

APPENDIX I

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

**SUMMARY OF COMMENTS
ON THE
RECOMMENDED PLAN**

GENERAL COMMENTS

- congratulates the city for the preparation of the KTMP
- language of draft more clearly recognizes that: the auto will continue to have importance in travel, increase in transit has been projected, need for additional capacity across the Cataraqui River has been included, and the importance of a prosperous downtown has been recognized
- in terms of the selection of strategic direction, there should be a statement as to whether it is consistent with TAC principles

Response: Clarification on the correlation of the strategic direction with the TAC principles.

CYCLING AND PATHWAYS

- S. 5 integration with Cycling and Pathways is evident and commended
- little reference to Transportation Association of Canada principles
- present modal shares are set out, and projections provided for vehicles and transit, also should set out modal shares for pedestrians and cycling
- trip tables for transit, cycling and pedestrians should be included in the KTMP
- 1% cycling travel shows Kingston has the 3rd highest per capita cycling to work – modal share is conservative because survey was done in winter months
- comments on the cycling and walking aspects of the KTMP; city has enormous potential for such paths;
- strong support for a trail along the waterfront for cycling, walking and rollerblading – other municipalities have developed these with success
- support for K & P acquisition, but concerns that the trail can be developed with much less than what the Cycling & Pathways Study recommended – K & P can be useable with very little investment for such items as bridge decking, culvert replacements, signage, fencing, etc.
- also support for new trailheads, one at the Little Cataraqui Conservation Area and the other at Orser Road; others possible in the downtown area
- City can increase bicycle usage, with development of single two-way path, which is made visible by use of a different construction material, and which allows neither cars nor pedestrians
- need to have better sidewalks on streets where transit service is provided, so people don't have to walk on the roads
- Define shoulder cycle lanes – be precise with wording- reference made to cycle paths (should be paved shoulders, multi-use paths or bike lanes)
- Estimates of trips across screenlines by other modes do not exist – city has this information? (pedestrians and cyclists)
- KTMP recommends standards for bicycle parking – these exist already, why would this issue be re-examined, and what groups would be involved?
- P. 33, Goal 4, refers to affordable cycling requirements – what is affordable? – why that? Response – check wording of C&P Study – which uses this wording
- P. 33, Goal 5 – should include a reference to cycling groups
Response – reference to users was intended to include the cycling groups

Summary of KTMP Public Consultation – Fall 2003

- P. 33, Goal 6 - Bicycle racks on buses – needs updating
- P. 33, bottom, No. 2 should refer to loop detectors

TRANSIT CONCERNS

- S. 7 – Public Transit – supports shuttle bus system will improve downtown traffic and parking
- S. 8 Recommendation 17 proposes city consider needs of pedestrians and cyclists when road reconstruction takes place
- need improved transit service to the downtown
- where there is low ridership (for example, through Kingston East) a van/bus could be used from Downtown over LaSalle Causeway through CFB Kingston up to STARTEK and return via Highway 15. A loop that could start and end in the downtown core would be more efficient
- should add a bus route from Ontario Street to Queen’s Campus, because Route 3 goes from Ontario St. to KGH, and in the winter, it is difficult to walk through to the Campus
- Kingston Bus System – fares are low, service can be improved, and other cities should be examined
- new buses are far from ideal, with uncomfortable seats, and noisy interiors

- transit usage is projected to increase by 400% by 2026; Entra has shown only 1% of the pm peak hour work trips were by transit; even increasing transit work by 400% would only mean 500 transit work trips during the pm peak hour, which would not eliminate any forecasted road widening/additional lanes
- TMP indicated that an 11 transit usage would eliminate some road widening s – the consultant should specific which arterials would not have to be widened/additional lanes
- Entra should provide their analysis for proposing about 400% increase in usage
- S. 7, should include reference to other transit improvements, such as 3 hour transfers, night stops, and request stops

- support for park’n’ride lots to serve the university and the downtown, for example, Fort Henry’s parking lot remains empty outside of the tourist season; allow drivers to park vehicles in that area for free; this will encourage individuals to walk, cycle or catch a free bus into the downtown core; this would reduce traffic over the swing bridge and reduce pollution from vehicles

- Kingston Accessible Service improvements should be recommended to increase the service with the aging community, allow para-transpo customers to ride regular buses; using low floor buses for wheelchairs
- supports comprehensive transit review take place

Response – Operational Review is recommended, and this initiative is currently underway. Results will come before Council in early fall (check w/ Malcolm on timing)

SCREENLINE COMMENTS

- S. 3 – opposed to the high growth scenarios of UGS; conclusions based on these high growth scenarios must be re-examined
- concern that the small sample size provided too little information; response is that the sample size is similar for most of the 15 municipalities which have done the Transportation Tomorrow Survey, (TTS) which was carried out for Kingston
- information lacking under transportation service criteria; evaluation of criteria for Natural Environment, Social Environment and Economic Environment was provided in the 1990 Third Crossing Study
- using the OD survey Dillon should show the number of current auto trips crossing the Cataraqi River not only at the LaSalle Causeway but also on Highway 401, as well as forecasted 2026 automobile trips at LaSalle Causeway and 401 without the Elliott/Gore Road Bridge
- Dillon should show the forecasted 2026 automobile trips at LaSalle Causeway and 401 and the proposed new Elliott Avenue Gore Road Bridge
- the forecasted 2026 automobile crossing (1600 vph pm) take into consideration the additional lane in each direction on Highway 401 to be built should be documented in the screenline analysis; the screenline map shows the screenline going from the south side of the Causeway to the north side of Highway 401 and yet the screenline table only shows 1640 vph automobile trips at the Causeway
- other screenline analysis should show the arterials included in the screenline analysis and the current and forecasted 2026 volumes
- KTMP should include a copy of the 2001 and 2026 trip tables for each of the other modes
- 16% of the households have no vehicle – report should show where these households are located; trip tables would probably show most households are in central Kingston; in this case, even increasing transit usage by 400% will probably not save any additional traffic lanes
- Table 3 in Modelling Appendix should contain the name of each arterial, its observe volumes and model volumes for 2001 pm peak hour by auto for each screenline
- Table 8 projected p.m peak hour travel demands by screenline in the Plan should also show the 2026 vehicular demand/capacity /solution to deficiency for each arterial within the screenline rather than a summary
- the KTMP should include a priority project list for at least the first ten year forecasted growth
- the requested information should be available, either in the report or appendices

Response:

MAJOR ROADWAY PROJECTS

- arguments presented for and against the Third Crossing
- in favour of the Third Crossing is that it is needed – build it as soon as possible
- opposing arguments include the following;
- only when there was an accident on Highway 401, when traffic was re-routed through the City's core, has there been a delay of more than 10 minutes to cross the Causeway
- Costs and Benefits – at \$33M – at a population of 114,000 = \$290 per person

Summary of KTMP Public Consultation – Fall 2003

- benefits of new bridge are unclear, and thinks it will serve a small group
- having the bridge as toll bridge, would discourage use of the bridge
- Alternatives – DND is a major contributor, and they could stagger work hours and encourage more work at home to reduce traffic on the Causeway; better bus service, or small licensed jitneys, and taxi service and improved pedestrian/cycling facilities along Highway 15 would encourage more people to leave their cars at home; add a third lane on the Causeway, (so two lanes could be inbound in the a.m., and two outbound in the p.m.)
- Environmental Concerns – 50% of city trips can be made by bicycle; bridges and roads cause environmental damage along the river, and encourages more auto trips, and causes more urban sprawl: one cannot support the bridge, and be a friend of the environment
- Property taxes and lost opportunities – estimates cost of bridge at about \$2,000 per residential property, basing his estimate on \$60M bridge; majority of residents will not use the bridge; opportunity costs of that money should be examined
- Kingston’s future revenue growth – while Kingston has had eight prosperous years, it may not continue in the same fashion
- concerns about the **Wellington Street Extension** which, if it is like King Street, will cut off access to the water; it is one of the last waterfront areas, and should be planned carefully
- S. 10 Intercity Transport examined, but recommends the consultant examine the area of intra-urban commuter transportation to neighbouring towns
- Intercity Transportation – park and ride facilities don’t encourage people to use the bus; perhaps they could be free to start with and then add charges later
- Goods Movement Network needs to be explained further, and this needs to be coordinated with the Downtown Action Plan

Response:

LOCAL NEIGHBOURHOOD TRAFFIC CONCERNS

- questions about timing on the Wellington Street project; also is there a plan to extend Dufferin St. past Rideau through to Wellington as part of the Wellington St.
- concerns about traffic calming in local neighbourhoods; the KTMP makes general recommendations about what should be done at a detailed level; it supports traffic calming measures as a means of traffic management and at the policy level, supports in the plan the application of a planning process to resolve traffic management issues
- traffic calming is not addressed in enough detail in the KTMP; cars speed through McBurney Park neighbourhood, and traffic calming should be installed to make the streets and neighbourhoods safe
- concerns about timing of lights on Highway 15, which is a problem when one tries to get to Barrett Court from 401 down Highway 15.

Response: City is coordinating all street lights with the use of Synchro.

PARKING

- work of Parking Advisory Committee should be reflected in the final document
- S. 9.1 – Parking Strategy provisions need to be coordinated with work of the Parking Advisory Committee
- S. 9.2 – Parking Goals and Objectives – should support growth of tourism industry and economic development
- bike parking should be part of the Parking Services Department

MINOR EDITORIAL COMMENTS

- offers a collection of editorial comments, many of which provided clarity in the text and tables of the draft plan, which were forwarded to the consultant for consideration;
- suggests an added table for mode of transport by trip type
- term transit should be expanded to say bus transit – the only kind in the City
- useful to know the average auto occupancy – show auto mode as auto-driver and auto passenger
- Table 4, p. 5 – heading trip purpose should read travel mode
- Table 5, p. 7 an error in the bicycle mode row for trip over 20 km in length
- Figure 6, p. 8 – showing Amherst Island places too much attention on it, where trips are negligible
- the results of the January survey showed little bicycle use in January, and a seasonal adjustment could have been added to account for off-season survey

FINANCIAL COMMENTS

- S. 11 should include recommendations on how to pay for the needed roads
- should cycling or pedestrian facilities have a guaranteed portion of the budget to prioritize these needs

IMPLEMENTATION

- KEAF expressed strong support for initiative
- S. 4 – KEAF doesn't support the position of a coordinator for implementation because it is viewed as another layer of bureaucracy
- objectives in the Plan are excellent and difficult to fault, but question how city staff will inform themselves regarding the detailed technical measures needed to implement the study
- should recommend formation of a cycling committee and a pedestrian committee
- in the Netherlands, stringent laws govern behaviour towards cyclist – in a car-bicycle collision, the motorist is presumed to be at fault
- need to include an initiative for “Public Education and Awareness” because of poor driving habitats in Kingston; offers a range of suggestions on public education

Response – complaint often is that planning studies are completed and not implemented, and new direction needs support of a dedicated person to implement both the KTMP, and the Cycling and Pathways; KTMP also recommends hiring a coordinator for this project because implementation of the direction crosses a number of city departments

June 14/04