

To Mayor Kate Akagi and Members of Council,

What follows is a summary of community feedback on the Market Wharf infill project, which I have gathered not as a consultant or politician, but as a concerned resident, property owner, business owner, and citizen who deeply loves this town.

I did not set out to be an activist. I set out to understand what was happening in the bay I see from my window—the same waterfront that brings peace to so many of us who call St. Andrews home. I reached out to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans with genuine concerns about how this project might affect my land and the surrounding ecosystem. I created a petition, then a survey, only after realizing how many others shared the same questions—and how few felt heard.

While many have thanked me for giving voice to concerns they share, raising awareness has come at a personal cost. I have been publicly shamed and humiliated by our former mayor, threatened, verbally accosted, and forced to step down from leadership roles I've held in service to this town. I have lost friendships. I've felt the sting of gossip and exclusion in a place I've given my heart to. The irony is that I did all of this not in opposition to progress, but in service to transparency, due process, and respect for place. This has been difficult to navigate, especially in a small community, but I felt a responsibility to bring this information forward because, once this infill is in place, we cannot undo it.

This process has revealed something deeper than disagreement—it has shown why more people don't speak up. Many have told me privately that they feared backlash, being labeled, having their business negatively impacted, or simply feeling they would not be listened to. When people feel that raising concerns leads to being criticized or dismissed, they stay silent. That silence should never be mistaken for consent. A healthy community needs open dialogue, not just quiet compliance.

There is one additional concern that was not covered in the survey, but has surfaced repeatedly in public discussion: the idea of off-site mitigation. The overwhelming response I've heard is frustration. Residents do not support creating environmental damage here while justifying it by restoring habitat elsewhere. It feels like a workaround that sidesteps the real issue, and I urge Council to remove this option from further consideration.

I acknowledge that the project has been years in the making, and that considerable effort has already gone into planning and engineering. But it is precisely because of the project's scale, permanence, and central location in our historic downtown that it demands a higher standard of engagement, transparency, and flexibility. As this report outlines, the concern in the community extends beyond environmental risk. It includes aesthetics, heritage preservation, communication gaps, and decision-making accountability.

I understand that Council faces difficult decisions and competing pressures. But I also believe that good governance allows for course correction, especially when the public expresses this level of concern. The survey results show that most respondents do not want the project abandoned—they want it paused, reconsidered, and improved. They want to feel that their town is being shaped with them, not around them.

I am not against improving the wharf. I am not against climate change mitigation. I am not against modernization done with care. But I am against doing something irreversible simply because the process was too far along to question, or because it was easier to dismiss opposition than to listen.

I hope Council will take the time to review the enclosed report carefully. It presents not just statistics, but perspectives—real, thoughtful contributions from residents, business owners, and a few visitors who care deeply about St. Andrews. Many of them have offered ideas, alternatives, and even their expertise.

It is my sincere hope that this feedback can guide a more inclusive and considered path forward—one that honours both the vision for progress and the values that make this town unique.

Best Regards,

Cindy Kohler

233 Water Street, St. Andrews NB E5B 1B3

"There's no going back if it's the wrong choice. This is forever."

"Preserve the peaceful, natural shoreline character. That's what makes St. Andrews special."

"We urge Council: do not go down in history as the body responsible for the irreversible destruction of one of New Brunswick's most iconic shorelines."

*"The community is clearly not comfortable with this plan.
This level of engagement is a barometer that should not be ignored."*

*"It is better to take a couple of steps backwards on this project than forge ahead with the wrong plan...
This infrastructure decision is going to affect the town for a long, long time."*

"Consider the town residents and their property before the legacy of council members."

"This infill plan feels like it's about convenience, not community. We're rushing to pour concrete over what makes St. Andrews beautiful."

"It's not just about water access. It's about the view, the feeling, the history—everything that gets lost when you replace a tidal shoreline with rocks and cement."

"People visit this town for the ocean. Not to walk beside a man-made wall."

"If council moves forward with this version of the wharf, it will damage more than the shoreline—it will damage public trust."

Public Feedback on the Market Wharf Infill Project - Survey Petition Results

While an environmental study is scheduled for presentation at Monday's council meeting, its findings remain unknown at the time of this report. The survey conducted independently reveals that concern among the public extends beyond environmental impact alone—spanning aesthetics, historical preservation, town identity, and transparency in governance.

The summary below provides clear data and feedback from the public. A directive accompanies each key result to guide Council in interpreting the results through a lens of public service, heritage stewardship, and environmental caution.

- **Platform:** Google Forms
- **Duration:** Two weeks prior to July 19, 2025
- **Outreach:** Social media, word of mouth, and local forums
- **Total Respondents:** 71

Key Findings

Not all respondents answered every question, and some questions allowed for multiple selections. As a result, percentages may not always add up to 100%. Each data point reflects the level of agreement or concern among those who chose to respond to that specific question.

1. General Opposition to the Infill Plan:

- 72% oppose the current plan
- 15% support the current plan
- 13% were unsure or needed more information

2. Strong Desire for Further Consultation:

- 88% want the Town to pause or halt the project
- 93% want more public engagement and visuals

3. Lack of Adequate Information & Transparency:

- Only 28% feel adequately informed
- 63% believe there was insufficient public feedback opportunity

4. Key Community Values Identified:

- 96% value open tidal flow and water views
- 94% want to preserve traditional wharf character
- 85% believe local residents should lead decision-making

Question-by-Question Summary and Directive

1. Do you support the current infill plan at Market Wharf as proposed?

- **Results:** 72% No, 15% Yes, 13% Unsure
- **Directive:** Strong opposition shows a disconnect between the project and public interest. It is critical that Council revisits the design.

2. Would you like the Town to pause or halt the current plan and consult further?

- **Results:** 88% Yes
- **Directive:** Council should treat this as a public mandate to pause and rethink the current trajectory.

3. Would you like to see more public engagement and visual presentations before proceeding?

- **Results:** 93% Yes
- **Directive:** There is a clear appetite for inclusive, visually supported consultation. This should be prioritized in future planning.

4. How did you first hear about the proposed infill project at Market Wharf?

- **Results:** Majority heard through social media, word of mouth, or the public petition. Few through official town channels.
- **Directive:** Town communications should be improved to ensure citizens are informed directly and reliably.

5. Were you aware that the Town was planning this infill before the petition circulated?

- **Results:** Many were unaware until the petition.
- **Directive:** Indicates a lack of outreach and transparency. Communication strategies must be revisited.

6. Do you feel adequately informed about the project by the Town?

- **Results:** 52% said No, 20% Unsure
- **Directive:** Demonstrates a critical need for clearer, earlier, and more frequent communication.

7. Were you aware of the scope of the proposed infill?

- **Results:** Many did not understand the full scale.
- **Directive:** Visualization tools and spatial impact assessments should be included in future materials.

8. Do you feel the public had adequate opportunity to give feedback before decisions were made?

- **Results:** 63% said No
- **Directive:** Council should review its consultation processes and timelines to ensure future inclusiveness.

9. **Were you aware that there is currently no designated project manager for the Wharf project?**
- **Results:** Majority were unaware.
 - **Directive:** Highlights the need for transparent leadership and designated accountability.
10. **Do you believe decisions should be made by people directly connected to the community?**
- **Results:** 85% Yes
 - **Directive:** Council should prioritize local knowledge and decision-makers in steering the future of this project.
11. **What concerns do you have about the infill project?**
- **Results:** Most respondents cited environmental damage, unattractive visual impacts, loss of heritage character, public safety, and lack of transparency.
 - **Directive:** The scope of opposition reveals this is not a niche concern, but a deeply held community-wide sentiment.
12. **What would you like to see happen instead of the current proposal?**
- **Results:** Majority favoured repairing the existing structure or using less invasive methods.
 - **Directive:** Council should invest time in studying and presenting realistic alternatives.
13. **What do you most value about the waterfront?**
- **Results:** Natural beauty, open tidal flow, marine life, historical ambiance, and peaceful scenery.
 - **Directive:** These values should form the core principles of any redesign.
14. **Do you have expertise relevant to this project?**
- **Results:** Several participants said yes and offered to help.
 - **Directive:** Council should consider forming a community advisory committee with these individuals.
15. **Would you like to be included in a list of people opposed to the current infill plan?**
- **Results:** High number of affirmative responses.
 - **Directive:** This list is available and should be acknowledged as a collective expression of dissent.
16. **Final comments to Council:**
- **Results:** Many thoughtful messages emphasizing environmental responsibility, town character, and the legacy impact of Council decisions.
 - **Directive:** These comments serve as both a warning and a roadmap. Council is strongly encouraged to read each with care.

The results are conclusive: the majority of respondents oppose the current infill plan due to its environmental, aesthetic, and historical implications. While a small minority supports moving forward, some do so contingent upon the results of the environmental study. However, the dominant sentiment is that the project in its current form does not reflect community values.

Given the clear direction from the community, it is recommended that the Town of St. Andrews:

1. **Suspend the project** until further studies and realistic alternatives are explored.
2. **Hold public forums**, both in person and online, that include detailed visual renderings, environmental and spatial impact assessments, and opportunities for meaningful dialogue.
3. **Prioritize alternatives** that preserve the natural, historical, and visual character of the waterfront while protecting marine ecosystems and public access.
4. **Appoint a dedicated project manager** and ensure that individuals responsible for key decisions have local knowledge, accountability, and transparent roles.
5. **Establish a formal Wharf Committee** that includes local residents with expertise in marine science, environmental protection, heritage conservation, and design. Several individuals with relevant education and experience have already come forward through this process and should be invited to help guide future planning and oversight.

This last point is particularly important. Our community is rich with talent—engineers, marine biologists, conservationists, heritage advocates, and other knowledgeable individuals who care deeply about the outcome of this project. Their voices should not only be heard but formally included in the next phases of planning and implementation.

This project will shape the future of St. Andrews' waterfront for generations. Public sentiment is clear: the current infill plan does not align with community vision or values. Council is urged to respect this feedback and pursue a path forward that is inclusive, sustainable, and worthy of the heritage it seeks to serve.

*“We were never really given a chance to weigh in on the core idea—just variations of the same plan.
That’s not consultation. That’s presentation.”*

*“It doesn’t make sense to destroy the ecosystem here and then fix it somewhere else. How is that
responsible planning?”*

“Once we build on this water, it’s gone. There’s no trial run. No turning back. Is that worth the risk?”

*“This isn’t opposition for the sake of it.
It’s about getting it right—for us, and for those who come after us.”*

*“The town needs to stop pretending this is a universally supported project.
The silence has been mistaken for consent, but it’s really confusion and frustration.”*

*“No one I’ve spoken to thinks this design reflects the spirit of the town.
It looks like a cargo terminal, not St. Andrews.”*

Full Text Responses

(Verbatim submissions from participants who consented to having their comments shared with Council. These have been presented as submitted, to preserve the authenticity of each voice.)

Do you have any thoughts or concerns about the lack of local project leadership or the decision-making process?

Some projects are too complex for local management- get the best from wherever they live

EVERYTHING has to be put before the people WITHOUT bias, which is what I feel has not been done.

No

Project leadership should be from people experienced with this type of project. Does not necessarily mean they have to be from here. That may be part of the problem, local people giving leadership who have no experience in this type of project.

New Brunswick is lagging in policy/rules/legislation requiring triplicate contractual solicitation. For example, town council was asked 4 times through members of the EAC (Environmental Action Committee; this questioning was by two members, and not asked as consensus of, by, or through the EAC) how Gemtek was solicited and was finally told that the solicitation was by direct phone call. A phone call is a way to hide biased solicitation and in effect nullifies the environmental analysis before it starts when considered in terms of openness and non-biased solicitation. It begs the question, 'Why did we (myself and other EAC member and not on behalf of EAC) have to ask four times?

In my view, at least CBCL options 4 and 5 need to be reconsidered, after all, when individual houses in Saint Andrews are all of a sudden being sold in the order of 2-3-4-5 million, some sold unseen, what's another 2-3 million on the heart of Saint Andrews for long term planning?

Many concerns, I feel because there are funds available to use, they are overlooking all environmental concerns, plus no thought given to the historic current visual appearance, which has been extremely functional for how many decades? Approving this foreign rock for use, stopping thus changing the water flow for the past thousands of years proves no care or thought to the repercussions has been given by the leaders who want this project done.

We have far too many decisions being made about our communities by outside influences. People come to Saint Andrews because it is beautiful and quaint but once here want to make it a carbon copy of where they live. Leave it and us alone. It is beautiful but will soon be just another commercial has been.

The wharf affects everyone and "leadership" needs to be managed from within the community so long as said "leader(s)" have a well-researched and educated understanding of all aspects of the project.

No. My concern is what they do- not where they're from.

Typically project leadership on most construction projects are lead by the engineering group awarded the initial tender for design and engineering. Most often project leadership and personnel involved are not residents of the community but do interface with local representatives as is the case with our town council and public consultations.

Why would the project not have a manager? Why not be transparent with those who live there? This affects more than just people, there are environmental concerns including marine life and water/tidal flow. This seems like a huge undertaking and should be studied for a long time before quick action is taken.

Unclear about process and ability of Gemteck to respond to all concerns, especially currents and impacts of climate change on coast neRby

No

I have been aware of this project for some four years. During that time I've been consulted on multiple levels about what the choices are. I am not an expert on any one of them, but I do know that if we don't proceed soon, we may not be able to forward any of the options as a lot of the money may lapse. Nothing worse than doing nothing when we have an opportunity to deal with these issues. I am sorry some people feel they weren't consulted. I can say as a new resident, I feel I was consulted on multiple levels, but perhaps I was lucky

Rescind the heritage bylaw

People who will experience the effects of any change should have the considered say.

The original decision felt rushed, and seemed to be based on outside advice, without real knowledge of the full impacts. The quick answer is not the right one. There is plenty of evidence about the damage the infill kind of structure will cause, which will end up costing more to rectify, after the damage is done. Responsible planning for the future should be in play, for long term solutions.

No

I feel people were misled to believe the necessary research had been done

Am appalled

Lack of a project manager has had and will continue to have a detrimental effect on the project with a high risk of scope changes, cost overruns and delays. The cost estimates are dated and from a firm that council appears not to trust, the estimates contain almost \$1M in fees to the firm that prepared the estimates. Basic project management principles require a project manager be in place from the start of the project to conclusion of the project to ensure that the project is completed on time, on budget and on scope. Injection of a project manager at this late date will do little to mitigate the high risks of this project because many of the decisions that make this a high risk project have already been made.

Disagree with premise of question and of survey

My key concern with this project and also the public feedback is a lot of folks providing input don't have the expertise. It isn't about the visual impact, it isn't about someone needing to be local - the concern should be around the environmental impact and an expert that it unbiased should have been or should be consulted before finalizing plans. The engineering firm pitching on the project is not an unbiased resource. Town council, local fisherman, other contractors and the residents are not experts either. A third party who is an expert on environmental impact is really the only qualified resource that should be weighing in on the plans & hired as a project manager (to continually assess changes as the build progresses). Not a popular opinion at this late phase of the project but a third party that is not linked to

any existing vendor (contractor or engineering firm) should be valued for their expertise to scrutinize & provide recommendations for the environmental impact in addition to the cost & time.

I am concerned about altering shoreline , and I thought it was against the law and environmental concerns. What the proposed uses of this extra land

Stop the project and question the need for a public wharf where private for profit tour operators are the main beneficiaries.

Environmental impact study should b a priority

Who benefits from made made shoreline? Greedy developers and business owners who want to change Mother Nature's shoreline for profit. Shame on you.

Strong, experienced local project leadership is pivotal to such an important project.

We have major concerns about the lack of local precipitation.

Yes. I believe that too many recent development proposals are focussed on an engineering approach lacking overall urban landscape environmental design understanding,

Expertise over local.

Seems like it's just an unneeded addition. Fix the wharf, no need to ruin the environment.

I have one thought..and that is that I don't think tourism should be the major focus or reason d'être for bigger and better "improvements " in St Andrews. These will ultimately destroy the essence of St Andrews and that for which it has become to be known. By altering the wharf and changing the waterfront and therefore changing the downtown ... this is inevitable. And the is apart from the environmental impact it will have on our area.

Our unique environment is special. Please consider the tides, sealife, and erosion. Do not ruin my hometown

It is a terrible idea. Repair the wharf properly without ruining the look and feel of the town. People come to this town to feel something and see something not like else where. This new look will diminish the culture of the town. It looks horrible!

yes

No

I think this is a loaded question looking for answers the author wants.

I believe we need both local input as well as expertise that may or may not live in town

I do have concerns, but don't have answers unfortunately. Most definitely though, any project that will harm the waterfront in any way, and that includes changing the appearance, should be well thought out and with lots of experts weighing in, not just decisions being made at town council level.

I'd be more concerned about the expertise of the project leader rather than where they live. Not clear to me who the question above is referring to.

What would you like to see happen instead of the current infill proposal?

Repair/rebuild what we have. If there needs to be climate considerations then look at all options (least disruptive options) with the environmental impact studies completed prior to going ahead with decision-making.

Fix the wharf entirely to the way it already is. Instead of destroying the environment around it. Destroying people's property and sending our tax payer money that should be kept in the town to another community.

Repair as is.

Repair what's there

I want the current infill project - we've discussed it and debated it for almost 5 years

rebuilding the wharf as needed on pilings, and any rock structures that need to be done, hidden from view under the wharf.

Nothing , let's start it

Rising water levels are not a certainty. There is a large body of belief that this is just not a forgoing conclusion. I would like to see piles driven and rebuild or repair the wharf.

Something less ugly that lets water pass through

Repair the current wharf to look the same. There are thousands of wharves like ours in the coastal communities of Canada and the US. Clearly repairing a wharf like ours is possible without going to such drastic measures.

In my view, at least CBCL options 4 and 5 need to be reconsidered, after all, when individual houses in Saint Andrews are all of a sudden being sold in the order of 2-3-4-5 million, some sold unseen, what's another 2-3 million on the heart of Saint Andrews for long term planning?

Keep the wharf design as is. Do not change the tidal flow in any way. Protect the shoreline, the existing marine life and ecosystem that has worked for over a hundred years.

Go back and look at work done to mitigate the sea level rise which is already happening. Concentrate efforts on securing what we already have in Saint Andrews. If not done soon it will go down the bay like communities in the US are dealing with right now. Open your eyes and ears and save what we have!

1. "Infill" is rarely good; 2. Rebuilding the whole wharf is required

Repair/replace what we have.

I am pleased with the current option.

I'm unsure

Not sure, is proposed infill solid or can water flow through it?

I have no problem with the infill, but a seawall vs a rock pile would better serve the eventual needs of the town and boating/fishing/aquaculture/tourism industries

Rebuild existing wharf as original

Make repairs when and where they are needed.

I am fine with the current proposal

Rescind heritage bylaw

With climate change, the whole wharf is going to be affected with rising sea levels. A 40 year plan embracing all contingencies should be developed before minor initiatives are implemented. Deep water breakwaters similar to tropical island reefs should be considered to break the major force of strong storms, especially with high tides. A proper boardwalk protecting the downtown low areas, avoiding landfills, would be a much better considered alternative.

New design based on real scientific analysis around known parameters.

Environmentally appropriate site

Status Quo

Simple repair and upkeep

repair the first third which is the part in question - use alternate ways to preserve the iconic beauty of the main tourist attraction. Do not cause the damage which has resulted from all groyne structures.

More consultation with residents of StcAndrews and neighbouring towns

Repair what's there!

Repair what is wrong with the wharf and develop a holistic program for rehabilitation of the entire wharf under the management of a qualified project manager. Part of the project manager's job is to develop the project scope, establish the budget and project schedule. A key question that needs to be addressed is why the residents of St Andrews should have to pay for a wharf which is a tourist related asset that primarily benefits a tourism businesses. It seems logical that those that benefit from the wharf should have to shoulder the costs associated with the wharf.

Nothing

I don't know that something different has to happen until we hear from an environmentalist. I'm not an expert and any feedback we provide has no quantitative foundation for this project.

Do minimum repairs and question the need for this facility.

One that harms the least environmentally

Fix the wharf, leave the shoreline as it is.

Some thing similar to what is already there regardless of how long it will last

An environmentally sustainable solution that does not negatively impact tidal flows, marine life and the natural environment.

Iwe are not sure - would have to see suggestions from experts in all facets of the project. (Especially environmental)

Maintain what is presently there

Just fix the wharf like always used too

Repair the wharf as it is and in a safe condition.

A wharf that will not impact the environment. Needs repair yes... not this

Repair the wharf properly with the proper materials of wood

As similar as possible to what we have---wooden-

A permanent solution that suits the aesthetics of the town

More wharves!

Something environmentally positive and possibly more in keeping w our waterfront heritage. Almost all of our shoreline is now rock infill, but this is THE focal point of our community. We need to get this right. A well informed decision is critical as this will impact many aspects including environmental, visual, as well as use and enjoyment of our waterfront.

Refer to Cindy Kohler

Repair what we have or rebuild in the same design.

The questions are biased and leading and assume all respondents have a problem with the infill project. Im ok with the infill project as long as it us dressed with a red stone that mimics the natural shore stone and mud.

Make the necessary repairs to the pier to remove the weight restriction. Develop a plan for the ongoing upkeep of the pier to ensure it can reman a tourist attraction into the future.

What would you like to say to Town Council about the proposed infill and your vision for the waterfront?

Appreciate efforts of council but do not agree with direction of wharf repair.

Consider the town residents and their property before the legacy of council members

Get er done!

Subject: Formal Objection to Proposed Infill Project and Use of Prohibited Groynes at Market Wharf, St. Andrews

To Whom It May Concern,

This letter serves as a formal objection to the Town of St. Andrews' proposed infill project at Market Wharf, which seeks to replace the open tidal waters with constructed landmass, permanently altering the natural coastal environment and creating a large artificial cove.

Let it be unequivocally stated: this design, if implemented, will irreversibly destroy the historic and environmental character of St. Andrews' cherished waterfront. Once completed, there will be no reversing this damage — the town's coastal legacy will be lost forever. Future councils will be powerless to undo the environmental and cultural harm done under this decision.

We urge Council: do not go down in history as the body responsible for the irreversible destruction of one of New Brunswick's most iconic shorelines. There are other engineering and environmental alternatives that must be explored with full transparency and due diligence. Failure to do so constitutes a gross oversight of duty to both the environment and the public interest.

Of particular concern is the use of structures functionally and structurally identical to groynes, which are clearly prohibited in New Brunswick as of April 2015. As noted in provincial engineering guidance documents, groynes are structures made of rock, concrete, or wood that extend into the water to

interfere with natural sediment transport — a description which aligns directly with the current design under review. Simply renaming these structures to evade regulatory scrutiny is disingenuous, deceptive, and unacceptable. Also, IF one Attempts to circumvent legal protections by rebranding a prohibited structure, constitutes at best, regulatory manipulation and, at worst, a willful violation of provincial coastal regulations. A very dangerous road to navigate if so.

This proposal raises serious environmental, economic, and visual impact concerns — all of which have been echoed by residents, local business owners, and coastal experts. We demand that this project be immediately paused and subjected to a full, independent review that includes consideration of alternative approaches that preserve the waterfront, comply with provincial law, and respect the town's historical integrity.

Hopefully the next study will be the last one needed to get the project started

To do this project because of free money is the wrong approach.

It is better to take a couple of steps backwards on this project than forge ahead with the wrong plan because a legacy project is on the to do list or because funding is available for something that we are going to try to fit the criteria. This infrastructure decision is going to effect the town for a long, long time. There's no going back if it's the wrong choice. This is a hard working council that wants to get things accomplished but proceed with caution as your legacy could just as easily end up being the council that ruined the wharf and the character of our quaint little town, as well as had a negative impact on our waterfront and marine life. The wharf project has been on the table for a long time and may feel like it's stagnant. That's because it's such a serious and final decision. It's wise for the council to take time. The push back from the community may feel like a negative to the council but this amount of community engagement is wonderful. This is your barometer. You are elected by the community and opinions from the community, even if they are not what you're hoping to hear, should be welcomed and respected. When someone sticks their neck out to speak up, be sure that they are not the only one that feels that way, they are just the one brave enough to say something. How they are treated is noted. If there is this much controversy, the community is clearly not comfortable with this plan.

Be completely transparent and if unsure, wait.

At least CBCL options 4 and 5 need to be reconsidered, after all, when individual houses in Saint Andrews are all of a sudden being sold in the order of 2-3-4-5 million, some sold unseen, what's another 2-3 million on the heart of Saint Andrews for long term planning?

There are far too many legitimate concerns on so many levels. Potentially destroying thousands of years old ecological system along the shore, plus altering tidal flow, risking damage and flooding to existing surrounding waterfront property and buildings. Altering historical significance, making a hideous foreign rock infill commercial eyesore. It seems this project has been attempted to be pushed through because of “free” funding available without seriously considering all factors.

Work on what we have to secure a working wharf which is what people like about it anyway. It is almost the last of what was many wharves in that down town. If you want to keep Historic Saint Andrews then don't add so much "bling"! New and shiny is not always the answer. And it costs the taxpayers more than needed for the look of that bling.

Before any decision is made, “follow the money” to see who profits from the infill (concrete, rocks, curbing, contractors, truckers, etc) - so as to understand the politics behind each design. Please choose the most environmentally acceptable option in terms of water/waves, sediment, overall pollution, user friendliness, visual beauty, and community functionality.

Please be more deliberate. St. Andrews’ natural beauty is its best attraction.

Be transparent. Always.

Town Council has been involved with every aspect of this decision making process. They have been open and transparent throughout the entire time. They are to be commended for their efforts to further this project before it is no longer feasible.

Better to get the right solution - wait until we have more information

If funds are a limiting factor, then just fix the approach for now

Get this project done right for generations to come

Groins are never a good idea.

If done correctly I think its great to bring more tourists in and boost the towns economy.more space equals more room for more activities on special event days.its very crowded now. There are good and bad in this project, but if done correctly it will be a good change for the town.

Go ahead with the current proposal

Get it done! The only thing worse than dithering for too many years is simply no action at all

Leave it the way it is

Access to present-day federal government funding will likely be available most anytime so avoid rushing into decisions now.

More consideration should be given to alternatives without prejudice.

It's a lovely wharf as it is

After researching groyne structures and reading about all of the damage they do , i would beg the council not to rush into this. I would also say it is a mistake to ruin the iconic wharf and historic harbour and turn it into a mass of rock and concrete. This will for sure damage the charm which draws the tourists. It should be a top priority to preserve the treasure of the town even if other options are not as easy. Walking the wharf is what they come for.

More information and more consultation

Be transparent—residents deserve to be fully informed about decisions that will deeply affect our coastal community. While improving the wharf’s durability is important, we must also consider the environment, marine life, and the heritage that makes St. Andrews unique. Preserving the integrity of our town should be just as much a priority as modernization.

This project is HIGH RISK for the Town. The time to complete this project has long since passed.

Consider that the funding partners will not increase funding; the tenders have not started; construction will take place in the winter storm season; the construction window is only six months long and in the winter; the estimate is dated and prepared by a firm Council does not appear to trust; there is \$1M in payments to the firm that prepared the estimate; an offsetting project is required in Campobello; there is no project manager; the project will be funded with borrowed money; there is an

election in nine months; and the Town resources are stretched to the limit (Town Mayor recently resigned; one Councillor has resigned; the Town Clerk recently left; the administration manager recently retired). The Town risk exposure from contract extras, scope changes and delays will be extremely high and borne solely by the Town since the funding partners have indicated no extensions and no additional funding. The most prudent course of action for the Town is to fix what is broken and restart a holistic program for the entire wharf.

Get on with it

I'm happy to have my name included based on my feedback. I'm not necessarily against the infill plan as long as it is validated by an environmental expert. I just don't believe the current plan has been yet - this is what I'm opposed to. Residents are providing opinions that are divided because there aren't facts provided by an unbiased, environmental source. Most of what I've heard to-date has been a lot of speculation because most of us are not qualified to validate the proposal.

I do not live in Saint Andrews, and probably have no real say but I do live on the Bay

The biggest things we have going for us, as a destination are aesthetics and nature. We're not bursting at the seams with reasons to visit and spend money that do not involve our natural scenery, coastline and general aesthetic. From my perspective there is an issue with communication, and better social media management could potentially be the answer to making sure residents have seen the 3d renderings you've most assuredly had produced to assess visual impact, and the supporting expert reports from biologists, geologists etc. that must have been considered for environmental impact.

Don't proceed with project. The Town shouldn't have to financially support private, for profit tour operators.

Dependent on environmental impact

Fix the wharf and stop acting like Trumplings, with no respect for Mother Earth, by building a "fake" shoreline for profit (who does it profit? Follow the money)!

I want it to remain looking the same but structurally sound.

Do the right thing.

We would suggest they take a step back to consider all facets of the project, and consult with as many qualified experts as possible, taking into consideration making it a safe viable wharf for the fishing industry and tourist industry, making it compatible with the historic nature and look of the town and not interfering with the natural flow within the harbour.

Look for a more visually & environmentally conscious approach in context with the historic nature of the waterfront and the Town.

Please ask for another alternative for improvement to the wharf

Good decision

It's st Andrews not Las Andrews. Keep it simple. Don't wreck the way tide has flowers for centuries. The local natives need this land to survive

Leave it alone... make it safe and clean, but leave it alone. Bigger and better is not always best.

Please do your homework with environment in mind

They have turned a beautiful scene and natural look of the town into something for cities. This look does not belong in saint Andrews at all. I hope they can see how much refusal they are getting from the residents and do not go forward. As a child who grew up in this town, I am HATING my idea of returning. I come home to revisit the views and if this moves forward, you will start to see less people returning. Keep the town original, don't change the look of it.

I cannot understand why they would even consider this plan

Support a solution that has improved optics and does not require a larger footprint than the current wharf. This would eliminate or reduce the high cost of fish habitat compensation while maintaining the current town atmosphere.

Go for it, let agent this wharf fixed and expand market Square.

The infill will matches with the majority of the St. Andrews shoreline that is already armour stone.

Our wharf is critical to a great variety of users. Look at the Cormier Report that was done to identify use and importance of this wharf to our community. Ask experts in tidal water flow. Read about the banning of this kind of infill. Raising one section of the downtown waterfront is not going to fix issues around climate change/water levels. Be as informed as possible. Balance this with the economics.

Refer to Cindy Kohler as in agreeance

Make sure you know what you are doing! Don't be in a hurry and mess up the town in a manner that will not be fixable at a reasonable cost.

Ive said already.

Full Survey Results Spreadsheet:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/17MvSdlvGE2h3z7MKn7qdUG4yedCryFbQivqjb1jvMu0/edit?usp=sharing>