



## NORTHEAST RIVER CROSSING FUNCTIONAL PLANNING STUDY

### Stage 1 - April 2017 Survey Comments

Identifying information removed to meet Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FOIP Act).

Comments are recorded exactly as they were received and grouped into common themes that are listed alphabetically:

#### **Alignment / Alternate Locations / Designation Suggestions**

Not that I would like to see another bridge but if there really needs to be, then make it the least intrusive to existing natural areas and farms, for example, using 195 Avenue that is already existing. That would keep the farm on the north and the natural area on the south.

To avoid bottleneck intersect Highway 15-21 direct traffic to the Industrial Heartland from Highway 16 and south Edmonton to a future four lane 830 and Highway 63 north. (included a sketch of existing Highway 15 (between AHD and 28A being removed and having Highway 15 from Anthony Henday Drive, connect with Highway 37 and/at 28A.)

I see the best route is heading south from Highway 28A down 17th Street and across the river just north of the wastewater treatment plant and then east to Highway 21. This route avoids much of the valuable river valley lowland and the old oxbow and Pointe aux Pins creek. There is the potential of having valuable natural parkland available for residents and wildlife into the future.

I think the bridge would be better placed on the south end of the map area, to go through the subdivision/development area, rather than through prime agricultural land that supports large quantities of local businesses, markets, communities and people in the Greater Edmonton Area.

With the current approval of funding for the Fort Saskatchewan bridge twinning (300 million) and current proposal by the City of Edmonton for a new interchange at Manning Freeway and Meridian Street (120 million) I would propose the scope of NERC should be amended to incorporate these two projects. I would challenge that if this new bridge was built sooner it would alleviate the necessity to twin the bridge at FS. The project should also incorporate an interchange at Manning Freeway and Highway 28A which would include access to the new Edmonton Energy and Tech Park. The scope should also include a bypass road around FS between Highway 21 and Secondary Highway 830. With this arrangement all heavy truck traffic as well as commuters from the industrial plant could all bypass FS and reduce congestion within the city.

1. The alignment for the bridge and connecting roads must align with existing infrastructure i.e. major highways like Hwy 15, Hwy 21, Manning Freeway, Hwy 28 A, etc.
2. The bridge must be built for a "heavy haul" and "high load" corridor, with provisions for future widening and or twinning, and the road must be built to a 110 kmph free-flow freeway design.

3. In general terms for alignment there is probably no chance of the road going through the lands owned by the federal government for their existing "radar station" (not sure what it is). Then on the opposite side of the river, we have the "regional wastewater treatment" plant on one side and City of Fort Saskatchewan on the other. So suddenly we are restricted to about a 3 to 4 km wide proposed alignment. And if the right of way (ROW) is say 1 km wide then there is no other choice for alternate alignments for this bridge and road.

4. Following the above logic, the road will need to go through some of the "wetlands" (old gravel pits etc) area on the south side of the river. This can be good thing as the "wetlands" can be reconfigured in their existing locations, or re-configured alongside and near the road and bridge. If this was done the area could turn into a very nice future wetland/park area. My suggestion would be to purchase the alignment ASAP and then start on removing and enhancing, replacing/relocating the wetlands area such that by the time the bridge and road are constructed the wetlands are fully re-established. And if it ends up being a park it can probably be used throughout all the construction activities.

5. The old gravel pit stockpiles that are in the area could be used as fill for the new bridge approaches thereby "cleaning" up the existing eyesore and utilizing these materials (which are pretty much by-products of aggregate production and not worth much money). And if the ROW is purchased now then that material could be used for fill on the bridge approaches. And that fill can be placed at any (*not complete - may have reached maximum characters*)

Please provide the Fort Saskatchewan area with good traffic options for both local people and industry.

Do not repeating STUPID road "planning" like the 2-lane, traffic light ridden Henday parking lot or 1 lane Parsons Road north from Ellerslie Road nightmare; using materials including paving that's APPROPRIATE for this climate, like other cities and provinces and states do. This ain't Florida, folks, and the vehicle population ain't going down, so THINK before spending our tax dollars this time!!!!

Why was this bridge crossing missed when planning the Anthony Henday? An exit from the Henday could be incorporated into the existing road going through Northeast Edmonton.

The parameters of the study are too limited. They need to consider impact on the area roads that would be connected to the bridge, and agriculture. Fort Saskatchewan should not be allowed to push the bridge south so that they can destroy prime farm land.

The bridge should also have the heavy haul component as part of its mandate, since this has long been a concern.

The other issue that I see is the fact that this is not a heavy haul route?! Not understanding why?

Most important to connect heavy haul to Heartland west and northern Alberta.

Long term need. Heavy haul.

Planning for this bridge needs to coincide with the study of oversize load routes.

I live on one of the proposed connecting routes (Twp 540) and believe that a route that follows the rail-road would be much better -- significantly fewer residences affected, does not interfere with a cemetery or golf course, fewer wetlands and "soft spots" to deal with.

Take the shortest route so the least amount of land and fewest affected people will be involved.

I live on one of the potential crossing sites. The crossing that makes the most sense and doesn't cross over so much land, is 195 Avenue. There is already a road there and has the least effect on environmental issues. The land that would be affected, directly to the south of 195, is already in the area structure plan. There would be the least amount of agricultural land effected by going directly down 195 Avenue. Thank you

I work east of Fort Saskatchewan and drive through it every work day. I see the impact that the large industrial sites that have turn-around events has on the amount of traffic passing through the city. Many times traffic is backed up and there are delays. Hopefully this project will address the following: 1. Large traffic volume passing through Ft Saskatchewan during turn-around events 2. Traffic congestion where highway 37, 15 and 825, 28 meet.

I travel through the study area to get to work. I'm looking forward to the upgrades to roadways to make intersections safer!

Save the two low lying future park spaces and put the bridge and access between the two.

Is another vehicle bridge really needed? Just expand the Highway 15/Manning freeway bridge. If another bridge is needed build it north through the industrial Heartland which is ugly already - don't destroy natural areas between 50 Street (Gold Bar) and Ft Saskatchewan. Any transportation project should address, first and foremost, PEOPLE: pedestrian access, dedicated cycling routes, public transit (billions spent on Anthony Henday with no allowance for public transit and only 2 meager pedestrian bridges on the N. Saskatchewan River crossing undercarriages with poor access to those pedestrian bridges).

Unsure why this bridge has been downgraded from a heavy haul?

Try to avoid "diagonal cuts" across privately owned properties; other than existing railway and/or pipeline corridor.

I would request the bridge be south in the planning area so that local food/urban ag farms are not affected. The southern land owners are interested to have their land developed.

No overpass and bridge needed

A number of years ago Sturgeon County conducted a study for a river crossing just south of the Agrium fertilizer plant. The study might provide some information helpful for the current one.

With the completion of the Henday, and the province twinning highway 15 soon, this crossing seems very unnecessary.

## **Development of Northeast Edmonton**

Is it realistic to do planning on the basis that the metro Edmonton population will double in 20 to 40 years?

Don't allow a few very vocal farmers to hold up development. They were told in 1982 when we were annexed that they area would be developed. They have known for 35 years that change was coming. Non farming landowners in our area have been waiting for 35 years to possibly have water and sewer, street lights and better roads. It is my understanding the one of the farmers on the river are planning to build a house. Will we allow them to build and hold up bridge construction while we negotiate to purchase their land and now a new home?

Please stop disturbing these areas. Start to build UP and not OUT.

## **Environment/ Historical/Wildlife/River**

What will the impact be for air quality and noise pollution to Fort Saskatchewan? With the twinning of the local bridge and adding another multi lane bridge within several kilometers, it will surely put a strain on our local quality of life and health.

The bridge location needs to minimize impact on the water resources and undisturbed river valley land as well as Pointe aux Pins creek and old oxbow lands. These are important wildlife areas and we have relatively little of such land left along the river valley in the northeast of Edmonton.

Minimizing damage including future damage and pollution to the environment including fish and wildlife.

I am also concerned about the use and future of the environment around the river and lands that Aboriginals traditionally use. They should be allowed to have decision making power as well.

Increased road kills with additional roadways added.....

The area being considered is also home to seasonal bald eagles along with water fowl and other animals. It also is used during the migration seasons for birds.

Minimize impact to the river and the fish habitat during construction.

Preserve the river-scape- restrict development to recreational purposes - look at Red Deer which has much better river access and promotes recreational use instead of blocking river access by relaying the land and constructing bridges that have no trail to the rivers.

Even though project construction is 25-35 years in the future, if the indigenous, environment, and historical and ag land isn't set aside now for future generations it is too late 25 years from now.

The crossing should be somewhere else to minimize the environmental impact.

Concerned with protect indigenous, environmental and historical spaces and also prime agricultural land on black land micro- climate.

## **Farming History and Background**

As someone who has grown up in the community family farming since 1924, we ask that the community isn't divided further, keep road on the path of "least family disruption". Also know that there are more people affected by the transportation than one farming family.

Remember there is a community involved as well as the 2 Ag producers. Do not allow to be dominated with one sided, unsubstantiated claims in order to control the decision.

I hope that your team pays attention to the facts of the study area, not the misinformation that many of the 'farmers' are circulating. I know that they lobby customers of their businesses to write letters and try to push the topic with wrong information... this is not fair.

My family has farmed in the northeast river crossing area for many years and it would be devastating to see their livelihoods destroyed by a crossing that can be located elsewhere. Not to mention the negative impact it would have on the land and surrounding ecosystems that are essential to the Edmonton area.

Please consider seriously the impact on the long established farms and business ventures.

## **Loss of Existing Agricultural Operations and/or Agricultural Land**

I am very concerned about a road being built thru prime agricultural land. I am concerned that local governments are not respectful of the tremendous agricultural value of the land. We know that there are better places to develop or pave over that should not include sensitive and prime agricultural land. These areas should be protected from development and we need governments to understand our concerns.

I have an agricultural background so I value prime farming land. So should all levels of government. Shame upon anyone who advocates for the urbanization of prime agricultural land.

I am concerned about the disruption of good, local farmland being used yet again for transportation and construction. I am afraid that opening up this area to more traffic will open it up to more development. I am afraid Edmonton will grow without concern for green spaces, feeding its population locally, and supporting the wildlife that either lives or migrates through Edmonton.

Extremely concerned about infiltrating the market gardens and farmlands of northeast Edmonton - best (#1) soils in Alberta now growing houses and box stores (and bridges next) instead of being preserved in perpetuity (real sustainability)! Assist and reward those farmers and buy them out fairly ONLY to preserve that land - help the farmers who do sacrifice to protect their land by covering costs of arranging land conservation agreements instead of imposing more obligations and costs.

We must minimize the lands lost to the new highway and river crossing.

The unique and special characteristics of the farm land should be strongly considered to preserve. The (*name removed*) lands have a restrictive covenant and are seeking to put a conservation easement on it with Edmonton Area Land Trust.

Having traveled the river by canoe, I have seen many railway crossings in the Industrial Heartland. The proposed bridge would go right through the most fertile soil in the district. Could we please recognize

and respect that. Could we do all that is possible to keep those beautiful acres for agriculture, relaxation, walking trails. Could we support the *(name removed)* and agricultural lands and forest to keep in perpetuity. A unique opportunity to learn and appreciate vegetable and flower growing. This protect is a very generous gift to the city. Furthermore, we need launches for boats and canoes so young and old may enjoy a beautiful river! There will be other locations for a bridge!

A highway and bridge over the *(name removed)* farmland would be devastating to their business, and does not adequately take into account the value of local agricultural land. It is important to me, as an Edmontonian, that our unique agricultural land is preserved for future generations to use.

Often current land use activities are sacrificed in favor of future land-use activities when other more feasible options are available. We need to know when to say NO! to development and consider land use options that provide a foundation for economic, environmental and social well-being.

Too much Prime farmland has been swallowed up by greed. This whole thing (the NE area) should be set aside to be a source of food for city dwellers. There will come a time when folks really will need the products of this fertile land. Why not build another city on rocky and marginal land? This is an area with its own micro climate, excellently suitable for agriculture! So please go elsewhere to satisfy the city growth....

It is very important that agricultural lands be protected and have priority over highways and houses. Land within this area are being used to produce food for farmer's markets and supermarkets. At this time when more and more people are concerned about eating close to home and knowing where their food comes from it is imperative we protect this resource. Once it's gone, it's gone.

This land is prime agricultural farm land that should be preserved for many future generations to enjoy. To disregard that, is a true shame. Majority of our lands have been torn apart and constructed on. Please consider that this study be spared of such plans.

I don't want to see such valuable agricultural and recreational land being taken away. The food that is being grown there is bought and sold locally and that is good for our local economy.

This area is one of the most important agricultural areas in all of Alberta. To preserve this area, it should be everyone's main goal!!!! To maintain the historical significance, harvest the most nutritional food and respect the farms, we must leave the land alone. My family, friends and myself all would be absolutely devastated if any development happened in this area. I am writing to you on earth day, begging to all decision makers, to preserve this important piece of land. We do not need to keep taking and taking from the earth, without giving back. We must respect this land that the universe had blessed us with, not letting it go to waste. I hope that as humans, you can hear the cry of the people who want nothing but for what is best for the farmers, the land and the public itself.

If our society loses the ability, knowledge and land to grow our food, our ability to live independently will be threatened.

This is farm land that I grew up on and working. You are considering on ending a life of memories and land that is used for fresh local vegetable. Please consider this. God bless.

Agriculture and environmental impact over convenience. You can't go back once you demolish it.

(*name removed*) and (*name removed*) are in the middle of the study area and will directly affected by this bridge. Both of these farmers will be affected along with all the organizations that benefit from their generosity throughout the year such as Hope Mission, Edmonton Food Bank, Mustard Seed. As well produce that myself and many others presently purchase at the Edmonton Farmer's Markets. The preservation of this rich agricultural land meets many of the objective and goals of the FRESH (Edmonton's Food and Urban Agriculture Strategy). We need this resource for food security.

Keep the area intact. Absolutely the best agricultural land around. These gardens are an important part of our community. Don't spoil it with a highway!

It would be a huge loss to the community to pave over (*name removed*). They are a family friendly farm and they produce a variety of local vegetables. They support local activities such as teaching children from low-income families about agriculture and the Native Healing Center uses the land for sweat lodges and to teach Native people about their culture. It would be really unfortunate to pave over (*name removed*).

Keep it all parks and farmland, especially places like (*name removed*). Don't lose that great place.

Don't want you to pave over the richest fertile land in Edmonton.

Terrible idea. This area has a unique micro climate excellent for growing. Putting roads in this area is terrible. Ensuring food security for the city should be made a priority not another road.

(*name removed*) is in a unique spot and it would be horrible to lose this land. It has its own little micro-climate and the soil is very unique to the area. We would lose a valuable resource should the plan for a bridge go through this land. The old growth forest is something else we should not lose. So many people benefit from this area and I personally would like to see this area preserved. Please reconsider the plan!

I am very concerned about the loss of prime agricultural lands and although always given as a high priority in land use bylaws are practically non-existent when challenged by any sort of development. I have seen countless numbers of times where urban and industrial sprawl have trumped any desire to protect valuable non-replaceable high quality farmland. This was the case in the Horse Hill region recently with City of Edmonton zoning, as well as Bremner in Strathcona County, and I can see agriculture getting the short end of the stick again in this consultation. Pardon my cynicism but we all know that developers generally have much more pull when it comes to drawing lines on a map. It's time that changed.

I am concerned about the bridge impacting the surrounding agricultural land. This land is incredibly valuable because it provides fresh, wholesome food for people in Edmonton and the surrounding areas, increasing food security and quality for local communities. I believe that the bridge must be built elsewhere, even if that requires more time, effort, and money because preserving the land for future generations is in the end much more valuable and important than finding a cheap solution to transportation needs in the present. I hope that the study will accurately value and emphasize the future benefits of preserving the land and that it will take those benefits (going beyond just economic value and including the cultural, social, and environmental values of the land) fully into account when making their recommendations and decisions.

Some areas should remain untouched: we as humans ruin everything. There are farmers here who will be forced out when they should be able to keep their land as it is.

I do not condone or support the northeast river crossing functional plan study for its proposed location. The proposed crossing(s) will disrupt prime farm land that provides valuable local food products and community to many in the Edmonton area and is of much greater importance.

Another river crossing would be awesome. But not at the cost of losing agricultural land that is not usually found around here. You promote green spaces and urban gardens but don't seem to want to protect some of our most important agricultural land. These areas have prime agricultural land on them and some are used for cultural purposes as well.

I'm concerned at the constant development of productive agricultural land to build more roads. It seems like we are failing to address future needs of our community in order to save someone 15 min on a commute.

Concern about loss of agricultural land. Once it's gone it's gone.

The area in question is a unique agricultural zone. It provides employment and produces a large quantity of the food my family consumes. I am very concerned about the use of number one agricultural land for roadways/transportation corridor. Once this land is covered up/unavailable for food production, it's gone. There is not a lot of viable (and highly productive) agricultural land in the region that can replace this land once it's gone.

The loss of land for agricultural purposes.

Any river crossing should not disrupt current farming and grazing lands

I am concerned that agricultural land will be taken over in the bridge project. I value local produce and know that the land in the study area is fertile and rich. I am particularly concerned for the future of (*name removed*) and surrounding raspberry farms. I believe farmland should be protected and considered a valuable asset.

Important agriculture spaces are of the utmost importance to our city and they should be protected.

We need to protect our functional agricultural sites. We have removed tons of the best soil in Alberta with Urban sprawl. Riverbend gardens is one of the last sites that still utilizes this rich earth. It would be a huge shame to pave over it. Where do people think our food is going to keep coming from if we destroy it all?

Ultimately, I don't want to see a degradation of the farmland on the area.

It will destroy prime farm land and recreational areas.

I can't understand why the Feds or province think it's okay to 1. build a bridge/road over a family farm and ruin what these families have spent lifetimes working. 2. That amazing agricultural land is going to be destroyed for what? A road, a bridge? 3. It's despicable that they think they can do what they want.

This area has been farmed for years and we need to keep good farm land.

Agricultural land is very important for our daily living. We can't keep destroying the good land for development. It is important to me to buy local produced food to keep costs down and to keep local producers in business. I have relatives that are dairy farmers in central Alberta and it is very costly to start up a dairy and without farmers we don't eat. I am also related to a potato grower in the area that is being discussed and losing growing acres for development is not responsible.

I am very concerned about potential risk to destroying/paving over/near the lands owned by people who have indicated that they want to continue to farm (*names removed*). These farmers are providing a very valuable supply of local, fresh food to our economy. (*name removed*) provides important space, food and resources to many agencies in the City working with people experiencing addiction, food insecurity, seniors, and many more. This land is very unique and special with its great soil and microclimate. It cannot be moved or replaced or recreated elsewhere. We need to protect important valuable agricultural land. This land must be protected from development into a roadway or bridge!

The disruption of farms.

This area contain the only number one soil for growing root crops in the Edmonton area. It is vital to our city to preserve it.

This will have a negative impact on prime farm land within the city limits. (*name removed*) will lose land and their livelihood. This family farm provides an incredible service to Edmonton and the surrounding area.

Worried about the loss of valuable local agricultural land. Local growers are important, and the ones located in the area where the river crossing is planned are ones that we love and would hate to see lost.

PLEASE do not pave over prime agricultural land. We need places like (*name removed*). If you continue to pave over top quality farm land where do you think people will grow vegetables and fruit for Edmonton markets?

Prime agricultural land should be kept as such. We cannot replace this. Why can we not twin the current highway, or move the road to an area where we are not destroying this precious land. Preserving this land should be of the utmost importance.

I work at (*name removed*), a local vegetable farm within the study area. I have worked there for the past six years and it has become not only my place of employment, but my home. (*name removed*) is situated in a extremely unique piece of agricultural land with a unique micro climate that allows us to provide fresh, local and traditionally grown vegetables to much of Edmonton and surrounding area. To put a road through this amazing area of land would be a travesty to humanity and not only put an end to an amazing agricultural resource but be in detriment to the future of Edmontonians.

Edmonton continues to neglect obvious needs. DO NOT take away from what is at peak popularity in the Edmonton region which is the numerous farmers markets. By running bridges and destroying pristine

farmland you will be taking away vegetable farmers from our city that help make us unique. Think long and hard about this as I know for a fact that plenty of available spaces to build bridges are held in trust by corporations with the intent to build just for personal profit.

I have gone to (*name removed*) for yrs to buy all my vegetables. Makes me sick to my stomach to think you would destroy something so important to thousands in this city. Senseless and shameful to even propose a bridge through such pristine vegetable farmland in our region.

The farm land in this area is extremely unique and plays a vital role in many lives, but in the agricultural side, but also in the quality foods that come from it. Putting roads and a bridge right through the farm land appears to me the easy way out with short-sighted and does not properly take into account the greater impacts on the city of Edmonton and surrounding areas.

As we plan for the future we must consider saving as much of the agricultural land as possible while developing trails for the enjoyment of the land. I strongly support the bridge to the south even though it will cost more. In the long run, the extra cost will be worth it.

Loss of agricultural land

Please keep this as farm land - it is vital for Edmonton to have area stay as farm land for urban farming, local economy and Edmonton's Food security!!!

I am fully against the development of this land. It is the number one best soil for growing root vegetables in central Alberta! It also has the longest frost free period (meaning our growing season is longer). This land has such agricultural value! To disregard that would be such a ginormous waste and shame. The area holds such importance and value to many people, including my family who has lived on and farmed the area for generations. This land is so, so important. We must protect it.

There is no way to describe the agriculture value of the land that is possibly going to be developed here. It is some of the best in Alberta and would be not only a waste, but a massive amount of shame to disregard that. Alberta's agriculture, particularly around Edmonton and area, is diminishing due to development. Please consider what the Northeast River Crossing will mean to the agricultural community and how it will affect them.

This would ruin agricultural land. We do not need this. Please leave the environment alone!

This farm land holds great value to a lot of people. It is very valuable and to destroy it for non agricultural purposes is a travesty. We need to preserve this land for agricultural purposes.

This area has a unique microclimate that provides vegetable growers with better growing conditions, which in turn provides a key source of food for people in the area. This must not be lost by paving it over.

I'm very concerned about the potential of taking away valuable agriculture resources in this area and also putting families business out of business. If we let this agriculture area go we'll be taking away a special resource that is so incredibly valuable.

While I am in favour of improving the lives of Albertans through public infrastructure, I also care deeply about local food options and local food security. Both *(names removed)* fall squarely into the study area and the approved ASP for Horse Hills development indicates the likely construction of this provincial bridge across their land. I am opposed to this proposed location because I value the contribution that both *(names removed)* make to the local food economy and believe that as a community, we should respect and care for the agricultural lands within our city limits. Placing the highway and bridge over *(names removed)* land would make farming that land an impossibility. *(name removed)* contributes to and works with so many agencies in Edmonton. I have been there several times harvesting potatoes and corn that were being donated to the Edmonton Food Bank while working alongside people from The Mustard Seed, Boyle Street and Hope Mission plus people that had just moved to Canada. Not only do people from the inner city receive good nourishment from the food they harvest, they also receive mental health benefits from working in the garden. There have been studies published in the last several years about the mental health benefits of both gardening and being in nature. Our city's reconciliation work has greatly benefited from the Indigenous cultural programming that *(name removed)* has been able to provide *(name removed)* for several years. Providing land for Indigenous youth programming certainly is a wonderful response to the Truth and Reconciliation Commissions Calls to Action. Kings University also has a relationship with the garden and is able to teach courses out at *(name removed)* along with many other schools that take students out for field trips. Preserving *(name removed)* fulfills many of the objectives and goals of FRESH (Edmonton's Food and Urban Agriculture Strategy

Do not go through the *(name removed)*. An agricultural easement is being worked on for that property. It has conservation value as old forest and has never been mined. It is a special farm. With an easement (currently a restrictive covenant is in place) it will help fulfil the YEG food security plan.

It will affect several farms on the Edmonton side of the river which are suppliers of locally grown fruits and vegetables along the river banks. These farms cannot be replaced, this is prime agricultural area which cannot be replaced.

I think it needs to be re-envisioned as it is going to negatively affect the users of the proposed area. While a crossing may become useful as growth and traffic increase, placing the crossing in the study area would be an unwise use of prime agricultural land and would destroy the economic, cultural, and social benefits of this land for people who have been using it for generations.

I would hate to see the new bridge and road connections destroy *(name removed)* where a local landowner is trying his best to conserve his farm and natural areas indefinitely. I would also like to see the province use LESS land for roads in keeping with our provincial land framework which calls for land to be used more efficiently. The development of Anthony Henday took up an incredible amount of valuable land, like there are no tomorrows. I would like to see the new roadway and bridge built more conservative as they do in Europe or elsewhere.

The area is highly diverse and has significant areas that are sensitive to disturbance such as environmental features, wildlife areas, and valuable agricultural land with farmers who want to see their children continue to farm even when they could sell for substantial financial gains. In particular, *(names removed)* near 195 Avenue. Also the raspberry farm; *(name removed)*. The proposed bridge and highway construction is not compatible with farming activities which would present a huge loss of our northeast farming heritage and fresh supply to our local population. While I am not directly affected, I have greatly benefited from the farmers and also from recreational activities on and around the river, as

well as in the natural areas in the area. I also have a community garden plot near Henwood Treatment Facility that I absolutely love and would be very upset to be impacted.

### **Property Values**

I believe this study was done before by the previous government. It really seems like a waste of tax payers money to do it all again. It would be nice to know exactly where this new road and bridge are going to be located. Put a line on the map so the land owners involved know and can move on with their lives. People are having a hard time selling because of this problem.

How a possible construction of a major road and connecting roads will affect our lifestyle and value of our property.

### **Public Engagement**

Need an ASP board (with the display boards).

Wherever this crossing is going to be placed I hope that the team speaks with the land OWNERS, not those who have sold off the land and 'farm it'. The LAND OWNERS need to be compensated when the line is drawn.

Reiterate my concern that the City of Edmonton does not take questions from the floor, so everyone hears the same answer, not just from the one staff member they talk to.

Not really public consultation when speaker says bridge crossing is necessary.

It would be useful to know more specific information relating to future public consultation efforts, such as whether personal consultations are being planned to be held with directly affected landowners.

Presentation was useless - no info- no ideas- no group feedback.

Need geographical elevation info on the maps (river banks) at the meeting. Mark Anthony Henday river crossing more clearly to situate the planning area.

Will be interested in attending the next session to see the proposed bridge crossing locations. Good session on collecting public feedback

Venue was easily accessible however a non-denominational location would be preferable. Thanks for hosting this!

I would like to say a thank you to all the individuals who came out to answer questions, 99% were fantastic, disappointed in (*name removed*) who had to bring the FOOD debate into light, knowing it was a contentious issue with the community.

I am currently a member of the (*name removed*). We have a model aircraft airfield in the study area that will be affected by any development in the area. Would like to be kept informed on any long term plans for the area. We have planned upgrades and expansions that may be impacted.

## **Timing of Project**

Hopefully it doesn't take 25 years!!

The roads/bridge should be constructed sooner. Protection of a transportation/utility corridor is of utmost consideration.

I believe it is a huge mistake to delay NERC for 20-25 years. Province suggests twinning highway 15 bridge will allow this - WRONG!! Highway 15 twinning will always have a bottleneck because of highway 37 signals and the City of Fort Saskatchewan. Twinning highway 15 will not accommodate heavy loads and is a waste. NERC will alleviate traffic issues on highway 15 and will accommodate heavy industrial roads. If only one gets built in the next five years, it should be NERC.

Timeline should be accelerated to ten years.

Long overdue

Work has been going on for many years to get this bridge and road work completed. Soil studies have been completed. Taking 2 years to make the decision as to where the bridge will go is NOT timely from the aspect of development and land sales. Landowners in this area are unable to sell their property when the uncertainty of bridge location remains uncertain. Whatever decision is made - make it as quickly as possible and GET ON WITH IT! We in this area do not believe that this bridge is 25-30 years out. It has been talked about and preliminary work has been worked on for the last several years.

## **Other Highways/Roads (not in NERC Study Area)**

I live on twp 542 by Range Road 221. My concern is if there are plans to use or upgrade twp 542 between 21 and 830. My acreage is close to 542 and there is already too much traffic. If there are future plans to upgrade 542 I will be moving to Lamont county.

A good start but a lot more work needs to be done with existing roads. 1) Department of Transportation - Highway junction 16 and 21 - terrible design, eastbound traffic on 16 wanting to go south on 21 forced to line up to a half mile as you have to exit across two lanes of traffic northbound and south on 21. 2) eastbound traffic on 16 forced to watch for westbound to get onto 830 to Josephburg, lots of accidents and that interferes with lots of traffic, traffic exceeding the posted speed limit, I would suggest semi's not be allowed on weekdays - send them down 21 and through Fort Saskatchewan; they are eastbound or northbound. 3) Highway 834 off of 16 used to transport large heavy equipment oversize to Fort Mac. They have to go through Lamont and pass schools. Suggest extending 834 north to 637.

## **Other**

I have concerns on any negative impact this project will have.

First off, I would like to express my utmost disgust with (*name removed*) the need to bring up "food" and farmers was not the time or the place. She ruined the evening for many of the residents in the area. There was no need to bring up such a debated topic to an event when it wasn't needed. It was ignorant and a very poor representation of the Province. As for the study, the other reps were very informative and answered questions.

*(name removed)* fed 7000 people potatoes from a small piece of this land. Nowhere do I see any concern for how people will eat in the future. We talk about the hungry children in schools but they have never starved.

I will wait and see the response to my personal concern (which it was noted).