

November 7, 2011 – SMAP Meeting

Tom Davies Square Rm C-12

19h – 21h

Present: Stephen Reitzel, Ben Reitzel, Counsellor David Kilgour, Mark Simeoni, Sgt. Eric Sanderson, Samantha Baulch, Debbie McIntosh, Peter Clark, Nicole Good, Cortney St-Jean, Chris Gore, Barb McDougall, Daniel Barrette

Regrets: Carol Craig, Donald Dennie, Jessica Perry, John-Wesley McGraw

Note-Taking

Panel agreed to rotate the role of secretary. Ben Reitzel will take notes tonight. Dan Barrette will take notes at the January meeting. Samantha will make a rotating list.

MMM Group Update/Roads Update: David Shelsted (Sudbury Roads Department)

Discussed an evening drop in session that can be attended with the road's department/MMM Group. Potential meeting dates include November 16 or November 22. David provided a large photo description of various cycling infrastructure that could be viewed by members present. Currently, a roads study is taking place to purchase a collision database/analysis software for the purpose of reducing potential dangers. A GIS survey of all sidewalks is occurring with a golf cart and this is something that will build the data currently available by the city. This is required for the completion of the official plan. A copy of the draft survey is available online; a hard copy was given during the meeting. It's titled "City of Greater Sudbury – Transportation Study Questionnaire". Including pedestrian infrastructure in this type of study is not required of for this particularly type of study but it has been included. SMAP was asked to review the draft Transportation Study Questionnaire and provide feedback.

Edge lines will be created from Lasalle to Westmount after Auger Ave. There will also be bulb-outs on Atlee. Some of the SMAP members questioned how that would work with cyclists.

Daniel Barrette asked if there was an opportunity to create paint sharrows on Walford to coincide with upcoming painting of sharrows on Regent. David Shelstad said that Walford is not wide enough for sharrows at the curb side.

Review of SMAP: Priority Setting Summary Report (Sept 8)

The SMAP was subdivided into subcommittees;

- Deb McIntosh – Policy Subcommittee lead
- Nicole Good – Infrastructure Subcommittee lead

- Benjamin Reitzel – Educational Subcommittee lead

If interested in joining a sub-committee, please contact the sub-committee lead listed above.

Sub-committee Presentations

Education committee meeting: the committee outlined some of their likes and dislikes with other cities and how they've presented information for cycling, transit and walking. The power point was presented and questions were asked regarding who manages the website and how it could potentially be altered so that the information could be synthesized in one location. Ron from "IT" was one of the listed names with regards to information regarding the formation of a potential webpage (one of the priorities of the education subcommittee).

Infrastructure committee meeting: the goals are connectivity of the various walkways and trails so that there is a seamless connection from one to the other. For example, the current Ramsey Lake Rd trail ends with no apparent connectivity. In addition, there were suggestions that reviews of some crossings in the city should be conducted to determine whether or not the wait times for the lights to change is a reasonable amount of time. David Shelstad suggested that some could be timed and the information be forwarded to him. However, the traffic signals are designed to maintain traffic flow. However, he indicated that areas that include the hospital or retirement facilities do have infrastructure in place and they are designed to provide sufficient time for safe crossings of slower pedestrians

Parking infrastructure was mentioned through the infrastructure subcommittee as a priority however there is question as to whether or not the onus is on the city or on the private party to maintain this infrastructure. Would it be possible to have a public reporting system for lack of infrastructure at some particular location? This will be reviewed at the next infrastructure sub-committee meeting.

Another side question was raised during the infrastructure meeting pertaining to the budget:

Budget: 5 – 10 % of the 32 million dollar city budget is currently spend on pedestrians and cyclists. Currently, the city's funding for roads doesn't meet a theoretical rehabilitation cycle. Our return cycle for gravel roads is every 80 years. Local roads are every 70 years. By increasing the cost associated with bike lanes, now you're looking at many more years in addition to the original cost. The whole point of the transportation report is what priority we need to put on these and how we prioritize this so that we can effectively prioritize these routes accordingly. While some approaches can be as simple as line painting and signage, there would be potentially a series of numbers and bike routes could be indicated. Alternative routes, such as Hawthorne versus Lassalle, would be an approach. Then it becomes a situation when parking is prohibited to allow for cyclists if dedicated bike lanes are constructed.

In addition to considering the budget as the sole source of funding, there is a planning process that also allows the city to acquire certain pieces of land that might facilitate development of a bike lane or infrastructure at a later date by requesting property from proposed developments.

Policy committee meeting: they're focusing on the transportation study and the Official Plan (OP), so they're looking at reading and doing research on other official plans and transportation studies to fulfill other policies. They're focusing on the "highs" because of the OP is currently being developed and considered. One of the things of the official plan is to look at an official street policy; they site Oakville and Kitchener/Waterloo as an example for this situation. The priority indexing system should also be established so that we can determine where certain moneys should be allocated so that the funds can be maximized.

The including of a bicycle classification system and the priority of what's going to be identified is infrastructure, and a spreadsheet has already been included with all of David Shelstad's comments and includes information from all the SMP recommendations. The policy needs to be incorporated into the OP. Other areas include a strengthening of the OP language with regards to bike parking, mixed use neighbourhoods, the stemming of "drive through neighbourhoods".

David Shelstad: There is lots of movement towards getting away from painting crossings without stop signs because you're actually increasing the risk that pedestrians feel that they have the right of way when in fact that's not the case. While you can't change desire lines, regardless what's been done at certain areas, you will not be able to curb traffic from one street to another. A Pedestrian Crossing Policy is currently in the works and a draft will be provided to the SMAP group when ready. Should be ready January 9, 2012.

Next Steps

We all know the official plan is coming up, should we look for language in other official plans to see whether or not it mimics what we're looking for? There are other advisory panels that could be looked at for the purpose of networking with people. These advisory panels include: Accessibility Advisory Panel, Children and Youth Roundtable Advisory Panel, Seniors Advisory Panel, Healthy Community Cabinet Advisory Panel. In addition, Community Action Networks (CAN groups) also would be an ideal networking opportunity because they are also concerned about common concerns. Samantha will be attending the CAN Summit on November 29. She will be representing SMAP.

Review of SMP and BAP Bike Routes

The Transportation Study is comparing and reviewing the two bike route panels. SMAP members will comment on the combined bike route map when completed by the consultants.

Bus Feedback

Comments:

- There are no instructions on how to deal with the four-digit number on each bus stop. The four-digit number is only for smart phones. We need a call in number for those users without smart phones.
- There was no signage saying when the bus comes.
- There was also no lighting at a bus stop. At night this could be a safety hazard
- Some were unable to bring their bikes on the bus because there was no bike rack however the driver did permit the bike to come on the bus because of heavy traffic.
- The walk home from a bus stop was unsafe for one member. There are no sidewalks and little lighting on the walk home. Cars travelling too quickly down the road to make it a safe journey.
- At one bus stop there was little space between the bus stop and the road. Traffic was often travelling too quickly to make the person feel safe.
- One of the panel members waiting 20 minutes for their bus and then had to drive in to make it to the meeting.
- The trans-cab option was not feasible for one member because she would not have been able to leave and arrive at a reasonable time. This was due to the fact that the transcab service stops at the nearest bus stop versus an area where various bus route converge (about 1 km down the road) which would have shaved significant time off the length of her trip.
- Some of the bus routes are tight. If you get stuck at a light you will miss your connecting bus at the main bus terminal and then have to wait a significant amount of time for the next bus.
- Many of the stops are not plowed in the winter. This is a safety hazard for seniors, disabled and young children. Need to coordinate snow plowing with clearing of bus stops. One panel members wondered if local businesses could help clear the bus stop nearest to their business
- Finding correct bus route confusing
- There is no signage on the bus indicating priority seating for elderly, disabled, pregnant women etc.

Education point side point:

There should be an area that provides the **location for bus tickets** –perhaps on a wayfinding map?

Mark Simeoni: A large percentage of the City of Greater Sudbury citizens live within 400m of a bus route. Currently the transit system is actually quite good; it only requires some small changes to improve efficiency. In many cases this involves cutting of some stops, rerouting other areas that avoid certain routes so that they are able to maximize efficiency. Right now there is sufficient raw data that is bring

brought forward however it is still be analyzed. We're quite close, the changes aren't that drastic but the potential benefits are great!

Mysudbury site: Communication with the Public

Includes the sustainable mobility advisory panel however it has all the information of the bicycle advisory panel. Jody Cameron from MySudbury would provide training to one of us to maintain that website so that it could be updated. Samantha Baulch agreed to spearhead the updating of this webpage for the committee. Some items that were mentioned for the purpose of staying within the city's bylaws:

- "This is what we're working on"
- "This is what we're working towards"
- The mysudbury site should also include information about upcoming meetings
- Be cognisant that some items on the webpage may not be certain because they may still require approval from council, therefore should be presented as such.

Need to update mandate and objectives, include notes and agendas on the site.

Homework

Panel will review the Transportation Study Questionnaire and provide feedback to David Shelstad by Wednesday, November 16

Future Meetings

For the future; all subcommittees please send a general email out to all committee members regarding meetings should they wish to attend.

Panel agreed to meet on Mondays from 19h – 21h and meet on Thursdays from 17h30 – 19h30

Next meeting,

- **January 12, 2012 @ 17h30 – 19h30**
- **Location:** Tom Davis Square – Room TBD

Respectfully submitted by Ben Reitzel