

<p style="text-align: center;">Questions / Comments for Website</p> <p>Add note: "Everyone who provided comments on the virtual PIC has been added to the project contact list. Comments have been modified to remove personal details for privacy purposes. "</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">CIMA+ Response</p>
<p>I want to say that the presentation here was excellent and the process was well thought out and executed. I agree, the option 1C is the best solution and least impactful to all considerations...including the First & Second Welland Canals lands, extant locks and in-situ associated infrastructures of which there are several (partially buried weirs etc). Great solution. Well done City of St Catharines!</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation and we appreciate your comment, and your in-depth knowledge of the area.</p>
<p>I think that 1C is an excellent choice and the best and cheapest way to go. This also leaves 3B and 3A to remain part of the Merritt trail and to be used for access by emergency vehicles only as agreed to back in 2012 with CN rail and City of St. Catharines when the crossing was put in. Also, maybe this will prompt the powers that be to do something about the auto repair and scrap yard at the corner of Abbot and Oakdale which presents problems for pedestrian and vehicular traffic alike. The police are there on a regular basis but nothing ever seems to get done. I would like to thank everyone involved in this project and hope it comes to fruition soon.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation and we appreciate your comment.</p>
<p>I would like to thank everyone involved in this project and hope it comes to fruition soon.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation and we appreciate your comment.</p>
<p>3A or 3B to Chestnut is my choice, maintaining the Merritt Trail, a rail crossing would be easy and 'cheap' compared to a bridge over the old canal, risking damage to it, and as for risk of rail crossing, the traffic volume of Moffat would be very low compared to how there used to be many busy rail crossings in St Catharines and Thorold that people coped with safely, including trains sharing streets with vehicles and people, and Glendale east of Merritt Street still has massive traffic volume and people and passing a park with a playground all coping very safely with the busiest rail crossing we have. The \$ 100 million money saved not doing a bridge should go to</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation and we appreciate your comment. In response to your comments on a rail crossing. Installing a new rail crossing would have to comply with Transport Canada standards, and it would cost in the region of \$5 million to install. This is why 3A and 3B were screened out.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Questions / Comments for Website</p> <p>Add note: "Everyone who provided comments on the virtual PIC has been added to the project contact list. Comments have been modified to remove personal details for privacy purposes. "</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">CIMA+ Response</p>
<p>preserving the old Welland Canals Heritage and prepping for the Bicentennial of 1824 start of construction and 1829 Opening the 1st Welland Canal.</p>	
<p>Congratulations on a well constructed presentation which clarifies the problem and proposal. The investigative process seems to be thorough and includes very important considerations. I endorse the proposed location for all of the reasons presented. I have invested a lot of time and effort over the past 10 years with the cooperation of many neighbours. I would, however, propose that the least amount of natural growth be destroyed in the construction process, especially the mature trees along the canal. Construction developments have driven wildlife to seek refuge along the canal and they deserve consideration in the building of the bridge. This location should best accommodate this request since the property on the east side is vacant and devoid of natural habitat. One other consideration is imperative. The automotive complex at the corner of Oakdale and Abbot presents impediment to both traffic and pedestrian safety because of the manner in which it is run. The City officials are well aware and it has been thus for years. City officials have been unsuccessful in convincing the owners/ operators to improve their methods of organizing client cars and coordinating oncoming traffic when large tow trucks and other trucks as well as cars present an obstruction. Cars are even parked along the west side of Oakdale to add to the maelstrom. It is survival of the fittest with no one taking responsibility; we have to wait until they get around to moving vehicles at their own speed, rarely acknowledging to motorists that they are aware of their presence!</p> <p>The addition of this new access will now compound the problem considerably. The City will have to adopt an aggressive strategy to resolve this issue now that more cars will be coming to that crossroad simultaneously.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation and we appreciate your comment. As a part of the Environmental Assessment process, a natural heritage assessment is completed to ensure that there is minimal impact to the environment. The Natural Heritage Assessment Report will be appended to the Environmental Study Report, submitted at the end of this Study.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Questions / Comments for Website</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Add note: "Everyone who provided comments on the virtual PIC has been added to the project contact list. Comments have been modified to remove personal details for privacy purposes. "</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">CIMA+ Response</p>
<p>Although I am very grateful and pleased that we are seeing this project go forward, a comprehensive approach will be necessary to make it truly serve this community.</p>	
<p>Can someone explain to me why option 2A is not a viable because of traffic safety? Tying into an existing intersection makes more sense then creating another side street further down on Oakdale. Traffic flow in this area is already horrible. So much for trying to save our tree canopy in the city. I am stating now that I am against the location of 1C. I commented earlier about my opposition to the preferred location 1C. After watching the video I understand more of what is being proposed and I am now more open to this possibility. We will see what transpires in the meetings ahead. Thank you for allowing comments.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation and we appreciate your comment. Alternative 2A was not a viable option because the tight curve required does not conform to design standards of a typical collector roadway.</p>
<p>I do not want access from Abbot to Marshal lane. I fear it will bring too much traffic into a very quiet neighbourhood. Will there be a 4 way stop at Moffat if we go this route? I would prefer the Gloryhill option. I would also like to see the merit trail between Moffat and Sobeys be improved as many pedestrians use it and currently it is not lit at night and is used to dump garbage. We need to highlight the history of the old canal.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation and we appreciate your comment. Impacts to traffic operations on the surrounding network will be further assessed in this next phase of the study. The final design, including intersection details, will be presented at Public Information Centre #2. Heritage has also been a consideration of this study and a Cultural Heritage Assessment Report will be appended to the Environmental Study Report, completed at the end of this study.</p>
<p>I support this decision of going forward with alternative 4</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation and we appreciate your comment.</p>
<p>1C, do it!!</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation and we appreciate your comment.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Questions / Comments for Website</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Add note: "Everyone who provided comments on the virtual PIC has been added to the project contact list. Comments have been modified to remove personal details for privacy purposes. "</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">CIMA+ Response</p>
<p>Having given my contact information will I be privy to the environmental study report by email and throughout the process? What are the cultural heritage resources that maybe impacted? Who will bear the cost of this project and does this impact our property taxes and if so how and when? Would the purchase of the industrial land be included in the estimated cost of 3.2M?</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation and we appreciate your comment. In response to your questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - You have been added to the study contact list and will be notified when the Environmental Study Report is submitted and available for public review. You will also be notified of other consultation milestones (i.e. PIC #2) prior to study completion. - A Cultural Heritage Assessment has been completed as part of the study and will be appended to the Environmental Study Report. Alternatives 1C and 4 do not have any direct impacts to cultural heritage resources. - The costs will be taken on by the City, subject to funding and municipal priority. - The estimated cost of Alt. 1C includes an estimated property cost.
<p>if you go ahead with plan 1c and purchase the industrial land, do you have any ideas at this time of what will be done with land on either side of the new proposed road ie expand the green belt or more housing?</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation and we appreciate your comment. In response to your questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - You have been added to the study contact list and will be notified when the Environmental Study Report is submitted and available for public review. You will also be notified of other consultation milestones (i.e. PIC #2) prior to study completion.

<p style="text-align: center;">Questions / Comments for Website</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Add note: "Everyone who provided comments on the virtual PIC has been added to the project contact list. Comments have been modified to remove personal details for privacy purposes. "</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">CIMA+ Response</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A Cultural Heritage Assessment has been completed as part of the study and will be appended to the Environmental Study Report. Alternatives 1C and 4 do not have any direct impacts to cultural heritage resources. - The costs will be taken on by the City, subject to funding and municipal priority. <p>The estimated cost of Alt. 1C includes an estimated property cost.</p>
<p>I have all along thought, for the past 2 years, it would be easiest to extend across from Marshall Lane to Oakdale! So I definitely agree and vote for 1C Alternative from Marshall lane to Abbott. That makes the most sense, will be more straightforward. Thank you for making this happen for our neighbourhood.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation and we appreciate your comment.</p>
<p>Thank you for making this happen for our neighbourhood.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation and we appreciate your comment.</p>
<p>I would think 1C would be the best</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation and we appreciate your comment.</p>
<p>Great choice!</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation and we appreciate your comment.</p>
<p>This proposed bridge will only benefit residents living in the very southerly end of Moffatt St. as everyone else living in the area will still be using the Disher St. Bridge the majority of the time. Why spend all this money to benefit such a small percentage of the residents in the area? Another issue is that having to purchase the land on Oakdale in order to put a road through it would ruin the development potential of that land. Using some of this budget money on acquiring land is unnecessary when there are other solutions available that don't</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation and we appreciate your comment.</p> <p>The aim of this study is to investigate improvement opportunities that would remove the reliance on a single access to Moffatt Street. An emergency / construction situation that closes the Disher Street crossing would also likely close another access within the immediate</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Questions / Comments for Website</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Add note: "Everyone who provided comments on the virtual PIC has been added to the project contact list. Comments have been modified to remove personal details for privacy purposes. "</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">CIMA+ Response</p>
<p>require land acquisition (i.e. twinning Disher bridge). Running a road through the Oakdale land would eliminate future residential development & tax dollar revenue as well. Finally, I believe the proposed access point would ruin the aesthetic of the Moffatt. St. area. Currently it is nestled away from all the activity on Oakdale Avenue. Residents in the area already have to deal with noise from the adjacent 406 and this proposed bridge would further increase the vehicular & pedestrian traffic activity in the area. I believe none of the solutions proposed are the best use of tax payers money. The best use of tax payers money would be to twin or widen the Disher St. bridge so that it benefits everyone in the area and can accommodate two way traffic in both lanes in the highly unlikely event that either lane is closed due to an emergency situation. Why has the city not considered an alternate solution of widening and/or twinning the Disher Street bridge so that it can accommodate two way traffic in both lanes in the highly unlikely event that either lane is shut down? The problem with the two recommended alternate access points is that their extreme locations (one very northerly & one very southerly) only benefits a select group of those on Moffatt; if the one near Glory Hill is built, only those far North of Disher would ever really use it, and if the one near Marshall Lane is built, only those far South of Disher would ever really use it. You are effectively proposing access points that will benefit and be used by 1/4 of the residents in the area the majority of the time. Why not invest the money in a better Disher St. Bridge that everyone will benefit from and be able to use? Spending \$3.2 million-\$4.3 million to build a bridge that will only be used by 1/4 of the residents the majority of time is a complete waste and a horrendous ROI on tax payers money. None of the proposed access points should move forward. The city needs to re-visit this and come back with a proposed</p>	<p>vicinity. Thus, a first step in the screening process was to identify a crossing location that was a fair distance away from Disher Street.</p> <p>To twin or widen Disher Street was not considered as it did not fulfill the study's objective, would be incompatible with the surrounding two-lane road network, and also have impacts to the Old Welland Canal lock, which is a key cultural heritage resource within the study area.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Questions / Comments for Website</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Add note: "Everyone who provided comments on the virtual PIC has been added to the project contact list. Comments have been modified to remove personal details for privacy purposes. "</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">CIMA+ Response</p>
<p>twinning and/or widening of the Disher Street bridge that can double as a secondary access point in an emergency situation as one of the proposed access points.</p>	
<p>1C offers good access to Oakdale forming a 4 corner intersection and is in close proximity to a considerable amount of the new building. This looks like a good and viable option. It would be important to know the impact on cultural heritage especially relative to the walking trail along the old canal. It would be hoped that the walking path can be accommodated and/or enhanced as part of the construction.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation and we appreciate your comment. The final design, including active transportation details, will be presented at Public Information Centre #2. Heritage has also been a consideration of this study and a Cultural Heritage Assessment Report will be appended to the Environmental Study Report, completed at the end of this study.</p>
<p>In BC, developers cram all new commercial and residential development into one end of a neighbourhood. The result was unbalanced urban density which created an insane amount of traffic congestion at two particular intersections, especially during the summer tourist season. So, looking at the proposals, the preferred new access 1C will tie into existing higher traffic areas. I guess that's fine since Moffatt St looks like an older pre-1980s area. But if there is new development, that will increase the traffic burden on existing infrastructure so perhaps alternative 4 might be a better option due to ongoing and future development. Not sure how much of a hazard the bend in the road is. If it's a wide arc it might be safe. Depends on how future-friendly you want to be.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation and we appreciate your comment.</p>
<p>Great work! I think you made the best decision.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation and we appreciate your comment.</p>
<p>The analysis looked fine, however, the problem that is being solved has not been made clear.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation and we appreciate your comment. The problem that is being solved is regarding the single access to Moffatt Street. If there were an</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Questions / Comments for Website</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Add note: "Everyone who provided comments on the virtual PIC has been added to the project contact list. Comments have been modified to remove personal details for privacy purposes. "</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">CIMA+ Response</p>
	<p>emergency situation or construction on Disher Street causing the road to close, there is no access to Moffatt Street which can be a problem if police, fire, or emergency medical services need to access Moffatt Street.</p>
<p>One thing that still exists is that Moffatt St. is hidden to the area neighbourhoods and not visible. I believe the best way to connect these neighbourhoods would be to extend Lincoln Ave. If this plan has already been ruled out, then the next best scenario would be Alternate 4. The recent three way stop at Lincoln Ave. has significantly slowed down the speeds along Oakdale Ave. but I believe another intersection or three way stop before Disher would definitely keep drivers from speeding. I also believe approximately 80% of traffic along Oakdale from Disher flows towards downtown and access to 406 and the QEW. Alternate 4 would make it closer to those areas and to the new hospital for residents on Moffatt street. I would like to see the vacant land in Alternate 1C being used, but that access would flow to a more industrial or deserted area and would lead into a dead end street. Just my thoughts, thank you. Thank you for making this project available and look forward to its completion.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation and we appreciate your comment. The decision between Alternative 1C and 4 considered several factors that included traffic safety. Cost and constructability were also factors and were disadvantages for Alternative 4 when compared to Alternative 1C. The EA process is designed to bring together all considerations and overall, Alternative 1C has been identified as preferred.</p>
<p>Thank you for making this project available and look forward to its completion.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation and we appreciate your comment.</p>
<p>I agree that the option 1c to connect Marshall lane and Abbott street is the better option. With route 4 it is too close to disher street and won't really alleviate much traffic flow with the greater amount of residential area being on the other half of disher.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation and we appreciate your comment.</p>
<p>What would the cost for #4 and #1c be compared to the other options?</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation and we appreciate your comment.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Questions / Comments for Website</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Add note: "Everyone who provided comments on the virtual PIC has been added to the project contact list. Comments have been modified to remove personal details for privacy purposes. "</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">CIMA+ Response</p>
	<p>The cost of the other options was only considered at a high level in the initial screening, as they were ultimately ruled out due to other key disadvantages.</p>
<p>Option 1C certainly appears to be the best choice. I could support it.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation and we appreciate your comment.</p>
<p>I think that 1C is probably the best move, and not just because it'd be really close to where I live.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation and we appreciate your comment.</p>
<p>Has the City considered the tourism value of the heritage canal system? How will any future plans to develop the existing locks into tourism related sites be impacted by this redevelopment? I walk the Merritt Trail everyday and have long considered the old canal/12 mile creek valley to be an underdeveloped opportunity for persons looking for historical tourist activities within the Niagara area not located in NOTL or Niagara Falls. There is nothing in your evaluation checklist to demonstrate that this thought is even on your radar.</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation and we appreciate your comment. Heritage has been a consideration of this study and a Cultural Heritage Assessment Report will be appended to the Environmental Study Report, completed at the end of this study. Impacts to existing and proposed Active Transportation (AT) routes will be considered in this next phase and the final design, including AT details, will be presented at PIC #2.</p>
<p>Having Toured on Foot, the entire Area from Westchester Ave through to the Plaza (Sobeys), the Merritt Trail designated 'parkland' and including roadway's Moffat and Oakdale, the choice of 1C makes it evident that the 1C proposal is the 'Best' possible option. Given the residential density of this neighbourhood, 1C connection of Marshall and Abbott streets will improve traffic flows to Oakdale and Moffat and be sufficiently distanced from Disher Street. ***One note of 'concern' though, is the traffic flows on Oakdale, which currently allow parking on a narrowing path from north to south along Oakdale near the 1C proposed intersection Abbott/Oakdale, impeding oncoming traffic in 'either' direction. The 'concern continues *** with the impediments to traffic flow in front of the Auto Body</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation and we appreciate your comment. Impacts to traffic operations on the surrounding network will be further assessed in this next phase of the study.</p>

<p>Questions / Comments for Website</p> <p>Add note: "Everyone who provided comments on the virtual PIC has been added to the project contact list. Comments have been modified to remove personal details for privacy purposes. "</p>	<p>CIMA+ Response</p>
<p>Shop(s) adjacent to the proposed 1C road connection, where substantial parking congestion on or off the roadway at this commercial site, and in and outflows of vehicle movement including public transportation 'impedes' safe traffic movement and should be considered unsafe! The business operations are more than unsightly to the neighbourhood in their present state (please note I am 'not' anti business what-so-ever!).</p>	