

2.0 Transportation Needs Assessment

This section of the report describes the first stage of the Route Laning process as initiated in 1994 and documented in the *Highway 69 Planning, Preliminary Design and Environmental Assessment* (GWP 327-91-00), dated November 1999.

2.1 PLANNING OPPORTUNITIES AND STUDY OBJECTIVES

The planning opportunities and objectives of the Highway 69 Planning Study and Environmental Assessment were:

- To improve the traffic carrying capacity of Highway 69 through the study area
- To improve the traffic operation and safety on the highway
- To improve the overall regional accessibility in the Sudbury-Toronto corridor

The improvements must consider the initiative to resolve the transportation needs between southern Ontario and the Sudbury area, the Trans-Canada Highway and beyond.

2.1.1 Project Initiation Stage

The first phase of the Route Planning Study involved the review of the need and justification for Highway 69 improvements between the French River area and Sudbury. The project initiation stage involved the following activities:

- Public and government notification of the project initiation
- Assessment of the “need” and development of the “alternatives to the undertaking”
- Screening of the transportation options
- Consultation on the above actions with the public, government agencies and the local municipalities.

2.1.2 Need and Justification

The need and justification for the improvements to the Highway 69 corridor between the French River area and Sudbury are provided below:

- Traffic projections indicate that traffic growth on Highway 69 will require capacity improvements
- Traffic safety is affected on Highway 69 as there is a relationship between an increase in traffic volumes and an increase in the number of accidents
- There is a growth in residential, commercial and recreational development along the existing Highway 69 that requires access to the highway. Local accessibility and long distance/high-speed travel are conflicting transportation functions of the highway. This has an impact on traffic safety and is visible from the accident analysis showing the concentration of accidents at intersections of Highway 69 with local roads

- There is an increasing travel demand between northern Ontario (particularly the Sudbury area) and southern Ontario (mostly the Greater Toronto Area). This connectivity is required in response to the existing transportation demand and as a stimulant to future economic development.

Traffic and road safety analysis that supported the need and justification for four-laning Highway 69 was originally established and is documented in detail in the *Highway 69 Planning, Preliminary Design and Environmental Assessment* (GWP 327-91-00), dated November 1999. This document provides a detailed description of the traffic growth analysis and levels of service considered at that time, as well as the highway geometrics, intersection analysis, traffic volumes and accident analysis carried out in the early stages of the Route Planning Study.

2.1.3 Traffic Conditions Update (2003)

Traffic conditions in the study area were initially analyzed using traffic data from 1960 to 1992. With the recommencement of the *Route Planning Study* (in 2003), traffic analysis work was updated to use existing and projected traffic volumes based on year 2000 traffic counts.

The recommenced study also makes updated recommendations for geometric, operational and safety improvements to address the deficiencies along this section of Highway 69. Other topics included in traffic engineering work on the recommenced study are level of service and capacity analysis, and collision analysis and a review of opportunities to enhance safety and operation within the Highway 69 corridor.

Average Daily Traffic Volumes within the study area, based on year 2000 counts, are as follows:

Highway 69 Between Estaire and Highway 64

Average Daily Traffic Volume: 6,000 to 6,300 vehicles/day

Average Summer Daily Traffic Volume: 8,350 to 9,150 vehicles/day

Average Percentage of Commercial Vehicles: 13% to 14%

Current transportation and traffic conditions are described in Section 3.4 of this report. The *Traffic Operations and Collision Analysis Report* prepared during the recommenced study is contained in Appendix J.

2.2 ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS (“ALTERNATIVES TO”)

The Environmental Assessment Act requires that “all reasonable alternatives” be considered in a planning study. This involves two levels of analysis. The “Alternative to the Undertaking” study refers to a broad range of transportation alternatives that could address the transportation needs. Once the best transportation system is selected, the “Alternative Method of Carrying out the Undertaking” is studied.

TRANSPORTATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT

This involves the study of the various alignments and preliminary design concepts possible to address the deficiencies as described in Section 3.4.

For this project, four different groups of “Alternatives to the Undertaking” were studied. These alternatives include:

- Do nothing
- Manage the transportation demand
- Improve the existing transportation facilities or methods of movement (modes) that use the facilities
- Introduce a new facility or method of movement (mode).

Table 5 describes in further detail the possible alternative transportation options.

TABLE 5: ALTERNATIVES TO THE UNDERTAKING

Alternative	Possible Improvements
Do Nothing	“Status quo” – no improvements are planned or improvements made
Manage Transportation Demand	Reduce, shift or eliminate the transportation demand to avoid the need for improvements
Spread the Peak Period	Spread travel over a longer period of time to avoid designing the facility to meet the “peak” need
Shift Travel Elsewhere	Shift the travel from Highway 69 to another corridor where capacity is available or the operational problems do not exist
Eliminate Growth	Control development and growth to restrict traffic both within and external to the study area
Manage the System	Control the use of the existing corridor through metered access to balance the demand and capacity
Reduce Demand	Reduce the demand by using fewer vehicles to move people and goods – requires larger trucks and a higher auto occupancy
Improve the Existing Facilities	Improve the existing highway or railway transportation facilities in the corridor
Roadway Improvements	Improve the existing highway facilities
Operational Improvements	Introduce traffic signal controls Intersection improvements Alignment improvements Truck climbing/ passing lanes
Infrastructure Improvements	Highway widening Access control
Infrastructure Addition	New roadway Bypass roadway
Modal Addition	Introduce/expand local/regional bus service High occupancy vehicle lanes Bicycle lanes Walkways
Railway Improvements	Improve the existing railway facilities
Regional Rail Service	Improve Sudbury-Toronto rail service
Local Transit Service	Provide a local French River to Sudbury rail transit service
Introduce New Modes	Add a new mode of travel that does not exist in the study area
Air Transportation System	Provide local/regional air connections
Water Transportation System	Provide a local/regional ferry or water taxi service

Additional information on these Alternatives to the Undertaking is provided in the *Study Design Report*.

2.3 SCREENING AND EVALUATION OF TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS

2.3.1 Community Liaison Team

The Highway 69 Study Area encompasses a variety of land uses, including natural areas, recreational facilities, residential development and service industries. These facilities would be affected to varying degrees by the various transportation alternatives. In recognition of the diversity of interests in the area and the potential for trade-off between differing interests, the Project Team proposed the development of a Community Liaison Team (CLT), which included representatives from the local communities, interest groups and other stakeholders to discuss these issues. The CLT provided the Project Team with advice and direction during the planning process to ensure the interest of the various local groups was integrated into the decision-making process.

The Community Liaison Team (CLT) was active on the project through the initial portion of the study (1994 to 1995).

COMMUNITY LIAISON TEAM'S TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Community Liaison Team was provided with a draft Terms of Reference for discussion to present the Project Team's expectations of the CLT members' role in the project. The following sections describe the CLT Terms of Reference and membership.

COMMUNITY LIAISON TEAM'S ROLE

The CLT provided the Project Team with advice and direction on the planning process used to identify and evaluate alternatives during the Highway 69 Route Planning Study. Throughout the planning process, priorities for significance were assigned to the features that are affected along the alternative corridors. The physical changes (or effects) were identified by the Project Team, but the importance of the environmental or unique features were better determined by the public. The CLT provided a public forum for the Project Team to discuss the planning process used to identify, compare and evaluate the alternative routes considered in the study.

A significant component of the planning process involved the public's priorities and concerns regarding the potentially affected natural, cultural and socio/economic environments. The CLT was asked to assist the Project Team in determining priorities and addressing concerns identified at the Public Information Centres (PICs). The CLT provided constructive criticism and comments regarding the planning process. Every effort was made by the Project Team to reach consensus with the CLT on the study recommendations.

PROJECT TEAM'S ROLE

The Project Team, comprised of representatives from the Ministry of Transportation, R.E. Winter Associates Limited and Azimuth Environmental Consulting Inc., presented information to the CLT and solicited comments. The Project Team provided the rationale for the planning process used and

TRANSPORTATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT

requested that the CLT comment on the information presented. The Project Team wanted CLT consensus on the issues or priorities to be used in the evaluation of the alternative routes.

Notes of meetings were used by CLT members to inform their respective interest or community groups of the project status and issues discussed.

COMMUNITY LIAISON TEAM CONSULTATION METHOD

During each of the early study stages, two meetings were held with the CLT to discuss the proposed study activities. In the first meeting, the Project Team explained the planning process for identifying and evaluating alternatives and requested CLT members identify their concerns. The Project Team used this input to undertake the planning. In the second meeting, the Project Team presented the results of their studies and discussed how the comments were integrated into the decision-making process. Based on the comments received at the second meeting, the results were finalized for presentation at PICs. At the CLT meeting following the PICs, the comments received were presented and discussed, prior to finalizing the recommendations and proceedings with the next stage of the study.

The consultation method between the Project Team and CLT followed a presentation/discussion format. In each of the early stages in the process the Project Team presented the following information for the CLT's review and comment:

- The decision-making process used to determine the preferred alternative(s)
- The proposed method of identifying, comparing and evaluating the alternative(s)
- The content of the presentation planning for Public Information Centres to ensure that all relevant data was provided
- Potential concerns or issues to be addressed
- The results of public, municipal and government ministry/agency consultation
- The rationale for the selection of the preferred alternative with regard for the above activities

The Environmental Assessment findings were discussed with the CLT to make sure the decision-making process was documented in a manner that was easy to understand and fully integrated into the planning process.

COMMUNITY LIAISON TEAM MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

- CLT members were asked to attend several meetings during the study period (1994 to 1995). The meetings were held in the study area.
- Each team member was expected to keep the members of the group he/she represented informed and bring back to the Project Team any concerns that his/her group may have regarding the project.
- If a CLT member could not attend a meeting then they were requested to send another individual from the group to represent them in their absence. The individual selected was familiar with the project and the previous CLT activities and acted as a back-up member of the CLT

- CLT members were asked to pass on to the Project Team any requests for additional study by members of the public. The CLT could not make commitments to satisfy the request until it had been considered by the Project Team
- The Project Team asked that if any member of the CLT were aware of any public concerns or misinformation regarding the study, that they would inform the Project Team and the CLT. The Project Team wanted to be proactive in addressing public concerns and misconceptions
- The CLT member committed to circulating accurate and up-to-date information consistent with that presented by the Project Team and reviewed by the CLT
- The Project Team appreciated the input and dedication of the individuals in assisting and volunteering to serve on the Community Liaison Team. Participation on the CLT was voluntary.

Additional details on the formation of the CLT and input received from the group in the early stages of the Route Planning Study are documented in the *Highway 69 Planning, Preliminary Design and Environmental Assessment* (GWP 327-91-00), dated November 1999.

2.3.2 Screening and Evaluation

To determine the most reasonable option for the study area, each alternative was subjected to a screening process that assessed feasibility using the following three screening criteria. Under each of the screening criterion, a number of factors were developed to assess each option's ability to meet the screening criteria.

1. Will the alternative meet the area's long-term (20 year) transportation needs?
 - Will the improvement result in reduced travel time in the corridor?
 - Will the improvement reduce the existing or anticipated congestion in the corridor?
 - Will the improvement result in increased safety for travel in the corridor?
 - Will the improvement result in better accessibility in the Sudbury to Toronto corridor?
2. Can the possible effect of the improvements be minimized or eliminated?
 - Can the economic effects on the highway-oriented businesses and the regional tourist operations be minimized?
 - Can the impact of the improvements on the natural environment be reduced or minimized to a reasonable level?
 - Can the social/cultural effects of the improvements on the local communities be minimized?
3. Are the improvements consistent with the existing transportation system?
 - Is there an existing corridor available that could be used for the improvements?
 - Will the means of travel suit the way people expect to travel in the future?

TRANSPORTATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT

- Is the means of travel convenient for travel requirements of the public?
- Is the proposed alternative a reasonable and cost effective solution?

The screening exercise was completed by the Project Team, public and the Community Liaison Team (CLT) in 1994. The combined public and CLT results were used to determine the alternative to the undertaking that satisfied the community transportation needs. The "need" for the project was determined by comparing the recommended "alternative to the undertaking" with the "do nothing" scenario to determine which best met the three screening criteria. Figures 3-1 and 3-2 (from the original route planning study, November 1999) show the results of the screening process.

Improvements to the highway and the railway systems were both reasonable alternatives, however, highway improvements were preferred because of the enhanced ability to meet predicted long-term local and provincial traffic needs.

TRANSPORTATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT

CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVES					
	Do Nothing	Manage Demand	Improve Highways	Improve Railways	Air Transport	Water transport
LONG TERM NEEDS						
Travel time improvement	Travel time will increase as traffic volumes increase	Travel time will not improve. May increase.	Travel time reduced with capacity improvements.	May improve travel time for long distance travel. Will not improve travel time for local traffic.	Will improve travel time for long distance travel. Will not improve travel time for local traffic.	Will not improve travel time for local or long distance travel.
Congestion decreased	Congestion will increase as traffic volumes increase	Congestion will not decrease. May increase.	Congestion reduced with capacity improvements.	May result in a small decrease in congestion as road travel switches to rail.	Will not appreciably decrease congestion.	Will not appreciably decrease congestion.
Safety improved	Accidents will increase as traffic volumes increase	Safety will not improve. May become less safe.	Safety improved with design/capacity changes.	Will not improve safety in the existing highway corridor.	Will not improve safety in the existing highway corridor.	Will not improve safety in the existing highway corridor.
Accessibility improved	Accessibility reduced as traffic volumes increase	Accessibility may not improve, may be reduced.	Accessibility improved with capacity improvements.	May improve regional accessibility. May not improve local accessibility.	May improve regional accessibility. Will not improve local accessibility.	Will not improve regional or local accessibility.
Serve local needs	Local needs will not be served	Will not serve local needs. Access to highway reduced.	Will serve local needs. Access restrictions possible.	Will not well serve local needs (shopping, commuting & recreational travel)	Will not well serve local needs (shopping, commuting & recreational travel)	Will not well serve local needs (shopping, commuting & recreational travel)
Can be staged	Not applicable	Can be staged	Can be staged	Cannot be effectively staged.	Existing operations can be expanded in a staged manner	Cannot be effectively staged.
MINIMIZE IMPACT						
Minimize economic impact	Congestion will cause economic impact to Sudbury & study area	Shifting travel patterns may cause economic impact	Increased traffic - a positive impact. Restricted access - a negative impact.	Minimal impact on highway businesses. Does not support area tourism focus.	Minimal impact on highway businesses. Does not support area tourism focus.	Minimal impact on highway businesses. Does not support area tourism focus.
Minimize natural environmental effects	Minimal impact	Minimal impact	Some impacts. Most can be mitigated.	Minimal impact if existing corridor used. Some impact with a new corridor.	Minimal impact as air corridor capacity can be expanded	Major impact to provide a direct marine corridor through the study area
Minimize socio/cultural effects	Congestion will cause socio-cultural impacts.	Minimal impact	Some impacts. Most can be mitigated.	Minimal impact	Minimal impact	Minimal impact
CONSISTENT WITH EXISTING SYSTEMS						
Existing corridor available	The existing highway corridor is available.	The existing highway corridor is available.	The existing highway corridor is available.	Yes, one of the two existing rail corridors	Yes, the existing air corridors.	No, a marine corridor requires development.
Suit travel, now & future	May suit travel now. Will not suit higher traffic volumes in the future.	May suit travel now. Will not suit higher traffic volumes in the future.	Will suit travel both now and in the future as capacity matches demand.	Does not suit travel now. Economic feasibility for rail travel in the future is questionable.	Suits long distance travel for business/vacation. Economic feasibility for more use in the future is questionable.	Will not suit most types of travel (commuting, shopping, etc) now or in the future.
Require different modes	Possible modes include cars, trucks and busses.	Possible modes include cars, trucks and busses.	Possible modes include cars, trucks and busses.	Yes, requires another mode (bus, etc.) to access the rail facility at both ends of the trip.	Yes, requires another mode (bus, etc.) to access the air facility at both ends of the trip.	Yes, requires another mode (bus, can, etc) to access the marine facility at both ends of the trip.
Cost effective solution	The most cost effective solution considering capital cost.	A cost effective solution considering capital cost.	More costly solution. Costs may be offset by economic benefit to the area.	Possibly	No, or the air option would be used more extensively at the present time.	No, requires extensive development of a corridor.
COMMENTS	Will not meet the area's future needs. Minimal impact Consistent with the existing systems	Will not meet the area's future needs. Minimal impact Consistent with the existing systems	Will meet the areas future needs. Some impact requiring mitigation consistent with the existing systems	Requires further investigation. The capacity of the existing corridors and the feasibility of implementation needs to be confirmed.	Air travel is appropriate for certain types of travel. Growth will depend on the cost of air travel and be market driven.	This type of travel is inappropriate for practical travel purposes (commuting, shopping). Appropriate for recreational needs, but costly.
RECOMMENDATION	Eliminate from consideration	Eliminate from consideration	Consider further	Does not adequately address Long Term needs as highways are the major method of transportation	Eliminate from consideration	Eliminate from consideration

W.P. 327-91-00 HIGHWAY 69 PLANNING, PRELIMINARY DESIGN AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT STUDY	FIGURE 3-1 ALTERNATIVES TO THE UNDERTAKING PROJECT TEAM SCREENING
--	---

TRANSPORTATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT

CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVES					
	Do Nothing	Manage Demand	Improve Highways	Improve Railways	Air Transport	Water transport
MEET LONG TERM NEEDS						
Travel time improved	Will not improve travel time	Will/will not improve travel time (50/50)	Will improve travel time	Will improve travel time	Will not improve travel time	Will not improve travel time
Congestion decreased	Will not decrease congestion	Will/will not decrease congestion (60/40)	Will decrease congestion	Will decrease congestion	Will not decrease congestion	Will not decrease congestion
Safety improved	Will not improve safety	Will/will not improve safety (50/50)	Will improve safety	Will/will not improve safety (50/50)	Will not improve safety	Will not improve safety
Accessibility improved	Will not improve accessibility	Will not improve accessibility	Will improve accessibility	Will improve accessibility	May improve accessibility	May improve accessibility
Serve local needs	Will not serve local needs	Will/will not serve needs (50/50)	Will serve local needs	Will/will not serve needs (50/50)	Will not serve local needs	Will not serve local needs
Can be staged	Cannot be staged	Can be staged	Can be staged	Can/cannot be staged	Cannot be staged	Cannot be staged
MINIMIZE IMPACT						
Minimize economic impact	May minimize impacts (50/50)	Will minimize impact	Will minimize impact	Will minimize impact	May minimize impact	May minimize impact
Minimize natural environmental effects	May minimize impacts (50/50)	Will minimize impact	Will minimize impact	Will minimize impact	Will minimize impact	Will minimize impact
Minimize socio/cultural effects	Should minimize impacts	Will Minimize impact	Will Minimize impact	Will Minimize impact	Will Minimize impact	Will Minimize impact
CONSISTENT WITH EXISTING SYSTEMS						
Existing corridor available	Existing corridor	Existing corridor (50/50)	Existing corridor available	Existing corridor available	Corridor available	No corridor available
Suit travel, now & future	Will not suit future travel	Suit future travel (50/50)	Suits future travel	May/may not suit future travel	Will not suit future travel	Will not suit future travel
Require different modes	Will not require different modes	Require different modes (50/50)	Require different modes (50/50)	Require different modes (50/50)	Require different modes (50/50)	Require different modes (50/50)
Cost effective solution	Cost Effective (50/50)	Cost effective (50/50)	Cost effective	Not cost effective	Not cost effective	Not cost effective
COMMENTS	Does not meet the area's long term needs	Does not meet the area's long term needs	Meets the area's needs & consistent with existing systems	May meet future needs and somewhat consistent with existing systems	Will not meet long term needs & consistent with existing systems	Will not meet long term needs & consistent with existing systems
RECOMMENDATION	Eliminate from consideration	Eliminate from consideration	Review further	Does not adequately address Long Term needs as highways are the major method of transportation	Eliminate from consideration	Eliminate from consideration

FIGURE 3-2	W.P. 327-91-00
ALTERNATIVES TO THE UNDERTAKING COMMUNITY LIAISON TEAM SCREENING	HIGHWAY 69 PLANNING, PRELIMINARY DESIGN AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT STUDY

TRANSPORTATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT

2.4 ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT PROPOSAL (STUDY DESIGN REPORT)

To ensure that public and government agencies had the opportunity to comment on the environmental planning process prior to its implementation, an *Environmental Assessment Proposal* was prepared in 1995. The *Environmental Assessment Proposal* (EAP) provided an overview of the study process to enable the public and government representatives to comment on the acceptability of the process prior to beginning corridor and route selection. The EAP was submitted to government agencies and put on display for public review (at the offices of the MTO, the study consultants and local municipalities). Comments received on the EAP were used to refine the planning process to address the needs of the affected public, municipalities and government ministries. During the EAP review period, no significant requests were received for any revisions to the planning process as defined in the EAP. The finalized EAP was then used as a guiding document for the planning process.

In 2003, when the Route Planning Study for this area was recommenced, the EAP was updated into a *Study Design Report* (in accordance with the current Class EA for Provincial Transportation Facilities (2000)). The report was provided to external agencies and made available to the public for review. The *Study Design Report*, dated September 2003, is contained in Appendix A.

2.5 PUBLIC CONSULTATION METHODS

The public consultation methods used to solicit public participation and comment throughout the initiation of the planning process included:

- Public Information Centres
- Newspaper advertisements
- Community Liaison Team
- Bulk mailing of notices
- Study Newsletter
- Study Design Report (i.e. Environmental Assessment Proposal)
- Web Site www.highway69.ca

2.5.1 Public Information Centre – April 1995

In April 1995, Public Information Centres (PICs) were held in the communities of French River, Wanup and Sudbury. The purpose of these PICs was to inform the public of the initiation of the project, to obtain input on the “alternatives to the undertaking” and to solicit input on the importance or weight that should be assigned to the environmental factors during the selection and evaluation of alternatives. Information on the environmental features in the study area was displayed to assist the public in weighting the environmental factors. The transportation engineering, environmental information and the study process were explained to members of the public. Newsletters describing the study activities and the results of

the work at the initiation stage were also presented at the PIC. Comment forms, soliciting public input were provided for documenting comments and concerns. Copies of the comment forms and factor importance weightings are appended to the *Highway 69 Planning, Preliminary Design and Environmental Assessment* (GWP 327-91-00), dated November 1999. The factor importance weighting is presented in Section 4.2 of this report, with the screening of alternative corridors.

In general, the majority of the public agreed with the need for the Highway 69 corridor improvements including the need for a new highway corridor. The main topics raised by the public included:

- Alternatives to the highway development
- Need for new highway alignment vs. improvements to the existing highway
- Road/traffic safety concerns
- Operational/local road improvements
- Timing for improvements/new highway construction.

Detailed comments received and the Project Team response are Appended to the *Highway 69 Planning, Preliminary Design and Environmental Assessment* (GWP 327-91-00), dated November 1999.

TRANSPORTATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT

2.5.2 External Agency Input

Government ministries either with a mandate for environmental assessment or for the management of resources within the study area, were contacted by letter to solicit their interest in the study. These contacts were outlined in Section 1.7.

Government comments received during the Project Initiation Stage are provided in Table 6.

TABLE 6: GOVERNMENT COMMENTS FROM PROJECT INITIATION STAGE

<i>Local Roads Boards</i>
Proposed schedule is long and historically, previous studies did not result in changes to the highway
Cost should be a consideration in selection of preferred alternative
Will passing lanes be used as an interim solution?
Will the new highway be a four-lane controlled access highway?
Will the design of the highway be decided during the study?
Road signs are important for advertising in the area and will a controlled access highway restrict signing?
Will Sudbury Region be a part of the Community Liaison Team?
Are aboriginal issues being addressed?
Can we speed up the schedule?
Are toll roads an option to help pay for highway in order to get it built sooner?
Any cost/benefit analysis should include construction, operation and maintenance
<i>Greater Sudbury (formerly Regional Municipality of Sudbury)</i>
No municipal services planned for south end of Sudbury
Salt contamination is an issue
Previous work on Southeast Bypass connection requires review of property acquisition and access to the conservation area
City and Region support the expansion of Highway 69 as soon as possible.
<i>Interest groups include: Transport 2000, Sudbury Solar Energy, Round Table on a Healthy Environment, South End Citizens and MacFarlane Lake Ratepayers</i>
Public interest in Sudbury/Toronto rapid transit link
Region indicated concerns about highway standards on existing Highway 69, if transferred to the Region when new highway constructed
<i>Ministry of Natural Resources and Ministry of Environment</i>
Questioned the length of time that the Environment Assessment (EA) approval is valid
Why were the study limits chosen between French River and Sudbury?
It was pointed out that French River is a waterway and heritage park
It was suggested to contact Ontario Hydro to determine groups with interest in the French River crossing
There is a new Official Plan for the Sudbury East Planning District
It was suggested to contact government landowners regarding development of the Burwash lands

2.5.3 Municipal Input

Meetings were held with the Sudbury East Planning Board, Local Roads Boards and the Regional Municipality of Sudbury during each stage of the project (i.e. project initiation, alternative corridors, alternative routes, recommended route) to review the planning and decision-making process and to solicit their comments.

In general all the municipalities supported the highway improvements.