

Notes on replies to questions for the Transportation Study team at June 24, 2015 meeting with SMAP.

MMM & DS: would really like to finish up. Holding up OP review.

Clarification on scope and intent of some key components and policies:

- **Complete Streets:** Is the section on Complete Streets intended to be a full Complete Streets Policy, or is the intent for this section to inform a Complete Streets Policy that will be adopted by Council? *A full Complete Street Policy should include all 10 elements identified by Complete Streets Canada.*

The Complete Streets section is not intended to be a Complete Streets Policy – this would be brought to Council later. It is the ‘start of the journey’.

MMM: could write a Complete Streets policy with all 10 elements

DS: need to ‘truth’ the criteria for local conditions

DS: individual policies to be brought in as they become available

SMAP: make a list of everything that needs to come forward. RE a Complete Streets Policy, our preference would be to have it included in the TS, or, if that is not feasible, to have a hard deadline attached.

- **Road Classifications:** Potential Cycling Provision recommendations are all based on AADT numbers. Will there also be guidelines for additional road designations like speed and type of traffic (buses, trucks) for arterials and collector roads?

DS: detailed designs will use Book 18.

MMM: made note of this request.

- **Sidewalk Priority Index:** earlier, it was stated that the Transportation Study would include a Sidewalk Priority Index. However, in the document, it appears that is not the case (recommendation for later adoption only). Please clarify.

DS: in the works – coming to Operations Committee within a year.

- **Active Transportation Master Plan:** Please clarify whether Section 8 (Cycling and Pedestrian Master Plan) is intended to be the Active Transportation Master Plan. *A full Active Transportation Master Plan is needed, with the level of detail needed for implementation, and inclusive of SMAP and community input.*

MMM: consider Section 8 to be a complete Active Transportation Master Plan, to be updated in 5 years. It is not a blank cheque to construct the routes shown – those priorities will come from SMAP, and streamlined with planned road projects.

DS: didn’t want to include budget numbers because that can vary a lot. Design feasibility to be done on a project by project basis. The Active Transportation plan identifies the routes. These routes will be fleshed out, and continuity between intersections will be looked at.

SMAP: Different perspective on what an Active Transportation Master Plan should include.

Bring road projects to SMAP before detailed designs are done – well ahead of time to that input can be included in the design.

- **Transportation Demand Management:** At the last Council meeting discussing the TS, Brett Sears indicated that the report would be adjusted to include better Transportation Demand Management sections. What will these be – policies, plan, strategy?

MMM: Will be addressed in the study. Lots of opportunities with big employers. It will be addressed, but there won't be a TDM plan. Recommend developing a TDM plan. DS: Issue – who does the work? (MMM: check Metrolinx example).

SMAP: concern that traffic modelling was done without TDM. Budget money could perhaps be used more effectively in improving transit and TDM strategies – need to see those numbers.

In your opinion, what is a realistic timeline to complete these necessary elements?

- a full Complete Streets Policy: DS: 2-3 years (MMM could complete one fairly quickly)
- a Sidewalk Priority Index: DS: coming within a year
- a full Active Transportation Master Plan: they feel it is complete
- a Transit Master Plan: DS: defer to transit doesn't want to tell another dept. what to do). Michelle: 2016 or 2017.
- A Transportation Demand Management Strategy/Plan: MMM: less than a year
- Complete Streets Guidelines: MMM: less than a year

These are necessary elements for a Transportation Study that supports all modes - they need to be included in the study, or tied to a firm deadline.

Questions and clarification regarding the Traffic Modelling

- It appears that goals to increase transit ridership and increase modal split for sustainable transportation were not included in the traffic modelling. Please confirm.
- Explain the 2% modal split used in the Traffic Modelling.
 - Does this mean that 2% of travel is assumed to be with modes other than private vehicles? Yes – 2% of trips via transit.
 - SMAP: n.b. data from 2006 and 2011 census data shows ~4-5% transit (and ~6.5% active transportation). SCF 2013 report cites 4.5% of workers get to work via transit in 2011 (compared to 12.5% in Ontario), 5.2% in 2006.**
 - Is this based on 2005 data? What is the current modal split (from most recent data, or inferred from the increase in transit ridership recorded)? MMM could not provide the source or rationale for the 2% used.
 - What is the sensitivity of the model to modal split? In your opinion, how would increasing the modal split impact the results of the modeling (in particular volume to capacity ratio, and list of road projects deemed necessary). Unknown. MMM acknowledges there would be some impact on the results, but suspects the impact would not be significant.
- What would the timeline be for re-running the model with: realistic goals to increase modal split; and adding evaluation metrics specific to sustainable mobility. MMM - that is right at the beginning of the process. Does not want to do that.
- Which road projects are included in the 'Do Nothing' alternative (i.e. which are considered 'projects under construction'). Projects that are in the works: e.g. Second Avenue, Barry Downe. (not Maley)
- It is stated that the 'Sustainability Focused' approach is 'Do Nothing' + transportation projects that also promote other modes, such as transit, sustainability, active transportation and infill development." Please explain the rationale or evaluation metric used to decide which new road projects were included. See pg. 123 of report. Other than impact on natural environment, no other direct metrics for sustainability used. MMM: have been used in other reports – these are the ones they chose to use here.

Cycling Routes

- Why do many of the proposed routes not meet the recommended road design standards?

Project based – check back with Book 18 for design details. Based on past work, and ‘truthing’ with rides to see what’s possible – the starting point.

- What criteria were used to set the implementation schedule?

What is available right now – what road projects are coming along.

DS: personally feels it will take a lot longer than the timelines given. Doing AT infrastructure only (versus as part of a road project) can be twice as expensive.

SMAP: need to act on AT priorities as well (dedicated funding) – set schedule according to AT goals, not just road project schedules.

- How would the implementation schedule change if it was guided by the goal of completing a minimum grid of safe and convenient cycling routes in a timely manner (including prioritizing key connectors such as arterials)?
- Under the implementation schedule in the Transportation Study, how long would it take until residents of Greater Sudbury could travel safely by bicycle among neighbourhoods and to key shopping, education, and recreation destinations? Realistically, in your opinion, how long will it take?
- What timeline do you envision for the completion of the design and feasibility studies for cycling routes?
- “creating a transportation network which offers more direct routings” was identified as a key opportunity. How was this applied to the proposed cycling routes and implementation schedule?
- The maps were based on Bicycle Advisory Panel and Sustainable Mobility Advisory Panel AT network recommendations. Our understanding is that MMM Group did not do a thorough evaluation of the proposed routes (based on questions answered consultants at the last PIC). These maps were prepared over 5 years ago. What process do you envision to review and adjust the proposed network recommendations and how will the community be involved?
- Mapping shows the recommended implementation schedule for cycling routes. However, it is also stated that “The implementation strategy (for pedestrian and cycling infrastructure) is designed to be fiscally responsible, coordinated with other longterm capital investments as they are scheduled and respectful of the fact that a significant investment is proposed and could take the City many years to complete. “ This seems to recommend that cycling and pedestrian infrastructure be primarily completed only in conjunction with other road projects, and implies that they are of secondary importance. Please clarify.
- There is now dedicated funding for priority cycling infrastructure - this is not mentioned in the Transportation Study, or in the section on implementation of cycling routes. Please explain how you see this money being used.
- There is no clear distinction between cycling routes for transportation and recreation. This is an important distinction for a Transportation Study. Please comment on how this could be changed.

Questions about some recommended programs

- How will community representatives and groups be involved in the proposed Inter-Municipal Active Transportation Working Group?

- What is the estimated timeframe for hiring the Active Transportation Coordinator?
- The TS states “As an interim solution in advance of future road improvements to install cycle tracks, the City of Greater Sudbury should modify current by-laws to continue to restrict cycling on sidewalks for adults but not prohibiting cycling on paved portions of boulevards where it is safe to do so.” Can you clarify how children will be affected?

Comparable data by mode

- Traffic volumes are given for traffic volumes in the PM peak period. However, transit trip data is given in terms of annual transit ridership. Is it possible to provide comparable data? (E.g. transit ridership in PM peak period).

Comparable data not available at this time.

Engagement with SMAP and others during review of the draft Transportation Study

- As originally intended, SMAP would like to work collaborative to make iterative positive changes to the Transportation Study to obtain the best result possible. Let’s discuss a good process to do this.

Would like to finish this up. No clear process was agreed to moving forward.

Proposed changes to the Official Plan

- There have been statements that the Transportation Master Plan is a “living document” and that changes can be made. Can you comment on how this will work and what the impact will be on the wording that is being recommended for the Official Plan, in particular phrasing like “The existing bicycle and pedestrian network will be expanded following the active transportation plans set forth in the Greater Sudbury Transportation Study Report (2015).” And “Implement the Active Transportation Master Plan, as part of the Greater Sudbury Transportation Study Report (2015), per the proposed network phasing and give consideration to active transportation improvements when road improvements and other capital infrastructure projects are programmed.” And “Recognize that future refinement of the proposed active transportation network will be required. This is consistent with a goal of ensuring that the plan is flexible and can respond to changes and new opportunities.”

Concern: being held to route or wording once they are in the OP.

DS: wants the strong language to so that it can be required of developers as part of planning process.

MMM: routes need to be ground trothed as part of desing process – not all set in stone.

SMAP: possibly set strongest language around complete street road design standards.

++++

Will get back to us in writing on these questions.