Township of Cramahe Committee of the Whole

Agenda

Meeting #: Meeting#-xx-xxxx
Date: Thursday, August 20, 2020, 6:00 p.m.
Location: Virtual Meeting

1. **MEETING DETAILS**

   Join Zoom Meeting:  https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81065152964

   Meeting ID: 810 6515 2964

   Dial by your location: 1 647 558 0588 / 1 647 374 4685

2. **CALL TO ORDER**

   As we gather, we are reminded that the Township of Cramahe is situated on treaty land that has a rich Indigenous history. As a municipality, we have a responsibility for the stewardship of the land on which we live and work. Today we acknowledge the Anishnabek, Huron-Wendat, Haudenosaunee (Iroquois) and Ojibway/Chippewa on whose traditional territory we are meeting.

   This territory is covered by the Williams Treaty.
3. **RECORDING EQUIPMENT**

In accordance with By-Law 2020-17, members of the Public are to advise the Mayor or the Clerk of the use of devices for transcribing or recording the proceedings of open session by auditory or visual means prior to the meeting.

*An individual must be granted permission by the Mayor and/or the Clerk of the Township of Cramahe to audio/visual record any meeting. As per The Township of Cramahe Records Retention By-law 2020-17, the Digital Privacy Act and The Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act, individuals must swear that they will not attempt to alter the audio/video recordings of today’s meeting. Subject to the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, the Digital Privacy Act and The Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act, the Mayor and/or the Clerk may at any time request a copy of the recording and individuals will be required to produce the recording within 5 business days.*

4. **OPEN DELEGATION FOR ITEMS ON AGENDA**

Members of the Public have three (3) minutes to ask questions on items listed on the current agenda. Please state your name and address for the records. Each member may only speak once.

5. **STATUTORY PUBLIC MEETINGS (IF REQUIRED)**

None.

6. **CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA**

*Be it resolved* that the agenda for the August 20, 2020 Committee of the Whole meeting be approved, as presented.

7. **DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY INTEREST**

Members can declare now or at any time during the meeting.
8. DELEGATIONS/PRESENTATIONS

8.a Presentation from Muhammad Waseem, Sr. Project Engineer, Ministry of Transportation Easter Region and Gregg Cooke, Consultant Project Manager, Stantec Consulting Ltd regarding Preliminary Design and Class EA of HWY 401

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Committee of the Whole receive the presentation from Muhammad Waseem, Sr. Project Engineer, Ministry of Transportation Easter Region and Gregg Cooke, Consultant Project Manager, Stantec Consulting Ltd regarding Preliminary Design and Class EA of HWY 401, for information.

9. COMMUNITY SERVICES

9.a REPORTS OF MUNICIPAL OFFICERS

9.a.a Appointment of Integrity Commissioner, CLERKS-12-20

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Committee of the Whole receive Report CLERKS-12-20 for information; and

THAT Committee of the Whole recommend to Council that staff be directed to prepare an RFP for Integrity Commissioner Services to commence following the expiration of Principles Integrity Services as of December 31, 2020.

10. FINANCE

10.a REPORTS OF MUNICIPAL OFFICERS

None.

11. PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

11.a REPORTS OF MUNICIPAL OFFICERS

11.a.a Property Standards Update, PLAN-21-20

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Committee of the Whole receive Report PLAN-21-20 for information.
BE IT RESOLVED THAT Committee of the Whole receive Report PLAN-20-20 for information.

12. OPEN FORUM

Members of the public have three (3) minutes to ask general questions and are not to enter into debate. Please state your name and address for the records. Each member may only speak once.

13. CLOSED MEETING (IF REQUIRED)

None.

14. ADJOURNMENT

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Committee adjourn the meeting at [TIME].
Agenda

1. Study Overview
2. Consultation
3. Evaluation of Alternatives
4. Preferred Plan
5. Potential Detours
6. Notification Strategy
7. Project Schedule
8. Questions
Study Area
Study Purpose

The purpose of the study is to identify a Recommended Plan that addresses current and future transportation needs for Highway 401, from 2 km east of Nagle Road to Percy Street (approximately 18 km).

This Highway 401 Planning Study includes:
• Replacement and/or rehabilitation of bridges and structural culverts
• Interchange modifications at Lyle Street and Percy Street
• Establishing the Highway 401 future footprint for interim 6-lanes and ultimate 8-lanes
• Commuter parking lot expansions or relocations

The timing of construction is currently not known.
Environmental Assessment Process

- This study is being carried out under the requirements of the Class Environmental Assessment (EA) for Provincial Transportation Facilities (2000)

- The study falls within the scope of a Group “B” project, which includes highway improvements that provide/cause a significant modification in traffic access
Existing Environment

The following environmental investigations are being completed as part of this Class EA study:

- Cultural Heritage Assessment
- Terrestrial Environment Assessment
- Fisheries Assessment
- Sediment and Erosion Risk Assessment
- Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment
- Contamination Overview Study
- Groundwater Overview Assessment
- Landscape Composition Plan
- Noise Impact Assessment
- Air Quality Assessment

Existing Study Area:

- Situated within a rural portion of Northumberland County
- Highway 401 acts as a visual and physical divide between Lake Ontario and the Oak Ridges Moraine
- The surrounding landscape contains potential built heritage resources, including residences, farmsteads, barns and a cemetery
- Areas having the potential for the recovery of archaeological resources are present
- Woodlands and Significant Wildlife Habitat for a number of species have been identified, including turtle wintering and nesting areas, amphibian breeding habitat and animal movement corridors
- 15 potential watercourse crossings have been investigated, most of which provide fish habitat
- All water crossings involve cold water streams, and include both spring and fall spawning fish species
- Aquatic and terrestrial species at risk have been recorded in the study area
Stakeholders

- Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks
- Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry
- Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries
- Lower Trent Conservation Authority
- Ganaraska Region Conservation Authority
- Town of Cobourg
- Township of Hamilton
- Township of Alnwick/Haldimand
- Township of Cramahe
- Northumberland County
Municipal Advisory Committee (MAC)

MAC Meeting 1 – May 16, 2019
• Study purpose and scope
• Environmental assessment process
• Consultation programs
• Preliminary alternatives

MAC Meeting 2 – April 15, 2020
• Preliminary Preferred Plan
• Potential construction detour routes
• Potential impacts and mitigation measures
Indigenous Consultation

- Williams Treaties First Nations Claims Coordinator
- Beausoleil First Nation
- Chippewas of Georgina Island
- Chippewas of Rama First Nation (Mnjikaning)
- Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation
- Alderville First Nation
- Curve Lake First Nation
- Hiawatha First Nation
- Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte
- Métis Nation of Ontario
Public Information Centre 1

Public Information Centre (PIC 1) was held on September 18, 2019 to present and gather feedback on:

- The project background and process being followed
- Existing study area conditions
- Bridge and structural culvert rehabilitation / replacement alternatives, long list of interchange alternatives, and future Highway 401 footprints for interim six and ultimate eight lane alternatives

What did we hear?

- Potential impacts to property
- Potential increases in noise
- Potential impacts to fish/aquatic species
- Potential impacts to cultural heritage landscapes/property
- Suggestions to improve drainage
- Suggestions for wildlife and snow barriers
- Suggestions to ensure that suitable detour routes are provided during construction
### Evaluation of Lyle Street Interchange Alternatives

#### Factor/Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway Engineering</th>
<th>Diamond</th>
<th>Parclo A4</th>
<th>Parclo A2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Operations</td>
<td>Lowest traffic capacity when compared to the other alternatives</td>
<td>Highest/surplus traffic capacity when compared to the other alternatives</td>
<td>Provides sufficient traffic capacity for the long-term operation needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometrics &amp; Safety</td>
<td>Highest number of traffic conflict points (left-turn movements) at ramps</td>
<td>Lowest number of traffic conflict points (left-turn movements) at ramps</td>
<td>Can be expanded to Parclo A4 to increase capacity if required in the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Does not provide any free-flow traffic movements from the crossing road to the ramps</td>
<td>All (4) traffic movements from the crossing road to the ramps are free-flow</td>
<td>Fewer intersections (3) within the interchange footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>Requires four closely spaced intersections within the interchange footprint</td>
<td>Direct ramps (N-W and S-E) conflict with adjacent intersections</td>
<td>Provides free-flow traffic movements for the dominant movement (S-W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lowest construction costs ($13.2M)</td>
<td>Highest construction costs ($20.0M)</td>
<td>Lower construction cost ($16.4M) compared to the Parclo A4 configuration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Social & Cultural Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Impacts smallest area of private property</th>
<th>Impacts greatest area of private property</th>
<th>Impacts smaller area of private property when compared to the Parclo A4 configuration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air/Noise</td>
<td>Impacts smallest area of land having archeological potential</td>
<td>Impacts greatest area of land having archeological potential</td>
<td>Impacts smaller area of land having archeological potential when compared to the Parclo A4 configuration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contamination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Natural Environment

| Terrestrial Ecosystem        | Potential to impact greater area of wildlife habitat and significant treed areas when compared to the Parclo A2 configuration | Potential to impact greatest area of wildlife habitat and significant treed areas | Potential to impact smallest area of wildlife habitat and significant treed areas |
| Species of Special Concern   |                                          |                                          |                                                                                  |
| Fish & Fish Habitat          |                                          |                                          |                                                                                  |

#### Overall Summary

- **Least Preferred**
- **Most Preferred**
## Evaluation of Percy Street Interchange Alternatives

### Factor/Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Diamond</th>
<th>Parclo A4</th>
<th>Parclo A2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Highway Engineering** | • Lowest traffic capacity when compared to the other alternatives  
• Highest number of traffic conflict points (left-turn movements) at ramp terminals  
• Does not provide any free-flow traffic movements from the crossing road to the ramps  
• Lowest construction costs ($12.8M) | • Highest/surplus traffic capacity when compared to the other alternatives  
• Lowest number of traffic conflict points (left-turn movements) at ramp terminals  
• All (4) traffic movements from the crossing road to the ramps are free-flow  
• Highest construction costs ($20.4M) | • Provides sufficient capacity for the long-term traffic operation needs  
• Can be expanded to Parclo A4 to increase capacity if required  
• Provides free-flow traffic movements for the dominant movement (S-W)  
• Lower construction cost ($15.4M) compared to a Parclo A4 configuration |
| **Social & Cultural Environment** | • Impacts greater area of private property when compared to the Parclo A2 configuration  
• Impacts highest number of private properties  
• Impacts greater area of land having archaeological potential when compared to the Parclo A2 configuration | • Impacts greatest area of private property  
• Impacts higher number of private properties when compared to the Parclo A2 configuration  
• Impacts greatest area of land having archaeological potential | • Impacts smallest area of private property  
• Impacts fewer number of private properties when compared to the Parclo A4 configuration  
• Impacts smallest area of land having archaeological potential |
| **Natural Environment** | • Impacts smaller area of wildlife habitat when compared to the Parclo A4 configuration  
• Impacts smallest area of significant treed area and potential bird Species at Risk habitat | • Impacts greatest area of wildlife habitat  
• Impacts greater area of significant treed area and potential bird Species at Risk habitat when compared to the Diamond configuration | • Impacts smaller area of wildlife habitat when compared to the Parclo A4 configuration  
• Impacts smaller area of significant treed area and potential bird Species at Risk habitat when compared to the Parclo A4 configuration |

### Overall Summary

- **Least Preferred**
- **Most Preferred**

---
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Two Highway 401 cross-section alternatives were presented at PIC 1 and subjected to further evaluation:

1. **Widen to Outside**
   - Construction to the outside only is simpler and less costly than widening inside and outside.
   - It minimizes traffic lane shifts during construction, which minimizes impacts to traffic flow and driver expectations.
   - The cross-section is consistent with the Highway 401 cross-section to west (i.e. previously widened to outside).

2. **Shift to Inside and Widen Outside**

Alternative 1 (**Widen to Outside**), is preferred because:
- Construction to the outside only is simpler and less costly than widening inside and outside.
- It minimizes traffic lane shifts during construction, which minimizes impacts to traffic flow and driver expectations.
- The cross-section is consistent with the Highway 401 cross-section to west (i.e. previously widened to outside).
Evaluation of Alternatives

Evaluation Process

Identify Criteria
Evaluation Criteria are established through:
- public input
- similar projects
- provincial guidelines
- existing conditions

Weigh Criteria
Each criterion is assigned a weight factor that best reflects its relative importance.

Evaluate Alternatives
The sum of the weighted scores provides a total score for each alternative. This is the basis for ranking the alternatives and, along with a reasoned argument assessment approach, helps to identify the recommended plan.

The highest scoring alternative

Evaluation Criteria (and Weighting)
The following criteria were used to evaluate Widening Alternatives and Short List of Interchange Alternatives. Criteria were refined based on the input received at and following PIC 1, and used to identify the preferred alternative:

**Engineering (50%)**
- Traffic Operations
  - Consider projected future traffic
  - Consider Level of Service (LOS) on Highway 401
- Geometrics & Safety
  - Consider design standards for provincial highways and interchanges
  - Consider potential for collisions on Highway 401
  - Consider potential to accommodate Long Combination Vehicles
  - Consider crossing road grades at ramp terminals
- Constructability
  - Consider construction techniques
  - Consider traffic flow and operations, including local access and out-of-way travel

**Community (30%)**
- Property
  - Consider impacts to private property
- Noise & Air Quality
  - Consider proximity to residences
- Built & Cultural Heritage
  - Consider potential to affect cultural heritage resources
- Archaeology
  - Consider impacts to areas of archeological potential
- Contamination
  - Consider potential to encounter contaminated soils/groundwater

**Environment (20%)**
- Terrestrial Ecosystem
  - Consider impacts on wildlife habitat
- Fish & Fish Habitat
  - Consider potential to impact watercourses
- Species of Conservation Concern
  - Consider impacts to Species-at-Risk or habitat associated with Species-at-Risk
- Designated Areas
  - Consider impacts to Provincially Significant Wetlands

Bridge Improvements  Culvert/Drainage Improvements  Interchange Improvements  Highway Improvements
**Summary of Bridge Improvements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Interim Strategy</th>
<th>Ultimate Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Danforth Road Underpass</td>
<td>Replace</td>
<td>Rehabilitate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gully Road Underpass</td>
<td>Replace</td>
<td>Rehabilitate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyle Street Underpass</td>
<td>Replace</td>
<td>Rehabilitate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter Valley Road (Culvert 21X-0273/CO)</td>
<td>Rehabilitate</td>
<td>Replace with bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernonville Road Overpass</td>
<td>Rehabilitate and widen</td>
<td>Replace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyce Road Overpass</td>
<td>Rehabilitate and widen</td>
<td>Replace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percy Street Underpass</td>
<td>Replace</td>
<td>Rehabilitate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preferred Plan

Typical Highway 401 Underpass

1: 250

WEST

1500 SHLD
3250 LANE
3250 LANE
1500 SHLD

 Profile Control T/A

Parapet Wall with Arch. Finish and Railings (Typ.)

Asphalt and Waterproofing System, 90 Total

DECK DRAIN CHANNEL (Typ.)

(3) Spaces at 2500 = 7500

(4) NU 2000 GIRDERS

10200

1: 50
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Typical Highway 401 Overpass

NEW CONCRETE RIGID FRAME

TL-5 BARRIER WALL

STEEL BEAM GUIDE RAIL AND CHANNEL ANCHORAGE (TYP.)

REMOVE EXIST. CONC. RIGID FRAME

MIN. CLEARANCE

1000* SHLD 3500* LANE 3500* LANE 1000* SHLD

1:75

* DIMENSIONS SHOWN ARE MEASURED PERPENDICULAR TO VERNONVILLE ROAD
### Summary of Culvert Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Interim Strategy</th>
<th>Ultimate Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culvert 21X-0467/CO</td>
<td>Replace (trenchless)</td>
<td>Rehabilitate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culvert 21X-0468/CO</td>
<td>Rehabilitate</td>
<td>Replace (open cut)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add retaining walls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culvert 21X-0469/CO</td>
<td>Replace (line and extend)</td>
<td>Rehabilitate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grafton Creek Culvert 21X-270/CO</td>
<td>Rehabilitate</td>
<td>Replace with bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add retaining walls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland Culvert 21X-470/CO</td>
<td>Replace (trenchless)</td>
<td>Rehabilitate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter Valley Creek Culvert 21X-272/CO</td>
<td>Rehabilitate</td>
<td>Replace with bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add retaining walls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyce’s Road Culvert 21X-0576/CO</td>
<td>Rehabilitate and strengthen</td>
<td>Replace (trenchless)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add retaining walls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Highway Improvements

1. Lyle Street interchange and carpool lot improvements
2. Percy Street interchange and carpool lot improvements
3. Highway 401 vertical curve improvements (sags and crests)
4. Highway 401 horizontal curve improvements at Gully curves
5. Future widening of Highway 401 to six lanes (interim)
6. Future widening of Highway 401 to eight lanes (ultimate)
Typical Highway Improvements

- Replace Bridge - Interim
- Extend Culvert Ends - Interim
- Vertical Curve Improvement - Interim

LEGEND
- Existing MTO Right-of-Way
- Proposed Retaining Wall
- Municipal Township Boundary
- Property Fabric (Approximate based on Assessment Mapping)
- Existing Culvert
- New Culvert or Culvert Extension
- Existing Driveway to be Closed
- Property Acquisition
- Potential Stormwater Management Facility

Site 21X:029/00
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Lyle Street Interchange

Carpool Lot Features
- Approximately 35 parking spaces (with provision for expansion)
- 2 accessible spaces
- Asphalt parking surface
- Illuminated entrance
- Located on MTO property
Lyle Street Interchange

Site 21-271 Lyle Street Bridge

WEST

1.5 MIN. SHLD | VARIES S.C.L. | 3.50 LANE

LYLE STREET

3.50 LANE | VARIES S.C.L. | 1.5 MIN. SHLD

EAST

1:100
Percy Street Interchange

Carpool Lot Features
- Approximately 40 parking spaces (with provision for expansion)
- 2 accessible spaces
- Asphalt parking surface
- Illuminated entrance
- Located on METRO property
Percy Street Interchange

Site 21-276 Percy Street Bridge

WEST

7.05

1.5 MIN. SHLD

1.50 BIKE

3.50 LANE

EAST

PERCY ROAD

3.50 LANE

7.95

1.50 BIKE

1.5 MIN. SHLD

1:100
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Highway 401 Future Widening

Interim (Future 6-Lane)

Ultimate (Future 8-Lane)
Highway 401 Vertical Curve Improvements

TYPICAL CREST CURVE IMPROVEMENT

TYPICAL SAG CURVE IMPROVEMENT
## Ecopassage Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culvert ID</th>
<th>Existing Culvert Dimensions</th>
<th>Interim Improvement</th>
<th>Ultimate Improvement</th>
<th>Landscape Feature</th>
<th>Opportunity for Ecopassage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21X-0467/C0</td>
<td>3.1 m x 1.8 m box</td>
<td>Slip-line with new culvert 2.7 m x 1.8 m</td>
<td>Possible rehab</td>
<td>Wooded valley; unnamed valley 02</td>
<td>Limited, due to culvert size and length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21X-0468/C0</td>
<td>3.1 m x 1.5 m box</td>
<td>Culvert rehabilitation</td>
<td>Culvert replacement; opportunity to increase size</td>
<td>Woodland and wetland, primarily to south; unnamed tributary 03</td>
<td>Good, but not a key landscape feature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21X-0469/C0</td>
<td>3.7 m x 1.8 m box</td>
<td>Culvert replacement (line and extend)</td>
<td>Possible rehab</td>
<td>Wooded valley: Barnum House Creek</td>
<td>Limited, due to culvert size and length but adjacent to large culvert/future bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21X-0270/C0</td>
<td>9.8 m x 4.9 m arch</td>
<td>Culvert rehabilitation and retaining walls</td>
<td>Replace with bridge</td>
<td>Wooded valley: Barnum House Creek</td>
<td>Excellent, existing large diameter culvert/future bridge and follows key landscape feature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21X-0470/C0</td>
<td>3.1 m x 1.8 m box</td>
<td>Slip-line with new culvert 2.7 m x 1.8 m</td>
<td>Possible rehab</td>
<td>Wooded valley; unnamed tributary 06</td>
<td>Limited, due to culvert size and length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21X-0272/C0</td>
<td>15.2 m x 7.7 m arch</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Replace with bridge</td>
<td>Wooded valley: Shelter Valley Creek</td>
<td>Excellent, existing large diameter culvert/future bridge and follows key landscape feature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21X-0576/C0</td>
<td>3.1 m x 2.5 m box</td>
<td>Culvert rehabilitation</td>
<td>Culvert replacement</td>
<td>Wooded valley and wetland, primarily to north; unnamed tributary 09</td>
<td>Limited, due to culvert size and length</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ecopassage Opportunities

Site 21-272 & 21-273 Shelter Valley Creek & Shelter Valley Road Bridge
### Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures

In accordance with the Class Environmental Assessment process, environmental factors were considered as part of the evaluation process, and many of the environmental concerns related to this project have been mitigated through the process by which the Preferred Plan was selected. A summary of the environmental factors anticipated to be impacted by this project and the proposed mitigation measures are briefly described below. A detailed description of potential impacts associated with this project and associated mitigation measures will be provided within the Transportation Environmental Study Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Factor</th>
<th>Proposed Mitigation Measures/Commitments to Future Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fish and Fish Habitat</strong></td>
<td>Modifications to existing watercourse crossings have been identified. Impacts to watercourses will be minimized to the extent possible. Opportunities to enhance fish habitat will be reviewed during detail design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trees/Vegetation</strong></td>
<td>Some trees/vegetation will need to be removed as part of the Preferred Plan. Vegetation and tree removal will be minimized to the extent possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wildlife/Habitat</strong></td>
<td>Potential wildlife passage locations have been identified and will be further assessed during detail design. MTO will continue to engage MECP and MNRF in relation to wildlife passage. Targeted species surveys will be carried out for species that have the potential to be present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Heritage</strong></td>
<td>Properties having cultural heritage value have been identified. Direct impacts to these properties are not anticipated, although impacts will be confirmed during detail design. No construction activities will take place until the Ministry of Sport, Heritage, Tourism and Culture Industries has confirmed in writing that all archaeological licensing and technical review requirements have been satisfied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape/Views</strong></td>
<td>Visual screening measures will be explored during detail design, in consultation with affected property owners. MTO will continue to consult with the Highway of Heroes Tree Campaign during detail design to explore opportunities for plantings that commemorate and honour Canada’s veterans and servicemen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property</strong></td>
<td>Impacts to private property have been identified in association with the Preferred Plan. Negotiations with impacted property owners will be carried out after Environmental Clearance has been obtained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality</strong></td>
<td>An Air Quality Assessment is being completed in accordance with Provincial guidelines to assess the potential changes in local and regional air quality, and to determine if mitigation measures are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise</strong></td>
<td>The potential changes in traffic noise associated with the Preferred Plan is currently being reviewed. A Noise Assessment is being completed in accordance with Provincial guidelines to determine if measures are required to mitigate potential increases in traffic noise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Operations</strong></td>
<td>Construction activities are expected to impact traffic operations. Advanced notification will be provided to affected residents in advance of construction activities. Detour and Staging Plans will be finalized during detail design. Detour Plans will be finalized in consultation with municipalities and emergency service providers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential Detours
Potential Detours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Approximate Duration</th>
<th>Typical Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overnight closures</td>
<td>12-18 hours</td>
<td>Highway 401 bridge demolitions and girder placements for new bridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term closures</td>
<td>1-30 days</td>
<td>Interchange ramp closures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term closures</td>
<td>1-4 months</td>
<td>Municipal road bridge closures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of overnight closures and the duration of short-term and long-term closures will be confirmed during Detail Design.
Overnight Closures
Short-term Closures
Long-term Closures

Potential Detours

Gully Road

Shelter Valley Road

Vernonville Road

Boyce Road
The Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO) has retained Stantec Consulting Ltd. to undertake a Planning, Preliminary Design, and Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) Study on Highway 401 for the replacement and rehabilitation of structures, interchange modifications, establishing the footprint of future six and eight lanes to address current and future transportation needs, and commuter parking lot improvements, from 2 kms east of Nagle Road to 800 m east of Percy Street (approximately 18 kms).

THE PROCESS
This study is considered a “Group B” project under the Class EA for Provincial Transportation Facilities (2000) and includes undertaking environmental and engineering field investigations and seeking input from the public, local municipalities, external ministries/agencies, and businesses. Upon completion of preliminary design, a Transportation Environmental Study Report (TESR) will be prepared and made available for 30-day public review period. Notices will be published in local newspapers, posted on the project website, and sent to the project mailing list to advise the public of the TESR public review period.

ONLINE PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE 2
Public Information Centre 1 (PIC 1) for this study was held on September 18, 2019, to present and solicit feedback on the preliminary improvement alternatives, the evaluation process and existing study area conditions. A second PIC has been arranged to present and solicit feedback on the evaluation of alternatives, the preliminary preferred plan, and the preliminary assessment of the anticipated environmental impacts and mitigation measures. In light of COVID-19 and associated physical distancing requirements for the foreseeable future, PIC 2 will be hosted online. The PIC displays and preliminary preferred plan will be available for your review on the project website at [www.highway401.cobourgcolborne.ca](http://www.highway401.cobourgcolborne.ca) on Thursday, August 27, 2020. A recorded presentation will be available as part of the online PIC, as well as an online survey for your feedback, until September 25, 2020.
### PIC 2 Notifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAC Meeting #2</td>
<td>April 15, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice to Impacted Property Owners</td>
<td>August 10, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Impacted Property Owner Meetings</td>
<td>August 24 – September 25, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Agency Mailing</td>
<td>August 10, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Mailing</td>
<td>August 10, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing to Indigenous Communities</td>
<td>August 10, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website updated with Notice</td>
<td>August 13, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland News</td>
<td>August 13, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Independent</td>
<td>August 13, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township of Alnwick/Haldimand Council Meeting</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland County Council Meeting</td>
<td>August 26, 2020 (9:30am)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township of Cramahe Council Meeting</td>
<td>August 18, 2020 (6:00pm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Public Information Centre</td>
<td>August 27, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments requested by</td>
<td>September 25, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impacted Property Owners

- Personal tailored letters and property plan to all potentially impacted property owners
- Online property owner meetings with significantly impacted property owners
## Project Milestone Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Milestone</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notice of Study Commencement</td>
<td>April 26, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC Meeting 1</td>
<td>May 16, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information Centre 1 (Alternatives)</td>
<td>September 18, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC Meeting 2</td>
<td>April 15, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice of Public Information Centre 2</td>
<td>August 13, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information Centre 2 (Preferred Plan)</td>
<td>August 27, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESR 30-day Public Review Period</td>
<td>January 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions
Meeting: Committee of the Whole

Date: August 20, 2020

Report No.: CLERKS-12-20

RESOLUTION NO:_______ BY-LAW NO: __________

Subject: Appointment of Integrity Commissioner

Recommendation(s):

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Committee of the Whole receive Report CLERKS-12-20 for information; and

THAT Committee of the Whole recommend to Council that staff be directed to prepare an RFP for Integrity Commissioner Services to commence following the expiration of Principles Integrity Services as of December 31, 2020.

Background:
The Township of Cramahe appointed Principles Integrity in January 2019 as the Township’s Integrity Commissioner and the agreement is due December 31, 2020. The 2019 costs for their services were $3,827.85 and the 2020 costs as of July 23, 2020 are $7,895.05.

Staff Comments:
Principles Integrity will be preparing their annual report and training to Council and staff on September 3 2020, prior to the expiration of their contract on December 31, 2020 as required in the terms of their agreement.

Municipalities are required to appoint an Integrity Commissioner who are made available to the public, staff and members of council for advice relating to conflict of interest. On March 1, 2019, the following was approved: 223.3(1) Without limiting sections 9, 10 and 11, those sections authorize the municipality to appoint an Integrity
Commissioner who reports to council and who is responsible for performing in an independent manner the functions assigned by the municipality with respect to any or all of the following:

1. The application of the code of conduct for members of council and the code of conduct for members of local boards.

2. The application of any procedures, rules and policies of the municipality and local boards governing the ethical behaviour of members of council and of local boards.

3. The application of sections 5, 5.1 and 5.2 of the Municipal Conflict of Interest Act to members of council and of local boards.

4. Requests from members of council and of local boards for advice respecting their obligations under the code of conduct applicable to the member.

5. Requests from members of council and of local boards for advice respecting their obligations under a procedure, rule or policy of the municipality or of the local board, as the case may be, governing the ethical behaviour of members.

6. Requests from members of council and of local boards for advice respecting their obligations under the Municipal Conflict of Interest Act.

7. The provision of educational information to members of council, members of local boards, the municipality and the public about the municipality’s codes of conduct for members of council and members of local boards and about the Municipal Conflict of Interest Act. 2017, c. 10, Sched. 1, s. 19 (1).

The legislation requires that municipalities establish codes of conduct not just for council members, but also for members of the municipality’s local boards. The definition of ‘local board’ will include the Municipality’s statutory committees (such as the Committee of Adjustment), advisory committees, BIAs, and such other bodies established or exercising the affairs or purposes of the Municipality. Committees established by other bodies to which the Municipality has appointed one or more Members of Council are likely local boards.

Further, the following bodies are specifically excluded by the legislation:

- School boards
- Conservation authorities
- Children Aid Societies
- Boards of Health
- Committees of Management established under the Long-Term Care Homes Act, 2007
- Police Services Boards
- Public Library Boards
Corporations established by the Municipality under section 203, Municipal Act, 2001.

Principles Integrity have provided staff, members of council and the public with advice over the past year, as well as a review of the procedure by-law and restructuring of the Council Champions in early 2020.

Staff are recommending that we release an RFP to engage in services and appointment of an Integrity Commissioner for the next five years.

Financial Implications:
The annual retainer for Principles Integrity is $1,000.00. There will be ongoing budget needs for the costs of investigations, reports and information provided to members that will be charged at $230 per hour.

Since 2019, the costs associated with Code of Conduct Complaints and discussions amongst members of Council, the public and the Integrity Commissioner were approximately $13,000 as of August 5, 2020.

Concluding Comments:
Staff are requesting direction from Committee of the Whole to provide Council with a request to prepare the necessary RFP to receive quotes for services.

Submitted by:  
Joanne Hyde, Clerk

Reviewed by:  
Arryn McNichol, CAO/Treasurer
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Subject: Property Standards Update

Recommendation(s):
BE IT RESOLVED THAT Committee of the Whole receive Report PLAN-21-20 for information.

Background:
The matter of Property Standards compliance and enforcement is a matter of concern in most municipalities and typically generates a high volume of activity, year over year.

The Township of Cramahe Building Department is responsible for administering permit applications, issuance and inspections in accordance with the Ontario Building Code, as well as other applicable laws and regulations to ensure the standards for construction are consistent throughout the Province.

In addition to building permits, the Building department is also responsible for the inspections of properties as set out in the Property Standards By-law 2010-03.

The Property Standard By-law is in place to address safety issues and the general repair of the exterior and interior of buildings and structures. The standards as set out in the Property Standards By-law are minimum maintenance standards that follow provincial standards found in various codes and legislation. These standards are put in place to protect the health and safety of occupants and the public.

Typical property standards complaints received by the Township include:
- dilapidated buildings and structures,
- abandoned vehicles
- unsightly properties/unkempt yards
- garbage and illegal dumping

Given the limited resources available within the Township of Cramahe, the Property Standards By-law is enforced on a written complaint basis only, except where health and safety is at risk. Staff have compiled a summary of Property Standards Complaints filed with the Township’s Building Department between 2016 and 2020. The chart includes:
- the number of written complaints received;
- the number of investigations carried out;
- number of letters written;
- complaints resolved (compliance gained);
- number of ongoing investigations;
- number of complaints from or involving properties outside the Township;
- number of neighbour disputes (feuds)

Property Standards Enforcement activity directly involving the CBO are shown in the following chart. Property Standards complaints handled directly by our former Compliance Officer are not included in this chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Files</th>
<th>Multiple Complaint</th>
<th>Investigated</th>
<th>Letters Sent</th>
<th>Compliance Gained</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
<th>Out of Township</th>
<th>Feud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff Comments:**
The Building Department is experiencing a prolonged high volume of activity and has been unable to respond in a timely manner to incoming property standards complaints. Council recently agreed to fill the vacant By-Law Enforcement Officer position on a part time contract basis and to have that individual take over Property Standards Enforcement.

Staff has been developing a Clean Yards By-law to manage complaints involving unruly properties. The By-law will enable staff to address these properties in a more timely fashion. Staff will be able to initiate clean-up by the municipality and to direct costs to the property owner. Staff are hoping to bring the new Clean Yards by-law to Council by
the fall. Staff will also prepare a more accurate synopsis of By-law enforcement activity at that time. Matters involving Building Code violations will continue to be addressed through the Property Standards By-law, overseen by the CBO.

**Financial Implications:**
None.

**Concluding Comments:**
Increased resources dedicated to By-Law and Property Standards Enforcement will ensure that complaints are attended to in a timely, professional, and efficient manner.

Specific information about complainants and details about properties are not included in this report to protect the privacy of the individual(s).
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Meeting: Committee of the Whole

Date: August 20, 2020

Report No.: PLAN-20-20

RESOLUTION NO:_______ BY-LAW NO: __________

Subject: Industrial Park Development Policies – Status and Update

Recommendation(s):

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Committee of the Whole receive Report PLAN-20-20 for information.

Background:

1.1 Development Policy

In April of 2010, Council for the Township of Cramahe approved a Development Policy for the Cramahe Industrial Park North. According to the document, the objective of the Industrial Land Development Policy was “to provide a framework for the purchase and development of land in the municipally owned park including site development process, application process, applicable uses, permitted industrial uses, zoning provisions and applicable charges”. The document provided a framework to be used for each purchase/sale transaction and “intended business development use” of the industrial park land.

The Development Policy included the advertised sale price for the industrial park approved by Council on June 4, 2009:
- north side lots with Hwy #401 exposure: $14,164 per ha ($35,000 per ac.);
- south side lots along Purdy Road: $12,141 per ha ($30,000 per ac.).

It was noted that the prices were subject to change at Council’s discretion and should be confirmed at the consultation stage by any prospective purchaser. The Municipal Act requires that lands sold by the Municipality be sold at fair market value.

A formal Agreement of Purchase and Sale was prepared by the Township’s Solicitor and was available to prospective purchasers upon request. Agreements of Purchase and Sale were subject to review by the Municipality’s solicitor and approval by Council.

1.2 Council Approval

As set out in the Development Policy, Cramahe Council approval of the land sale is to be exercised through a Resolution and the passing of a by-law in a public Council meeting. Staff will present Council with the Agreement to Purchase and Sale and accompanying Staff Report. Council will then determine whether it wishes to accept the offer. The policy requires a deposit of 10% of the purchase price with every Agreement of Purchase and Sale to be presented to Council.

1.3 Lands Available

There is land available on the south side of the easterly extension and to the east of the ‘Cheer’ property, and east of the CESB, as shown in Figure 1. The extension of Industrial Park Road North provides access to all lands within the development. Water service is available along Purdy Road. Municipal staff can investigate with LUSI, the option to extend the service to the north and east along the Industrial Park Road North. As Members of the Committee know, there is no sewer service available. As a result, only dry industries can be accommodated.
Staff has completed a rough layout design for the remaining lands within the CIPN and has determined that a five (5) lot plan, with lot sizes ranging from 1.6 acres to 4.1 acres, is feasible for the lands. This layout would maximize the use of frontage for all lots, while continuing to provide adequate.

Although some flexibility in lot layout is reasonable, the Township should strive to maintain the integrity of the lot fabric of the lands, as a whole. The proposed layout provides variety in the configuration and location of access as well as size. Having said that, it would be possible to create fewer, larger lots, provided that the balance of the lands retain sufficient market value. It would also be possible to sell the entire parcel as a single unit, should a single prospective purchaser come forward.

1.4 Servicing Availability

Official Plan policies permit partial servicing, as per Section 5.1.12.1 General Servicing Policies, as follows:

*Partial servicing will generally be discouraged, except where necessary to address failed services or because of physical constraints, and except in*
the Township Industrial Park, which is presently serviced with municipal water services.

Unless on full municipal services or approved communal services, industrial and commercial uses will be restricted to those of a dry nature only. Those commercial or industrial uses of a dry nature will be permitted on private services on lands designated to permit industrial uses, or on partial services (i.e., municipal water services only) in the Township Industrial Park.

For the purposes of this Plan, a use of a “dry nature” shall mean one in which water is not required in the processing, assembling, fabricating, manufacturing, washing or cooling, or similar function of the establishment, and which requires water and sewage disposal facilities only for domestic uses, i.e., for employees and visitors to the establishment.

1.5 Updates to Current Policy

The Policy was updated in 2014. In 2016, a Closed Session of Council was held to discuss a matter subject to solicitor client privilege, relating to the sale of municipal land. There were no motions passed in Open Council as a result of the closed session (Minutes of Township of Cramahe Council in Committee held Dec 6, 2016). As such, the 2014 policy remains in effect for the Industrial Park.

Staff Comments:

We have recently received two inquiries regarding the opportunity to purchase lands within the Cramahe North Industrial Park. Should an Offer of Purchase be received by Township Staff, we will be advising Council that the current policies are applicable until such time as they are revised by Council. Council can consider an Offer, provided that the purchase price put forward in the Offer reflects current market value for the lands, based on values of comparable lands.

Given that the policies date from 2014, we are recommending that the Development Policy be updated to better reflect current requirements. A copy of the proposed revisions will be brought forward to a future meeting of the Committee of the Whole, following review by the Planning & Development Committee. Highlights of the changes include:
• Updating the lot area available for development
• A statement with respect to Source Protection and restricted uses within the WHPA
• Revised land costs, fees, etc.
• Changes to the administrative structure at Town Hall.
• In the meantime, the current policies remain applicable.

Financial Implications:

Although the current value of the lands is unknown, it is understood that the value of the lands will have increased from 2014 levels, especially given that the access road is now in place. There are 5.44 hectares (13.45 acres) available within the Industrial park. If we assume a value of $103,782 per hectare ($42,000 per acre) for un-serviced lands, the total value of lands is approximately $564,500.

The Municipality currently receives no taxes for these lands. Based on average assessments values and resultant property taxes for developed lands within the Industrial Park, it is estimated that the average tax revenue per acre of land in the Industrial Park is $4800 per acre. If the entire area of land owned by the municipality were developed at a scale which reflects an average assessment value, the taxes generated would be approximately $64,000. Should full municipal servicing become available in future, it is possible that the lands would further increase in value and further increases in property taxes receivable would result.

Concluding Comments:

We are seeing a definite increase in development pressures from the GTA, especially since the onset of COVID-19. It would be beneficial to the Township to be able to take advantage of this demand, to the greatest extent possible. In our experience, municipalities that fail to respond to a wave of interest in development within their boundaries can be left behind, as prospective purchasers look to other areas in which to invest. The old adage “A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush” may well be applicable here.

Given the financial hardship to the Township resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic and the high costs of bringing full servicing to the Industrial Park, including upgrades to the existing Wastewater
Treatment Plant, it may be in Council's best interests to consider Offers moving forward.
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