

From: rmniemela@hotmail.com

Sent: December 7, 2016 11:47 AM

To: 'LyAnne Chenier'

Cc: 'David Shelsted'; 'brian.bigger@greatersudbury.ca'; 'mayor@greatersudbury.ca'; 'mark.signoretti@greatersudbury.ca'; 'michael.vagnini@greatersudbury.ca'; 'gerry.montpellier@greatersudbury.ca'; 'evelyn.dutrisac@greatersudbury.ca'; 'robert.kirwan@greatersudbury.ca'; 'rene.lapierre@greatersudbury.ca'; 'mike.jakubo@greatersudbury.ca'; 'al.sizer@greatersudbury.ca'; 'deb.mcintosh@greatersudbury.ca'; 'fern.cormier@greatersudbury.ca'; 'lynne.reynolds@greatersudbury.ca'; 'joscelyne.landry-altmann@greatersudbury.ca'

Subject: SCU Comments on the City of Greater Sudbury's Master Transportation Plan

Good morning LyAnne. As discussed at the last SMAP meeting, I'm submitting the SCU response to the Master Transportation Plan directly to you, since the online form format does not lend itself to submitting formatted documents. We appreciate your offer to ensure that the submission gets to the appropriate people and that our comments are included in the official record.

Dear Mr. Shelsted and Members of Council:

Thank you for supporting a vision of Sudbury that includes safe cycling and for the opportunity to submit comments to the Transportation Master Plan (TMP). There are many good things recommended in the TMP, including policies that will help direct our future decisions, and cycling routes that were added after several community consultations.

The Sudbury Cyclists Union (SCU) speaks out on behalf of cyclists of ages and abilities. Some of us chose to use our bikes to get to destinations in all areas of the city. Others don't own a car, and using their bike is their major form of transportation. We all want to see the City create a safe cycling grid in a timely manner.

This goal will not be accomplished with the current cycling recommendations in the TMP:

The TMP identifies a network of cycling routes that has gaps and that is therefore incomplete. The result is that many people will not consider cycling as an alternative to taking their car to where they want to go. If we want to encourage more people to bike, and if we truly believe that we should implement Complete Streets in our city, then we need to address those gaps.

The TMP's cycling network implementation plan is primarily focused on building cycling infrastructure on major roads when a road reconstruction is planned. This results in fragmented routes, and means that a complete network is far into the future. The TMP contains very long timeframes for main travel routes like Paris and Lasalle. This does not reflect Council's vision, as expressed in the direction that is currently taking place with implementing cycling infrastructure on Paris and Notre Dame, and evaluating infrastructure on Lasalle. We need to change the way we prioritize our cycling infrastructure implementation, based on the principles of connectivity, continuity, safety, and accessibility.

The TMP needs to prioritize building a grid of primary routes in a much shorter timeframe than 11-15+ years. This means putting the highest priority on building separated cycling infrastructure like cycle tracks or off-road paths along all of our main arterial corridors. Our second highest priority should be to build appropriate separated or dedicated infrastructure like bike lanes, cycle tracks or edge lines on the roads that connect our arterial corridors to our local neighbourhoods. This will result in building a cycling network that serves existing and potential cyclists of all ages and abilities.

Our most important recommendations

Identify our main arterial corridors as our highest priority, and our neighbourhood connectors as our second priority. We need a prioritized plan that will address our most dangerous roads, that will impact the most people, and that will provide contiguous routes to desired destinations. Prioritizing these roads fits in well with the direction that is being taken by funding opportunities like the Cap and Trade program (potentially \$150-225M within the next 5 years).

Expedite the adoption of the policies that will set the framework for developing this network. These policies need to be developed within the next 5 years, along with some additional policies that we are recommending to help prioritize the required projects, all while ensuring the safety of all road users. There are no recommended timeframes currently identified in the TMP for these policies.

We're attaching an MTP Comments letter with expanded information and an MTP Comments Summary chart that summarizes our comments.

Sincerely,

Rachelle Niemela
Chair, Sudbury Cyclists Union



Sudbury Cyclists Union

Connecting Greater Sudbury Cyclists

December 7, 2016

To: David Shelsted and members of Council

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on what will be presented to Council on December 13th, 2016.

Please accept this letter and the attached summary chart as our official comments to the revised Draft Transportation Master Plan (TMP) which is currently posted on the City's website.

The Sudbury Cyclists Union (SCU) welcomes the changes that were made to some of the proposed cycling routes, and looks forward to seeing the development of the proposed policies.

There were a number of recommendations that we made in previous submissions that are not reflected in the current revised plan. Some of these recommendations are for some reason not included in the community response appendix. We appreciate the opportunity for additional input. We believe that our recommendations will make our roads safer for cyclists of all ages and abilities, and will put the City in a better position to apply for future provincial or federal cycling infrastructure funding.

Our most important recommendation is that we need to create a safe cycling grid in Sudbury in a timely manner. We need an implementation plan that prioritizes primary cycling routes that will be completed in the short-term timeframes. We are currently planning on implementing our cycling network only when road reconstruction is done. Our implementation plan needs to prioritize building a continuous, connected, safe and accessible network that will be in place in a much shorter timeframe than 11-15+ years.

OUR PRIMARY CONCERNS

1. We need to make roads in Greater Sudbury safe for all cyclists.

SCU members are both recreational and utilitarian (eg commuter) cyclists. We want to see safe options on all city roads and streets, for ourselves and for our friends and families. All of our roads and streets have destinations that we want to get to: schools, businesses, places of work, parks, homes of friends and families.

We believe that our roads and streets should be safe for everyone. **We should not be planning a transportation network that does not include safe options for all users. We need to proactively plan to address dangerous roads, and not plan to do this only when major road work is planned. We need to re-evaluate our timeframes to more proactively address the roads that critically need safe cycling infrastructure. And we need to follow the principles of Complete Streets and install dedicated and separated infrastructure on our high traffic and high speed roads, as recommended by the Ontario Traffic Manual Book 18: Cycling Facilities.**

2. We need to provide a continuous, connected, safe and accessible cycling network

Our arteries provide a “minimum grid” of primary routes that allow the flow of traffic throughout the City and that allow people to get where they need to be in a direct and timely manner.

Our city core arteries have destinations that people want to reach. We have an obligation to ensure that everyone can safely get to their destinations of choice by using the transportation options they want to, and in many cases, need to use.

Arteries that connect our outlying neighbourhoods also need to be safe, and retrofits along these roads are critical to ensuring that multi-modal transportation in the City of Greater Sudbury is an option for everyone.

Our top priority should be to make our primary routes safe for everyone. Residential streets will not significantly benefit from “signed routes”. If the speed and traffic volume are low enough, these roads are safe for cyclists. Signs are good for wayfinding, but do not provide any additional safety to roads. Spending money on putting up signs does not give us the best value for very limited cycling infrastructure dollars.

Putting the priority on retrofitting our arterial and collector roads will provide huge gains towards getting more people to safely bike to their destinations. This means putting the highest priority on building separated cycling infrastructure along all of our main arterial corridors.

The SCU recently attended a provincial cycling workshop in North Bay, one of a number of workshops held throughout the province. The direction from the province was made very clear. Their priorities in implementing a provincial cycling network are: **continuity, connectivity, safety and accessibility**. These are the priorities that we should use for our local cycling network. Adopting these priorities will bring us in line with the province’s CycleON strategy, and will strengthen any submissions we make for provincial funding.

We therefore respectfully ask that the following changes be made to the TMP before it is approved by Council.

INFRASTRUCTURE

1. The TMP should prioritize constructing a cycling transportation network built on the **minimum grid of arterial and collector roads** that provide movement through the city as well as access to all of their destination points. This is how we build roads for motorized traffic; we should do the same for all users of these roads. These roads need appropriate cycling infrastructure that will protect cyclists from heavy traffic and high speeds; this means constructing **separated cycling infrastructure** on these roads.
2. Put a priority on the roads that would provide the best gain for providing equitable and safe access to destinations for all residents in the city core. The roads below are SCU priorities for retrofits and the long-term timeframes identified from the TMP must be changed. To be identified as a priority, cycling infrastructure on these roads should be designated short term phasing (0-5 years).
 - a. Paris/Notre Dame (11-15+ years)
 - b. Lasalle (11-15+ years)
 - c. Barrydowne (0-5 years)
 - d. The Kingsway (11-15+ years)

- e. Lorne (some sections 0-5 years, some sections 6-10 years, some sections do not identify proposed cycling infrastructure)
 - f. Elm (0-5 years)
3. The roads that would provide the best gain for providing equitable and safe access to outlying communities are below. All of them are identified in the TMP as middle or long-term initiatives:
 - a. MR 35 to Azilda (whole route not in place for 6-10 years)
 - b. MR 80 to the Valley (whole route not in place for 6-10 years)
 - c. Falconbridge Rd to Garson and Falconbridge (whole route not in place for 11-15+ years)
 - d. MR 55 to Lively (whole route not in place for 11-15+ years)
 - e. Long Lake south (whole route not in place for 11-15+ years)
 - f. Bancroft/Allan to Coniston (route showing complete, however not all of Bancroft or Allan contains cycling infrastructure)
 4. The Official Plan should contain a list of prioritized cycling infrastructure projects like it does for road reconstruction projects.
 5. Clarify what is the proposed cycling network. Do not include recreational cycling/hiking trails in the cycling network. If off-road infrastructure is being proposed for our cycling network, standards need to be developed to provide safe options, including but not limited to path surface materials, lighting, and accessibility during all seasons.

POLICIES/PLANS:

1. All proposed policies and plans should be expedited and developed in the 0-5 year timeframe.
2. The TMP should recommend developing additional policies/plans that are currently in force or being developed in other Canadian cities:
 - a. **Complete Streets Guidelines** to direct the implementation of the Complete Streets Policy.
 - b. A **multi-modal level of service policy** which would evaluate the levels of service on roads as they relate to walking, cycling, taking transit, driving cars and driving trucks. These levels of service will give us a clearer picture of the deficiencies we need to address for all road users.
 - c. A **Cycling Priority Index** based on the new service levels to help prioritize short and long-term investments required to address deficiencies.
 - d. A **Vision Zero policy** to provide direction on how to address the injuries and deaths that occur on our roads.
3. The TMP should clarify the following:
 - a. In the Road Classifications and Design Standards, add **additional Book 18 considerations** like traffic type and topography when evaluating the cycling infrastructure that should be installed on streets and roads. These would be in addition to the current metrics of annual average daily traffic (AADT) and speeds. Identify that these standards apply to all future road work development as well as existing roads, and that an evaluation/plan for retrofitting deficiencies will be done.
 - b. In the Road Classifications and Design Standards, provide guidelines for what defines **alternate route options** and when they are an acceptable option.
4. The TMP should reconsider:
 - a. The **current minimum car travel lane width of 3.5m**. MMM Group has developed a provincial guiding document that recommends a minimum of 3.2m.
 - b. Only being able to install cycling infrastructure by widening roads. More creative options like **road diets** should be part of our toolkit to give parity to all of our road users.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

We acknowledge the additional consultation that the City has done for the MTP. However, we need to continue to work on expanding our community engagement processes for major directions like the TMP. We need to make it easier for the general public to understand what is being proposed, and to have access to information that is clear.

The SCU recommends:

1. In future community engagement that requires the use of maps:
 - a. Develop online maps that allow looking at information in various ways; provide layers to look at specific categories of information.
 - b. Ensure that we can use zooming properly so information is not so fuzzy as to be meaningless.
 - c. Use tables to list major planned work. Listing the minimum grid for example, with suggested infrastructure and timelines, are what interests the majority of cyclists who want safer roads.
2. Use strategies to go out to the public. The 2017 budget process, where the City went to CAN meetings, is an example of good consultation which provides the public with several opportunities to ask questions and get answers.
3. Ensure that online submissions on the website make it easy for people to submit both summary and more complex feedback. Only offering a box in a form will not accommodate submissions like the one that we have prepared.

MOVING FORWARD

The SCU welcomes the concept of a multi-modal transportation plan as referenced in the new Corporate and Strategic plan. We would very much like to see one plan that addresses all modes of transportation, and that is presented in a format that is easily understood by residents.

We also would like to see transportation studies incorporate the impact of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and increased transit and AT modal shares. We suggest that plans for widening roads, especially in the city core, need to be re-evaluated if we properly use these strategies to decrease the number of single-passenger car trips in our city.

And finally, thank you for approving the position of Active Transportation Coordinator. The SCU looks forward to working with our new coordinator.

Sincerely,

A rectangular box with a thin black border, used to redact the signature of Rachelle Niemela.

Rachelle Niemela
Chair, Sudbury Cyclists Union



DRAFT TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

Comments from the Sudbury Cyclists Union

December 7, 2016

Our Guiding Principles

Direct, connected, continuous, safe, and accessible cycling options are needed on all roads, inclusive for people of all ages and abilities.

Our priority is to build an active transportation network of priority routes (a minimum grid) that will ensure that people can safely reach all of their commuting destinations.

Active Transportation (AT) options need to be identified as part of our transportation infrastructure deficit. A proactive planned approach is needed to address this deficit, and we need to move away from addressing it only when we do major road reconstruction projects.

INFRASTRUCTURE

POSITIVE DIRECTIONS

More proposed cycling routes on major roadways have been added and some recommended infrastructure was changed based on community input.

RECOMMENDED CHANGES

- Include safe and appropriate Active Transportation options (including cycling) on all major core roads and community connectors. They should be the highest priority timeframes: 0-5 years. A transportation network requires a minimum grid of primary routes (arteries) that is the backbone to get to all destinations. It should include options for not only motorized traffic, but also other modes of transportation.
- List a table of prioritized AT projects in the Official Plan along with the other roads projects already identified.

Other Considerations

- List minimum grid AT projects in the 5-year capital budget outlook.
- Ontario has identified continuity, connectivity, safety and accessibility as its major goals for cycling infrastructure development. We need to do the same.
- Prioritizing a minimum grid of primary routes supports the four provincial goals, and provides clear priorities when we need to take advantage of external funding opportunities.
- While they are important community assets, recreational cycling/hiking trails should not be identified as part of our cycling transportation network. Standards need to be developed for the multi-use paths that will be part of our cycling transportation network.

MTP POLICIES/PLANS

POSITIVE DIRECTIONS

The MTP recommends the following:

Complete Streets Policy
Transportation Demand Management Plan
Transit Master Plan
New Road Classifications/Design Standards

RECOMMENDED CHANGES

- Assign a priority of 0-5 years for the policies/plans detailed above.
- Recommend additional policies/plans:
 - Complete Streets Guidelines
 - Multi-modal LOS (levels of service)
 - Cycling Priority Index based on Cycling LOS
 - Vision Zero policy
- Clarify the new road classifications/design standards:
 - Include additional Book 18 considerations like traffic type and topography
 - Provide definitions for what defines good/acceptable alternative route options
- The 3.5m minimum car travel lane width restricts the ability to use available road widths for AT options. Consider narrower lanes widths.
- Consider road diets or other creative solutions to ensure the inclusion of AT options on all roads.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

POSITIVE DIRECTIONS

The City has provided more community consultation opportunities during the development of the MTP and community groups are identified as having a role in establishing priorities.

RECOMMENDED CHANGES

- Recommend developing a community engagement plan that includes community outreach opportunities from the conceptual stage to final plans, and that clarifies the processes to consult with community groups.

Other considerations

- The SCU welcomes the opportunity to work with the city in establishing priorities and plans.
- Develop better online maps for consultation purposes with layers and views that allow the public to easily understand what is being proposed. Consider route tables that would allow people to search for routes that interest them.
- Consider different outreach opportunities in order to include more public input. Add other engagement techniques to the existing Public Information Centers and online submission forms. Include on-going consultation with key stakeholders, including CAN's, SMAP, and grassroots groups.

FUTURE STEPS AND NEXT MTP

RECOMMENDED CHANGES

- Develop an integrated Multi-Modal Transportation Plan, with multi-modal Levels of Service and modeling that uses AT and transit data and projections.
- Include safe streets principles.
- Include a larger focus on pedestrian needs.
- Develop a full implementation plan with deliverables, timelines and associated budget requirements.
- Provide a yearly review and report on completion status.