

## **Appendix D**

### ***PIC and PIC Update Public Comments and Responses***

Table 3: Summary of PIC Comments and Responses

Ref No.	Date of Contact	Party	Comment Received	How it was Addressed
01	03/30/2018	Local Resident	<p>-Concerned that the CR17 WB on ramp will now be a stop.</p> <p>-Believes the posted ramp speed reduction will not be effective.</p> <p>-Concerned about the detour route through Main Street of Hawkesbury being chaotic given the narrow Main Street and 3 traffic lights.</p> <p>Suggested an alternative of using McGill St and involving the Hwy 34 diversion loop</p>	<p>-The conversion of the N/S-W Ramp (on-ramp) from an acceleration lane to a stop condition with a right turn onto County Rd 17 (westbound) meets the current roadway geometric design standards for the observed traffic volumes, sight distance and design speed along County Rd 17. The stop condition with a right turn onto County Road 17 also eliminates an additional lane that would otherwise be required on the Highway 34 Overpass at County Road 17 which would increase the cost of construction and possibly have environmental and property impacts.</p> <p>-The existing W-N/S Ramp (off-ramp) speed change lane, which includes a taper and deceleration lane, will be re-configured with a right turn lane with a total length of 145 m which meets the current roadway geometric design standards. A posted ramp speed lower than present conditions is required for the proposed radius of the re-configured W-N/S Ramp in order to meet current standards.</p> <p>-Yes, the proposed detour route of County Rd 17 eastbound/westbound traffic is along County Rd 4 (Main St) and Tupper St which will be operational for up to 4 weeks during bridge replacement. Half of the Highway 34 interchange will remain in operation, maintaining traffic flow to/from the east, to/from McGill Street. The Hwy 34 "diversion loop" is being used over two or three weekends only, and will re-route traffic around the Highway 34 Overpass bridge structure at County Road 17 during girder/diaphragm erection and formwork/falsework installation, rapid demolition of existing bridges, and lateral slide of new bridges into final position. Using McGill St as a detour route was considered however the northbound left turn lane at Main St is very short and unable to accommodate the additional traffic volumes related to the detour. Operation of the proposed detour route along Main St and Tupper St will require some traffic signal modifications and a temporary traffic control signal at Main St/Tupper St to operate efficiently.</p>
02	04/11/2018	D&W Forwarders Transportation Company	<p>-Asked if traffic from Montreal to Ottawa or Ottawa going to Montreal will have to use the main street in Hawkesbury.</p>	<p>-Traffic from Montreal going to Ottawa and from Ottawa going to Montreal will not need to use the detour route through Main Street. Signage will be posted to notify vehicles of the construction works and advise them to use HWY 417 instead of CR 17 to access Ottawa/Montreal during the full road closures.</p>
03	04/12/2018	OFSC Local Snowmobile Association	<p>-The group has an OFSC prescribed trail on the south side of the study area with a bridge over the creek. They also have trails on the County Road 17 property.</p>	<p>-Information has been noted and will be considered.</p>
04	04/23/2018	Bell Utility Company	<p>-Wondering if the existing Bell structure running underground on the east side of Hwy 34 will need to be relocated.</p>	<p>-Company was asked to provide survey data and/or GIS mapping for assets to import the information into our base mapping and identify potential conflicts. Once the composite utility plan is generated, further coordination will be required.</p>
05	04/19/2018	Local Resident	<p>-Wondering if there are conceptual drawings to comment on, or if the public has the opportunity to provide input on the design.</p>	<p>-Further information, including conceptual drawings, will be included in the Transportation Environmental Study Report. The public will have a 30-day review period. Input from the public will be reviewed.</p>
06	04/19/2018	Local Resident	<p>-Asking if there will be lights or simply stop signs when exiting CR 17 from the west or entering it going west bound. Resident has real concerns that the risk for traffic accidents will be increased with the</p>	<p>-Traffic lights will not be provided at the County Road 17 and Highway 34 interchange. Illumination of the interchange is under review.</p> <p>-Conversion of the N/S-W Ramp (on-ramp) from an acceleration lane to a stop condition with a right</p>

			<p>removal of the merging lanes with going westbound or coming from the westbound and exiting on the 34. A light was added along the Tupper Street intersection for that reason. The resident would like to know why the existing merge lane will not be kept.</p> <p>-Resident has an issue with the elimination of the SCL on the eastbound County Road 17. He is concerned about the safety of vehicles slowing down to access the ramp in combination with the visibility of the movement due to the horizontal and vertical curve of the approaching road.</p>	<p>turn onto County Rd 17 (westbound) meets the current roadway geometric design standards for the observed traffic volumes, sight distance and design speed along County Road 17. The stop condition with a right turn onto County Road 17 also eliminates an additional lane that would otherwise be required on the Highway 34 Overpass at County Road 17 which would increase the cost of construction and possibly have environmental and property impacts.</p> <p>-The existing W-N/S Ramp (off-ramp) speed change lane, which includes a taper and deceleration lane, will be re-configured with a right turn lane with a total length of 145 m which meets the current roadway geometric design standards. The County Road 17 vertical curve is being improved (compared to existing conditions) and adequate signage to inform traffic of the upcoming W-N/S Ramp (off-ramp) will be provided.</p>
07	04/30/2018	Ivaco Rolling Mills LP	<p>-Company Superintendent asked what consideration has been given to, and what information is available regarding the following items:</p> <p>-Ivaco Rolling Mills ships and/or receives in excess of 100 truckloads daily). Based on their origin, or outbound destinations, the logical and likely detour they will take will be through VanKleek Hill using Cassburn Rd. with access to or from Highway 17 being Highway 34 or County Road 10. Has there been any thoughts regarding the volume and weight of this traffic and the likelihood of them using the route described? Are there any concerns? The proposed detour route provided on the online public information website does not seem suitable for the volume of transport trucks that will be moving through these narrow, congested streets on a daily basis.</p> <p>-What, if any disruption is foreseen for rail service through the affected area? Ivaco ships and receives significant product by rail, and are typically served twice weekly to maintain the flow of product. Has there been any discussion regarding the potential impact to service along that corridor? Will there be any delays?</p>	<p>-Traffic data was collected and analyzed along the proposed detour route and at the County Road 17 and Highway 34 interchange. The level of service was concluded to be satisfactory for the duration of the full closure of County Road 17, which is between two and four weeks. Other options reviewed for the detour route could not accommodate observed commercial traffic volumes or truck turning movements without significant improvements to intersections.</p> <p>-Disruptions to rail traffic will be avoided, where/when possible. All works are being coordinated with CN throughout the detail design phase which include track protection schemes, rail flagging services and instrumentation/monitoring during construction.</p> <p>-The rapid demolition of existing structures and lateral slide of new structures into final position, which will occur over two separate weekends, may impact rail traffic.</p>
08	04/5/2018	Local Resident	<p>Resident indicated that she is visually challenged and was asking what the letter was about.</p>	<p>It was explained to her that the bridges are being replaced and residents in close proximity and along the detour route are all receiving letters and can express their concerns or ask questions. She was reminded that she may call back if any questions or concerns arise.</p>
09	04/6/2018	Hawkesbury Honda	<p>-We have no concerns at this time but wish to remain on the contact list for this study.</p>	<p>-No response required. The individual was added to the project contact list and will receive notification regarding the filing of the TESR for the 30-day public review period.</p>
10	04/16/2018	Member of Parliament	<p>-We have no concerns at this time but wish to remain on the contact list for this study.</p>	<p>-No response required. The individual was added to the project contact list and will receive notification regarding the filing of the TESR for the 30-day public review period.</p>
11	04/9/2018	Croupe Corbeil	<p>-We have no concerns at this time but wish to remain on the contact list for this study.</p>	<p>-No response required. The individual was added to the project contact list and will receive notification regarding the filing of the TESR for the 30-day public review period.</p>

12	04/10/2018	Laplante Cadillac	-We have no concerns and do not need to be involved in this study.	-No response required. The individual was removed from the contact list.
13	04/20/2018	OPP	-We have no concerns at this time but wish to remain on the contact list for this study.	-No response required. The individual was added to the project contact list and will receive notification regarding the filing of the TESR for the 30-day public review period.
14	04/27/2018	CEPEO	-We have no concerns at this time but wish to remain on the contact list for this study.	-No response required, as indicated on the study comment sheet. The individual was added to the project contact list and will receive notification regarding the filing of the TESR for the 30-day public review period.

### Hawkesbury PIC Update Comment Tracking Form

Response #	Agency	Comments Received from Stakeholders
1	Resident	<p>Bonjour, je suis très réaliste. Je sais que moi même étant sur la route souvent dans tous l'est de l'Ont. Je suis entièrement contre les nouvelles analyses de réduire et de changer la largeur a + petit !! Je passe tous les jours et je peut vous dire que les fins de semaines le trafic double et même triple a tous les vendredis. Souvent les statistiques sont fausser par leurs questions mal poser ou incomprise. Je vous demande sincèrement de réviser car le pont c'est correct, mais S.V.P respecter ce qui est déjà en place car trafic depuis que la route 50 a été ouverte a doublé. !! Merci ! Au plaisir d'avoir un avenir pour notre compter et nos municipalité qui on besoin de bonne Infrastructures. Bonne Journée.</p> <p><b>Translation: Hello, I'm very realistic. I know that myself being on the road often in all East of the Ont. I am completely against the new analyses to reduce and reduce the width!! I spend every day and I can tell you that the on weekends traffic doubles and even triples every Friday. Often the statistics are distorted by questions that are poorly asked or misunderstood. I sincerely ask you to revise because the bridge is correct, but please respect what is already in place because since route 50 was opened traffic doubled. !! Thank you! Looking forward to having a future for our count and our municipalities who need good infrastructure. Good day.</b></p>
2	Resident	<p>no.27.51 il faut qu'il reste pareille comme il es pour le trafic et embarquer sur la route 17 plus facile comme ca. merci</p> <p><b>Translation: No. 27.51 must remain as is for traffic and entering Route 17 is easier like this. Thank you.</b></p>
3	Resident	<p>In the initial review of proposed changes to existing entry and exit pattern to Highway 17, the absence of any mention of traffic signals regulating vehicles from entering onto the highway from the northerly ramp and turning eastward or conversely from the southerly direction and turning westward. The existing entry and egress pattern avoids this from occurring. The original designing of the ramp system (currently in place) was to allow vehicles to regulate their vehicle acceleration or reduction to match traffic flow. Furthermore, the proposal fails to consider and contributes to jeopardizing the future growth potential of both Champlain and Hawkesbury. Therefore, we would recommend to maintain the existing ramp pattern for the safety of all.</p> <p>This evening during a gathering for dinner, the topics of conversation included the proposed interchange and the recommendation put forward (credit G.Bennet) was to establish a traffic circle. A circle by nature controls entry and exit speed automatically, promotes orderly and controlled traffic flow and accommodates the reduction of four (4) lanes down to two(2). This form of traffic control is a proven method in countries such as Britain, Europe, Australia and even in parts of Canada.</p>
4	Resident	<p>Do not remove speed lanes. Will Kill people to remove. They have proven to provide safety and no fatalities. Dead stop in an obstructed view will kill people. Poor design which will claim innocent lives uneedingly. No additional cost to keep they are pre-existing. Scrap the project design to bring transport trucks to dead stop which will cause t-type fatal collusions. Poor view, no clear view of oncoming traffic eastbound Ridiculous to eliminate existing speed ramps.</p>
5	Resident	<p>Although the memo is entirely in English, my understanding is that you will abolish the speed up lane that allows us to merge into traffic rather than cut cars off ( coming at 90 km/hr) because our aging population doesn't need it. I am a bit baffled by this info. Can you provide the study that Confirms this fact? In my opinion, (based strictly on using the road on a regular basis) the volume of traffic seems to increase regularly. I can cynically imagine that you hired the firm that Colachem hire a few years ago stating that only 100 cars go by in a day. I went to Rockland on Tuesday and apparently, 1/2 of the day's volume was there with me. I hope that public safety will prevail. The demographically Francophone East is always treated as second class area. Pleas, SAFETY FIRST.</p>
6	Resident	<p>I have serious concerns with the removal of the merging lanes. I reported my concerns to you last year and I am again. Being a first-responder and having conducted manual emergency traffic control on and around that bridge, I can tell you that the merging lanes proposed in your plan will put at risk the security of the public and of the emergency personnel.</p>
7	Resident	<p>Considering the amount of traffic entering hwy 17 and exiting hwy17, particularly the amount of transport trucks and cottage country persons using the on-off ramps, I feel that reducing the ramps to T stops is asking for trouble. Suggest a better and longer study of the traffic is required before going ahead with current plans.</p>
8	Resident	<p>j'ai recu par la poste un depliant concernant le changement pour le viaduc de la route 17 et 34 a Hawkesbury ont. Malheureusement le depliant est en anglais seulement, Hawkesbury etant une ville majoritairement francophone aurait du etre au moins bilingue</p> <p><b>Translation: I received by mail a pamphlet regarding the change for the viaduct of Highway 17 and 34 in Hawkesbury Ontario. Unfortunately the pamphlet is in English only, Hawkesbury being a predominantly francophone city should have been at least bilingual</b></p>
9	Resident	<p>A good presentation...but a lousy plan. The idea of having tee junctions instead of speed change lanes is a recipe for trouble and would cause back-ups even with the present volumes and would also increase the chance of collisions from frustrated drivers .From environmental aspects : the stopping/idling/starting sequences increase gas consumption and consequent atmospheric pollution, furthermore, the noise pollution, especially from big trucks going through these transitions would be a major inconvenience to local residents. An alternative arrangement which would avoid the above hazards may well cost more but would be well worth the investment. Thanks for the opportunity to comment. Best regards and good luck. Len Box.</p>

### Hawkesbury PIC Update Comment Tracking Form

Response #	Agency	Comments Received from Stakeholders
10	Resident	<p>1. The cost of building a 2 lane bridge is much less than the cost of building a 4 lane bridge so that part is settled as I see it. Now we double the savings because there are 2 bridges. Discussion closed on cost factor and why the proposed 2 lane bridges are being put forward for consideration versus simple replacement of the current 4 lane bridges. 2. Looking at the current roadway design of the 2 bridges and any pre- scene or on-scene items, it would appear that any traffic movement assistance rendered by the current design is incorporated to some degree in the new design. This is relation to traffic movement on to and off of Cty Rd 17 for both eastbound and westbound traffic and refers to distances only. 3. Without the benefit of a scale diagram, the following notes would need some clarification.... a) What is the distance from the proposed T intersection on the north side of the roadway to the end of the merge or on ramp for westbound traffic compared to the current distance with the merge or on ramp using the 4 lane bridge design? b) What is the distance from the proposed east end of the bridge/start of the off ramp for eastbound traffic, to the T intersection compared to the current distance afforded with the 4 lane bridge design? c) What are the distances between the 2 proposed T intersections? They appear to be some sort of off-set intersection however would need some distances to see how much off-set there is. Knowing the answers to these questions will impact the answers to the following issues that I perceive: a) Currently on the north side of the roadway there is a merge lane for westbound traffic which enters the lane with some degree of speed versus the proposed design where westbound traffic enters the merge from a dead stop. This difference is obviously impacted by individual vehicle capabilities however I question if there is enough distance in the new design to merge safely having consideration for acceleration rates and factors. Issues of Point of Possible Perception and other related viability issues are not a factor here but I am simply looking at how quickly merging traffic can get up to speed considering that it is a 90 km/h zone and traffic is starting from dead stop. b) For vehicles entering County Road 17 from the south side, there is a T intersection proposed. I have concern regarding again, the distance for merging, which is zero and the affect of acceleration rates and factors for these turning vehicles so as to not adversely impede westbound traffic on County Road 17 considering that the turning vehicles will be starting from a dead stop. c) The suggestion of traffic lights for the 2 T intersections is, using the T intersection design the only real option. I question however whether these light will be a "demand trigger" or a constant light change pattern. The distances between them will probably answer whether 1 light system or 2 separate systems is being contemplated. I am unfamiliar with how this open interaction works but please contact me. Thank You</p>
11	Resident	<p>When the Hwy 34 was closed in Vankleek Hill advanced notice was given of that fact by warnings of the closure. The Vankleek Hill diversions were effective. In this case westbound traffic on the 17 can be routed via CR12 and CR11 and Eastbound traffic in the opposite direction. Why cannot the same process be employed in this instance. Everything possible should be done to prevent the traffic problems that will occur in Hawkesbury Main Street.</p>
12	Resident	<p>Please begin by fixing all the spelling mistakes on the french version of the CIP (ICI). Il y a PLUSIEURS accents qui sont mis du mauvais côté. What is the estimated cost of the project?</p>
13	Supervising Distribution Engineering Technician, Hydro one	<p>Would you be able to tell me how the traffic will access (and exit) Cty Rd 17 from Hwy 34 if the existing speed change lanes are removed?</p>
14	Cogeco, OSP Infrastructure Delivery	<p>Cogeco has an existing plant in the Bell structure running along Hwy 34 (see plan below for approximate location) Will this plant need to be relocated or altered in any fashion? When do you expect this work to commence?</p>
15	OPP Officer	<p>I only have two (2) concerns in reading your letter with regards to the updated project details " The replacement bridges will be reduced to two lanes (eliminating the existing speed change lanes), as recent traffic analysis has shown that they are no longer required to accommodate future traffic volumes. The bridges will be replaced using accelerated bridge replacement construction, which will involve short duration road closures (lasting from 2-4 weeks in duration), traffic detours and modifications to the existing WB on-ramp and EB off-ramp at Highway 34. " I don't understand why you will be eliminating the existing speed change lanes. Could you explain or send me a diagram of what the new bridge, with the lanes and on- and off- ramps, will look like. The eastbound lane, speed change lane, I can understand the elimination. But eliminating the westbound lane speed change lane, that I don't understand. As a matter of fact, it should be extended (be even longer) as some motorists have difficulty merging onto westbound traffic. Can you explain to me what an accelerated bridge replacement is, or what it looks like, so I can comprehend better. Thank you. My second concern is the detours. Could you give me an idea of where the detours will be, how the set up will be.</p>
16	Operations Manager Hawkesbury OPP	<p>Will on-going construction affect our "wide load" or oversized tractor trailer escorts that travel thru our area and routinely use this route? Will there be a lane or height reduction? When will this construction commence and end? Will wide loads have sufficient space to access the provided detours?</p>
17	Enbridge	<p>I have reviewed the information provided online. Does not look like anything changes from our end. I have attached the email communication between myself, our engineering and Brad Hewson. As long as our third party requirements are met the engineer did not have too many questions.</p>
18	Real Estate Appraisers and Consultants	<p>Good Day Mr. McFadden, I'd like to oppose the proposed changes to both bridges replacement in the Hawkesbury area on County Road 17. Presently both bridges have 2 lanes, + 1 exit &amp; 1 on ramp lane on both bridges, for a total of 4 lanes wide. The proposed change to the new bride construction to eliminate the on &amp; off ramp lane, is unacceptable. The last time there was major changes in the town of Hawkesbury's road infrastructures was a disaster, re: Cartier Boulevard which have caused a multitude of problems that Hawkesbury resident has suffered with the boulevard becoming so narrow that the snow plow can't clean up the road properly, eliminating parking on 1 side of the Boulevard. It seems that the short insight on the project, will be worse than what purpose those bridges are accomplishing at the moment. I'm not against the replacement of those aging bridges, however leave the existing configuration in place as the future growth of the region will require those extra lanes.</p>

### Hawkesbury PIC Update Comment Tracking Form

Response #	Agency	Comments Received from Stakeholders
19	Resident	We have been examining the thought of removing the change of speed lanes and believe this will cause serious safety issues at prime times and weekends, traffic embarking on the bridge going west is dangerous as it rarely yields to oncoming traffic. With the growing additions of the Cr17 between the Cr34 and Tupper Street, Ex added OPP station, added CANAC, adding GMC dealership within the next 2 years, traffic will increase exponentially and become life threatening as the slower traffic getting on and off the Cr17 at the Cr34 will eventually cause death. The 17 at that point is 90 KM/hr the CR 34 is 50KM/Hr, not a good idea, increasing the size of the bridge would be a better idea for the future of the area.
20	Resident	I believe the speed change lanes should stay. They are useful and still used. In the future if conditions were to change and they proved to be needed, they are there and nothing further needs to be done.
21	Resident	If you decide to change it make better arrangements this picture is no good. The design we have now is better than yours is no good. If you want to change the design is no good very dangerous.
22	Resident	I humbly submit this letter requesting you don't remove the slow down or speed up lanes on Hwy overpasses over Hawkesbury Creek and Hwy 34 (no. 27-51). My reason for wanting to keep these 2 extra lanes of traffic is this, we have a lot of heavy duty traffic heading to our local steel mill. There is a lot of steel billets crossing this area from the Montreal area. Billets are long pieces of steel approx 6x6 by 40ft. approx weight is 4000lbs each and could be a lot heavier. With 30 years plus of transporting all types of material steel being the worst or one of the worst because if you have to brake hard this steel will not stop. No amount of chains or straps will keep it from moving. What I'm saying is if you have a car or truck that comes up the ramp of Hwy 34 to head west on Hwy 17 (county road 17) and there is no speed up lane and it does not yield to truck loaded with billets with no speed up lane this could mean an early death to driver of this truck because if he has to brake suddenly to avoid car or truck that pulls out in front of him because of lack of speed up lane, his load will come through his cab killing him. Who ever is responsible will not matter to this truck driver, he'll be dead and his family will not have him coming home after his run is finished. I'm using this example because there are all types of loads crossing our area. If you don't get my explanation or would like more information please feel free to call me at 613 632 8019 at home. Thanking you in advance for considering my comments.
23	Local Business	Phone call received on May 08th, 2019 at 15:44 hr from a female who was asking general questions about the Hawkesbury Bridge Replacements Project. A general summary was given that we were replacing two bridges, there will be a detour route and that information can be found on <a href="http://www.cr17bridges.com">www.cr17bridges.com</a> . When asked for her name and phone number, she indicated that she wanted to remain anonymous but did reveal that she was calling on behalf of a local business. Also, she said that she would follow-up with the Township for more information if needed.
24	Resident	objection à l'intersection en T avec ARRÊT (STOP) sur la Route 17 <b>Translation: objection to the T-intersection with stop on Route 17</b>
25	Resident	Je me demande pourquoi la retrait de la ligne de changement de vitesse dans chaque direction sur la 17. Cela ne me semble pas prudent et moins sécuritaire. Si le dessin du plan est trop avancé pour être changé et revenir à la conception actuelle, j'espère qu'il y aura au minimum un feu de circulation à ces accès à la route 17.  <b>Translation: I wonder why the removal of the speed shift line in each direction on the 17. That does not seem prudent and less safe. If the design is too advanced to be changed and go back to the current design, I hope there will be at least a traffic light at these accesses to route 17.</b>
26	Director of Public Works Township of Champlain	The Council of Champlain Township is adamantly opposed to the recommended interchange configuration for the County Road 17 Bridge Replacement for the following reasons; Serious safety concerns related to the WB ramp having a T intersection with a stop sign and eliminating the speed change lanes: We can appreciate that studies have been conducted where it would indicate that this design will be sufficient for current traffic and future projections, however as the residents of this community who are the ones using these roadways we know that this would be a grave design error if approved. The volume of traffic, the heavy trucks (many steel trucks travelling from IVACO Rolling Mills) and many other transport trucks and the speed of these vehicles travelling East and Westbound on Cty. Rd 17 would make it hazardous for any vehicle travelling on or turning onto Cty. Rd 17. This design does not seem to take into account the difficulty and danger it would be for any transport truck to have to come to a complete stop and then expect that heavy vehicle to pull out into the roadway and to get their vehicle up to speed safely without impacting the flow of the East and Westbound traffic. We also anticipate that with this design there would be an increased possibility of vehicles entering the on-ramp, making a stop at the stop sign and deciding that they are going to go the opposite direction the ramp is intended for and as a result will make a dangerous left hand turn onto Cty. Rd. 17. Having speed change lanes (such as the current design) eliminates this risk; vehicles have no choice but to merge onto the road in the direction that the on-ramp is intended for. It is our opinion that the speed change lanes need to be included in this design. If it is a matter of reducing the bridge deck width to only two lanes, then perhaps a design layout could be made with the speed change lanes set back further so that it provides the required merge lane distances, and if that is not feasible, design the bridge in a way that allows for the speed change lanes to stay as is. Perhaps it is of value to remind you of the recent Highway 417 Eastbound ramp and Highway 34 intersection improvements. This was a very dangerous T intersection with a stop sign where many traffic accidents occurred. If you move forward with the current proposed design it will likely result in the same hazardous outcome. On behalf of the Township of Champlain we thank you in advance for your consideration on this matter.
27	Resident	Objection à l'intersection en T avec stop sur la route 17.  <b>Translation: Objection to the T-intersection with stop on Route 17.</b>
28	Mayor of Hawkesbury	Further to your letter of May 13, 2019 I wish to bring your attention to paragraphs 4 and 5. During your presentations on September 2018, of which Guillaume Boudrias has photos where the T-stop was not in your drawings. Furthermore, all presentations by MTO before the UCPR, Champlain and Hawkesbury, you receive very strong objections against the ramps. We needed to have an additional meeting of April 15, 2019 to reiterate to you that we were still in disagreement with the ramps and even more so with the T intersection with a stop on highway 17.
29	Resident	Je roule sur la route # 17 très fréquemment et je considère que les bretelles que je dois utiliser pour entrer et sortir à la hauteur de la route # 34 sont très facile à négocier. J'ai consulté le plan pour la nouvelle configuration du pont sur la route # 34 et je trouve

### Hawkesbury PIC Update Comment Tracking Form

Response #	Agency	Comments Received from Stakeholders
		<p>que ça ressemble énormément à celle qui enjambe la route 50 à l'est de Lachute. À mon avis, celle-ci n'est pas aussi facilement négociable que celle qui existe présentement. La circulation est beaucoup plus fluide de la façon qu'elle est présentement. Pourquoi devons-nous remplacer un système qui fonctionne? Prenez-en ma parole; voilà plus de 45 ans que je conduis et soyez assurés que cette configuration est tout ce qu'il y a de parfaitement adéquat. Je serais quand même curieuse de savoir combien d'accidents se sont produits dû à cette configuration...</p> <p><b>Translation: I drive on the road # 17 very frequently and I consider that the ramp I have to use to get in and out at the height of road # 34 is very easy to negotiate. I consulted the plan for the new bridge configuration on route # 34 and I think it looks very much like the one that spans the 50 Road East of Lachute. In my opinion, it is not as easily negotiable as the current one. Traffic is much more fluid in the way it is now. Why do we need to replace a system that works? Take my word for it; I have been driving for over 45 years and rest assured that this configuration is all that is perfectly adequate. I would still be curious to know how many accidents occurred due to this configuration...</b></p>
30	Resident	<p>Qui sera tenu responsable pour les accidents que sa va occasionner La police a telle été consulter</p> <p><b>Translation: Who will be held responsible for the accidents that its going to cause the police have such been consulting</b></p>
31	Resident	<p>With the volume of heavy truck traffic at this site, I do not agree that a complete stop before entering the flow of traffic would make any sense. I feel that the existing configuration is much more sensible.</p>
32	Resident	<p>This plan will create a very hazardous situation. Any traffic analysis would indicate the need for proper exit lanes, given the HIGH volume of heavy truck traffic. May I refer you to the situation at the 417/34 junction which has seen many serious and fatal accidents, and which has only recently been improved for safety reasons. We do not need another example of poor road design.</p>
33	Civil Engineering Project Manager, Town of Hawkesbury	<p>Dear MTO, Please find below the comments and concerns from the Town of Hawkesbury: 1. Difficulty for vehicles, especially for heavy trucks, to enter County Road 17 using the new STOP control westbound ramp configuration; 2. Risk of congestion on County Road 17 and westbound access ramp; 3. Risk of collision when a vehicle engages westbound on County Road 17 due to the new configuration of the access ramp. 4. The potential for a traffic signal being required in the future at the intersection of County Road 17 and the westbound ramp as result of the intersection now being a T-intersection STOP sign control. 5. The merge control with acceleration lane option should be revisited by MTO and all efforts should be put towards providing a free flow westbound access ramp. Finally, following the filing of the TESR for 30 day public review, the Town intends to submit a request for Bump-up.</p>