

3.0 CONSULTATION

The Project Team undertook stakeholder consultation throughout the study. Those consulted included:

- ▶ External agencies, including provincial and federal ministries, and the local Conservation Authority;
- ▶ Municipalities;
- ▶ Potentially interested Indigenous Communities; and
- ▶ The public, including affected property owners, community / interest groups and the general public.

Consultation has been an integral component of this study. It has provided opportunities for two-way communication with interested stakeholders. Consultation activities enabled the identification and consideration of potentially significant environmental issues early in the decision-making process.

Throughout the study, stakeholders were engaged through a variety of forums and activities, including:

- ▶ Project website (www.qewgcs.ca);
- ▶ Three Public Information Centres (PICs);
- ▶ Stakeholder meetings;
- ▶ Two sessions with potentially impacted property owners;
- ▶ Direct contact with the Project Team via mail, email, phone or fax; and
- ▶ Newspaper advertisements (for Study Commencement, each PIC, and the filing of the TESR) inviting stakeholder participation and comments.

Consultation events were held at key study phases, including the generation of design alternatives to the undertaking, selection of a preferred alternative, and during Preliminary Design to present the environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures. **Exhibit 2-2** reflects the timing of PICs in relation to study phases.

Meetings and discussions with federal and provincial agencies and municipalities (see **Table 3-5**), and impacted property owners also occurred outside of key study phases.

Project Mailing List

At the commencement of the project, the Project Team developed a contact list which includes federal and provincial ministries, the local Conservation Authority, municipalities, political representatives, community groups, and other interest groups and relevant bodies that may hold interest in this project. As the project progressed, the contact list was updated to ensure that all interested parties receive a copy of any future study notification documents. At Study Commencement and prior to each Public Information Centre, notification letters were distributed by direct mail to the project mailing list. Samples of all notification letters are provided in **Appendix A**.

Project Website

The project website (www.qewgcs.ca) was launched to coincide with the Study Commencement notification on November 27, 2010. The website has remained active and has been updated throughout the study.

The website provides an opportunity for the public and stakeholders to review study information, study materials, and contact the Project Team through the project email address (project-team@qewgcs.ca), which

is provided on the “Contact Us” page. A webform feature is included on the “Contact Us” page, where comments can be entered and sent directly to the Project Team from the website to facilitate feedback from interested parties at any time during the study.

3.1 Study Commencement

In November 2010, notification letters announcing Study Commencement were distributed by direct mail to the project mailing list. A project commencement notice was published in local newspapers. Copies of the notice are included in **Appendix A**. The notice was published as follows:

- ▶ *St. Catharines Standard* – November 27, 2010
- ▶ *Niagara Falls Review* – November 27, 2010
- ▶ *Welland Port Colborne Tribune* – November 27, 2010

3.2 Public Information Centres

Public Information Centres (PICs) are informal drop-in style sessions where area residents and other interested parties are provided the opportunity to review planning and project information, identify concerns and provide input to the project and Project Team. Three rounds of PICs were held during the study. The PICs were arranged to allow the public to see results, exchange information and ask one-on-one questions of the Project Team. The PICs served an important function of providing two-way communication on specific local conditions, issues and concerns regarding the study. **Table 3-1** outlines the key consultation events and when they occurred. Summary reports for the PICs are provided in **Appendix B**.

TABLE 3-1: KEY PUBLIC CONSULTATION EVENT DATES

Public Information Centre #1	March 30, 2011
Public Information Centre #2	October 22, 2013
Public Information Centre #3	June 19, 2014

Public Information Centre #1 (March 30, 2011)

The first PIC was held on Wednesday, March 30, 2011, to provide the public and stakeholders the opportunity to review and comment on project details, including the study process, existing conditions, need and justification, problems and opportunities, generation of preliminary alternatives and the next steps in the study. The PIC displays are included within the PIC #1 Summary Report in **Appendix B**.

The PIC notice was advertised as follows:

- ▶ *Niagara Falls Review* – Saturday, March 19, 2011
- ▶ *St. Catharines Standard* – Saturday, March 19, 2011
- ▶ *Welland Port Colborne Tribune* – Saturday, March 19, 2011

A copy of the notice is included in **Appendix A**.

PIC notification letters were distributed by direct mail to external agencies, municipalities, interest groups, and other relevant bodies on March 14, 2011. In addition, the Project Team sent letters and emails to members of the public and interest groups on the study contact list. Notification was also distributed within the study area via Canada Post unaddressed bulk mail. Notifications were posted online on the project website at www.qewgcs.ca. All notifications and letters included the project website address.

A session for agency and municipal staff was held prior to the PIC. A total of twelve agency / municipal staff attended, including representatives from:

- ▶ City of St. Catharines
- ▶ Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake
- ▶ Niagara Region
- ▶ St. Lawrence Seaway Management Corporation
- ▶ Ministry of Tourism and Culture, Ontario Travel Information Centres – Niagara / Southwest Region
- ▶ Niagara Health System

The PIC was attended by approximately 45 people including local residents, property owners, and business owners. Media representatives from the *St. Catharines Standard* also attended the PIC.

Comments were requested by April 13, 2011. Eighteen comment submissions were received and responded to. The key comments and responses are summarized in **Table 3-2**.

TABLE 3-2: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS FROM PIC # 1

Comment Expressed	How the Comment was Addressed
Concern that the Ontario Travel Information Centre (TIC) will be relocated based on the alignment alternatives. Requested that the Glendale interchange be considered as a potential relocation site.	Several of the alternatives would displace the existing Travel Information Centre. The Project Team has been consulting with the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) regarding the TIC and will consider impacts to the facility as part of the evaluation of alternatives. If the facility is impacted by the preferred alternative, the Project Team, in consultation with MTCS, will develop mitigation and/or relocation plans. The preference for relocating the TIC to the Glendale interchange is noted.
Comment that the QEW Garden City Skyway provides unique views of the Niagara-on-the-Lake landscape, which would be lost if the replacement tunnel alternative was selected.	Feedback regarding the views from the QEW Garden City Skyway is noted.
Concern that information and directional sign placement is currently less than adequate for Niagara bound traffic.	Signage requirements will depend, in part, on the nature of the preferred alternative. Signage will be considered as part of the current Preliminary Design phase; however, specific signage plans will be developed during the subsequent Detail Design phase.
Comment that the study limits fall within the study limits of the Glendale/QEW/405 Planning Study EA underway by the Region of Niagara. Impacts of the alternatives on interchange configurations, particularly with respect to ramp design, should be considered.	The Project Team is aware of the Region's study and will coordinate with that study as appropriate.
Concerns regarding potential impacts to traffic operations.	Potential traffic operations impacts are included in the evaluation of alternatives and will be minimized during construction.
Concerns about noise and property.	An environmental noise impact assessment was completed as part of the study. Details of this assessment are provided in Section 8.2.3 . All property acquisition will occur on a case-by-case basis and will be based on fair market value.

Comment Expressed	How the Comment was Addressed
Comments expressing preference for the replacement tunnel alternative.	Preference for a tunnel was noted by the Project Team. The assessment and evaluation of alternatives considered a range of factors, including socio-economic, cultural and natural environment impacts, along with technical considerations including cost, and constructability risk. The final evaluation of alternatives focused on the comparison of north and south twinning, with north twinning ultimately being selected as the technically preferred alternative.
Comments about the heritage value of the QEW Garden City Skyway.	A Cultural Heritage Assessment Report was completed for the QEW Garden City Skyway and adjacent heritage resources. Details of this assessment are provided in Section 8.3.2 .
Concerns about cost.	Life cycle costing, including capital and future maintenance costs, were a key factor in the evaluation of alternatives.
Comment expressing preference to retain the existing bridge. If a twinned bridge is the selected alternative, the design should not detract from the image of the existing bridge.	Feedback regarding the alternatives is noted.
Concern about safety resulting from restricted visibility over the crest of the bridge. Suggestion that signal lights be installed over each lane before the crest to indicate if a lane is blocked.	The Project Team will review the need for signals or other treatments as part of the Preliminary Design phase of the study.

Public Information Centre #2 (October 22, 2013)

The second PIC was held on October 22, 2013, to provide an opportunity for the public to review and comment on the results of the assessment and evaluation process, and to present the technically preferred alternative. The PIC displays are included within the PIC #2 Summary Report in **Appendix B**.

The PIC notice was advertised as follows:

- ▶ *Niagara Falls Review* – October 10, 2013
- ▶ *St. Catharines Standard* – October 10, 2013
- ▶ *Welland Tribune* – October 10, 2013

A copy of the notice is included in **Appendix A**.

PIC notification letters were distributed by direct mail to external agencies, municipal staff, emergency services, utilities, and other stakeholders on October 4, 2013. Potentially impacted property owners were notified via direct registered mail. In addition, letters and emails were sent to members of the public and interest groups on the study contact list. Notification was also distributed to mailing addresses adjacent to the preferred alignment via Canada Post unaddressed bulk mail. Notifications were posted online on the project website, as well as on the municipal websites for the City of St. Catharines, Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake, and Niagara Region. All notifications and letters included the project website address (www.qewqcs.ca).

A session was held for potentially impacted property owners earlier in the day on October 22, 2013, which included a brief presentation. The purpose of this session was to provide potentially impacted property owners an opportunity to discuss questions or concerns regarding potential property impacts. Fourteen people attended this session.

A session for agency and municipal staff was also held prior to the PIC. Seven agency / municipal staff members attended the agency session, including representatives from:

- ▶ Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake
- ▶ City of St. Catharines
- ▶ Niagara Historical Society
- ▶ Niagara Region Development Services

Approximately 45 people attended the PIC (44 signed the registration sheets). Attendees included local residents, property owners, and business owners. Media representatives from the *St. Catharines Standard* also attended the PIC.

Comments were requested by November 5, 2013. Twelve comment submissions were received and responded to. The key comments and responses are summarized in **Table 3-3**.

TABLE 3-3: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS FROM PIC #2

Comment Expressed	How the Comment was Addressed
Concerns regarding property impacts and fair property acquisition.	Potentially impacted property owners have been identified and were sent notification prior to PIC #2. The Project Team is following up with owners who have expressed interest in property-specific discussions. Any property which is required to complete the proposed works will be acquired by MTO. Property negotiations will be carried out individually with property owners. Those directly affected will be compensated at fair market value for their property. At this point in the study, anticipated property impacts are preliminary and will be defined more accurately as the project proceeds to Preliminary Design.
Concerns regarding noise impacts.	The Project Team includes a noise specialist who will be reviewing anticipated noise impacts related to the preferred alternative and providing mitigation recommendations in accordance with current MTO policy. An environmental noise impact assessment was completed as part of the study. Details of this assessment are provided in Section 8.2.3 .
Concerns regarding impacts to cultural heritage landscapes, built heritage and archaeological resources.	Interest in built heritage, cultural heritage landscapes and archaeology is noted. The Project Team includes heritage and archaeology specialists who have been involved in reviewing existing conditions, providing input to the evaluation of alternatives and documenting effects and proposed mitigation related to the preferred alternative. The scope of heritage assessment includes all identified heritage resources within the study area. The scope of archaeological assessment includes a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment, which will identify the need for any further assessment to be completed during Detail Design.

Comment Expressed	How the Comment was Addressed
	A Cultural Heritage Assessment Report was completed as part of the study. Details of this assessment are provided in Section 8.3.2 .
Comment inquiring if there will be improvements to the Glendale interchange to improve traffic flow and access.	The scope of this study does not include improvements to the Glendale interchange. In 2010, Niagara Region commenced a Glendale/QEW/Highway 405 Planning Study and EA. The Project Team has been in touch with the team undertaking that study. The Project Team will continue to coordinate and consult with Niagara Region staff and is also in contact with staff from St. Catharines and Niagara-on-the-Lake.
Concern about traffic operations in the vicinity of the westbound QEW off-ramp and Dieppe Road.	These concerns have been noted. The Project Team will keep these issues in mind as the Preliminary Design is prepared.
Comments expressing preference to focus on rail transportation through the study area instead of twinning the QEW Garden City Skyway.	The possibility of incorporating a rail link into the QEW crossing of the Welland Canal was considered early in the study. The concept was deemed to be not technically feasible for several reasons, including: the different grade requirements for a rail bridge versus a road bridge; incorporating rail on the QEW Garden City Skyway requires significantly longer and flatter approaches and bridge structure, substantially increasing cost and resulting in additional property impacts to accommodate the grading requirements; existing CN mainline rail track (which would provide GO Rail service to the region) is located approximately 3 km south of the QEW. To combine the QEW and rail would require a substantial realignment of the existing track through built-up areas of St. Catharines, which would be very costly and would result in major property impacts. Additionally, combining a rail crossing with the North Twinning technically preferred alternative would require the railway to cross to the north side of the existing QEW in St. Catharines, and cross back over to the south side of the QEW in Niagara-on-the-Lake, again resulting in significant cost and property impacts.

Public Information Centre #3 (June 19, 2014)

The third PIC was held on June 19, 2014, to provide an opportunity for the public to review and comment on the Preliminary Design of the Recommended Plan, potential environmental effects, and proposed mitigation. The PIC displays are included within the PIC #3 Summary Report in **Appendix B**.

The PIC notice was advertised as follows:

- ▶ *Niagara Falls Review* – June 7, 2014
- ▶ *St. Catharines Standard* – June 7, 2014
- ▶ *Welland Tribune* – June 7, 2014

A copy of the notice is included in **Appendix A**.

PIC notification letters were distributed by direct mail to elected officials on May 30, 2014, and to external agencies, municipal staff, emergency services, utilities, and other stakeholders on June 3, 2014. In addition, letters and emails were sent to members of the public and interest groups on the study contact list. Impacted property owners were notified via direct registered mail on June 12, 2014. Notifications were also posted online on the study's website and on the municipal websites of Niagara Region and Niagara-on-the-Lake. All notifications and letters included the project website address.

A session was held for impacted property owners earlier in the day, which included a brief presentation. The purpose of this session was to provide impacted property owners with an opportunity to discuss questions or concerns regarding anticipated property impacts. Ten people signed in at this session.

An agency session was also held prior to the PIC. Sixteen agency / municipal staff attended the agency session, including representatives from:

- ▶ Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport
- ▶ Metrolinx (GO Transit)
- ▶ Niagara Region
- ▶ Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake
- ▶ City of St. Catharines
- ▶ St. Lawrence Seaway Management Corporation

Approximately 40 people attended the PIC (36 signed the registration sheets). Attendees included local residents, property owners and business owners. Media representatives from CHCH News also attended the PIC.

Comments were requested by July 3, 2014. Thirteen comment submissions were received and responded to. The key comments and responses are summarized in **Table 3-4**.

TABLE 3-4: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS FROM PIC #3

Comment Expressed	How the Comment was Addressed
Suggestion that light rail transit or dedicated mass transit lanes should be included in the planning of the new bridge.	Dedicated lanes for buses / carpooling are not proposed as part of the current design, and are not planned for the larger QEW corridor; however, future HOV lanes are not precluded by the proposed bridge design. The Project Team is not aware of any municipal plans for mass transit across the Welland Canal that would benefit from the use of the QEW Garden City Skyway.
Concerns about property impacts and property acquisition.	Impacted property owners have been identified and notified by mail. Future right-of-way requirements at a Preliminary Design level of detail are known at this time however final impacts to property will be known when property negotiations occur during the Detail Design phase of the project. Property acquisition is normally carried out with impacted owners two to three years before a scheduled construction project. Compensation is based on a fair market value appraisal. MTO will negotiate with each impacted property owner to try and come to a mutually satisfactory agreement.
Concerns about noise, water, and air quality impacts.	The Project Team has completed an Environmental Noise Impact and Screening Level Vibration Assessment Report, which assesses noise impacts resulting from the proposed works and identifies mitigation measures to minimize noise

Comment Expressed	How the Comment was Addressed
	impacts resulting from construction. Details of this assessment are provided in Section 8.2.3 and 8.2.4 . An Air Quality Assessment Report was also completed for the study. Details of the air quality assessment are provided in Section 8.2.5 . Regarding water impacts: stormwater runoff from the new bridge will be carried from the bridges to drain into stormwater management ponds at each end of the structure.
Preference for south twinning over north twinning.	The selection of north twinning as the preferred alternative was based on a detailed evaluation which considered socio-economic environment criteria, technical considerations, natural environment criteria and cultural environment criteria. From a socio-economic perspective, north twinning will result in fewer business and employment impacts than south twinning. From a technical perspective, north twinning has a lower constructability risk than south twinning, as no construction is required between the existing QEW Garden City Skyway and the Homer Bridge, and because it provides better flexibility for future replacement of the existing Homer Bridge.
Questions about timing for construction.	Timing of construction commencement is subject to completing the current Preliminary Design study, obtaining all approvals, acquiring all required properties, completing Detail Design, and availability of funding. In 2016, construction was not in MTO's five (5) year program; however, this five-year program is reviewed every year.
Concerns regarding aesthetics of the new structure.	The final bridge type will not be determined as part of this Preliminary Design study. The goal of the current study is to identify the property requirements for the new bridge, and investigate the range of potential impacts and mitigation measures associated with different bridge types. The final decision regarding bridge type will be made as part of the future Detail Design study, and will consider aesthetics, as well as other factors, including construction costs, long-term maintenance costs, cultural heritage, clearance requirements for the St. Lawrence Seaway and Niagara District Airport, and other relevant factors.

3.3 Agency, Municipal, Utility and Interest Group Consultation

Agency, municipal, utility and interest group input was an important part of the study, and helped the Project Team understand and incorporate municipal, regional, provincial and federal perspectives.

The following agencies, municipalities and organizations were consulted during the study:

Federal Agencies

- ▶ Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada
(formerly *Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada*)
- ▶ Transport Canada
- ▶ Fisheries and Oceans Canada
- ▶ Environment Canada
- ▶ Canadian Transportation Agency
- ▶ Health Canada
- ▶ Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency

Provincial Agencies

- ▶ Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change
(formerly Ministry of the Environment)
- ▶ Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry
(formerly Ministry of Natural Resources)
- ▶ Infrastructure Ontario (formerly Ontario Realty Corporation)
- ▶ Ministry of Indigenous Relations and Reconciliation
(formerly *Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs*)
- ▶ Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs
- ▶ Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport
(formerly Ministry of Tourism and Culture)
- ▶ Ministry of Citizenship, Immigration and International Trade
(formerly Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration)
- ▶ Ministry of Energy
- ▶ Ministry of Economic Development, Employment and Infrastructure
(formerly Ministry of Infrastructure)
- ▶ Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
- ▶ Metrolinx (GO Transit)
- ▶ Ontario Provincial Police

Municipalities and Local Agencies

- ▶ City of St. Catharines
- ▶ Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake
- ▶ Niagara Region
- ▶ Niagara District Airport
- ▶ St. Lawrence Seaway Management Corporation
- ▶ Trillium Railway Company Limited
- ▶ Canadian National Railway
- ▶ Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority
- ▶ Niagara Health System
- ▶ Niagara Emergency Medical Services
- ▶ District School Board of Niagara
- ▶ Niagara Catholic District School Board
- ▶ St. Catharines Transit Commission
- ▶ St. Catharines Fire & Emergency Management Services
- ▶ Niagara-on-the-Lake Fire & Emergency Services
- ▶ Niagara Regional Police
- ▶ Niagara Region Development Services
- ▶ Greenbelt Council

Utilities

- ▶ TransCanada Pipelines
- ▶ Enbridge Pipelines Inc.
- ▶ Bell Canada
- ▶ Enbridge Gas Distribution
- ▶ Canadian Niagara Power Inc.
- ▶ Niagara-on-the-Lake Public Works
- ▶ Niagara-on-the-Lake Hydro
- ▶ Hydro One Networks Inc.
- ▶ St. Catharines Hydro Utilities Services Inc.
- ▶ Rogers Cable
- ▶ Cogeco Cable
- ▶ Alectra Utilities (formerly Horizon Utilities Corporation Inc.)

Interest Groups

- ▶ Niagara Economic Development Corporation
- ▶ Niagara-on-the-Lake Chamber of Commerce
- ▶ Greater Niagara Chamber of Commerce
(formerly St. Catharines – Thorold Chamber of Commerce)
- ▶ Niagara College of Applied Arts and Technology
- ▶ Historical Society of St. Catharines
- ▶ Canadian Canal Society
- ▶ Historical Highways Society of Ontario
- ▶ Architectural Conservancy of Ontario
- ▶ St. Catharines Museum
- ▶ Ontario Nature
- ▶ Friends of the Greenbelt Foundation

Agency, municipal, utility and stakeholder consultation activities were structured around obtaining input at key project phases. Copies of key agency correspondence are provided in **Appendix C. Table 3-5** outlines the key agency and stakeholder meetings.

TABLE 3-5: KEY AGENCY AND STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS

Meeting	Meeting Date	Meeting Purpose	Meeting Summary
Ontario Provincial Police (OPP)	October 20, 2010	To discuss Niagara Region OPP's safety and emergency responder concerns on the QEW Garden City Skyway.	A meeting was held with the Ontario Provincial Police (OPP) Niagara Region Detachment in advance of study commencement to discuss the OPP's safety and emergency responder concerns on the Garden City Skyway. The OPP identified three specific geometric concerns with the existing bridge including narrow shoulder widths, tight vertical curvature and tight horizontal curvature. The OPP and Project Team discussed existing emergency response procedures on the existing bridge, the number of incidents (including collisions, disabled vehicles, and debris) that had occurred on the bridge in the previous year, and winter maintenance and weather issues on the bridge. The OPP's priority issues with the existing bridge are shoulder width and horizontal and vertical curvature. The OPP would prefer shoulders of at least 3.0 m width, and indicated preference for a bridge over a tunnel replacement due to safety concerns, such as in case of fire.
St. Lawrence Seaway Management Corporation	November 11, 2010	To discuss the QEW Garden City Skyway Class EA Study.	A meeting was held with the St. Lawrence Seaway Management Corporation (SLSMC) in advance of study commencement to discuss the Garden City Skyway Class EA Study. The Project Team provided an overview of the study to SLSMC, before discussing permission to enter SLSMC property to complete natural environment investigations (non-invasive) and borehole investigations (invasive). SLSMC indicated permission to enter was possible, subject to their protocols and receiving the required documents from the Project Team. The meeting included discussion of navigation clearance requirements for Seaway operations, future plans for the Seaway, and an ongoing SLSMC internal property reassessment which could result in some Seaway properties being deemed surplus; these lands would then be transferred to Transport Canada. SLSMC provided information about the Seaway including timing of the off-season, maintenance schedules for the canal, and SLSMC's preferred method of excavation. The Project Team requested that SLSMC provide information including a digital terrain model of the canal bottom, contamination-related records and maps, natural environment data, available borehole data, and information on utilities in the vicinity of the study area. SLSMC indicated that MOE (now MOECC) had conducted several contamination-related studies in the area, noted there was potential for species of conservation concern in the vicinity of the study area, and identified the potential for construction period restrictions over the canal.
Niagara Region, Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake, City St. Catharines	July 27, 2011	To provide an update on the status of the study, and to review the short-listed alternatives for the QEW Garden City Skyway.	A meeting was held with Niagara Region, Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake (NOTL), and City of St. Catharines staff to provide an update on the project status and to review the short listed alternatives for the QEW Garden City Skyway. The Project Team presented meeting participants with roll plans showing the short-listed alternatives. Discussion occurred regarding the existing Travel Information Centre (TIC), located on the north side of the QEW east of the bridge, as several of the alternatives impact the TIC. Should the TIC be impacted by the preferred alternative, the Project Team would explore opportunities to relocate the facility. Niagara Region and NOTL staff expressed a preference for the TIC to be relocated to the Glendale Avenue interchange, also noting the possibility to combine it with a potential future carpool lot at the same interchange. There was discussion about the possibility of combining the QEW crossing of the Welland Canal with a new GO Transit rail crossing; however, the Project Team advised that it had been discussed and determined to be infeasible for several reasons. The grade requirements for a rail bridge versus a road bridge differ. To incorporate rail on the Skyway significantly longer and flatter approaches and bridge structure would be required. This would substantially increase cost and result in additional property impacts to accommodate the grading requirements. The existing CN mainline rail track (which would provide GO Rail service to the region) is located approximately 3 km south of the QEW. To combine the QEW and rail would require a substantial realignment of the existing track through built-up areas of St. Catharines, which would be very costly and would result in major property impacts. Additionally, combining a rail crossing with the North Twinning technically preferred alternative would require the railway to cross to the north side of the existing QEW in St. Catharines, and cross back over to the south side of the QEW in Niagara-on-the-Lake, again resulting in significant cost and property impacts.
Federal Review Team	September 22, 2011	To introduce the QEW Garden City Skyway project to potentially interested Federal agencies, and to discuss Federal-Provincial coordination.	The Project Team met with the Federal Review Team to introduce the QEW Garden City Skyway project to potentially-interested Federal agencies, and to discuss Federal-Provincial coordination. The Project team gave a presentation providing an overview of the study, and there was discussion about topics including: the ongoing evaluation of alternatives; navigational and air space clearance requirements; potentially pursuing a joint federal-provincial EA, including the process, timing, federal review requirements, and approvals; public response to PIC #1; and First Nation and Métis Nation consultation to-date.
Niagara District Airport	November 2, 2012	Teleconference to discuss short-listed alternatives and potential airport impacts/requirements	The Project Team held a teleconference with Len O'Connor, Manager of the Niagara District Airport, to discuss the short-listed alternatives and any concerns related to the airport. Mr. O'Connor advised that the airport is willing to work with the Project Team. He advised that the project should not present a significant problem; however, he stated that an assessment of impacts to the airport will be required. It was noted that costs of the assessment would be borne by the Project Team. It was noted that a new bridge could require a Notice to Airmen (NOTAM) if new obstacles are constructed within the obstacle limitation surfaces. <i>Post-Meeting Note: Aeronautical Assessments to determine potential impacts to the airport as a result of the Recommended Plan were completed as a result of this consultation.</i>
Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake Council	October 7, 2013	To present a study overview, short list of alternatives, the technically preferred alternative, and the study's next steps to the Town Council in advance of PIC #2.	Project Team members made a presentation to NOTL Town Council to provide a study overview, including the objective of the EA, description of the study area, and a description of the key tasks. Project Team members discussed the short list of alternatives with council / committee members, before presenting the technically preferred alternative of north twinning. The Council meeting also included a general discussion during which Project Team members answered Council's questions regarding the following considerations: impacts to property owners; a park and ride facility in the Glendale area; the location of public meetings; bridge elevations; impacts to service roads; traffic rerouting; the construction timeline; and GO Bus service.
City of St. Catharines Council	October 7, 2013	To present a study overview, short list of alternatives, the technically preferred alternative, and the study's next steps to the City Council in advance of PIC #2.	Project Team members made a presentation to St. Catharines City Council to provide a study overview, including the objective of the EA, description of the study area, and a description of the key tasks. Project Team members discussed the short list of alternatives with council / committee members, before presenting the technically preferred alternative of north twinning.
Niagara Region Transportation Strategy Steering Committee	October 8, 2013	To present a study overview, short list of alternatives, the technically preferred alternative, and the study's next steps to the Regional committee in advance of PIC #2.	Project Team members made a presentation to the Niagara Region Transportation Strategy Steering Committee to provide a study overview, including the objective of the EA, description of the study area, and a description of the key tasks. Project Team members discussed the short list of alternatives with council / committee members, before presenting the technically preferred alternative of north twinning.
Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport – Ontario Travel Information Centres	October 28, 2013	Teleconference to discuss the potential impacts of the Technically Preferred Alternative on the St. Catharines Travel Information Centre following PIC #2.	The Project Team held a teleconference with MTCS to discuss potential impacts to the St. Catharines Travel Information Centre resulting from the technically preferred alternative. MTCS advised that the TIC is expected to be retained in the long term, and that visibility and access are important. They noted that a high proportion of users are American tourists, and that MTCS would prefer to maintain direct access to the TIC from the highway. The project team advised that scenarios retaining the current TIC location were considered, but are not feasible. Relocation to the area of the Glendale

Meeting	Meeting Date	Meeting Purpose	Meeting Summary
			interchange was discussed, potentially in conjunction with other improvements at the interchange (e.g., carpool lot). MTCS advised that any relocation costs would be the responsibility of MTO, and that any move would require review by MTCS management. Relocation details are likely best addressed as part of a separate study.
Niagara Region Public Works Committee	June 3, 2014	To present information regarding the QEW Garden City Skyway Class EA to the Regional committee in advance of PIC #3.	Project Team members made a presentation to the Niagara Region Public Works Committee to provide a study overview; discussed the recommended strategy of north twinning, including benefits of that strategy; discussed the bridge design types under consideration; provided a summary of PIC #2; outlined details including date, location, and purpose of PIC #3; and discussed next steps in the study.
City of St. Catharines Council	June 9, 2014	To present an update on the preferred alternative for the QEW Garden City Skyway Class EA to City Council in advance of PIC #3.	Project Team members made a presentation to the St. Catharines City Council to provide a study overview; discussed the recommended strategy of north twinning, including benefits of that strategy; discussed the bridge design types under consideration; provided a summary of PIC #2; outlined details including date, location, and purpose of PIC #3; and discussed next steps in the study.
Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport – Culture Services Unit	July 28, 2014	To provide a project overview including discussion of the Preferred Alternative, Cultural Heritage Assessment Report, and Public Information Centre #3, and to discuss the Transportation Environmental Study Report, including mitigation measures related to cultural heritage impacts and commitments to future work.	The Project Team met with MTCS Heritage staff to discuss heritage and archaeology studies and findings related to the Garden City Skyway Class EA. The Project Team provided a project overview to MTCS staff, discussing study objectives, major tasks, notable features in the study area, project background, evaluation of alternatives, and the Recommended Plan, north twinning. Potential bridge types were discussed, with the Project Team noting that the final bridge design would be determined during Detail Design. MTCS and the Project Team discussed cultural heritage documentation, including the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) completed for the Garden City Skyway, the Stage 1 Archaeology Assessment and Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (CHAR) completed as part of the current Preliminary Design study, and cultural heritage documentation to be included in the Transportation Environmental Study Report. MTCS indicated they would like to provide comments regarding the CHAR, for which they were given the opportunity to do so, and also indicated that CHERs should be completed before the completion of Preliminary Design for 49 Queenston Road and 61 Queenston Road, Niagara-on-the-Lake, which are both anticipated to be impacted by the Recommended Plan. <i>Post-Meeting Note: As a result of this consultation, preliminary CHERs were completed for 49 Queenston Road and 61 Queenston Road during the Preliminary Design and Class EA Study</i>
Niagara Region, Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake, City of St. Catharines	October 24, 2014	To provide an update on project status, and to review the proposed municipal road realignments as part of the QEW Garden City Skyway Class EA.	Project Team members met with municipal representatives from Niagara Region, the Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake, and the City of St. Catharines on October 24, 2014, to provide an update on project status, and to review the proposed municipal road realignments as part of the Garden City Skyway Class EA. The meeting included discussions about Queenston Road realignment alternatives, bicycle lanes, York Road realignments, the realigned Taylor Road / Niagara Stone Road / Queenston Street intersection, the Dieppe Road / Bunting Road intersection, and other business including identification of appropriate municipal contacts for various design elements.
Hydro One	June 11, 2015	To provide an update on project status and to establish mitigation options for the Hydro Transmission Corridor, east of Bunting Road.	The Hydro One Transmission corridor, east of Bunting Road in St. Catharines, is assumed to be 230 kV lines and passes over the Garden City Skyway via steel monopoles. The proposed plan requires the new bridge to be higher than the existing bridge at the hydro corridor, and it is presumed that this would result in insufficient clearance to the lines from the new bridge. WSP noted four potential mitigation options that could be considered: (1) Raise the towers on the existing corridor (2) Decrease the cable span at the bridge to reduce the sag in the lines, (3) Reconfigure the towers, and (4) Bury the hydro lines. Hydro One noted that raising the towers (Option 1) would typically be the most cost-effective mitigation measure. Hydro One noted that reducing the cable span (Option 2) is likely problematic due to limited space for new poles near the bridges. Hydro One noted that reconfiguring the towers (Option 3) to shift the lower wires higher on the poles may not be feasible, given that the existing monopoles do not lend themselves to this type of configuration. Changing the tower type (i.e., to a lattice-type tower) would be more costly and would require a larger footprint. Hydro One stated that burying the lines (Option 4) would likely be possible, although it would be the most costly alternative. An engineering study (by Hydro One) would be required to provide an accurate cost estimate. Burying the lines would maximize the flexibility for the Garden City Skyway over the long term. It was identified that for burying the lines (Option 4), a junction of approximately 10 m x 10 m is required for the transition between underground and overhead lines. Hydro One stated that it is reasonable to believe that the new Garden City Skyway bridge can be accommodated in terms of its conflicts with the transmission corridor, although the best method for dealing with the impacts would require study by Hydro One.
Niagara District Airport	May 1, 2015	To provide an update on project status and to review the completed Aeronautical Assessment	The Project Team met with the Airport Manager and the chairman of the Airport Commission, to provide an update on project progress. The Aeronautical Assessment completed as part of the study was also reviewed. The Airport was content with the assessment of the impacts and the proposed mitigations.
Transport Canada	August 17, 2015	To discuss regulatory approvals mandated by Transport Canada as it relates to this study and the Niagara District Airport	The Project Team met with representatives from Transport Canada to determine and discuss the regulatory approvals mandated by Transport Canada as it relates to this study and the Niagara District Airport (NDA). The direction the Project Team received from Transport Canada at the time was to engage with local municipalities and the NDA directly.
Niagara District Airport	October 20, 2016	To provide an update on the project status, present the findings of the additional Aeronautical Impact Assessment, and obtaining a letter of no objection.	The Project Team met with the Niagara District Airport's Airport Commission to provide an update on the project progress, present the additional Aeronautical Impact Assessment completed, and to discuss obtaining a letter of no objection. A letter of no objection was received from the Niagara District Airport on May 4, 2017.

3.4 Indigenous Community Consultation

Indigenous communities, as well as related organizations and agencies, were contacted by the Project Team at key milestones throughout the study process.

At the start of the study, enquiries were submitted to the Ministry of Indigenous Relations and Reconciliation (*formerly Ontario Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs*) and Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada (*formerly Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada*) to request information on Indigenous communities and/or related organizations that may have an interest in the study.

The following communities and organizations were sent notification letters throughout the study:

- ▶ Association of Iroquois and Allied Indians
- ▶ Métis Nation of Ontario (Note: Notification sent following Study Commencement milestone)
- ▶ Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation
- ▶ Niagara Region Métis Council
- ▶ Six Nations of the Grand River
- ▶ Six Nations of the Grand River Haudenosaunee Confederacy Council
- ▶ Union of Ontario Indians

No comments or concerns were raised by the above-listed communities during the course of the study.

3.5 Notice of Filing

A Notice of Filing of the Transportation Environmental Study Report (TESR) was advertised as follows:

- ▶ *Niagara Falls Review* – September 14, 2017
- ▶ *St. Catharines Standard* – September 14, 2017
- ▶ *Welland Tribune* – September 14, 2017

A copy of the notice is included in **Appendix A**.

Notice of Filing letters were distributed by direct mail to elected officials in September 2017 prior to the publication of the Notice of Completion, and sent through direct mail or email to external agencies, municipal staff, emergency services, utilities, impacted property owners, and other stakeholders prior to the publication of the Notice of Filing. In addition, letters and emails were sent to members of the public and interest groups on the study contact list. Notifications were also posted online on the study's website and on the municipal websites of St. Catharines, Niagara Region and Niagara-on-the-Lake. All notifications and letters included the project website address.

3.6 Consultation during Detail Design

Ongoing consultation with stakeholders, agencies, Indigenous communities, property owners, and the general public will be carried out during Detail Design. This includes holding additional Public Information Centre(s) as necessary.