough
County Road 20 Reconstruction
Environmental Assessment Study

Introduction
The County of Peterborough has initiated a Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Study for the reconstruction of County Road 20 from County Road 18 to County Road 23 (approximately 9.5 km). This study will provide recommendations for staged improvements to the roadway, including cross section alternatives, intersection alternatives, Active Transportation facilities and drainage. The EA will determine if property acquisition is required to implement the project. There is a possibility for an interim improvement phase, which will be explored during this study.

Study Process
The County Road 20 Reconstruction EA Study is being conducted as a Schedule "C" EA Study under the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (2007), as amended in 2016. The Study will complete Phases 1 to 4 of the Class EA Process by establishing the need and justification for the project, considering all reasonable alternatives with acceptable effects on the natural, social and cultural environments, and proactively involving the public.

Public Consultation
A draft Study Design is available on the County’s website www.p彼得borough.ca/environment. The draft Study Design describes the study approach, study process, alternatives under study and public consultation program.

A Public Information Centre (PIC) and Community Café will be held on Thursday, November 29, 2018 to help define the study scope and issues. Persons wishing to participate in the Community Café should contact the EA Project Manager below to register. The Community Café/PIC No. 1 is scheduled for:

Date: Thursday, November 29, 2018
Public Information Centre Time: 6:00 pm – 9:00 pm (drop-in)
Community Café Time: 7:00 pm – 9:00 pm (by registration)
Location: Lakefield-Smith Community Centre (Niles Find Room)

There is an opportunity at any time during the Class EA process for interested persons to provide comments. All information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (2009). With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record. Persons will be advised of future communication opportunities by electronic notice.

For more information, to register for the Community Café, or if you wish to be placed on the study’s mailing list, contact either:

Steve Taylor, P.Eng.
EA Project Manager
BT Engineering Inc.
100 Craig Henry Drive, Suite 201
Ottawa, Ontario K2G 5V3
Tel: 613-228-4813
Fax: 613-228-1205
Email: steven.taylor@bteng.ca

Doug Beconorola, P.Eng.
Project Manager
County of Peterborough
470 Water Street
Peterborough, Ontario, K9J 3M3
Tel: 705-775-2373 Ext. 3201
Email: dbeconorola@peteence.ca

This notice issued November 22, 2018.
Appendix D

Comment Sheets

County of Peterborough  County Road 20 Reconstruction
Environmental Assessment and Detail Design
Public Information Centre No. 1
Thursday, November 29, 2018

Thank you for attending tonight’s public meeting. Please provide your comments on any of the material presented.

- Dear interesting and informative
- Like the format of the round table discussion
- Dear favourable on having the last option (bike trails) put in place.

(Please turn over if additional space is required.)

Please complete your comment sheet this evening and place in the comment box provided OR send your completed comment sheet by Friday, December 14, 2018 to:

Doug Saccocia, P.Eng.
Project Manager
County of Peterborough
470 Water Street
Peterborough, Ontario, K9H 3M3
Tel: 705-775-2737 ext. 5201
Email: Dsaccocia@peterborough.ca

Steve Taylor, P.Eng.
EA Project Manager
BT Engineering Inc.
100 Greg Henry Drive, Suite 201
Ottawa, Ontario K2G 5W3
Tel: (613) 228-4813 Fax: 1 (613) 280-1306
Email: steven.taylor@btengineer.ca
County of Peterborough County Road 20 Reconstruction
Environmental Assessment and Detail Design
Public Information Centre No. 1
Thursday, November 29, 2018

Thank you for attending tonight’s public meeting. Please provide your comments on any of the material presented.

Informative evening. Residents had good opportunity to voice concerns. Hopefully concerns will be taken into serious consideration by the county.

(Please turn over if additional space is required.)

Please complete your comment sheet this evening and place in the comment box provided OR send your completed comment sheet by Friday, December 14, 2018 to:

Doug Saccocia, P.Eng.
Project Manager
County of Peterborough
470 Water Street
Peterborough, Ontario, K9H 3M3
Tel: 705-778-2737 ext. 3201
Email: dsaccocia@pbcounty.ca

Steve Taylor, P.Eng.
EA Project Manager
BT Engineering Inc.
100 Craig Henry Drive, Suite 201
Ottawa, Ontario K2G 5W3
Tel: (613) 228-4813 Fax: 1 (613) 280-1305
Email: steven.taylor@bteng.ca

(Please turn over if additional space is required.)

Please complete your comment sheet this evening and place in the comment box provided OR send your completed comment sheet by Friday, December 14, 2018 to:

Doug Saccocia, P.Eng.
Project Manager
County of Peterborough
470 Water Street
Peterborough, Ontario, K9H 3M3
Tel: 705-778-2737 ext. 3201
Email: dsaccocia@pbcounty.ca

Steve Taylor, P.Eng.
EA Project Manager
BT Engineering Inc.
100 Craig Henry Drive, Suite 201
Ottawa, Ontario K2G 5W3
Tel: (613) 228-4813 Fax: 1 (613) 280-1305
Email: steven.taylor@bteng.ca
I hope that you might take the time to come out to the Community Café scheduled on November 29th. It will be a discussion of neighbours who have the most knowledge of actual observations of issues on the road.

See you on the 29th.

Steve

---

On Nov 19, 2018, at 2:15 PM, Steve Taylor <steven.taylor@bteng.ca> wrote:

Thank you for taking the time to compose this extremely useful comment on the road operations in your area. It will be recorded as the first public comment for our public meeting.

---

Dear Mr. Taylor,

(Please note I had composed this letter after the accident listed below of November 7, 2018 but since then have received the letter from BT Engineering so I am aware of any future plans. I have also gone on the website to look at the Study Design.)

I am writing to you in regard to the high number of accidents that have taken place at this location on Selwyn Road. They have all occurred with drivers heading north on Selwyn Road and losing control on the curve in the section of the road that starts some distance before my driveway. Thankfully, as far as I know there have been no serious injuries yet. I have not always been home to witness when these accidents have occurred. It is so extremely fortunate that there has not been a vehicle coming from the opposite direction when these drivers have lost control. Depending on their location on the road at the time, drivers heading south would have no chance of avoiding a collision with the out of control vehicles. My fence sections have been replaced more than once as well as mailboxes and the wooden post (3 mailboxes on one post).
1. October 2005. Full size pick up. Dry roads  Afternoon. Destroyed 4 fence sections, tree and bushes. Vehicle came to a stop about 300 feet down the slope into the hayfield on my property.

2. About 3 or 4 years ago (summer). Car. Landed on roof in ditch on the other side of the road directly across from my fence.

3. October 2014. SUV. Damp roads. Late afternoon/early evening. Destroyed fence sections on both sides of driveway, green metal address sign, mailboxes and post. Ended up in my front yard - rollover. Apparently passenger was trapped in vehicle for a couple of hours until she could be freed by emergency crews.

4. October 2015. Car. Dry roads. Afternoon. Destroyed 2 sections of my fence and ended up being wedged against the cable that anchors hydro pole into the ground.

5. October 2016. SUV. Damp roads. Possibly afternoon. Destroyed 2 sections of my fence, bushes, mailboxes and post.

6. September 21, 2018. Full size pick up. Damp roads. Around 5 p.m. Ended up in ditch on the other side of the road across from my fence. Destroyed hydro pole and transformer. Hydro wires strewn across the road. Hydro One crews worked all night to restore power. Power restored 7 a.m. the next morning.


I have seen other less serious incidents where vehicles have ended up nose first in the ditches (emergency services not needed) or seen evidence of incidents where shoulder/grass has been gouged and broken branches on lilac bushes on other side of the road.

I am fearful of cutting the grass, clearing the snow, going to the mailbox or doing any kind of yard maintenance anywhere near that area. I would think the Canada Post mail deliverer would also have some concern when stopping at the mailboxes. After the accident of November 7, 2018 I have presently decided not to replace the destroyed fence section again (this section was replaced just over a year ago from the accident the previous year) as I have no confidence it will stay intact for any length of time.

Another issue is that when there is an accident I or other people have had to hurry back up the straight stretch before the curve to flag traffic heading north to slow down or take Birch Island Road as a detour until Selwyn Township Fire Department arrives to take over redirecting traffic. Due to the curve in the road drivers (some, of course, driving over the speed limit) on the straight stretch cannot see the accident scene until they are nearly upon it. Again, fortunately so far these accidents have not been made worse by drivers who suddenly come upon the scene and are unable to react.

Hopefully some kind of upgrade will be in the planning to make this part of the road safe for drivers in both directions? I believe the situation is getting urgent (2 accidents in just over 6 weeks this fall alone) and that it is just a matter of time before something dreadful happens.

I have attached some of my photos for your information.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely yours

Looking south from my driveway after full size pick up truck accident of November 7, 2018.

Looking north along fence line after car accident of October 2015. Vehicle destroyed 2 sections of fence and ended wedged up against hydro pole cable and remaining fence section.

Looking north after SUV accident of October 2014. Fence sections on both sides of driveway damaged. Vehicle ended up as a roll over on front yard.
Hi Doug & Steve,

I attended the meeting last week, and I found the materials were very informative, and the discussion following review of the presentation, was also good and helpful. In particular, the consensus on the type of road agreeing on the last alternative, and even the idea of having it designated as a Character Road - much lower speeds, modifications to allow for walking paths and bike paths, and elimination of the heavy truck travel on the road. I have only been in this neighbourhood for 2 years, and in that short period of time, the large commercial/industrial dump trucks and tandem trucks have exploded in use in the last year. I also think if you review the road conditions over the last year, you would note the road has significantly deteriorated with the weight and frequency of use by these vehicles. The safety conditions have also deteriorated as the weight in some areas is not sufficient to allow for oncoming traffic to pass safely and people are sometimes forced to the shoulder when there are several trucks in the oncoming lane.

I would also like to bring to your attention this past Saturday, Dec. 1, 2018 a further tragic accident claimed another life, and left 1 person critically injured, and 2 people (maybe 3) in serious condition with a head on collision on Selwyn Rd. south of the Buckhorn 4 way stop. I understand road conditions and speed were part of the cause and I'm sure you can get further details from the OPP. The road was apparently closed until after 2 a.m. on Sunday.

I am interested in doing something to initiate a change in speed and types of vehicles on the road and if there is any ideas or information you can provide to assist it would be appreciated. We (my family and neighbours) are concerned when we enter Selwyn Rd. from our driveway or exit back into our driveway, particularly during peak travel times - 7 to 9 a.m., and 4 to 6 p.m. The area has a significant amount of local traffic with all the feeder streets from the lake, and the significant increase in truck traffic at 80 Km/hr speeds is making conditions unsafe. I would hate to hear of further incidents particularly when this issue is being highlighted in the local neighbourhood and by the County.

Please pass along any information that would assist.
If you have any questions, please call or email.

Best Regards,
County of Peterborough County Road 20 Reconstruction
Environmental Assessment and Detail Design
Public Information Centre No. 1
Thursday, November 29, 2018

Thank you for attending tonight’s public meeting. Please provide your comments on any of the material presented.

- Roads: I have been made at the meeting favor techniques for traffic flow to City Rd. 23
- Reduction speed limit from 60 km/h to 50 km/h
- Construction of walking path/bicycle lane along the road
- Improve drainage in potential flood areas

(Please turn over if additional space is required.)

Please complete your comment sheet this evening and place in the comment box provided OR send your completed comment sheet by Friday, December 14, 2018 to:

Doug Saccomoia, P.Eng.
Project Manager
County of Peterborough
470 Water Street
Peterborough, Ontario, K9H 3M3
Tel: 705-777-2737 ext. 3201
Email: d.saccomoia@pbcounty.ca

Steve Taylor, P.Eng.
EA Project Manager
BT Engineering Inc.
102 Craig Henry Drive, Suite 201
Ottawa, Ontario K2G 5W3
Tel: (613) 228-4813 Fax: 1 (613) 280-1305
Email: steven.taylor@bteng.ca

Personal Information contained on this form is being collected pursuant to the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act and will be used for the purpose of responding to your request. Questions about this collection should be directed to the County Project Manager.

County of Peterborough County Road 20 Reconstruction
Environmental Assessment and Detail Design
Public Information Centre No. 1
Thursday, November 29, 2018

Thank you for attending tonight’s public meeting. Please provide your comments on any of the material presented.

- No speed limit on County Road 20 from County Road 23 to County Road 8.
- Tagger trailers of all types, including dump trucks to County Road 8.
- Boxes are always a hazard, unless there’s a pick-up or delivery between County Road 23 and County Road 8.
- Reduce road width and surface area with shoulders and all signs.
- Particularly at the many intersections along the route (for example, intersection) and at each gate which leaves the fields. Surface the same width.
- Standpipe stops where the road for the whole lane separated from road adjacent to the pipeline.
- Present maximum speed limit of 60 km/h to the road property for residential areas.
- Farm property to be used for expansion from the farm boundary. The fence is necessary both to the farm and to create a managed farm property line - not power line.
- Reduce speed limits to 50 km/h on the west side. They can be reached at the original farm property line.
- Around the 50% “slow and take” and slow traffic.
- Additional measures at the intersection. Slow down, slow down, slow down, slow down.
- For safety, all property owners should be informed as power lines passed right of a 50% line or right on the same side. This is not a good idea.

(Please turn over if additional space is required.)

Please complete your comment sheet this evening and place in the comment box provided OR send your completed comment sheet by Friday, December 14, 2018 to:

Doug Saccomoia, P.Eng.
Project Manager
County of Peterborough
470 Water Street
Peterborough, Ontario, K9H 3M3
Tel: 705-777-2737 ext. 3201
Email: d.saccomoia@pbcounty.ca

Steve Taylor, P.Eng.
EA Project Manager
BT Engineering Inc.
102 Craig Henry Drive, Suite 201
Ottawa, Ontario K2G 5W3
Tel: (613) 228-4813 Fax: 1 (613) 280-1305
Email: steven.taylor@bteng.ca

Personal Information contained on this form is being collected pursuant to the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act and will be used for the purpose of responding to your request. Questions about this collection should be directed to the County Project Manager.
Mr. Steve Taylor and Mr. Doug Saccoccia

For the record

Sirs. Please find my below my observations, notes and recommendations in regard the proposed reconstruction of the Selwyn Road otherwise known as County road 20.

We have been resident at this property for over 40 years throughout which we have observed all the changes to the roadway from it’s use as a sedate gravel country road to what has become a high speed short cut to cottages to the north and as a commercial artery serving an ever increasing, commercial roadway serving heavy transport.

The dramatic change to the road commenced with the adjustment of the roadbed at the turn to the north west at our property. This adjustment raised the roadbed by 3 feet at our driveway entry to near 6 feet approximately 100 feet to the south west. I imagine this was a good faith effort to make the turn at our home, know locally as “The House in the Middle of the road” for decades, safe for the increasing traffic over the years.

The sad fact is that all the past “improvements” managed to accomplish was to increase the speed on the road from the maximum historical speed of 80 kilometers per hour to the current speed of between 100 and 110 and as your Police reports confirm a significant increase in accidents. I’m sure that this study is attempting to mitigate these unintended outcomes. We wish you well in this important work and as our neighbour has observed we have
been lucky until last weekend to avoid fatalities and that your efforts will go some way in providing a suitable remedy.

NOTES

1. As noted above it is our observation that since the raising of the road bed to accommodate the safe taking of the curve, the result has been an increase in the speed of traffic by 25% as well as a dramatic increase in accidents.
2. The evidence suggests that most if not all accidents occur in the fall in the months of October and November in wet weather when the air temperature is slightly above 0 degrees.
3. The evidence shows that skids occur just past the apex of the curve when heading north causing drivers, to make adjustments to the north, into oncoming traffic in order to avoid the Hydro pole at our driveway causing the vehicle to cross the road ending up on the Stanton property.
4. Inasmuch as there is little room allocated to the shoulder at the entryway to our property as well as that of our neighbour to the south I have observed many near misses caused by the speed of traffic following, braking or swerving into the oncoming lane when we slow to a crawl to negotiate entry to our driveways.
5. We have noticed a dramatic increase in the salt levels in our century old surface well that I submit is caused by the drainage insufficiency of the salt contained in the snow wind rows that accumulate in the winter between our drive and.
6. Some 30 years ago when built the home now occupied by I asked him why he had chosen a site so far back from the road to which he postulated that it was inevitable that the roadbed would be moved towards his prospective site. It seemed obvious at least him that the roadbed would eventually require adjustment. This was before the raising of the roadbed.
7. Should the line of the roadbed remain as it is now, I should think, that the substantial lilac bushes at our road frontage will be substantially affected. This is of great concern as these bushes act as a filter for the great deal of fine particulate matter made airborne by traffic which invades our home in summer as well as a providing a windbreak in winter. They have also served as a soft landing for those vehicles that have left the road acting as a natural guard rail.

OBSERVATIONS

1. If one is travelling from Selwyn south west one can easily observe that beginning within 100 feet to the north of the intersection at the 11th line the road turns approximately 10 to 12 degrees to the south west thereby increasing the arc of the curve heading south west which we know has already proven problematic.
2. There appears to be a slight subsidence of a few inches slope of the roadbed just past the apex of the curve which may explain the loss of control of cars heading north during the fall.
3. Despite Police efforts to control the speed on the road it has had no effect and the speeds only increase.
4. There has been a geometric growth in the number and weight of heavy commercial vehicles over the years since the development of quarries near Buckhorn.
5. There has also been a dramatic increase in automobile traffic no doubt caused by the increase in the number of cottages turned into permanent dwellings, increasing use of cottages during the winter months as well as the use of the road as a bypass of Lakefield to points north of Young’s Point especially since the improvement of the roadbed on County between Selwyn and Youngs point.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Whichever grade of improvement to the road is finally chosen I submit that the roadbed be moved to the north commencing at the 11th line decreasing the arc of the curve and allowing for an increase to the width of the shoulder on both sides at the 3 closely located driveways.
2. That all efforts be made to decrease the rate of speed on the road.
3. That all heavy commercial traffic be diverted to County 18.
4. That bicycle traffic be accommodated.
5. That accommodation be made for deceleration and entry to the 3 closely located entries on the curve.
6. That the ramp entry to be widen and made less steep so as to allow safe entry of farm machinery.
7. That the lilac bushes be retained or equivalent structures be constructed to mitigate fine particle infiltration to our home and replace the wind break provided by same.
8. That the salt infiltration to our well be addressed.

Thanks to all that attended the public meeting recently who kindly addressed our questions. It is my hope that you find our comments to be of some help and we remain

Yours truly
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Evidence shows that Complete Streets provide better and more transportation options, improve safety for vulnerable road users, reduce traffic congestion, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and create more walkable and livable communities. Additionally, this recommendation aligns with our Board of Health’s Complete Streets Position Statement (passed on November 13, 2013) in response to the growing body of research that demonstrates the public health benefits associated with Complete Streets.

### Inclusion of walking and cycling infrastructure as part of the final design.
- During the County of Peterborough’s Active Transportation Master Plan consultations residents’ cited a strong interest in the expansion and update of the County’s active transportation network.
- Physical activity from active transportation has very important health benefits, including significantly reducing the risk of all-cause mortality, cardiovascular disease, obesity, type II diabetes, and certain types of cancer.
- Walking and cycling provide affordable, basic transport. Physically, economically and socially disadvantaged people often rely on walking and cycling, so improving active transport can help achieve social equity and economic opportunity objectives.
- This project provides an opportunity to include pedestrian and cycling facilities in a location that there is currently none. This will increase access to points of interest in the area such as Selwyn beach, as well as increase the safety of roads for all users and add to the existing network to strengthen connectivity.

### Inclusion of safety elements to reduce the risk of injury for all road users.
- Safety on rural roads is an important consideration, given the potential for collisions at higher speeds to have more severe injuries. Although the full collision information for County Road 20 was not available at the PIC, the collision information presented indicated that safety is a major issue on this road. Since the PIC there has also been a collision-related fatal injury in the study area. Therefore, we recommend that collision information and safety be prioritized in the final design for County Rd 20.
- Traffic calming measures have shown to be effective in reducing collisions and injuries, traffic speed and volume, and may also improve the perception of safety. Traffic calming measures may include a variety of strategies to reduce speed and improve safety such as: reduced speed limits, roundabouts, raised intersections, sidewalks, landscaping, narrow lanes, and cyclist/pedestrian priority areas.
- The County of Peterborough’s Active Transportation Master Plan identifies County Road 20 as a planned project and recommends paved shoulders, however Cross Section Alternative #4 which includes a multi-use pathway, would be preferred choice for this road as it provides separated cycling and pedestrian facilities. Separation of cyclists/pedestrians and motor vehicles becomes increasingly important as traffic volumes and speeds increase. This design alternative also has a narrow cross section compared to the alternatives, and there is evidence to suggest that narrow lane width reduces travel speed, decreases the likelihood of collisions, and reduces severity of injury in the event of collisions. The speed a vehicle is travelling impacts both the probability of collisions and the severity of injury. If this design is chosen, it would be important to consider safety in any road crossing areas including the beginning and end of the trail, as users can be more vulnerable to collisions at these points.
- It is important to also consider the intersections in the study. Intersections are the site of a large proportion of injuries between cyclists and vehicles and pedestrians and vehicles. In 2013, 68% of all bicycle collisions and 66% of pedestrian injuries and fatalities in Ontario were intersection related. Roundabouts have been found to reduce collision frequency and severity as compared to signalized intersections by reducing speed and the number of conflict points, particularly in the case of single-lane roundabouts. Intersection alternatives for both County Road 20/County Road 18 and County Road 20/County road 23 include a roundabout as an option and we recommend choosing this option as it both increases safety and allows for increased traffic capacity.
- Signage is an important part of a pedestrian and cyclist safety strategy, and evidence shows that it can contribute to decreased injury. There should be signage to explain the requirements for vehicles, but also separate signage for cyclists and pedestrians.

### Ensuring accessible year-round design.
- Transportation networks are important multi-season public spaces. As traffic volumes grow, it will be important to ensure that the chosen design is accessible to all users (regardless of age and ability) and maintained year-round. This means that the final design chosen should allow for adequate snow and ice removal to prevent falls, collisions and other injuries to all users of this space (pedestrian, cyclist, and driver).

### Maintain tree canopy and shade.
- Cross section alternative 4 allows for preservation of some of the existing mature trees, and we recommend that the final designs include as many mature living trees as possible. This can be done by limiting the removal of current trees or by the implementation of a mature tree planting strategy as soon as the construction phase is complete.
- Trees improve air quality by removing CO2 from the atmosphere. Trees also provide shade, which has many benefits including:
  - a reduction in ultraviolet radiation (UV) overexposure; something that has been linked to skin cancer.
  - creates a cooler environment that makes outdoor space more inviting and comfortable for physical activity, relaxation and play.
  - contributes to a sense of place, which also encourages active forms of transportation and fosters mental and physical wellbeing.

In conclusion, PPH would like to thank the County of Peterborough for your consultation on the County Road 20 Reconstruction and for the opportunity to provide comments. If you have any questions or would like additional information about our comments, please do not hesitate to contact:

Manager, Family and Community Health

cc: Doug Saccoccia, Assistant Manager, Engineering & Design, County of Peterborough


6 Toronto Centre for Active Transportation. (no date). What are Complete Streets? Retrieved from: http://completestreetsforcanada.ca/what-are-complete-streets

7 Toronto Centre for Active Transportation. (2012). Complete Streets by design: Toronto streets redesigned for all ages and abilities. Toronto, ON: Author.


10 Ibid.


12 Ibid.


19 Ibid.

20 Ibid.
