

August 1, 2013

Ministry of Highways and Infrastructure
Regional Services Division
Major Projects Unit
18-3603 Miller Avenue
Saskatoon, SK. S7P 0B2

**Attention: Mr. Gerald Beaton
Senior Project Manager**

VIA EMAIL

Dear Mr. Beaton:

**Reference: SOUTH EAST REGINA BYPASS
Criteria Weighting**

As requested during the July 22nd steering and technical meeting we have attached a copy of our rankings and explanations for each of the Concepts 1, 2 and 2A for your review. The fact that your consultant has already ranked the concepts and has redrawn the interchanges at Tower Road to indicate turning movements with traffic lights suggests to us that this is exactly how the City wants to see this interchange incorporated and also confirms their recommendation of Concept 2A.

This also appears to be the concept in which the Ministry is leaning towards as well which was confirmed when you met with Argue's who live along Highway # 1 south service road. I don't accept the fact that it was an error on the consultant for not showing this stakeholder the Concept 1 drawing. The consultant also failed to inform all property owners of the proposed concepts for the bypass prior to the 1st open house which also suggests that the option to move the bypass outside the current City limits was already decided by the Ministry and that this functional study is now trying to conform to accommodate Concept 2A. The fact that more alterations have been done since the VE session also appears that the City is involved in more depth with the consultant as well. The West Regina Bypass Functional Planning Study was done by another consultant and this study doesn't even come close to the expectations or detail in which the South East Bypass is currently being done.

The most frustrating aspect of the whole functional planning study however is the fact that Ted Stobbs stated that the RM of Sherwood will not get any compensation for the upgrading of the existing Tower Road which may not be utilized with the preferred Concept 2A. The RM of Sherwood invested over 2.5 million (\$800,000 debt still remains) to upgrade this 4 km stretch of

municipal road to a heavy haul standard and the Ministry feels that we shouldn't be compensated at all.

As stated in the fall of 2012 during the previous planning study done by the MMM Group, the RM of Sherwood does not agree with the bypass location and still feels it needs to connect with Highway # 1 east of White City, however if you feel that the Ministry needs to build the City another Ring Road then please proceed as we feel that our presence at any further meetings are redundant and a waste of my time.

Yours truly,



ROD BENROTH
MANAGER OF PUBLIC WORKS

CC

Zvezdan Lazic – Executive Director, Major Projects Unit
George Stamatinos – Assistant Deputy Minister, Planning and Policy
Don McMorris – Minister of Highways and Infrastructure
Kevin Eberle – Reeve, RM of Sherwood
Members of Council, RM of Sherwood
Rachel Kunz – CAO, R. M. of Sherwood

RM of Sherwood – Weighting of Evaluation Criteria

| | Weight | Base | C1 | C2 | C2a |
|-----------------------------------|--------|------|----|----|-----|
| Trans Canada Functionality | 25 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| Safety | 25 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| Phasing Opportunities | 10 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| Existing Property Impacts | 10 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Constructability | 5 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Utility / Railway | 5 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| Right of Way Required (footprint) | 10 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Performance Rating | 10 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| | | 21 | 25 | 19 | 16 |

Excluded from Criteria

1. Noise - If the MHI is planning on installing sound berms or fences why would this be a consideration? If they are not going to install sound control then any future residential development within the city limits would become a requirement of the developer to install these sound control devices. The existing levels taken in the Creeks are behind a fence and protected from noise levels occurring on Hwy 33. The existing noise level with residents in the RM east of the bypass will have no change in noise levels as they are the same.
2. Environment – The Chuka Creek is affected by all options equally.
3. Economic Development Potential – This category is misleading as economic development potential is defined by your consultant as value of residential development and the consultant states the land between the bypass and railway tracks as being isolated. This isolated land is for future highway commercial as identified in the RM of Sherwood’s OCP. If fully developed into hotels and restaurants the value of the isolated land could have the same value per acre as residential development. Residential development does not spur economic opportunities commercial and industry spurs the economy. The only time the isolated land will be developed into residential property is when and if annexation occurs. The RM does not agree with the City’s statement of economic potential and does not agree with statement that servicing costs are similar between residential and commercial, residential servicing and maintenance costs are greater than if the land was serviced into commercial development.
4. Access to Adjacent Development – There is no access off the bypass, access will have to be by service roads, and all options have access by service roads the fact that the consultant states the amount of isolated land between the bypass and the railway is less makes no difference on accessibility. The east service road tie-in to Hwy 33 in Options 2 and 2A are adjacent to the railway and this design does not meet TAC standards.

Notes on Scores Provided

1. Trans Canada Functionality - Option 1 is free flowing and meets all MHI design criteria while being simple for driver expectations. Option 2A has the eastbound bridge over the bypass over the railway tracks; this will result in the eastbound lane at the bridge being approx. 10m higher than the railway tracks and potentially 5m higher than the westbound lane. Option 2 and 2A

RM of Sherwood – Weighting of Evaluation Criteria

will not meet the design standard for K values on the vertical crest curve. The Trans-Canada Highway functionality should consider that both eastbound and westbound lanes shall have similar vertical alignments and the difference in elevation shall be minimized to accommodate snow drifting and winter maintenance. The consultant states that Option 1 does not have the minimum sight stopping distance at Tower Road and Victoria Avenue. The RM does not plan to signalize this intersection; the closest signal will remain just east of the funeral home when this intersection becomes a full intersection with all turning movements. At 130km design speed the distance is approx. 300m according to TAC standards and there is approximately 1200m from the existing signals going east to Tower Road, therefore this consideration by the consultant has no bearing. The RM also feels that a future flyover at Tower Road with N-W and S-E circular off ramps will achieve the desired access result without signals.

2. Safety – Option 2 will have to incorporate increased super-elevation values and Option 2A will have to increase the K value on the crest curve and will incorporate steeper slopes based upon the fill.
3. Phasing – Both Options 2 and 2A will require the horizontal alignment in the future to swing 400m west 800m south of Hwy # 1, the desired radius will have to be compromised which will result in northbound traffic reducing their speed from 110 km/hr. to possible 100 or even 90. This will also have an effect on the super-elevation and thus push the northbound exit ramp further south.
4. Options 2 and 2A will have a considerable effect on the existing property owners on the south side of Hwy # 1 and the owners north of Hwy 33 as the service roads will have to be relocated from the front of their property to now behind or in the middle plus the bypass has moved close to those existing developments. The City's argument about saving the ball diamonds is absolutely ridiculous compared to the impact of somebody's home.
5. Constructability – Option 2A does have an advantage in this scenario however constructing the eastbound bridge and lanes prior to the bypass will achieve the results required in all other options.
6. The impact on existing utilities along highway # 1 in the south ditch and the amount of bridges required to cross the railway is minimized in the base case and Option 2.
7. Right of Way - The entire footprint required for the right of way has a detrimental impact on existing property and land owners along with land which could be developed. It also will have a bearing on cost to acquire additional land.
8. Performance Rating – Construction costs shall be minimized as much as possible, especially when the difference from the cheapest option to the most expensive is a difference 35 Million dollars of taxpayers money, however the best Option is that which performs the best for the cost required. I don't think safety should ever be compromised versus the cost of spending a few more million dollars to achieve that. The performance rating is similar to that which was reflected in the VE sessions thus Option 1 at 121 million has the best performance rating and Option 2A has an increased cost of 25 million and the second lowest performance.

The RM of Sherwood still favours Concept 1 and as such if approved will continue to maintain the existing Tower Road if utilized as the east service road of the future bypass.