

SMAP meeting notes [SMAP input on revised Transportation Master Plan appended]

Meeting – Thursday, November 24, 2016, 5:30 p.m.

Tom Davies, rm C-10

**Present:** Daniel Barrette, LyAnne Chenier, Carol Craig, Michelle Ferrigan, Chris Gore, Naomi Grant, Stephen Holmes, Deb McIntosh, Rachelle Niemela

**Regrets:** Pam Banks, Samantha Baulch, Mary Ann Duynisveld, Barb McDougall-Murdoch, Lilly Noble

1. The agenda and Sept. meeting notes were accepted. Naomi took notes until 6:30 p.m., Dan took notes for the remaining half hour.

2. Bike friendly community criteria: request for SMAP input from Joe Rocca, in response to a query from Councillor Reynolds about 'bike friendly' signage for Minnow Lake.

Rachelle gave background information. The Bicycle Friendly Community Award is an existing designation in Ontario through Share the Road. It is based on the '5 E's': Engineering; Education; Encouragement; Enforcement; Evaluation & Planning. Thirty communities in Ontario are designated 'Bike Friendly.' Thunder Bay is the only northern city. The previous term of SMAP looked at the criteria and determined that Sudbury is not yet ready to apply. There are many questions when thinking about whether Sudbury should make its own criteria for 'bike friendly' designation, whether parts of the city can be designated as such, and how. Any designation should be meaningful and consistent.

SMAP's cycling representatives discussed Joe Rocca's question and made the following recommendation, which was supported by SMAP:

**"Bike friendly designations should be meaningful, and consistent. Share the Road 'Bike Friendly Communities' is an existing and recognized framework. Decisions about seeking Bike Friendly Community recognition or creating consistent local neighbourhood standards should be done in collaboration with the Active Transportation Coordinator."**

3. Consider recommending letter of support from Council regarding provincial cycling infrastructure funding

Ontario's Climate Change Action Plan (June): outlines a plan to invest \$150-\$255M in cycling infrastructure over the next 5 years.

Share the Road is asking bike advisory committees to encourage letters of thanks and support for this funding sent by Mayors to Minister Murray.

Rachelle explained Share the Road's request and informed us they had shared a sample letter. Letter from Northern cities are important to ask for equity for northern communities.

SMAP agreed to recommend to the Mayor that a letter of support be sent. Rachelle will send the example letter to Chris and Deb. Rachelle or Chris will draft a letter from this example. Chris and Deb will share the letter and recommendation with the Mayor.

#### 4. Update on transit wayfinding, & Transit Master Plan – SMAP input to terms of reference of route rationalization study

Michelle updated SMAP on transit.

The wayfinding map is up at the transit terminal. They are collecting input via a survey. The response has all been positive so far. There are a few typos to fix. The results of the survey will be in in mid Dec. Then they will make any needed changes.

We should all plan some rides, test out the wayfinding map, and provide input.

-The link to the survey: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/MJX7P6C>

-The link to the map: <http://www.greatersudbury.ca/living/transit/pdf-documents/greater-sudbury-transit-citywide-network-map/>

Following up on the funding announcement for transit that Michelle explained at the last meeting, Michelle let us know they are still waiting for some final approvals, but are getting prepared to move forward as soon as that is obtained. E.g. preparing RFP's, including for the Route Optimization Study. See the report to Council (Nov. 22):

<http://agendasonline.greatersudbury.ca/?pg=agenda&action=navigator&lang=en&id=955&itemid=1227> (Note that some projects address accessibility to transit via walking or cycling, so improve AT infrastructure)

To prepare the terms of reference for the Route Optimization Study, transit has met with SMAP's transit rep's, as well as Laurentian University, Friends of Sudbury Transit, the Accessibility Advisory Panel and others. With this feedback and the feedback received over the past number of years, the same needs are expressed by all: express buses, direct routes, hub system, better service for outlying communities, better Sunday service (consistent weekend service).

The Route Optimization Study will have a full look at route needs to create a new network model (including routes and schedules). Michelle is considering moving to a 20 minute clock, so that peak service can be every 10 minutes (this is an amount people are willing to wait for a transfer – 15 minutes is the maximum before it becomes a barrier).

There is funding for infrastructure: implementing hubs, bike racks, heated shelters, accessible bus stops (including retrofitting existing bus shelters/stops for accessibility where needed); pay-as-you-go fares.

#### **Additional comments from SMAP:**

- need Trans Cab on google maps
- check if Operations has comments about snow clearance at bus stops
- add signage at bus stops to show people where they need to wait for the bus if the stop is blocked by snow.
- Publicize the 100 new stops to be cleared this winter
- N.B. Azilda CAN adopts all the Azilda bus stops, and clear them all winter. They just decorated them! LyAnne will send a picture.

#### 5. 2017 municipal budget + sustainable transportation – quick overview & set opportunity to review 2017 projects

Items related to walking and cycling:  
 Kingsway sidewalk (north side): \$2,700,000\*

Cycling Infrastructure

Miscellaneous improvements: \$305,000  
 Paris/Notre Dame cycling improvements: \$735,000\*  
 Travel Demand Management study: \$55,000\*  
 Lasalle corridor design study: \$200,000\*  
 Total: \$1,295,000

\* Stephen and LyAnne confirmed that this was tied to the transit funding

Transit capital budget:

<b>Transit</b>				
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PROJECT TYPE		2017 REQUEST	2018 REQUEST
	R (Renewal)	E (Expansion)		
	N (New)			
Garage Improvements - Lome St.	R		\$ 3,700,000	<sup>1,3</sup>
Transit Buses	R		\$ 2,908,000	<sup>1,3</sup>
Accelerated Rebuild Program Costs	R		\$ 1,350,000	<sup>1,3</sup>
Terminal Improvements - Elm St.	R		\$ 1,025,000	<sup>1,3</sup>
Route Optimization Study	N		\$ 1,000,000	<sup>1,3</sup>
AVL Modem Upgrade	R		\$ 200,000	<sup>1,3</sup>
Scheduling Software Upgrade	N		\$ 200,000	<sup>1,2,3</sup>
Accelerated Shelter Restoration	R		\$ 120,000	<sup>2,3</sup>
Handi Transit Buses (Contribution to Operating)	E		\$ 80,000	<sup>2,3</sup>
Bus Rebuilds	R		\$ 50,000	\$
Transit Maintenance Software	N		\$ 40,000	<sup>3</sup>
Pedestrian Crosswalk Upgrades to Terminal (for Roads Project)	N		\$ 25,000	
Bus Shelters (Contribution to Reserve Fund)	E		\$ 13,000	\$
Stop Announcement System Upgrade	R		\$ 7,000	
Vans/Cars	R			\$
Service Trucks/Equipment	R			
<b>PROJECT COSTS</b>			<b>\$ 10,718,000</b>	<b>\$</b>

Stephen will circulate a list of 2017 road projects, to review AT needs.

He highlighted some upcoming projects:

- The study work for improving cycling on Paris/Notre Dame is not yet done, but will be soon. It should outline quick fixes, intermediate fixes, and long term plans. The 2017 funding should be enough for some quick fixes. The details are not yet known.
- When they do the Barry Down work, they will be putting cycling facilities on Westmount to connect to Atlee. He was unsure of the type – possibly edgelines.

- Work on Kelly Lake Road from the Junction Creek bridge to Lorne. Paved shoulders are expected. (Deb indicated more is needed for safe walking and cycling there, connecting the Junction Creek and Copper Cliff trails)

Stephen will share the cross sections when they are available. It will be a very quick turn around for comments.

Deb has asks for an accounting of the 2015/2016 cycling infrastructure dollars. The response should be made public on the City's budget website through the portal. This is updated every Friday.

Chris has not yet confirmed if SMAP's submission on the 2017 budget has been delivered to Council through the GM.

6. Revised Transportation Master Plan (TMP) – overview of outcome in relation to SMAP comments & process to provide timely SMAP input on revised draft

SMAP has made detailed submissions on the TMP. It was agreed that this substantive past work be the basis for SMAP's comments on the revised draft.

It was agreed that the submission contain a table of SMAP's past recommendations, with the relevant outcome in the revised TMP, and that an 'executive summary' provide a quick overview.

The TMP will go to Council Dec. 13, therefore it was decided SMAP would aim to provide Council with this overview for their information by November 29 if possible.

Naomi had prepared a table of SMAP's recommendations, responses to those comments, and outcome in the TMP as a starting point.

Dan, Lilly, Rachelle, Niall and Naomi agreed to prepare and finalize the summary of SMAP's recommendations and outcome in the TMP for Council.

Deb emphasized the need for solid comments from SMAP for herself and other councillors.

7. Quick updates

- AT Coordinator: the group was informed that this person is Marisa Talarico and will be starting in early December. The group was excited and spoke very positively of this person who previously worked and resided in Greater Sudbury.

- PXO's: Approximately 20 PXO's were installed in miscellaneous locations in the City. Some have been formally opened while others will be in early December. There has been plenty of media coverage and positive responses.

20 locations; tactile panels in the sidewalks with signs; 3 levels: just signs, signs + light on sign; signs + light on sign + sign on the lane; triangle showing where cars need to stop; education campaign happening - radio. <http://www.greatersudbury.ca/living/roads/traffic-and-transportation/pedestrian-crossovers/>

Feedback from SMAP: staff will look at the crossings to make sure old signs that tell pedestrians they have to wait are all removed. The Nelson St. crossing has a high curb.

- Frood Street Safety Zone (St. David School). A City resolution was passed to change the limit from 60 km/hr to 40 km/hr. However, continued safety concerns were noted as a probable scenario due to general road topography and alignment. This area should be reviewed for additional measures, such as traffic calming, enforcement, PXO possibility... Daniel/Rachelle to contact Jeniffer Babin-Fenske to see if this area will be reviewed under the Active Neighborhoods Donovan project.

Question about putting in a crosswalk at Shevshenko. Stephen: Is not sure if that will happen; there is an overview on the City's website with a list of the planned PXO crossings.

- Pedestrian Safety Campaign: Road Safety Committee has an MTO grant with different messages and formats: outside billboards, bus backs, yard signs. Billboards and bus backs are installed.

On-going strategies being undertaken by the Roads Safety Committee (Bus Backs: Watch for me / do the bright thing). The group has obtained neighborhood action signs but no details of the implementation strategy was known by attendees at the moment.

- Sidewalk Priority Index: Progress has been made and it is closer to complete than not. No timelines were provided.

- MTO Cycling Route Network:

Daniel and Rachelle talked about the MTO Cycling Route Network Session they attended earlier in the day in North Bay. Joe Rocca from the City also attended.

The objective was to review the priority and secondary routes identified in the first round of consultations which happened in the Summer of 2016. With this information, the MTO aims to confirm the preferred provincial network and prepare the summary report in the Spring of 2017.

The primary objectives are as follows: Connectivity, Continuity, Safety and Accessibility. Secondary objectives are Trip Attractors, Value for Money, Climate Change.

- a couple articles of interest:

A great piece on complete streets: <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/toronto/meet-the-new-kind-of-street-coming-toronto/article32828137/>

Study results for the economic benefits of walking and cycling infrastructure:

<https://cyclingindustry.news/study-tells-real-estate-developers-building-for-walking-and-cycling-is-good-for-business/>

8. Cycling route wayfinding – update from Niall (including material from Mary) and LyAnne (15 min)

- The group held a broad discussion around this item. LyAnne emailed correspondence and examples available from other Cities. From discussions with those municipalities, the process often starts with identifying the minimum grid and many have hired consultants to complete the detailed strategy plan. Niall noted that google maps is often the platform used (embedded in website, or as a link).

- Maryanne was doing apps, Niall was doing online, LyAnne was doing signs. LyAnne had contacted various communities in relation to wayfinding. Vancouver has a guide, there are some examples in the US. Someone from Waterloo offered to come and speak about their program.

LyAnne will resend the samples that she gathered.

- Discussion about how wayfinding may be able to layer road information to give better choices to people – comment about how the MTP static maps are hard to decipher in places and that having

different information displayed in layers would be helpful for people trying to find commuting vs recreational wayfinding. Possibility of using Open Data?

- The goal would be to develop the minimum grid with online route planning functionality. Existing sources include the TMP Map, Google Mymaps and City GIS.

- Item deferred for future meeting and potentially involved the AT coordinator

- Daniel to forward the CGS Arc GIS map for others to reference.

<http://sudbury.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=e25d98bebd64aa09a53765a215bffe6>

9. Next meeting January 26.



## Sustainable Mobility Advisory Panel

November 29, 2016

### Sustainable Mobility Advisory Panel (SMAP)

#### Draft Transportation Master Plan (TMP): comments on revised document (Nov. 2016)

The mandate of the Sustainable Advisory Mobility Panel (SMAP) is to assist staff and Council in implementing a vision for a holistic approach to a multi-model transportation system where citizens can walk, cycle and/or use public transit efficiently and safely to get to their destinations. Our vision is that all citizens are able to get to their destinations safely and conveniently, whether they are walking, biking, busing, in a wheelchair or scooter, or in their private vehicle.

SMAP has provided many comments to the TMP, and these are reviewed in detail below.

**At this time, our most important outstanding recommendation is to prioritize a safe cycling network on primary travel corridors.**

SMAP has consistently noted the need to create a cycling network on primary corridors, so that residents can travel safely and efficiently by bike. This approach ensures timely connectivity and continuity of cycling infrastructure, necessary to have the biggest impact in making cycling a safe and appealing travel option in Greater Sudbury.

This approach is being used in the provincial cycling network strategy which targets user impact and projects that provide connectivity, continuity, safety, and accessibility. Aligning priorities for cycling infrastructure in the TMP with provincial priorities will facilitate funding applications and will better address community need. Ontario's Cap and Trade program proposes 5 year funding of \$150-225M. Having TMP identified priorities that are high impact projects would visibly strengthen funding applications and City readiness.

**We strongly recommend the following five travel corridors be identified as high priority (short term phasing), stand-alone cycling infrastructure projects** in the following sections of the TMP: the Cycling and Pedestrian Master Plan (S9), Transportation Study Report Implementation (S11), Recommendations (S12), Active Transportation Network maps, and appendix M: Transportation Updates to the Official Plan.

ROUTE	INFRASTRUCTURE TYPE	PHASING (HIGH PRIORITY)
Paris/Notre Dame	Separated*	Short term**
Lasalle	Separated	Short term
Barry Downe	Separated	Short term
Kingsway	Separated	Short term
Lorne	Separated	Short term

\* Separated cycling infrastructure is appropriate on an arterial for safe cycling (MTO Book 18)

\*\* Short term phasing indicates the highest priority level.

These five travel corridors will create a skeleton minimum grid that connects neighbourhoods, post-secondary institutions, the Hospital and Science North, all major commercial centres and many major employers. It connects people and places and emphasizes primary travel corridors where there are limited alternate cycling routes. **Completing these five travel corridors will transform our community and create opportunities.**

This is the starting point for a larger minimum grid that adds more primary travel routes to New Sudbury and the South End with connections to Azilda, Chelmsford, Copper Cliff, Lively, the Valley, Garson, Falconbridge, and Coniston, and more connectivity among routes. *Based on this minimum grid, SMAP has provided tables with cycling routes recommended for implementation (analogous to the tables provided for recommended road projects). These can be viewed below, in section 6.*

SMAP has provided many comments to the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) and we appreciate the opportunity to provide input on this guiding policy document. We also recognize and appreciate some of the positive changes made in response to our input. Below is a brief summary of Nov 2016 TMP outcomes resulting from the consultation process, followed by detailed tables of SMAP's most recent recommendations and the corresponding outcome.

Sincerely,  
Your Sustainable Mobility Advisory Panel  
Contact: Naomi Grant (Chair), [grant\\_naomi@hotmail.com](mailto:grant_naomi@hotmail.com)



## SMAP Consultation Quick Summary:

### *Positive additions in the November 2016 TMP:*

- New section on pedestrian safety and recommendations to: Identify intersections and midblock locations with a history of vehicle/pedestrian conflict; Study and implement appropriate measures to improve pedestrian safety.
- New section on Transportation Demand Management and recommendation to prepare a Transportation Demand Management Plan.
- Some positive edits/additions to cycling routes.

### *Outstanding comments:*

- Recommend preparing and adopting a Cycling Infrastructure Priority Index, Complete Street Guidelines, Vision Zero, and a Pedestrian Crossing Priority Index.
- Prioritize a cycling route minimum grid. In the TMP, some major routes, including the Paris/Notre Dame and Lasalle corridors, are listed as long term (11-15+ years). Some other major routes are incomplete, while others propose unsuitable cycling infrastructure which are not consistent with MTP or MTO Book 18 design guidelines. Active transportation projects should be listed in 'Section 11 - Transportation Study Report Implementation.'
- Identify the recommendation for a sidewalk priority index, complete streets policy, transit master plan, and transportation demand management policy as short term objectives (0-5 years).
- Recommendation of various elements to consider in the next Transportation Study, such as multi-modal traffic modelling, evaluation, and levels of service for all modes of transportation.

### *Moving forward*

Section 9.4.1, Establishing Priorities, states: "The suggested structure for managing and implementing the cycling and pedestrian network would see interaction between the Roads and Transportation Services Department and Community and Strategic Planning Department **as well as interaction with groups outside of the City departments, such as the Sustainable Mobility Advisory Panel**, the Rainbow Routes Association, the Trans Canada Trail Organization, Sudbury and District Public Health Unit and the Greater Sudbury Police."

We look forward to effective collaboration to maximize sustainable mobility opportunities in Greater Sudbury.

## Review of SMAP comments and TMP outcome (Nov. 2016)

### 1. Pedestrian safety and pedestrian infrastructure

SMAP comment	Content of Transportation Master Plan – Nov. 2016
Include a section on best practices for safe streets	New section on pedestrian safety - Ch. 10 (Policies to support transportation alternatives) Pg. 201 - proposes some general measures for consideration, as well as <b>three recommendations</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finalize Sidewalk Priority Policy.</li> <li>• Identify intersections or midblock locations with a history of vehicle / pedestrian conflict.</li> <li>• Study and implement appropriate measures to improve pedestrian safety.</li> </ul>
Recommend adopting Vision Zero	No mention of Vision Zero
A timeline should be given to complete the <b>Sidewalk Priority Index</b> in a timely manner – i.e. identified as a short term (0-5 year) goal.	Ch. 10 (Policies to support transportation alternatives) Pg. 196. ‘Sidewalk Priority’. Lists criteria to consider. Ch. 12 (Recommendations) – Transportation Policies, pg. 218: ‘Finalize a Sidewalk Policy as detailed in Section 10.4’ No timeline given. Not listed in implementation. <i>N.B. Sidewalk Priority Index is in progress. Expected to be presented to Council in 2017</i>
Recommend that a <b>Pedestrian Crossing Priority Index</b> be developed in the short term	No mention of Pedestrian Crossing Priority Index

### 2. Cycling infrastructure

SMAP comment	Content of Transportation Master Plan – Nov. 2016
Support real and timely progress on a minimum grid of cycling routes.  Active transportation projects should be referenced in the Implementation chapter.  Completing a minimum grid of safe cycling infrastructure in a timely manner should guide the routes and implementation schedule. Due to safety concerns, arterials and collector roads are top priorities. Note SMAP’s 2012 recommendation that the priority should be on primary corridors to create cycling infrastructure that is most visible, useful, and safe. <b>See item 6 ‘specific cycling routes’ for more detailed comments.</b>	Approach remains the same. The implementation strategy for cycling infrastructure does not prioritize completing a minimum grid of cycling routes in the short or medium term. No mention of minimum grid  No reference to retrofitting existing roads with appropriate active transportation infrastructure in order to create connected routes.  Active transportation does not appear in the implementation chapter. ‘AT implementation’ is instead in ‘Recommendations.’ No specific projects listed (phasing and cycling infrastructure type is mapped only).  Modifying the by-law for in-blvd cycle tracks is listed as a ‘long term’ recommendation. <i>N.B. Staff report on this topic is expected in 2017.</i>  No reference to traffic type & topography in regards to appropriate safe cycling infrastructure; and appropriate selection of ‘alternate’ routes.

Road classification street design guidelines: Include reference to traffic type & topography in regards to appropriate safe cycling infrastructure; and appropriate selection of 'alternate' routes (consistent with Book 18).	
Recommend that a <b>Cycling Infrastructure Priority Index</b> be developed in the short term	No mention of Cycling Infrastructure Priority Index
Distinguish between recreational trails and transportation cycling routes in the cycling network mapping	Not done

### 3. Transit

SMAP comment	Content of Transportation Master Plan – Nov. 2016
Include short term goals for increased transit ridership	<i>N.B. A route rationalization plan, and Transit Master Plan are underway and budgeted.</i>
<b>Supporting policies</b>	
A timeline should be given to complete the <b>Transit Master Plan</b> in a timely manner – i.e. identified as a short term (0-5 year) goal.	<p><b>Transit Master Plan:</b></p> <p>Ch. 10 (Policies to support transportation alternatives) Pg. 198. 'Recommendation: Develop a Transit Master Plan'</p> <p>Ch. 12 (Recommendations) – Transportation Policies, pg. 218: 'Develop a Transit Master Plan to leverage the road and active transportation plans recommended in the Transportation Study Report. No timeline given. Not listed in implementation.</p> <p><i>N.B. Almost underway. Funding for route rationalization study obtained.</i></p>

### 4. Broader supporting policies

SMAP comment	Content of Transportation Master Plan – Nov. 2016
Recommend that <b>Complete Street Guidelines</b> be developed in the short term	Does not appear.
Include information on Transportation Demand Management and recommend that a TDM plan be developed in the short term	Ch. 10 (Policies to support transportation alternatives) Pg. 199. Section 10.10 added 'Transportation Demand Management.' Provides information on TDM. 'Recommendation: The City should prepare a Transportation Demand Management Plan.'
A timeline should be given to complete key guiding policies in a timely manner – i.e. identified as a short term (0-5 year) goal. They are: a <b>Complete Streets Policy, Complete</b>	<p><b>Complete Streets Policy:</b> Ch. 12 (Recommendations) – Transportation Policies, pg. 218: 'Implement a "Complete Streets" policy .' No timeline given. Not listed in Implementation.</p> <p><i>Complete Streets Policy is in the Corporate Strategic Plan – Implementation Plan; timeline is Jan/17 – Mar/18</i></p>

<p><b>Streets Guideline, Transportation Demand Management Plan</b></p>	<p><b>Complete Streets Guideline:</b> Does not appear</p>
	<p><b>Transportation Demand Management:</b> Ch. 12 (Recommendations) – Transportation Policies, pg. 219: ‘Prepare a Transportation Demand Management Plan.’ No timeline given. Not listed in implementation. <i>N.B. Line item in 2017 capital budget</i></p>
<p>Recommend redoing traffic modelling with TDM and transit ridership goals, and using evaluation metrics for all modes to evaluate alternative scenarios</p>	<p>No mention of redoing traffic modelling in this way</p>
<p>Require annual progress reports on active transportation infrastructure and sustainable transportation goals &amp; recommendations, including comments by SMAP.</p>	<p>Section 9.4.1. states “an efficient reporting and implementation structure is vital..” <b>We look forward to a more detailed implementation plan in the near future.</b></p>
<p>We are concerned that recommended road widths are quite wide. Narrower traffic lanes have been shown to be safer for all road users.</p>	<p>No change <i>N.B. Other guidelines are also used by the City to determine desired lane width</i></p>

**5. Setting the framework for the next Transportation Study**

<p><b>SMAP comment</b></p>	<p><b>Content of Transportation Master Plan – Nov. 2016</b></p>
<p>The future transportation study must incorporate the key policies already identified (which should be completed by this time). In addition, the following elements should be required: - Levels of Service for all modes (not just vehicular traffic) - Evaluation metrics directly related to pedestrians, cyclists, and transit. - Traffic modelling and evaluation based on TDM, and meeting needs of all transportation modes. Not basing capacity on peak time use. - A complete Active Transportation Master Plan (complete with goals and action plans, timelines, budget, and implementation strategies) - Safe streets: street designs safe for all users - A Transportation Master Plan that sets transportation in the bigger picture of planning and land use. - Inclusion of Transit - Road projects should be assessed and prioritized based on the needs of all modes, and with a holistic assessment that includes health, social, and environmental impacts. - Recommend a TDM staff position</p>	<p>No recommendations made for elements of next Transportation Study.</p>

## 6. Specific cycling routes

*Requested route changes that were accepted by MMM group are found in the updated maps as expected.*

Below are the tables we would like to see included in 'Section 11 - Transportation Study Report Implementation,' listing specific cycling infrastructure projects, as is done for planned road projects. Notes have been added to reference what is currently in the TSR cycling route maps, for comparison. Planned phasing (short, medium or long term) reflects the priority level of the routes. It is very important that highest priority routes include the top 5 routes for a skeleton minimum grid. It is also important that any routes prioritized by Council are recognized as high priority (short term) routes. Having these priorities reflected in the phasing schedule in the Transportation Master Plan will strengthen funding applications to complete these routes.

In addition, 'Section 11 - Transportation Study Report Implementation' should also include guiding principles for prioritizing implementation of cycling infrastructure:

- The priority is to create a functional network of cycling routes starting with primary travel corridors. The highest priority should be given to completing the top 5 routes creating a basic minimum grid of cycling routes. They should be listed as stand-alone cycling infrastructure projects (not reliant on larger road projects). These projects are ideal candidates for road retrofits.

"It is important to develop integrated active transportation networks. The greater the connectivity and reach of a network, the more potential it has to encourage cyclists and pedestrians to use it. While it may be convenient or cost-efficient to implement facilities in sections, their effectiveness will be compromised if potential cyclists feel that the provisions are not adequate or safe along the entirety of their route. The period over which the links in a network are implemented should therefore be as short as possible." TMP, Pg. 79

- High impact connectors and neighbourhood routes are also high priorities because they are 'low hanging fruit' that require fewer resources but make a significant improvement in cycling infrastructure.
- Whenever a road project is undertaken, it must follow the street design guidelines (which take a complete street approach) and provide appropriate, safe infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists.

The tables below contain highlights and notes to compare SMAP's route recommendations with what is currently in the cycling route maps in the TSR.

**Table 53: Cycling routes recommended for implementation in the Short Term (generally 0 to 5 years)**

*Implementation could be retrofit, or as part of a planned road construction.*

<b>Road name</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>To</b>	<b>Short term in MTP</b>
<b>Notre Dame</b>	Separated, dedicated cycling route. <i>MTP: Cycle Track; Multi-use trail (Wilma-Lasalle)</i>	Elm	Lasalle	- Yes (Kathleen-Lasalle) -Long (Elm-Kathleen) N.B. Council priority. 2017 budget line.
<b>Paris/Long Lake</b>	Separated, dedicated cycling route. <i>MTP: Cycle Track.</i>	Elm	MacIsaac	Long term N.B. Council priority. 2017 budget line.
<b>Barry Downe</b>	Separated, dedicated cycling route. <i>MTP: Bike lane. N.B. Cycle tracks proposed in design for Kingsway-Westmount.</i>	Kingsway	Cambrian College	Yes
<b>Lorne Partial (Edna-Copper Cliff Trail)</b>	Separated, dedicated cycling route. <i>MTP: Signed bike route (or none) Current design plan for Martindale-Logan has in-boulevard cycle track on N side, paved shoulder on S side.</i>	Elm	Big Nickel Road	-Yes (Martindale-Logan) -Remainder medium term, or non-existent. N.B. Council seeking funding for road reconstruction of Lorne.
<b>Kingsway</b>	Separated, dedicated cycling route. <i>MTP:: Cycle track.</i>	Barry Downe	Bancroft	Long term
<b>Lasalle</b>	Separated, dedicated cycling route. <i>MTP: Cycle track. Multi-use trail (Notre Dame to College Boréal; Gary-Falconbridge)</i>	College Boréal	Falconbridge	Long term N.B. Council priority. 2017 budget line for design study.
<b>Second</b>	Separated, dedicated cycling route. <i>MTP: Cycle track (Bancroft-Donna). Multi-use trail (Donna-Kingsway).</i>	Kingsway	Bancroft	Yes ? Donna-Bancroft missing from phasing map
<b>Elm</b>	Separated, dedicated cycling route. <i>MTP: Signed bike route.</i>	Lorne	Paris	Yes

Martindale-Ontario-Riverside - Worthington-Edmund-Elizabeth	Bike lane <i>MTP: bike lane on Worthington; signed bike route elsewhere – may meet need if done with edgelines, but bike lane preferable.</i>	Regent	Bell Park bike route	<i>Some short, some medium term. N.B. Riverside 2<sup>nd</sup> on list for traffic calming.</i>
Hyland-Connaught-Wembley-Marion-Medora	Bike lane <i>MTP: bike lane on E end of Wembley; signed bike route elsewhere – may meet need if done with edgelines</i>	Regent	Worthington	<i>Some short, some medium term.</i>
MacIsaac	Continue cycle track, or bike lane. <i>MTP: multi-use trail</i>	Regent	Algonquin	<i>? missing from phasing map</i>
Algonquin	Bike lane <i>MTP: signed bike route – may meet need if done with edgelines, but bike lane preferable.</i>	Regent	Regent	<i>Medium term</i>
Frood	Bike lane <i>MTP: multi-use trail, bike lane, signed bike route, paved shoulder. High traffic speed and volume, school, and many kids = need for dedicated space from Kathleen to Burton</i>	Elm	Burton	<i>Medium term</i>
Kathleen	Bike lane <i>MTP: signed bike route – may meet need if done with edgelines, but bike lane preferable.</i>	Frood	Notre Dame	<i>Medium term</i>
Lansing	Bike lane <i>Signed route with edgeline has been done</i>	Lasalle	Maley	<i>Done</i>
Madison – Old Falconbridge	Bike lane <i>MTP: signed bike route</i>	West end of Madison	Falconbridge	<i>Medium and long term</i>
Gary	Bike lane <i>MTP: signed bike route</i>	Lasalle	Caribou	<i>Medium and long term</i>
Hawthorne	Bike lane	Beatrice	Claudia	<i>Not included</i>
Auger	Bike lane <i>MTP: signed bike route</i>	Lasalle	Falconbridge	<i>Medium term N.B. Auger 1<sup>st</sup> on list for traffic calming</i>

**\*Routes in bold are minimum grid routes, and are highest priority. Some high impact neighbourhood routes are ‘low hanging fruit.’**

**Table 54: Cycling route connectors recommended for implementation in the Short Term (generally 0 to 5 years)**

*Implementation could be retrofit, or as part of a planned road construction.*

<b>Road name</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>To</b>	<b>Short term in MTP</b>
Ramsey Lake Road	Separated, dedicated cycling route. Crossride	Paris cycle track	Ramsey Lake Road multi use trail	<i>Medium term</i>
Morris	Bike lane <i>MTP: signed bike route</i>	Nelson Street pedestrian bridge	Howie bike lane	<i>? Marked as done</i>
Moonlight	Bike lane <i>MTP: signed bike route – may meet need if done with edgelines, but bike lane preferable.</i>	Bancroft	Moonlight Beach	<i>Long term</i>
South Bay Road	Bike lane	Bioski	Ramsey Lake Road multi use trail	<i>Existing signed bike route</i>
Kelly Lake	Bike lane <i>MTP: edgelines</i>	Junction Creek Waterway Park trail	Copper Cliff trail	<i>Medium term N.B. road work planned for this section in 1-2 years</i>
Westmount	Bike lane <i>MTP: edgelines</i>	Barry Downe	Rotary Trail. Atlee.	<i>Medium term N.B. plans to incorporate with BarryDowne work this year</i>
Walford	Bike lane	Regent	Paris	<i>Short term</i>



**Table 53: Cycling routes recommended for implementation in the Medium Term (generally 6 to 10 years)**

*Implementation could be retrofit, or as part of a planned road construction.*

<b>Road name</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>To</b>	<b>Medium term in MTP</b>
<b>Kingsway</b> <i>Except for Barry Downe-Falconbridge</i>	Separated, dedicated cycling route. <i>TSR: Cycle track.</i>	Elm	Falconbridge	<i>Long term</i>
<b>Regent</b> <i>Partial (Ida-York)</i>	Separated, dedicated cycling route. <i>MTP: Signed bike route on paved shoulder (Ida-Loach); Cycle track (Loach – Paris); Signed bike route (Paris – Walford); Multi-use trail (Walford-York); Nothing (York -Lorne)</i>	Ida	Lorne	<i>Medium, long term, or non-existent</i>
<b>Falconbridge</b> <i>Partial (Kingsway-Lasalle; Maley-Church)</i>	Separated, dedicated cycling route. <i>MTP: Multi-use trail (Kingsway-Lasalle); Nothing (Lasalle-Maley); Signed bike route on paved shoulder (Maley – Carr); Cycle track (Carr-Church)</i>	Kingsway	Church	<i>Long term, or non-existent</i>
<b>MR35</b>	Separated, dedicated cycling route. <i>TSR: Signed bike route on paved shoulder</i>	Elm	Chelmsford	<i>Existing, short term, medium term</i>
<b>Kelly Lk-Southview</b>	Bike lane <i>MTP: edgeline</i>	Lorne	Regent	<i>Medium term</i>
<b>Brady</b>	Separated, dedicated cycling route.	Paris	Douglas	<i>Not in TSR</i>

And any remaining routes currently marked as Medium Term in the MTP.

**Cycling routes recommended for implementation in the Long Term (11 to 15 or more years)**

All remaining routes mapped out in Figures 67-76.