

This is the e-mail sent to the MOECC correspondence contact on May 15th 2017 expressing our concerns with the process.

Some **pertinent comments** with respect to your latest correspondence with respect to the Second Avenue project in which you “clarified” the term “operation” and suggested further contact with the proponent (city) with respect to the process involved. You stated that the city had the “right” to proceed with construction prior in effect to “finalization” of the “plan” and of which we have some question. This e-mail has been reviewed and approved upon consultation by other requestors, namely Ms. Dot Klein RN and Mr. Lionel Rudd CET who appreciate your position within the Ministry and the various restraints under which you are required to address your responsibilities and represent your department. This correspondence in no way reflects on your involvement.

There seems to be some **misinterpretation** with respect to various aspects of this matter either on the part of those of us as requestors and the MOECC. Taking certain “conditions” literally it would appear that not all actions suggested were satisfied as officially presented. We would **not like to think** that the Ministry in its directions to the proponent and ourselves was in effect “sucking and blowing at the same time” which now does appear to be the case.

In particular the Traffic Safety Plan was to include “mitigation” measures **“not limited to”** those described in the letter to Rob Rocca of January 20th 2017 specifically, signage, timing of traffic signals and calming measures (streetscaping) and could include those submitted by myself and others such as attached and elaborated upon further in this correspondence.

In addition Annamarie Cross, Manager of Environmental Services in correspondence gave **"encouragement to continue to be engaged during the detailed design phase of the project to ensure your participation in the finalization of the plan"**

Definition of finalization is simply – **“to put into final form”** This did not take place. The consultation process was basically as “show and tell” on the part of the city with no serious discussion of our input which we did provide previously at the time and subsequently by others.

You have suggested we discuss any further concerns we might have with the city, however as you have been told by myself and other requestors this has not been possible at any time during the process with **no response on the part of the city to e-mails, letters or phone calls**. This attitude is reflected in the short video attached that illustrates the lack of practical public environmental concerns on the part of many road engineers that is also very evident in our community. **This is the reason the Ministry has a vital role to plan to ensure that the public interest is respected and not just given what might be described as bureaucratic “lip service”.**

We have additional questions with regards to the matter of “operation”. If indeed the Ministry were to determine that additional mitigation measures were to be required “prior to the road being open to traffic” this would seem to be “putting the cart before the horse” and may cause delay, perhaps costly, before the project becomes operational. **We would expect the Ministry to review both the Traffic Safety Plan of the city and also the input by requestors and any other citizens prior to “finalization” and actual road construction.**

Already construction personnel have removed the “berm” separating the proposed new five lane roadway from the large dog park and exposed this facility to traffic noise and pollution upsetting both dogs and people, not a good environmental situation. This was documented as a concern and should have been considered prior to “finalization”. We expect other environmental issues will become evident as construction proceeds.

We are not satisfied with the Traffic Safety Plan as prepared by the city and find it a **superficial treatment of the original project plan**. Our submission based on a comparable stretch of roadway in Grand Rapids Michigan would be a better option in our and the opinion of others. We were able to speak to the engineering department in that city and determined that the design (attached) was proving to be very successful. Four traffic lanes were reduced to three (two traffic, one turning). **Speeds were observed to be reduced from 8 to 10 miles per hour with traffic volumes up to between 17,000 and 20,000 vehicles per day (much in excess of any predicted volumes for Second Avenue)**. Grand Rapids Road width including bike lanes – 66 feet, compared to over 88 feet in the current Second Avenue five lane design. Also Grand Rapids roadway has standard size intersections. We were informed that Grand Rapids is currently reconfiguring other roads in the city and has developed a zero road fatality policy. **We should learn from other jurisdictions.**

Although we were not to be involved with respect to salt mitigation measures we did discuss this with Mr. Rob Rocca at the “Consultation” session and were surprised (and discouraged) to learn that he had rudimentary knowledge as to the disposition of storm water runoff from the roadway, but did finally admit it did deposit to Ramsey Lake. It is acknowledged that the reconstructed roadway will have 19,500 square meters of surface area compared to 7,500 at present which could result **in an additional 10 or more tons of road salt entering the watershed and the lake annually** this, despite the claim by the director of Roads, David Shelstead in a media quote to “try not to use an excessive amount” and “pre-wetting salt” which regardless would not in any significant measure reduce the overall salt loading from this expanded road way. Ramsey Lake already has a sodium level in excess of 50mg/L and as shown on the attached notice levels above 20mg/L requiring public notice. **Ramsey Lake is the source of drinking water for between 50,000 and 60,000 Sudbury residents – this is a serious environmental concern which demands the attention of the Ministry.**

We respect that the MOECC has protocols in place with respect to procedures however these do not or should not preclude environmental considerations that benefit and/or safeguard citizens. **We trust that the input of the requestors and other members of the public will receive the upmost consideration as part of the Ministries review process.**

I should note that the primary requestors are all senior citizens, older adults who only have the best of intentions with regards to this project. We all have **extensive backgrounds in environmental issues** and in particular safety concerns. We all stand nothing to gain personally from our involvement and only have contributed our opinions and suggestions based on concern for the wellbeing of the community and the local population. **We further note that the majority of interested and concerned citizens support the views of the ward councillor who from the outset suggested that a three lane roadway would be sufficient for this artery in a number of environmental respects.** An opportunity was present, and we believe still exists to create a safe and attractive roadway rather than a typical ugly **environmentally**

unfriendly thoroughfare similar to those elsewhere in the city which have unfortunately it would seem have served as a model for this project without due consideration of any alternatives.

We expect the Ministry to be fully engaged with respect to their responsibility in this matter, and have copied the Minister and our local provincial members of parliament as well as others we know to be interested.

John Lindsay on behalf of myself, Dot Klein and Lionel Rudd.