



**Local Concept Development Study for  
PASSAIC COUNTY  
Sixth Avenue Bridge over the Passaic River  
City of Paterson, Borough of Prospect Park and Borough of Hawthorne**



**COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDERS MEETING NO. 2  
MEETING REPORT**

DATE: Tuesday, September 26, 2017

TIME: 2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

LOCATION: Louis Bay 2<sup>nd</sup> Library & Community Center, 345 Lafayette Avenue, Hawthorne, NJ

**ATTENDEES:**

First Name	Last Name	Representing	Email	Phone
<b>Attendees</b>				
Bruce	Brotherston	Shotmeyer Brothers	bruceb@shotmeyerbros.com	973-427-1000
Jason	Bruno	Accurate Box Company	jbruno@accuratebox.com	973-345-5760
Ben	DeMario	City of Paterson, Engineering	bdemario@patersonnj.gov	973-321-1320
Capt. James	Garrison	Hawthorne Police Department	jgarrison@hawthornepdnj.org	973-304-2061
David	Garval	Fastech Engineering	dg@fastech-eng.com	201-345-4647
Danielle	Ireland Imhof	Borough of Prospect Park	irelandd@prospectpark.net	973-790-7902
John	Kruse	Big Boyz Toy Box	classicjsk@gmail.com	973-418-3101
Ammen	Matari	Prospect Park Police Department	amatari@prospectparkpolice.org	973-790-7900
George	Meadows	Paterson Planning & Zoning	gmeadows@patersonnj.gov	973-321-1220
John	Norton	J.I.T. Manufacturing & Packaging	jno5503696@aol.com	973-247-7300
Michael	O'Brien	Sun Metal Finishing	mjobrien@sunmetalfinishing.com	201-290-3052
Robert	Scully	Hawthorne DPW	rscully@hawthornenj.org	862-881-7492
Mohamed	Sharkas	Prospect Park Resident		973-904-1332
William R.	Smith	Prospect Park Resident	ppfratreas@gmail.com	973-956-0889
Judy	Tate	Hawthorne Resident	camryt1215@gmail.com	973-219-5325
John	VanderMolen	Prospect Park Resident		973-790-8142
<b>Project Team</b>				
Val	Aylesworth	M.A. Culbertson, LLC	maculbertson2@aol.com	856-795-8485
Martine	Culbertson	M.A. Culbertson, LLC	maculbertson@verizon.net	856-795-8485
Steven	Edmond, P.E.	Passaic County Engineering	stevee@passaiccountynj.org	973-881-4456
Sascha	Frimpong	NJTPA	sfrimpong@njtpa.org	973-639-8422
Magdy	Hagag, P.E.	Michael Baker International, Inc.	mhagag@mbakerintl.com	609-807-9528
Sarbjit	Kahlon	NJTPA	skahlon@njtpa.org	973-639-8419
Jonathan	Pera, P.E.	Passaic County Engineering	jonathanp@passaiccountynj.org	973-881-4456
Joe	Romano	Michael Baker International, Inc.	jromano@mbakerintl.com	609-807-9585
Marty	Wade, P.E.	Michael Baker International, Inc.	mjwade@mbakerintl.com	609-807-9524
Amy	Wong	Michael Baker International, Inc.	amy.wong@mbakerintl.com	609-807-9582





**Local Concept Development Study for  
PASSAIC COUNTY  
Sixth Avenue Bridge over the Passaic River  
City of Paterson, Borough of Prospect Park and Borough of Hawthorne**



---

## **PURPOSE OF MEETING**

The purpose of this meeting is to review the project status, present the Purpose and Need Statement, discuss conceptual alternatives for proposed improvements to the Passaic County Sixth Avenue Bridge over the Passaic River, and obtain community input on the benefits and impacts associated with each option.

## **MEETING SUMMARY**

### 1. Project Overview & Background

After introductions from the Project Team and Attendees, Martine Culbertson, Meeting Facilitator, provided an overview of the agenda and handouts. Jonathan Pera, Passaic County Project Manager reminded everyone of the need to study the bridge is due to its age and structural deficiencies. The purpose of the bridge study is to identify how to rehabilitate or replace the existing bridge. The North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority (NJTPA) is overseeing this phase of the project. The bridge is under Passaic County jurisdiction. Comments received from community stakeholders and the general public at the prior outreach meetings have contributed to developing the conceptual alternatives that will be discussed at this meeting. The County welcomes input from the communities in determined what bridge improvements are needed and supported by the public.

### 2. Project Status

Marty Wade, Baker International Project Manager, via power point presentation slides, provided the project status and schedule as listed also on the Project Information handout distributed to attendees.

- (a) Currently, the project is on schedule. The Purpose and Need Statement has been approved and is included in the handouts and posted on the project web site.
- (b) The Concept Development Flow Chart shows the steps to be completed for the Concept Development Phase. The project team has completed the Purpose and Need Statement, and developed conceptual alternatives. A comparison of alternatives matrix has also been developed and over the coming months the engineering and environmental data for each alternative will be entered into the matrix to analyze the options and recommend a preliminary preferred alternative (PPA) to move forward to the design phase.

### 3. Purpose and Need Statement

Marty Wade presented information on the Purpose and Need Statement as described on the handout. It is based upon the input received from the community at the prior Community Stakeholders Meeting No. 1 and Public Meeting No. 1 and has been reviewed by the agencies. It is from these goals and objectives that the conceptual alternatives were developed.

### 4. Conceptual Alternatives Overview

Marty Wade provided an overview of each of the Conceptual Alternatives as shown in the power point presentation slides and detailed in the Draft Written Description of Alternatives Handout distributed to attendees. Each conceptual alternative is also listed on the blank comparison of alternatives matrix copy provided at each table for viewing.

- (a) Conceptual drawings and profiles of the bridge alternatives were on display boards during the presentation and for viewing by attendees. Each table also had a set of plans for viewing and





**Local Concept Development Study for  
PASSAIC COUNTY  
Sixth Avenue Bridge over the Passaic River  
City of Paterson, Borough of Prospect Park and Borough of Hawthorne**



during the group discussion.

- (b) Marty explained for each of the bridge alternatives, the proposed bridge cross-section that would be two six foot sidewalks, 8 foot shoulders, one 11 foot lane eastbound and one 11 foot lane westbound where the existing has only one sidewalk and no shoulders. One of the handouts distributed at the meeting tables illustrates the existing bridge cross-section and the proposed cross section.

#### 5. Group Discussion on Alternatives – Pros & Cons

Attendees gathered around three table groups to review each of the conceptual alternatives in detail and discuss the benefits and impacts to each alternative. A Preference Survey (yellow handout) was distributed to attendees to provide comments on each of the alternatives and a Questionnaire (pink handout) to provide input on the cross section of the bridge and any approach roadway intersection comments.

- (a) The notes taken during each table group discussion are provided below.
- (b) Both completed handouts by attendees were collected at the end of the meeting. A Preference Survey Summary Report and a Questionnaire Summary Report are attached at the end of this meeting report, respectively.
- (c) After the group discussions, a presenter from each table provided a brief summary of the discussions from their table to share with all attendees. The following comments were noted on newsprint:

#### **Input / Comments from Table Group Discussion**

##### Table 1

- Will it impact Shady Street? No
- Need to know the cost for the alternatives to make an informed decision. When will the cost be available? Cost is part of the AA matrix and will be made available at the PIC.
- Which funding source is the bridge being funded with? County or State? If the project advances to the next phase the bridge will either be using State or Federal funding.
- The 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue Bridge is a major through fare to Route 3.
- Bridge at the 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue location isn't feasible if it is at a lower elevation and is going to cause flooding.
- 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue already floods right now during heavy rainfall.
- Roundabout is not a good idea because of the heavy vehicle traffic and truck traffic at the 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue. This intersection also has a lot of accidents. Adding a roundabout will only increase the number of accidents.
- Long term bridge closure is a concern but will deal with it.
- Favor the Left hand turn that is proposed.
- Alternative 5 may be the best alternative because it has the least amount of impact to property owners and environmental impacts.

##### Table 2

- Magdy presented process & clarification of the purpose.
- Question before NB & rehab – address structure & road structure. Why would we need to replace
- Design not met because of issues of superstructure





**Local Concept Development Study for  
PASSAIC COUNTY  
Sixth Avenue Bridge over the Passaic River  
City of Paterson, Borough of Prospect Park and Borough of Hawthorne**



- Reply – steel structure 25 yrs ago not enough, need funds to replace. Temp bridge been in place 25 yrs. Existing condition not possible. We need to consider this as required
- Review of each alt & the impact of each
  - What about the gas station in Hawthorne
  - Alt (3A) - Throw out intersection on Mohawk Ave back up would be bad cars. Only 1 can make left. intersect – Wagaraw, Goffle, & Mohawk
    - Mayor and Bus. Admin. against moving north. Favor of the alts that replace in kind
  - Alt 3B - get in as quick as possible. Same design but w/roundabout. No roundabout because of driving habits; takes more property; in a floodplain. Don't see it will work because of Dunkin Donuts heavy use, also 7-11
    - fair amount of tractor-trailer traffic heading to 287
    - don't see it is
  - Resident (Mohamed) lives in 6<sup>th</sup> Street house - cracks in the street & the houses. Trucks come down hill when change gears & have gravel, loose load. Moving asphalt when brake. Good policing by Dunkin Donuts & 7-11
  - Alt 4 - a bridge between 6<sup>th</sup> Ave & Straight Street 20 yrs ago. Shady Lane in the flood plain & lower than other locations
  - Alt 5A - Diff between dedicated left turn off of 6<sup>th</sup> St will also impact on-street parking. No parking in 5B big problem. Is there ped crossing on bridge – yes 1 side why add another
  - No best decided at this table but would like Alt 5 to be further examined

Table 3

- Trucks NB right onto 6<sup>th</sup> Ave tight – pull back stop bar or increase radius
- Which one cost more
- No build – no reason to do no build
- Alt 2 – extended discussion – maybe better than no build – concerns regarding cost of aging maintenance
- Alt 3A/3B – flood concerns, don't like location, don't like 5 leg intersection. Property owner is part of group
- Alt North 6<sup>th</sup> in Prospect Park
- Alt 4 – Flood concerns again, don't like location, turn radius concerns at west end
- Alt 5B – Prospect Park likes their parking
- Alt 5A – PPA
- Lots of traffic on Goffle Rd
- Look at adding right turn w/o the bridge improvements

The following are the notes scribed on newsprint while a presenter from each table shared a summary of their table discussion to the whole group:

**Table Group Comments – Key Points**

Table Group 1

- Cost of alts
- 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue option no sense with flooding





**Local Concept Development Study for  
PASSAIC COUNTY  
Sixth Avenue Bridge over the Passaic River  
City of Paterson, Borough of Prospect Park and Borough of Hawthorne**



- Wood Ave in flood plain
- Roundabout – not safe too busy, crazy traffic
- Long-term bridge closure
- Favor 5B – alt with least property impact & environment
- Funding sources – county, federal or state

Table Group 2

- Speed over bridge
- Parking in street
- Alt 5A & B – dedicated left turn impact to residents
- Pedestrian crossing on both sides
- 3A & 3B not in favor – Hawthorne
- Bridge w/other crossing
- Alt 4 – no way
- Alt 2 – rehab okay maybe

Table Group 3

- Alt 5A favored
- Flood concerns w/new location
- Turning radius Alt 4
- Parking spaces – loss not supported
- Right turn NB East Main Street

6. Closing Comments – Next Steps

Martine Culbertson reminded attendees of the project website for viewing information on the bridge study. The website includes project information such as the handouts, project information sheet, meeting announcements and reports, photos, contact information, and opportunity to submit comments and questions.

In summary, following feedback comments by noted by attendees:

**Feedback / Action Items**

- Flooding - identify high levels
- How much weight – does community feedback impact on project (*Response: it's a Federal requirement and agencies will review public comment as part of reaching consensus on a preferred alternative to move forward with support for improvements*)
- Alt 5A vs. Alt 5B
  - Left turn not related to bridge – could it be done separate effort later
- Parking is a concern – not a lot of spaces (especially overnight)
- Trucks on hill – weight shakes residences, braking noise & gravel

7. Next Steps - Closing Comments

Jonathan Pera, Passaic County Project Manager and Tom Malvasi, Passaic County Engineer, thanked attendees for their comments. The next steps will be for the project team to fill in the information needed to complete the Comparison of Alternatives Matrix, to coordinate with the agencies to review the matrix; to meet with local officials to present the matrix information and





**Local Concept Development Study for  
PASSAIC COUNTY  
Sixth Avenue Bridge over the Passaic River  
City of Paterson, Borough of Prospect Park and Borough of Hawthorne**



discuss a preliminary preferred alternative (PPA) to recommend; and then a public information center meeting will be scheduled to present the matrix information and a PPA for additional public input, that is anticipated in the late Fall 2017/early Winter 2018.

Any questions, please contact Jonathan Pera, Passaic County Project Manager. A meeting summary will be provided and posted to the web site with other project information. If anyone would like to view the conceptual alternative plans, an appointment can be made Passaic County or NJTPA or copies will be at the local municipalities: Borough of Prospect Park, Borough of Hawthorne, and City of Paterson Engineering Department.

In closing, the project team thanked attendees for their input. It is another important step to developing improvements for the Sixth Avenue Bridge. Martine Culbertson will inform community stakeholders of the public meeting date to be held in late fall of 2017 or early winter of 2018. A public meeting notice mailing and legal posting will be done to notify the general public. Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

#### **KEY ACTION ITEMS**

1. Project team will study the input provided at the meeting and enter data in the Comparison of Alternatives Matrix from bridge, roadway, traffic analysis, environmental and cultural resources in coordination with Passaic County and the municipalities.
2. Attendees to review Community Stakeholders List, Draft Written Description of Alternatives and other Handouts; provide any comments and updated contact information; and attend Public Meeting in Fall 2017/Winter 2018.
3. Martine Culbertson will provide meeting summary, update Community Stakeholders List, notify community stakeholders and the general public in scheduling the Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting in the late Fall 2017 or early Winter 2018.

#### **NEXT MEETING**

Local Officials Meeting and Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting No. 2  
(2 Sessions- separate locations)

Date: Fall 2017/Winter 2018 (*date to be determined*)  
Time: 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. (*brief presentation at 2:30pm*)  
Location: Riverside Vets Community and Recreation Center, Paterson, NJ  
(*location to be determined*)

Time: 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. (*brief presentation at 6:30pm*)  
Location: Louis Bay 2<sup>nd</sup> Library & Community Center, Hawthorne, NJ  
(*location to be determined*)

We believe the foregoing to be an accurate summary of discussions and related decisions. We would appreciate notification of exceptions or corrections to the minutes within three (3) working days of receipt. Without notification, these minutes will be considered to be record of fact.  
NJTPA / Passaic County Sixth Avenue Bridge Study Project Team





**Local Concept Development Study for  
PASSAIC COUNTY  
Sixth Avenue Bridge over the Passaic River  
City of Paterson, Borough of Prospect Park and Borough of Hawthorne**



**Community Stakeholders Meeting No. 2  
Tuesday, September 26, 2017**

*Louis Bay 2<sup>nd</sup> Library & Community Center, 345 Lafayette Avenue, Hawthorne, NJ  
2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.*

**AGENDA**

The purpose of this meeting is to review the project status, present the Purpose and Need Statement, discuss conceptual alternatives for proposed improvements to the Passaic County Sixth Avenue Bridge over the Passaic River, and obtain community input on the benefits and impacts associated with each option.

**I. *WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION***

- Project Overview & Status
- Community Stakeholders Update

**II. *PASSAIC COUNTY SIXTH AVENUE BRIDGE OVER PASSAIC RIVER***

- Purpose and Need Statement
- Conceptual Alternatives Overview

**III. *DISCUSSION***

- Group Discussion on Alternatives - Pros & Cons
- Group Discussion on Alternatives – Improvements
- Group Results - Key Points

**IV. *NEXT STEPS***

- Community Feedback
- Action Items – Local Officials Meetings & Public Information Center Meetings
- Closing Comments





**Local Concept Development Study for  
PASSAIC COUNTY  
Sixth Avenue Bridge over the Passaic River  
City of Paterson, Borough of Prospect Park and Borough of Hawthorne**



**PREFERENCE SURVEY SUMMARY  
Community Stakeholders Meeting No. 2**

TOTAL MEETING ATTENDANCE: 16 TOTAL SURVEYS RECEIVED: 13

OPTION	PREFERENCE	COMMENTS
<p><b>1: NO BUILD</b></p> <p>Maintain bridge in current state of repair and on-going maintenance.</p>	<p><u>1</u> Support</p> <p><u>5</u> Maybe</p> <p><u>6</u> Don't Support</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve maintenance and keep bridge open</li> <li>• If its structurally sound</li> <li>• Not an option</li> <li>• Not the most responsible option</li> <li>• On-going labor intensive for maintenance</li> <li>• Traffic problems – unresolved</li> <li>• What would be the cost of repair &amp; maintenance</li> <li>• What would be the life expectancy</li> </ul>
<p><b>2: REHABILITATION OF SUBSTRUCTURE &amp; REPLACEMENT OF DECK/ SUPERSTRUCTURE</b></p>	<p><u>4</u> Support</p> <p><u>7</u> Maybe</p> <p><u>2</u> Don't Support</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternate traffic to other locations worsens traffic flow north and south if bridge closes!</li> <li>• Bldg new in flood plain; round about poor option; bridge closure not an option</li> <li>• Concern regarding ongoing repairs and it's effect on the public (inconvenience)</li> <li>• Depends on cost &amp; extended life &amp; time to complete compared to 5B or 5A</li> <li>• Least amount of impact on surrounding areas</li> <li>• Need more info about pros &amp; cons (cons. Time, cost, detour, etc.)</li> <li>• Ongoing maintenance costs concern</li> <li>• Only if cost &amp; timeline of other options are too great</li> <li>• Think this the best alternative</li> </ul>
<p><b>3A: REPLACEMENT - NEW LOCATION AT 5<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE</b> <i>(North Alignment)</i> Existing Bridge removed.</p>	<p><u>2</u> Support</p> <p><u>1</u> Maybe</p> <p><u>10</u> Don't Support</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Best” – will not disrupt area</li> <li>• Bad traffic location</li> <li>• Concerned about current flooding in the area of the Lukoil stations</li> <li>• Cost, time, brown areas too great</li> <li>• Cost. Large span. Taking of property, flooding</li> <li>• Crazy intersection</li> <li>• Don't like right of way issues</li> <li>• Flooding area</li> <li>• Location will cause backup on narrow roadways</li> <li>• Makes sense and only drawback is the lower elevation</li> <li>• Too low in flood zone</li> <li>• Traffic on Hawthorne side would be too much</li> <li>• Would destroy our property flow and continuity</li> </ul>





**Local Concept Development Study for  
PASSAIC COUNTY  
Sixth Avenue Bridge over the Passaic River**



**City of Paterson, Borough of Prospect Park and Borough of Hawthorne**

OPTION	PREFERENCE	COMMENTS
<b>3B: REPLACEMENT - NEW LOCATION AT 5<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE WITH ROUNDABOUT</b> <i>(North Alignment)</i> Existing Bridge removed.	<u>1</u> Support  <u>1</u> Maybe  <u>11</u> Don't Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost, time, brown areas too great</li> <li>• Cost. Large span. Taking of property, flooding</li> <li>• Crazy intersection circle/crazy drivers</li> <li>• Flooding area</li> <li>• Good – will not disrupt</li> <li>• Location will cause backup on narrow roadways</li> <li>• Too low in flood zone</li> <li>• Traffic on Hawthorne side would be too much</li> <li>• Would destroy our property flow and continuity</li> </ul>
<b>4: REPLACEMENT- NEW LOCATION AT WOOD STREET</b> <i>(South Alignment)</i> Existing Bridge removed	<u>1</u> Support  <u>1</u> Maybe  <u>11</u> Don't Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bad flood area</li> <li>• Bad location (traffic, flood, etc.)</li> <li>• Flood</li> <li>• Just bad idea – flood plain</li> <li>• Location is not optimal</li> <li>• Poor turning ability. Unknowns on land acquisition. Flooding</li> <li>• Too low in flood zone</li> <li>• Traffic</li> </ul>
<b>5A: REPLACEMENT - EXISTING ALIGNMENT AT 6<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE WITH 3-SPAN BRIDGE</b>	<u>7</u> Support  <u>3</u> Maybe  <u>3</u> Don't Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5A will not take parking away from residents which is a hardship already</li> <li>• As long as this crossing is not closed for long period of time. Fast construction would be good.</li> <li>• Best cost impact</li> <li>• Depends on cost &amp; extended life compared to #2 &amp; 5B</li> <li>• Location is preferred and there is minimal concern about maintenance in the future</li> <li>• Long term improvement</li> <li>• New bridge. Longer life.</li> </ul>
<b>5B: REPLACEMENT - EXISTING ALIGNMENT AT 6<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE WITH 3-SPAN BRIDGE AND LEFT-TURN LANE</b> <i>(Eastbound on North 6th Street)</i>	<u>5</u> Support  <u>4</u> Maybe  <u>4</u> Don't Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Best overall!</li> <li>• Concern regarding loss of parking spaces on North 6<sup>th</sup> St in Prospect Park</li> <li>• Depends on cost &amp; extended life compared to #2 &amp; 5B</li> <li>• If there is a left turn only to short down traffic. How long will be close.</li> <li>• Left turn will take parking spaces. Can be done separately.</li> <li>• Parking issues</li> </ul>





**LOCAL CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT STUDY FOR  
PASSAIC COUNTY  
Sixth Avenue Bridge over the Passaic River  
City of Paterson, Borough of Prospect Park and Borough of Hawthorne**



**Community Stakeholders Meeting No. 2 - QUESTIONNAIRE  
SUMMARY REPORT**

TOTAL MEETING ATTENDANCE: 16 TOTAL QUESTIONNAIRES RECEIVED: 14

**1. Do you support the proposed cross section for the bridge replacement? (see existing bridge cross section and proposed bridge cross section handout)**

Yes: 12 No: 1

Comments:

- Even with a yes, the one sidewalk would work.
- None
- Shows differens between current and proposed

**2. For Alternative 3B, do you support the proposed roundabout as a possible improvement?**

Yes: 1 No: 13

Comments:

- 3A-3B cost, timeline too great
- Drivers here are too crazy to follow roundabouts
- Roundabout sometime good, location bad
- Taking of land
- That area by the Triangle Diner floods often in heavy rains
- We don't support the new/proposed location

**3. For Alternative 5B, do you support the proposed eastbound dedicated left turn lane?**

Yes: 8 No: 6

Comments:

- Not now. If the issue of lost parking spaces is addressed, the option is better to consider.
- Parking too valuable
- Takes away parking
- This helps flow. Yes work with elected officials/trade off may cap six spots "Show them"
- Will cost parking spaces
- Would make traffic flow easier.

**4. Do you have any additional suggestions to improve traffic conditions at the bridge approach intersections than what is proposed?**

- 5A is fine
- Help trucks
- Make sure trucks can turn right, both on & off the bridge from all directions
- No – without increasing cost & time
- Not at this time
- The proposed changes will help traffic flow, others may help also
- Wide intersection





## LOCAL CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT STUDY FOR PASSAIC COUNTY

### Sixth Avenue Bridge over the Passaic River

City of Paterson, Borough of Prospect Park and Borough of Hawthorne



#### **5. Concerning traffic changes or detours, what should the project team be aware of when the bridge has been closed, or should it be closed, if bridge is replaced in the existing location?**

- Do as much pre-work/pre-fab construction as possible to minimize the time the bridge is closed.
- Find a way to shorten traffic
- It is horrible when the bridge is closed. Traffic is pushed north & south making worse already a bad situation
- Just clear/concise detours
- No closure if possible
- Replacement not an option
- The best pre-constr./ i.e. pre-build piers
- Turning east onto the bridge from East Main can be easier for drivers to manage
- Will cause major traffic for 2 years
- Would not affect my business on Peel Street

#### **6. Other comments?**

- If you went forward with the Wood St. bridge the company on the intersection of 6<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> St would create a major traffic jam
- Not at this time.
- Something must be done, but at the least disruption to the public that uses the crossings. Closing 6<sup>th</sup> Ave for a long period of time is a bad idea.
- Thank you for time and pat.

