



September 12, 2008

Project # 4313

Mr. Christopher Bell
Senior Planner
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 400
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3

Dear Sir:

**Re: St. Marys Flamborough Quarry
Response to CART Comments and IBI Peer Review**

CART provided several attachments with comments in an email on August 29th, 2008. The following table is intended to provide the members of CART and their review team an overview of how comments and concerns will be addressed (many within the forthcoming Preliminary Draft Report) and/or our response to these issues.

Item No.	Comment	Response/Action
CART Minutes (August 14, 2008)		
1.	Require a 3-4 week review period for report and PIC Panels	Our proposed schedule provides a 3-4 week review period for CART.
2.	PIC held in two locations, two separate dates	We intend to proceed with a single PIC location in November, and we are prepared to discuss the location with CART. The public has not raised this as a concern.
3.	Notice to the public 3-4 weeks in advance of the PIC date	TOR only requires 2 weeks, and community has been satisfied with this timeframe.
4.	Older PIC materials should be archived on the website.	The information has remained on the website throughout the process and can be accessed through the following link. http://www.flamboroughquarry.ca/haul_route.php

iTRANS Consulting Inc.

100 York Boulevard
Suite 300
Richmond Hill, ON
L4B 1J8 Canada
Tel: 905 882-4100
Fax: 905 882-1557

www.itransconsulting.com

5.	More info on proposed access location and related sight line issues	More details on the potential site access location(s) is provided in the preliminary draft report.
6.	Include travel time analysis	We are in the process of conducting travel time runs and will include as part of our evaluation (although this is not a requirement of the TOR).
7.	Include queuing analysis	The baseline conditions did not include traffic analysis but it was always intended to be included in the draft report.
Milton Comments (August 25, 2008)		
1.	Railway exposure index at Twiss and Campbellville after quarry is in place.	This information is provided in detail in the Preliminary Draft Report.
IBI Review (August 14, 2008)		
1.	Transportation-related technical information was sufficient to address the scope of transportation criteria required to indentify a preferred haul route for the most part.	Thank you, we hope to continue to build on this thorough information.
2.	More info on proposed access location and related sight line issues.	More details on the potential site access location(s) is provided in the preliminary draft report.
3.	Include travel time analysis.	We are in the process of conducting travel time runs and will include as part of our evaluation (although this is not a requirement of the TOR).
4.	Include queuing analysis.	The baseline conditions did not include traffic analysis but it was always intended to be included in the draft report. In addition there will be discussion for site entrance and rail crossing queuing.
5.	Site access, travel time, and queuing should be	These factors are only considered in the evaluation of the preferred route and were not considered in short-listing of alternatives.

	considered in the short-listing of alternatives	
6.	Limited disclosure of analysis procedures and results.	As CART underwent staffing changes and was experiencing staffing shortages condensed information that was “results focused” was provided on the analysis. Details of the analysis are provided in the Preliminary Draft Report.
7.	No explicit accounting for other area developments.	All of the municipalities were contacted regarding background developments and only Hamilton suggested possible minor developments at the very south end of our study area. It is assumed that the minor impacts of these developments are captured in the growth. No quarries or expansions were brought forward by municipalities.
8.	Quarry trip distribution is theoretical.	Given the proprietary nature of this data, what has been provided already goes above and beyond what is required for a haul route study. That said discussion with CART representatives (Chris and Steven) identified opportunities for clarification in Preliminary Draft Report.
9.	More explanation of how heavy vehicles are accounted for in Synchro analysis	A note addressing this is included in the Preliminary Draft Report.
10.	No actual measure for cyclist and pedestrian volumes.	The acknowledgement of cyclists and pedestrians is reflective of municipality goals, bike and trail plans, correspondence with cycling committees, and public consultation. We have not let numbers dictate how vulnerable road users should be safely accommodated.
11.	More information is required regarding sight distances.	Additional detail is provided in the Preliminary Draft Report.
12.	Collision analysis was very high level.	The collision analysis applied state-of-the-practice operational performance functions to predict the number of collisions before and after the opening of the proposed quarry. The results were applied to the development of the criteria and indicators. This approach is both detailed and defensible.
13.	Safety analysis	An on-site safety assessment was conducted of

	does not give any consideration to operating speeds.	existing conditions. The assessment included consideration of observed and posted speeds of the roadways. More details will be provided in the Preliminary Draft Report.
14.	No discussion of the analysis of the safety performance indicators has been provided.	This will be documented in the Haul Route Analysis report.
15.	More info is required on the calculation of indicators.	Details on the criteria and indicators and associated calculations are provided in the Preliminary Draft Report
16.	More detail required on the mitigating measures for each haul route.	These details are included in the Preliminary Draft Report for each alternative.
17.	Unable to verify the accuracy of the Synchro analysis.	Print outs of the Synchro reports are included in the appendix of the Preliminary Draft Report.
18.	Input from MTO, CN, and CP sought?	Input from MTO, CP, and a long list of other external agencies have been received and documented in the Preliminary Draft Report. There are no CN lines that run through the study area.
19.	Have speed studies been conducted? Anticipated impacts of pavement widening on operating speeds?	No speed studies were conducted. The design speed was selected as the posted speed plus 10 km/h which is standard practice. It is acknowledged that wider pavements tend to increase operating speeds. Effects may be mitigated somewhat with the bike lanes and should be considered in preliminary and detailed design stages for road improvements.
20.	What design vehicle was used for the design of mitigating measures?	The largest design vehicle a WB-20 was used for the design of the road improvements. This is all documented in the Preliminary Draft Report.
21.	Identify advantages and disadvantages, direct comparison of parallel or	Advantages and disadvantages are already listed in the report however additional comparative discussion has been added to help understand the short-listing process.

	mutually exclusive link options would be helpful.	
22.	Disclosure of the relative weightings of the individual indicators.	Details on the weightings of each indicator are provided in the Preliminary Draft Report.
23.	More detail on the sensitivity analysis including weightings.	Details on the sensitivity analysis and the associated weightings are provided in the Preliminary Draft Report.
24.	Full cost estimates for all haul route alternatives need to be reviewed and accounted for.	We have prepared construction cost estimates for the haul route alternatives, and they are displayed in the analysis tables. Property acquisition costs are excluded.

If you have any concerns regarding the above please advise my colleague Matthew McCumber (x 5246) at your earliest convenience so that it can be addressed prior to the submission of the Preliminary Draft Report.

Yours truly,

iTRANS Consulting Inc.

Tara Erwin, P.Eng.