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**SUBJECT:** Highway 52 & Jerseyville Road Intersection Improvements  
(PW08041a) - (Ward 14)

### RECOMMENDATION:

(a) That the General Manager, Public Works, be authorized and directed to file the Highway 52 and Jerseyville Road Intersection Improvements Environmental Report with the Municipal Clerk for a minimum thirty (30) day public review period;

(b) That upon completion of the minimum thirty (30) day public review period, the General Manager, Public Works Department, be authorized and directed to proceed with implementation of Alternative 4 - Roundabout, as further detailed in report PW08041a, subject to funding approval through the 2009 budget process.

---

Scott Stewart, C.E.T.  
General Manager  
Public Works

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process has generally been followed for the recently completed Intersection Improvements study at Highway 52 and Jerseyville Road (see Appendix A). The planning process has identified alternative solutions to the problem. The problems identified for this project are related to speeds on Highway 52 and the ability for safe traffic movements at the intersection.

The conclusion is that the preferred alternative is to construct a roundabout at the intersection of Highway 52 and Jerseyville Road. The Project Environmental Report is
recommended for filing on public record and, subject to any comments received, authorizing staff to proceed with implementing the preferred alternative.

**BACKGROUND:**

The information/recommendations contained within this report primarily affect Ward 14. The City of Hamilton initiated the process to address the need for intersection improvements at Highway 52 and Jerseyville Road. A number of traffic safety issues have been identified with the intersection by nearby residents, of which the main concern appeared to be speeding.

This project generally followed the planning and design process under the Municipal Engineers Association’s Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (October 2000, as amended in 2007). However, traffic calming is exempt from the Environmental Assessment process and localized operational improvements (< $2.2 million) and traffic control (< $8.7 million) are pre-approved. As such, the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process does not require the Environmental Report to be filed, therefore, no formal Part II Order (appeal) process would be allowed for this project.

Notwithstanding, due to the potential community interest in this matter, the City voluntarily followed the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process. A Project Environmental Report has been prepared documenting the process followed to determine the recommended undertaking and an evaluation of the environmental effects of alternatives.

**Municipal Class Environmental Assessment**

Phases 1 and 2 of the Class EA Planning process have been used to guide the study:

- Phase 1 Problem Definition
- Phase 2 Identification and Evaluation of Alternative Solutions to determine a preferred solution

Public consultation is a key component of the Class Environmental Assessment process. The public were invited to provide comments for the proposed intersection improvements at Highway 52 and Jerseyville Road in the Notice of Study Commencement and Public Information Centre advertised twice in the Hamilton Spectator (At Your Service Section) on February 22 and February 29, 2008.

A Public Information Centre was held on March 4, 2008 at the Copetown Community Centre, Main Hall, 1950 Governors Road, Hamilton to present the existing environmental and traffic conditions, an evaluation of the long list of alternatives, and the preferred alternative.

A number of alternative solutions have been considered as part of this study. The following intersection improvement alternatives have been identified and evaluated:

**Alternative 1**  **Do Nothing** - leave the intersection as is, with no modifications

**Alternative 2**  **Urbanization** - add turn lanes, median islands, curbs, line painting and street lights. Maintain stop condition of Jerseyville Road.

**Alternative 3**  **Signalization** - add turn lanes, median islands, curbs, line painting, street lights and traffic signals.
Alternative 4 Roundabout - construct a roundabout with median islands, curbs, line painting and street lights.

Table 1 provides a summary of the conclusions drawn from the evaluation of the alternatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALTERNATIVE</th>
<th>CONCLUSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>Does not improve safety at the intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do Nothing</td>
<td>Not Recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>Improved aesthetics and improved intersection safety with addition of left-turn lanes. Minimal impact on traffic speeds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanization</td>
<td>Not Recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>Improved aesthetics and improved intersection safety with addition of left-turn lanes. Increased delays and increased Green House Gas emissions due to greater number of stops. Highest operation and maintenance costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signalization</td>
<td>Not Recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>Improved aesthetics and improved intersection safety through lower traffic speeds, fewer conflict points and reduced collision angles. Initial construction costs are higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundabout</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preferred Solution

Alternative 4 (Roundabout) was selected as the preferred alternative because:
- Provides the greatest impact for lowering speeds on Highway 52 in the vicinity of the intersection,
- Greatly improves the overall safety at the intersection,
- Reduces vehicle emissions,
- Increases intersection capacity,
- Pedestrian crossing distances are shorter, and
- Provides for improved aesthetics (gateway feature).

The majority of public comments received were from nearby residents of the study area and were in favour of the roundabout.

In response to the Notice of Study Commencement and Public Information Centre, members of the public, government and agencies, submitted comments to the City of Hamilton. In summary, the following general comments and concerns were received:
- Concerned about large trucks being able to use the roundabout.
- Intersection improvements that encroach into the GRCA’s Regulation Limit will require prior written approval from the conservation authority.
- Inquired about proposed construction date.
- Concerned about snow clearing.
- Concerned about the destruction of greenery.
- Concerned about the amount of traffic using the intersection.

All comments received from public and agencies were fully reviewed and responded (where appropriate) to by the City of Hamilton Project Team and were considered when determining the final alternative.
ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION:

There are two alternatives for Council to consider with respect to the recommendations of this report:

1) To not file the Highway 52 and Jerseyville Road Intersection Improvements Project Environmental Report on public record for a minimum thirty (30) day review period and proceed with implementation, subject to funding approval.
2) To not endorse the recommended solution (roundabout), however that decision would result in doing nothing at the intersection, therefore not resolving the safety issues.

FINANCIAL/STAFFING/LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:

Financial - A budget of $50,000 was approved in the 2008 capital budget for design of the preferred alternative (roundabout). Construction costs in the amount of $350,000 have been proposed for the 2009 capital budget for Public Works (Project ID No. 4030716725). The construction costs are subject to approval through the 2009 capital budget process. Should the estimated cost of the preferred alternative exceed the preliminary budget of $350,000, the revised amount will be submitted for review as part of the 2009 budget process.

Staffing/Legal - N/A

POLICIES AFFECTING PROPOSAL:

City of Hamilton Public Works Strategic Plan

The preferred alternative complies with the City of Hamilton - Public Works Strategic Plan because sound financial management for the long haul is being achieved. Although the initial construction costs will be high compared to the other alternatives, the lifecycle costs of the roundabout are expected to be lower than the signalization option. The implementation of a roundabout will achieve greater intersection safety, while ensuring sound financial management.

The roundabout also complies with the City of Hamilton - Public Works Strategic Plan because it is a ‘green’ option. The local community will be enhanced environmentally because with a roundabout there is less idling, resulting in fewer emissions and less noise and vibrations.

RELEVANT CONSULTATION:

As required under the Municipal Class EA, affected public agencies were consulted throughout the planning process. A contact list of potentially interested internal and external participants (see Appendix B) was developed at the start-up phase of the project.

CITY STRATEGIC COMMITMENT:

By evaluating the “Triple Bottom Line”, (community, environment, economic implications) we can make choices that create value across all three bottom lines, moving us closer to our vision for a sustainable community, and Provincial interests.
Community Well-Being is enhanced. ☑ Yes ☐ No
The construction of a roundabout at the intersection of Highway 52 and Jerseyville Road will assist in lowering speeds, allowing fewer conflict points and reduced collision angles, therefore improving the overall safety at the intersection.

Environmental Well-Being is enhanced. ☑ Yes ☐ No
Human health and safety are protected. The preferred alternative will allow for less vehicle emissions and noise and vibrations will likely be reduced.

Economic Well-Being is enhanced. ☑ Yes ☐ No
Based on an evaluation of alternatives, the preferred alternative was selected due to the costs and the ability to improve safety at the intersection. The lifecycle cost of the roundabout is lower than for signalization of the intersection.

Does the option you are recommending create value across all three bottom lines? ☑ Yes ☐ No

Do the options you are recommending make Hamilton a City of choice for high performance public servants? ☐ Yes ☑ No
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Appendix B - Consultation List

The following City of Hamilton Departments were contacted for this project:

- Public Works
- Planning and Economic Development
- Hamilton Emergency Services
- Hamilton Police Services
- Corporate Services
- Public Health Services
- Community Services
- Mayor
- Councillor, Ward 12
- Councillor, Ward 14

The following agencies were contacted for this project:

- Ministry of the Environment
- Ministry of Transportation
- Ministry of Natural Resources
- Department of Indian and Northern Affairs
- Municipal Affairs & Housing
- Hamilton Conservation Authority
- Niagara Escarpment Commission
- Canadian Geographical Names Database
- Ministry of the Attorney General
- Hamilton Regional Indian Centre
- Ontario Secretariat of Aboriginal Affairs
- Nipissing First Nation Union of Ontario Indians
- De dwa da dehs nyes Aboriginal Health
- Huron Wendat First Nation
- The Metis Nation of Ontario
- Association of Iroquois and Allied Indians
- Lands & Resources
- Cultural Explorers
- Six Nations Lands & Resources
- Council of Ontario Chiefs
- Six Nations
- Haudenosaunee Recourse Centre
- Ontario Federation of Indian Friendship
- Assembly of First Nations
- Patent & Trademark Agents
- Six Nations Eco-Centre
- Six Nations of the Grand River Territory
- Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation
- TransCanada Pipelines
• Union Gas
• Canadian Pacific Railway
• CN Rail
• Horizon Utilities Corporation
• Cogeco Cable
• Ontario Power Generation
• Enbridge Pipelines Inc.
• Hamilton Utilities Corporation
• Mountain Cablevision
• Bell Canada
• Southern Ontario Railway
• Hydro One
• Sun Canadian Pipeline
• South Mount Cable Ltd.
• Eastern Pipeline Operations
• Ontario Power Generation
• Canadian National Railway
• Hamilton District Catholic School Board
• Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board

The following agencies were contacted and provided comments:

• Indian and Northern Affairs, Comprehensive Claims Branch
• Six Nations of the Grand River
• Grand River Conservation Authority
• Niagara Escarpment Commission
• Canadian National Railway
• Horizon Utilities Corporation