

Request for Decision

Maley Drive Extension Project Speakers' List / Written Submissions

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Presented To: | Public Input and Information Session |
| Presented: | Tuesday, Mar 01, 2016 |
| Report Date | Tuesday, Feb 23, 2016 |
| Type: | Public Input |

Resolution

THAT the City of Greater Sudbury temporarily suspends Articles 32.02(2) of the City of Greater Sudbury Procedure By-law 2011-235, which outlines the rules for speakers to limit their presentations to five (5) minutes so as to allow speakers the opportunity to provide a maximum of ten (10) minute presentation at the Public Input Session of March 1, 2016 regarding the Maley Drive Extension project. (Requires Unanimous Consent)

*REVISED REPORT

Background

Article 32.02(2) of the City of Greater Sudbury Procedure By-law 2011-235 outlines that the Chair may allow a maximum of five (5) minutes to each speaker, in order to allow as many persons as possible an opportunity to speak.

As the time limit is outlined in the procedure by-law, should Council Members wish to allow presenters the opportunity to speak for ten (10) minutes, they are required to temporarily suspend the rules under Article 32.02(2).

This will require unanimous consent of all members present. Should unanimous consent not be reached, presenters will be allowed the usual five (5) minutes to provide their presentation.

All written submissions received and those who have notified Clerk's Services to be included on the speakers' list prior to February 16, 2016 have been included in this agenda. All those submissions received after February 16, 2016 will be distributed under separate cover.

Signed By

Report Prepared By

Brigitte Sobush
Deputy City Clerk
Digitally Signed Feb 23, 16

Recommended by the Department

Caroline Hallsworth
Executive Director, Administrative
Services/City Clerk
Digitally Signed Feb 23, 16

Recommended by the C.A.O.

Kevin Fowke
Acting Chief Administrative Officer
Digitally Signed Feb 23, 16

**PUBLIC INPUT & INFORMATION SESSION
MALEY DRIVE
TUESDAY MARCH 1, 2016
SPEAKER'S LIST AS OF FEBRUARY 17, 2016**

| NO. | NAME and/or ORGANIZATION |
|------------|---|
| 1 | Joyce Mankarios, Chamber of Commerce |
| 2 | Thomas Price |
| 3 | John Lindsay, Friendly to Seniors |
| 4 | Gord Slade |
| 5 | Dr. David Robinson, Laurentian University Institute for Northern Ontario Research and Development |
| 6 | Dot Klein |
| 7 | Peter Desotti |

**PUBLIC INPUT & INFORMATION SESSION
MALEY DRIVE
TUESDAY MARCH 1, 2016
WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS AS OF FEBRUARY 17, 2016**

| NO. | NAME and/or ORGANIZATION |
|------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | Antonioni, John |
| 2 | Brian (Sliede) |
| 3 | Cedric |
| 4 | Dreger, Karl |
| 5 | Hugli, Wayne |
| 6 | Lindsay, John (Friendly to Seniors) |
| 7 | Maurice, Christine and Richard |
| 8 | Tessier, Ron |

Fwd: Maley Drive Comments Form

From: clerks

Date: 2/10/2016 9:31 AM

Subject: Fwd: Maley Drive Comments Form

>>> Maley Drive Comments Form <webmaster@greatersudbury.ca> 2/9/2016 8:51 PM >>>

This form was sent at: 9-Feb-2016 8:51 PM

NAME: John Antonioni

ORGANIZATION:

PHONE: [REDACTED]

EMAIL: [REDACTED]

COMMENTS1: An assessment of primary users of this route must be undertaken and primary Industrial users of this route should be responsible for paying a significant percentage of build cost. We all know that this project is really for diversion of mine ore trucks away from central arterial roadways. This, at a time when mining operations are relocating significant portions of their operations sub-surface in order to dodge municipal taxation.

Maley Drive Comments Form

From: clerks

Date: 2/16/2016 3:45 PM

Subject: Fwd: Maley Drive Comments Form

>>> Maley Drive Comments Form <webmaster@greatersudbury.ca> 2/16/2016 11:56 AM >>>

This form was sent at: 16-Feb-2016 11:56 AM

NAME: Brian

ORGANIZATION: Sliede

PHONE: [REDACTED]

EMAIL: [REDACTED]

COMMENTS1: Why are we spending money on a new road, that is clearly optional, when we cannot maintain the roads that we have. I do not see this road benefitting very many people. I go to Garson regularly and do not see a situation when I would use this road. I understand that the project will be funded partially by the province, but they are in debt and running deficits.

Fwd: Maley Drive Comments Form

From: clerks

Date: 2/11/2016 11:10 AM

Subject: Fwd: Maley Drive Comments Form

>>> Maley Drive Comments Form <webmaster@greatersudbury.ca> 2/10/2016 5:26 PM >>>

This form was sent at: 10-Feb-2016 5:26 PM

NAME: Cedric

ORGANIZATION:

PHONE:

EMAIL:

COMMENTS1: Please make this happen! It is important to the future of Sudbury.

Fwd: Maley Drive Comments Form

From: clerks

Date: 2/10/2016 9:30 AM

Subject: Fwd: Maley Drive Comments Form

>>> Maley Drive Comments Form <webmaster@greatersudbury.ca> 2/9/2016 5:46 PM >>>

This form was sent at: 9-Feb-2016 5:46 PM

NAME: Karl Dreger

ORGANIZATION:

PHONE: [REDACTED]

EMAIL: [REDACTED]

COMMENTS1: Do it for god's sake. Every minute of delay and consultation increases the cost of the extension exponentially. Just do it!

Fwd: Maley Drive Comments Form

From: clerks

Date: 2/10/2016 9:30 AM

Subject: Fwd: Maley Drive Comments Form

>>> Maley Drive Comments Form <webmaster@greatersudbury.ca> 2/9/2016 7:50 PM >>>

This form was sent at: 9-Feb-2016 7:50 PM

NAME: Wayne Hugli

ORGANIZATION:

PHONE: [REDACTED]

EMAIL: [REDACTED]

COMMENTS1: As a retired person in Garson who currently uses Maley Drive to travel to New Sudbury on a regular basis, I look forward to the planned upgrade to that road. I also look forward to being able to avoid travelling on Lasalle Blvd. when driving to Val Caron and Hanmer, or to Chelmsford and Azilda once the extension to Notre Dame Avenue is completed. This roadwork has been needed for many years. The ability to access provincial and federal funding at this time should make it easy to decide to go ahead with the project.

Re: Maley Drive Comments Form

To: clerks
Date: 2/17/2016 8:58 AM
Subject: Re: Maley Drive Comments Form

>>> Maley Drive Comments Form <webmaster@greatersudbury.ca> 2/11/2016 11:33 AM >>>

[Click to add a signature](#)

This form was sent at: 11-Feb-2016 11:33 AM

NAME: John Lindsay
ORGANIZATION: Friendly to Seniors - Sudbury
PHONE: [REDACTED]
EMAIL: [REDACTED]
PRESENTATION: on
COMMENTS1: The submission below is reference material to accompany my oral presentation.

Maley Myths: Popular Misconceptions – Fact Sheet:

What exactly is the Maley Drive "Extension" Project? While a city roads priority for decades many citizens have little knowledge as to what the proposal actually involves. Is the road now actually needed? What will be the real costs for the project and what other worthwhile endeavors might be sacrificed such as repair and maintenance of present infrastructure or other capital projects of greater value to the community and its residents without significant borrowing and/or increasing taxes? Like an ancient story there are many myths that will be examined in detail for a better understanding of all the factors that deserve to be revealed for full disclosure.

Myth One: Maley Drive is a road north to the "valley" area – specifically Hanmer from Barrydowne Road.

Fact: The Maley Drive extension runs east and west and not north – an extension north would be another entirely different project. Maley Drive provides little benefit to those in the north and virtually no benefit whatsoever to those in the southern portions of the city. The mining industry will benefit to some extent, but will not contribute to the cost of the road, only taxpayers will pay for the roads construction and ongoing maintenance and eventual replacement. Note: The provincial government does not allow municipalities to charge tolls for road usage.

Myth Two: Maley Drive is to be a perimeter "ring road" similar to the southern bypass.

Fact: There are no current plans to make Maley Drive a northern perimeter bypass "ring road" which would link Highway 17 East and Elm Street to the West and to Highway 144. That would require a new roadway from the Maley Drive, Falconbridge Road intersection to the highway 17th southwest bypass intersection

near Coniston which is not part of the current plan and due to the distance and topography would be expensive. The total present estimated cost to create a northern "ring road" as part of the Maley Drive extension could likely be in excess of \$200 million of which the city might well have to pay most of the cost.

Myth Three: The Maley Extension will be a four lane highway with roundabouts large enough to accommodate mining vehicles.

Fact: Only a portion identified as phase one will be four lanes, unlike what was originally planned and shown on city videos and maps. This first part of the project at a projected cost of over \$80 million, shared with the province and possibly the federal government, will be four lanes from the present Barrydowne Road, Maley Drive intersection westward to around College Borel on Lasalle Blvd. The present Maley Drive would remain two lanes, perhaps resurfaced, but not upgraded to four lanes as part of "phase two" until some future date at an estimated cost of \$70 million dollars which is at present unfunded by any level of govt. Any cost overruns are most likely to be the responsibility of the municipality as will upkeep and replacement

Myth Five: Money is available now in the city budget for the city portion of the first phase.

Fact: Less than half of the city's contribution of almost \$27 million required to match promised provincial and yet to be announced federal contribution. With a budget allocation of just over two million dollars a year it will be around another six years before the city portion is available unless the city borrows in some manner, takes money from reserves, or raises taxes. While there can be a case made to borrow money it should be only for projects of real need and long term benefit otherwise it is waste of taxpayer dollars present and future.

MYTH Six: Maley Drive is or will take most of the area mine haulage traffic:

Fact: Mine haul material from the south rim, north rim or west end will never see Maley Drive, The ore from these mining areas will either be shipped to Clarabelle Mill (Copper Cliff), Strathcona Mill (Levack) or a mill in Timmins. For all three cases using the proposed Maley Drive would add a significant cost burden to mining operations. Mine haul material from the east rim is currently being shipped to Strathcona Mill (Levack) and the most efficient route for that is through the Valley. Money to be spent on Maley might better be allocated to other area mine haulage roads if it is the city intent to provide better road conditions for the mining sector.

Myth Four: Maley Drive will open up needed land for development

Fact: According to the planning dept the city already has enough building lots for decades into the future throughout the city and intensification will likely reduce the need for these properties even further

Myth Eight: This project will "boost" our economy, providing jobs and related benefits.

Fact: Road building is long term negative contributor to the community only employing limited skills during the construction period and adding little value going forward as compared to construction of social meaningful developments such as sporting, arts or convention facilities or providing social housing for low income earners.

Myth Nine: The city can do Maley Drive and other city projects within budget and has done a thorough cost/benefit study. .

Fact: Unless borrowing, raising taxes or taking from reserves this cannot be done. A study was done by a consulting firm (AECOM) paid for by the city using data supporting the project, supplied by the city and not independently verified, and which "makes no guarantees with respect to the report, the information or any part thereof". There is nothing in the report which would indicate the return on investment for other projects the city could undertake which a fully independent cost/benefit study would show.

Myth Ten: Maley Drive will provide an overall long term benefit to the city:

Fact: Any benefits if any will be short term and only for those in road construction and possibly mining, land speculation and development. Initial cost and cost overruns and on going maintenance and replacement will have a detrimental effect on local taxpayers and preclude other possible projects of greater value without borrowing and/or increasing taxes as our present assessment base is not growing and revenues from all sources decreasing.

Recommendation: As the project has changed in nature and scope from what originally conceived it is incumbent on the present council to conduct a full review in the most transparent and accountable manner with input from all quarters including those with specific relevant knowledge and the general public. This is essential to determine the validity of proceeding with this endeavor that could have far reaching economic and social consequences for our community.

This fact sheet prepared by Friendly to Seniors – Sudbury. More information on the web at www.friendlytoseniors.ca.

Fwd: Maley Drive Comments Form

From: clerks

Date: 2/10/2016 9:40 AM

Subject: Fwd: Maley Drive Comments Form

>>> Maley Drive Comments Form <webmaster@greatersudbury.ca> 2/10/2016 9:38 AM >>>

This form was sent at: 10-Feb-2016 9:38 AM

NAME: Christine and Richard Maurice

ORGANIZATION:

PHONE: [REDACTED]

EMAIL: [REDACTED]

COMMENTS1: We have lived in Val Caron/Hanmer since 1970. The Valley has become a very popular residential and business area, and continues to grow. The growing numbers of people needing access to many parts of the Greater City make it essential that changes are made to our roads system. The Maley Drive project is essential to improving access and we very much approve of it. Thank you.

Fwd: Maley Road Extension

From: clerks

Date: 2/16/2016 3:45 PM

Subject: Fwd: Maley Road Extension

>>> Ron Tessier [REDACTED] 2/16/2016 1:37 PM >>>

Re;

Maley Road Extension,

Please be notified that the proposed Maley Road Extension project is projected to extend over land located at the corner of Barrydown road and Maley drive registered as PCL 3782 .

As such the road will extend over property on which we own the mineral rights.

The property was obtained under threat of expropriation due to potential flooding by the Maley Dam Project on or about 1965. The settlement price was in due consideration that we would maintain the mineral rights to this property and access would be unencumbered due to the nature of the expropriation issue which was to simply prevent permanent structures that could be flooded in a one in a thousand year event based on the Mason hydrological report.

It should be noted that the construction of a permanent road on this parcel gives credence to our argument that the hydrological report was flawed and also the construction of this road will further impede access to our mineral rights and reduce its value in excess of what would have been assumed during the 1965 settlement.

Please note that this parcel is located in a very favourable area between the Frood and Garson mine along the Nickel Belt periphery which hosts the majority of the Sudbury mines.

Respectfully,

Ron Tessier

