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1.0 INTRODUCTION

The City of Hamilton (the City) is undertaking a review of the previous Cycling Master Plan (“Shifting Gears”) and conducting a comprehensive City-wide study of the Cycling Network in order to implement and expand upon the recommendations made in the Growth Related Infrastructure Development Strategy (GRIDS) and the City-wide Transportation Master Plan (2007). The study will investigate how to better connect cycling systems together in a city-scale network, improve connections to transit nodes and encourage cycling use within the City of Hamilton.

This study is following the approved environmental planning process for Master Plans under the Municipal Engineers Association’s Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (June 2000, as amended in 2007) with the opportunity for public input throughout the study. The Master Plan is intended to fulfill the Class EA requirements for Schedule B Projects that are identified and to outline additional work that will be required for any Schedule C Projects that are identified. Upon completion of the study a Master Plan report will be completed and filed for public review.

This report documents the results of the first round of Public Information Centres for the Hamilton Cycling Master Plan Update study and other community comment received in the information gathering exercise.

2.0 PURPOSE

Public Information Centres (PICs) are informal meetings where area residents and other interested parties are provided the opportunity to review planning and project information. PICs are a key part of consultation programs and are designed to involve stakeholders early and throughout the EA process to identify concerns and provide opportunities for input.

The main purpose of the first round of PICs was to provide the opportunity for the public, interest groups, agencies and stakeholders to review existing conditions and provide preliminary input. The first round of PICs was an optional consultation requirement under the Municipal Engineers Association’s Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (June 2000, as amended in 2007).

3.0 LOCATION, DATE, TIME

The first round of PICs was held as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuesday November 11 2008</th>
<th>Tuesday November 18 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Board of Education</td>
<td>Stoney Creek Municipal Service Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Main Street West Hamilton, ON</td>
<td>777 Jones Road Stoney Creek, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 to 8:00 p.m.</td>
<td>6:00 to 8:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday November 25 2008</strong></td>
<td><strong>Thursday November 27 2008</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancaster Rotary Centre</td>
<td>Sackville Hill Seniors Recreation Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385 Jerseyville Road West Ancaster, ON</td>
<td>780 Upper Wentworth Street Hamilton, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 to 8:00 p.m.</td>
<td>6:00 to 8:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, a Stakeholder meeting was held on November 20, 2008 in Room 400A of the City Centre from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

### 4.0 NOTIFICATION

A notice regarding the study commencement and PIC #1 was published in local newspapers as follows:

- The Hamilton Spectator    October 31, 2008    November 7, 2008
- Ancaster News    October 31, 2008    November 7, 2008
- Dundas Star News    October 31, 2008    November 7, 2008
- Mountain News    October 31, 2008    November 7, 2008
- Stoney Creek News    October 31, 2008    November 7, 2008
- Glanbrook Gazette    October 31, 2008    November 7, 2008
- Flamborough Review    October 31, 2008    November 7, 2008
- View Magazine    November 6, 2008

The City of Hamilton also posted the notice on the project website ([www.hamilton.ca/shiftinggears](http://www.hamilton.ca/shiftinggears)) and on the EcoNet information website. A copy of the Ontario Government Notice newspaper advertisement is included in Appendix I.

A project initiation letter, notice of study commencement and PIC #1, Stakeholder Advisory Committee invitation and Stakeholder meeting notification was distributed via mail and email on October 30, 2008 to those on the stakeholder contact list. Copies of the letters are included in Appendix II.

### 5.0 STAFF ATTENDANCE

The following key City and Consultant staff were in attendance at the PICs:

- Margaret Fazio, City of Hamilton, Environmental Planning
- Danielle Gilby, City of Hamilton, Environmental Planning
- Daryl Bender, City of Hamilton, Traffic Engineering
- Hart Solomon, City of Hamilton, Traffic Engineering *(Downtown Hamilton and Ancaster venues only)*
- Rich Shebib, City of Hamilton, Traffic Engineering *(Stoney Creek and West Hamilton venues only)*
- Sandy Nairn, Ecoplans Limited, Consultant Environmental Planner
- Catherine Christiani, Ecoplans Limited, Junior Environmental Planner

The following City staff were in attendance at the Stakeholder meeting:

- Margaret Fazio, City of Hamilton, Environmental Planning
- Danielle Gilby, City of Hamilton, Environmental Planning
- Daryl Bender, City of Hamilton, Traffic Engineering
- Rich Shebib, City of Hamilton, Traffic Engineering

McCormick Rankin Corporation
Ecoplans Limited

December 2008
6.0 MATERIAL DISPLAYED

The following panels were displayed at the PICs, Stakeholder meeting and on the project website:

1. Welcome (text)
2. Environmental Assessment Process (text)
3. Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Planning and Design Process (flow chart)
4. Study Timeline and Methodology (text)
5. Shifting Gears Implementation to Date (text)
6. Shifting Gears Proposed Projects (map)
7. Existing Cycling Facilities - City-wide (map)
8. Existing Cycling Facilities - Urban (map)
9. Opportunity Statement and Study Goals (text and photo)
10. Existing and Planned Cycling Facilities (map)
11. Cycling Facility Designs (text and graphics)
12. Collision Data (text, map, and pie chart)
13. Bike Parking (text and photos)
14. Ultimate Network Options (text)
15. Criteria for the Review of Alternatives (text and photo)
16. Cycling Promotion (text and photo)
17. Thank You/Next Steps (text)

A reduced sized copy of the display panels is provided in Appendix III.

7.0 FORMAT

Individuals attending the PICs and Stakeholder meeting were asked to sign the register. They were informed of the availability of comment sheets, which they were encouraged to complete. Staff was available to answer questions and provide information regarding the study. Large scale city maps displaying the City’s existing and planned urban and rural cycling facilities were also available for participants to sketch their priority routes. If individuals wished to take comment sheets home, they were requested to provide their responses to the appropriate contacts outlined on the comment sheet by December 2, 2008.

A reduced sized copy of the comment sheet is provided in Appendix IV.

Figures 1 and 2 – Attendees at the Ancaster PIC
8.0 SUMMARY OF ATTENDANCE AND COMMENTS RECEIVED

8.1 Public Information Centres

Approximately 75 people attended the first round of PICs. Table 1 provides a breakdown of attendance and comments received by PIC date/venue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/ Location</th>
<th>Total Attendance</th>
<th>Written Comments Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 11 2008</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 18 2008</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 25 2008</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancaster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 28 2008</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the PICs, public input was encouraged throughout the study and facilitated through the project website, the project team email address (cycling@hamilton.ca) and the project team contact information listed in each newspaper notification. A breakdown of the submissions received from the study’s commencement to the deadline for comments on PIC #1 materials (mid January 2009) is provided in Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Comments</th>
<th># Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All comments were reviewed and information was provided where requested. All legible names and addresses from the comment sheets were added to the study email and/or mailing list (as indicated) and will be advised of any future consultation events.

8.2 Stakeholder Meeting

The Stakeholder meeting was attended by 11 people representing a variety of organizations and interests, including:

- Hamilton Cycling Committee
- Ontario Bicycling Route
- Scattalon Cycling Club
- Central Cycle Bike Shop
- Ancaster Cycle
- Great Canadian Bicycle Tours
25 written comments were received in total; 9 at the meeting by stakeholders, 1 at the meeting by a member of the public and 15 by the comment deadline. All comment sheets were reviewed and information was provided where requested.

9.0 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

Comments were received at the PICs and Stakeholder meeting through discussion, comment sheets and map sketching. The comments received have been summarized and are presented in Section 9.1. The summarized comments also include those comments received by the comment deadline.

The complete text of all of the public comments received can be found in Appendix V, the complete text of all of the stakeholder and agency comments received can be found in Appendix VI and the PIC and Stakeholder Maps can be found in Appendix VII.

9.1 Public Information Centres and Stakeholder Meeting

The comment sheets provided at the PICs and Stakeholder meeting asked specific questions pertaining to the information presented on the display panels. The answers to Questions 1, 2, 4, 6 and 9 have been tallied and the results follow. The results reflect the amount of responses received for each question.

Question 1: What type of cyclist would you consider yourself?

![Bar Chart]

Public Information Centres: 33 Commuters, 47 Recreational, 28 Utilitarian

Stakeholder Meeting: 27 Commuters, 14 Recreational, 9 Utilitarian

Total Number of Responses = 108

Total Number of Responses = 50
Question 2: Where do you ride?

**Public Information Centres**

- Downtown Area: 24%
- Recreational Trails: 22%
- Harbourfront Trail: 16%
- Rural Roads: 6%
- Dundas: 8%
- Ancaster: 6%
- Stoney Creek: 4%
- Mountain Area: 14%

Total number of responses = 136

**Stakeholder Meeting**

- Downtown Area: 25%
- Recreational Trails: 21%
- Harbourfront Trail: 21%
- Rural Roads: 3%
- Dundas: 12%
- Ancaster: 3%
- Stoney Creek: 9%
- Mountain Area: 6%

Total number of responses = 34
Question 4: Which of these cycling facilities do you feel safest using?

Public Information Centres

- Multi-Use Paths: 28%
- Reserved Bike Lane: 42%
- Signed Bike Route: 11%
- Paved Shoulders: 19%

Total number of responses = 99

Stakeholder Meeting

- Multi-Use Paths: 39%
- Reserved Bike Lane: 39%
- Signed Bike Route: 9%
- Paved Shoulders: 13%

Total number of responses = 23

Question 6: Which of these strategies do you prefer?

Public Information Centres

- Option A: Bike lanes/facilities on all major streets: 26
- Option B: Bike lanes/facilities on a select network of streets: 25

Total number of responses = 51

Stakeholder Meeting

- Option A: Bike lanes/facilities on all major streets: 13
- Option B: Bike lanes/facilities on a select network of streets: 6

Total number of responses = 19
Question 9: Do you agree with the criteria listed?

Public Information Centres

- Yes: 78%
- No: 4%
- Other: 17%

Total number of responses = 43

Stakeholder Meeting

- Yes: 62%
- No: 38%
- Other: 0%

Total number of responses = 13

The remaining questions, map sketching results and any other comments have been summarized and the key issues have been listed in Tables 3 and 4. It should be noted that the following is a broad generalization of specific suggestions. They have been listed in no particular order.
### TABLE 3. SUMMARY OF PUBLIC AND INTEREST GROUP COMMENTS; QUESTIONS 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11 AND OTHER COMMENTS

#### QUESTION 3: What areas of the network are a priority to implement for you? And why?

- Route between downtown Hamilton and McMaster/Westdale neighbourhood
- Connections (trails and/or bridges) over/under 403, QEW, Red Hill Valley Parkway and LINC
- Connections into Burlington
- Jolley Cut
- System through the city centre
- More north-south connections through city
- More east-west connections, particularly in the lower city
- Rail trail in CNR east-west right of way
- Trail along old pipeline right-of-way
- Innovation Park trail
- Connection between Gage Park and the waterfront
- Increased amount of off-road trails
- Increased amount of escarpment crossings, ex. Free bus rides for cyclists going up the escarpment between designated stops, incline railways, etc.

#### QUESTION 5: Why did you choose the previous cycling facilities as the safest?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi Use Paths:</th>
<th>Reserved Bike Lanes:</th>
<th>Paved Shoulders:</th>
<th>Signed Route:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoid conflicts with cars</td>
<td>Provide a defined division between cycling and road traffic</td>
<td>Safely away from high speed traffic</td>
<td>Works well if signs are visible and both cyclists and motorists obey rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those that are paved are preferred</td>
<td>Separation makes you feel safer</td>
<td>Wide shoulders are preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The only thing motorists respect</td>
<td>Provide room to manoeuvre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide room to manoeuvre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Those with barriers are preferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- King St.
- Barton St.
- Wilson St.
- York St.
- Herkimer St.
- Brock Rd.
- Highway 8
- Main St.
- Dundurn St.
- Gage Ave.
- Chatham St.
- Garner Rd.
- Highway 6
- Mohawk St.
- Bay St.
- Carlisle Rd.
- Queenston St.
- Waterdown Rd.
- Golf Links Rd.
- Upper Wellington St.
- Upper Ottawa St.
- Charlton Ave.
- Gray Rd.
- Nash Rd.
- Nebo Rd.
### TABLE 3. SUMMARY OF PUBLIC AND INTEREST GROUP COMMENTS; QUESTIONS 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11 AND OTHER COMMENTS

#### QUESTION 7: Why did you choose the previous strategy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option A - bike lanes/facilities on all major streets:</th>
<th>Option B - bike lanes/facilities on a select network of streets:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Encourages more people to cycle</td>
<td>- Prefer quality over quantity approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provides more options and access, particularly for commuter cyclists</td>
<td>- Routes would need to be thoughtfully determined with logical connections to transit modes and different sections of the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Equalizes cars and cyclists</td>
<td>- This option seems more feasible and cost-friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- This option is ideal however seems unlikely and costly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### QUESTION 8: Are there other strategies?

- Use a strategy that combines A and B, where bike lanes/facilities are made available on all major streets in the city center and a select network is provided in the periphery
- Require bike lanes on all new streets, then retrofit existing streets
- Add bike lanes during any road reconstruction/upgrading
- Expansion of the off-road trail system
- Create pedestrian/cyclist only streets
- Create pedestrian/cyclist/bus only lanes

#### QUESTION 10: Are there other factors to consider?

- Research the cycling networks in other cities, particularly those that are physically similar, such as Montreal, Victoria and Quebec City
- The number of users who will utilize the route if implemented
- Directness of route
- Safe for young children
- Population density
- Likelihood to encourage a modal shift from car to bike
- Ease of implementation
- Continuous route?
- Ease of maintenance

#### QUESTION 11: Please note any other promotional and/or educational ideas that you feel the City should invest more effort in.

- Driver and cyclist education
- Increased signage, particularly signs that remind cars to “Share the Road”
- Increased bike parking, particularly in commercial areas, at recreation centers, hospitals, clinics and parks
- Encourage more bike garages, lockers and showers for commuters at existing and new workplaces/institutions
- Close major streets to car traffic on Sundays and holidays. Allow pedestrian and cyclist traffic only
- More cyclist education in schools
- Cycling network maps more readily available, ex. In bus shelters and placed downtown for reference
- Bikes for rent along the waterfront
- Sponsor advertisements that promote safe cycling and sharing the road
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3. SUMMARY OF PUBLIC AND INTEREST GROUP COMMENTS; QUESTIONS 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11 AND OTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Hold annual cycling races, such as “Tour du Hamilton”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hold more cycling events geared towards families and casual riders, such as “Bike to Work Day”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increased enforcement of cycling rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Give away free bike lights, helmets or merchandise that encourages cycling, particularly in low income areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Create a reporting mechanism for cyclists to detail accidents, close calls and road issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Offer cyclist courses that teach safe cycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Create incentives for cycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase the amount of questions on cyclist rights and rules on drivers license tests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Ensure bike lanes/facilities are maintained and kept free of debris all year round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Consider changing downtown streets to two-way streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review the projects work in conjunction with the work completed by the S.C.U.B.E taskforce to ensure that they are aligned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- All infrastructure should be cyclist friendly, i.e. grates, lighting, paving with finer grade gravel, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Action is needed now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Traffic signals should detect cyclists. This would minimize wait times at traffic lights and decrease the amount of red light running by cyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- All trails should be designed to avoid barriers, such as stairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Should encourage the creation of cycling facilities, particularly for those who can’t afford a car or don’t drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase the amount of buses with bike racks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4. Summary of Stakeholder Comments; Questions 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11 and Other Comments

**Question 3:** What areas of the network are a priority to implement for you? And why?

- Routes around Mohawk College and McMaster University
- Connections over the LINC
- Central and lower city routes
- Cross boundary trails into/out of Hamilton to promote cycle tourism
- Routes to hospitals
- Rural road routes
- Trail parallel to the downtown CN Rail line
- Connection to the beach strip
- Increased amount of escarpment and mountain crossings, ex. Free bus rides for cyclists going up the escarpment between designated stops, incline railways, etc.
- GO Service locations, such as Hamilton GO Centre, McMaster University bus terminal, Stoney Creek Park and Ride lot, former Liuna Station
- Continuous north-south route through the downtown
- Connections to/around Hamilton International Airport
- Increased cross-boundary crossings to municipalities outside of Hamilton
- Increased cycling infrastructure in Stoney Creek
- East-west corridor through the downtown that links with the Red Hill Valley
- The following streets: King St., Main St., James St., Dundurn St., Binbrook Rd., Arvin Ave., Scenic Dr.
- Gage Ave., Woodward Ave., John St., Lawrence Rd., Mohawk St., Arvin Ave., Upper Paradise Dr.
- Barton St., Cannon St., Hunter St., Bay St., Cannon St., Hunter St., Bay St., Cannon St., Hunter St., Bay St.
- Fennell Ave., Jolley Cut, Dundurn St.

**Question 5:** Why did you choose the previous cycling facilities as the safest?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi Use Paths:</th>
<th>Reserved Bike Lanes:</th>
<th>Paved Shoulders:</th>
<th>Signed Route:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Little/no interaction with cars</td>
<td>- Physically separated from cars</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Easy to ride on</td>
<td>- Allow room to swerve around holes, grates, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Are able to travel quickly, with a low risk of collision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Make cars more aware of cyclists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Are better on arterial and collector roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE 4. SUMMARY OF STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS; QUESTIONS 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11 AND OTHER COMMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Those with barriers are preferred, ex. Medians, raised surface paint, bollards, curbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION 7: Why did you choose the previous strategy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A – bike lanes/facilities on all major streets:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provides the most travel options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provides equal opportunities for cyclists and cars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provides the most direct routes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Encourages cycling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Would offer a complete and connected cycling network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B – bike lanes/facilities on a select network of streets:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More economical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Omits those areas that aren’t practical for bike lanes/facilities, ex. Narrow streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provides facilities to only those roads that need them, ie. With higher traffic volumes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION 8: Are there other strategies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Two-way dedicated bike only lanes on main commuter routes, such as those used in Holland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Combination of Options A and B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Paved shoulders along all rural routes, which can be installed during road reconstruction/upgrading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Option B, along with a review of all major streets as they come up for reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bike facilities placed on all new streets and on older streets as they undergo construction/repaving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bike facilities through parks and the escarpment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Incorporate paved shoulders into all rural road construction/reconstruction projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Trails throughout the city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Speed reduction strategies implemented for vehicles, ex. Speed bumps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Utilize the approach used in the Niagara Cycling Map, which identifies bicycle friendly routes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION 10: Are there other factors to consider?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Connectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Directness of route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Common destinations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The number of people who would use the proposed paths/routes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Promotion of cycling tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Connections with public transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION 11: Please note any other promotional and/or educational ideas that you feel the City should invest more effort in.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Promote cycling courses, particularly in elementary schools ex. CAN-BIKE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Share the Road” campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Driver, cyclist and pedestrian education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Signage, ex. “Watch for cyclists merging”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Advertising (TV, radio, print, billboards, bus ads) that promote safe cycling and a ride to work day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4. SUMMARY OF STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS; QUESTIONS 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11 AND OTHER COMMENTS

- Promote cycling events
- Increased education on cycling in schools, particularly programs for Grade 4 and 5 students
- Increased bike parking facilities in every area of the City, such as racks, lockers and/or cages. Look into compound design.
- Give away free bike lights, helmets or merchandise that encourages cycling, particularly in low income areas
- Create a bike share program for low income families, particularly children
- Tax credits to those who commute to work via cycling
- Indoor all-weather cycling facility, such as a velodrome
- Cyclovia event every week with city support
- Increased driver awareness/visibility of pedestrians and cyclists at expressway crossings

### OTHER COMMENTS

- Review cycling policies
- All infrastructure should be cyclist friendly, i.e. grates, lighting, etc.
- Ensure bike lanes/facilities are maintained and kept free of debris all year round
- Repaint and sweep bike lanes more frequently
- Measures should be taken to limit the interaction of bikes and other vehicles on major roads in the City
- Low income areas have a low amount of cycling infrastructure, although they have the most cyclists
- Look at the Montreal cycling network as an example
- Hold meeting for students, staff and faculty at McMaster to discuss the project
- Contact the Regional Niagara Cycling Committee for input
9.2 Other Community Comment

Prior to study commencement, the City of Hamilton received and recorded general comments from the public made in regards to cycling and potential cycling system improvements. These comments were collected via email and phone conversations between October 12, 2007 and September 29, 2008, and have been briefly summarized below. The complete list of Other Community Comment Data can be found in Appendix VIII.

- Recreational trails should have E-bike lanes.
- Increased cyclist and driver education.
- Increase the amount of cyclist crossings over the 403 and Red Hill Valley Parkway.
- Place left turn lanes for cyclists on Wilson Ave. at Rousseaux St.
- Design cycling infrastructure with children in mind.
- Increase the amount of bike parking facilities.
- Cycling next to busy traffic can be harmful, particularly due to car exhaust fumes.
- Some trails by the Escarpment are too steep for recreational riders.
- Continuous north-south and east-west routes that access the downtown are needed. The current routes are satisfactory due to the frequency of stop signs and one-way streets.
- Encourage the installation of showers in schools and businesses for cyclists.
- Create better cycling linkages to McMaster.
- Perform a road diet on the following streets in order to install bike lanes:
  - Aberdeen Ave.
  - Bay St. (particularly between Jackson and Cannon St.)
- Place bike lanes on:
  - Garth St.
  - Jolley Cut
  - Bay St.
  - Sherman Ave.
  - Cumberland Ave.
  - York Blvd.
  - Cannon St.
  - Dundurn St.
  - Gage Ave.
  - Main St.
  - King St.
  - Victoria Park
  - Windermere Basin Loop
  - Wilson St.
  - Barton St.
  - Stuart St.
  - Dewitt Access
  - Golf Links Rd.
- Pave the shoulder lanes on Jerseyville Rd.
- Place bike lanes and traffic calming measures on Sanders Blvd.
- Create a pedestrian/cycling connection at the north end of Columbia Dr.
- Create a multi-use trail from the end of Columbia Dr. to Governors Blvd.
- Retrofit the Ferguson Tunnel with lighting, signage and a curb cut. Also perform regular brush clearing.
- Research the cycling infrastructure built in New York City, particularly the bike lanes on Ninth Ave. and on the Broadway Esplanade.
- Research using alleys and other underutilized corridors as bike routes.
- Create better designed cycling routes through industrial areas.
• Pave the Chedoke Radial Trail from Dundurn St. to the Chedoke stairs so that it can be maintained in the winter.
• There are too many stop signs on designated cycling routes. Stop signs should be changed to yield control traffic circles.
• Traffic lights along cycling routes should detect cyclists, particularly at cross arterial roadways.
• Create a cycling route signage strategy that provides useful information, ie. communicates the network's connectedness, destinations and distances, and/or travel time.
• Conduct a review of all 4 lane roadways. Where possible, convert to 3 lanes plus bike lanes.
• All roadway projects should consider the needs of cyclists.
• Perform on-going quality audits to ensure the cycling system is being implemented and maintained as planned.
APPENDIX I:

NOTICE OF STUDY COMMENCEMENT / PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #1
THE STUDY

The City of Hamilton has initiated the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) – Master Planning process for the review of the previous Cycling Master Plan ("Shifting Gears"). A comprehensive City-wide study of the Cycling Network must be undertaken in order to implement and expand upon the recommendations made in the Growth Related Infrastructure Development Strategy (GRIDS) and the City-wide Transportation Master Plan (2007). This study will investigate how to better connect cycling systems together in a regional-scale network, improve connections to transit nodes and encourage increased cycling use within the City of Hamilton.

THE PROCESS

This study is following the approved environmental planning process for Master Plans under the Municipal Engineers Association’s Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (June 2000, as amended in 2007) with the opportunity for public input throughout the study. The Master Plan is intended to fulfill the Class EA requirements for Schedule B Projects that are identified and to outline additional work that will be required for any Schedule C Projects that are identified. Upon completion of the study, a Master Plan report will be completed and filed for public review.

Following the 1st Public Information Centre (PIC) a 2nd PIC will be held to present the findings of the study and the preferred alternatives. Additional advertisements will be published notifying the public of the 2nd PIC and indicating where and how the public can have access to the final report.

PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE

Stakeholder consultation is an important part of the Class EA process. Therefore the following Public Information Centre will be held to present the existing conditions and to gather input from the public.

DATE: Tuesday, November 11, 2008
TIME: 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
LOCATION: Hamilton Board of Education
100 Main St. E, Hamilton
DATE: Tuesday, November 18, 2008  
TIME: 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.  
LOCATION: Stoney Creek Municipal Service Centre  
777 Jones Road, Stoney Creek

DATE: Tuesday, November 25, 2008  
TIME: 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.  
LOCATION: Ancaster Rotary Centre  
385 Jerseyville Road West, Ancaster

DATE: Thursday, November 27, 2008  
TIME: 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.  
LOCATION: Sackville Hill Seniors Recreation Centre  
780 Upper Wentworth Street, Hamilton

PUBLIC COMMENTS INVITED

There is an opportunity at any time during this process for interested persons to review outstanding issues and bring concerns to the attention of the Project Managers. If you have any questions or comments or wish to be added to the study mailing list, please contact:

Daryl Bender  
Project Manager, Alternative Transportation  
Public Works  
City of Hamilton  
77 James Street North  
Ste 320, Hamilton, Ontario, L8R 2K3  
Ph 905-546-2424 ext 2066  
Email cycling@hamilton.ca

J.A. (Sandy) Nairn, MCIP, RPP  
Consultant Project Manager  
Ecoplans Limited  
2655 North Sheridan Way  
Mississauga, Ontario, L5K 2P8  
Ph 905-823-4988  
Fax (905) 823-2669  
Email snairn@ecoplans.com

Information will be collected in accordance with the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record.

This Notice issued on October 31, 2008 and November 7, 2008.
APPENDIX II:

STAKEHOLDER LETTERS
August 12, 2009

RE: Cycling Master Plan Stakeholder Meeting Invitation

The purpose of this letter is to invite you to joint the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) for the City of Hamilton Cycling Master Plan. The purpose of the project is to conduct a comprehensive formal review of the cycling network, to implement and expand upon the recommendations made in the Growth Related Infrastructure Development Strategy (GRIDS) and the City-wide Transportation Master Plan (TMP, 2007). This study will also investigate how to better connect cycling systems together in a regional—scale network, improve connections to transit nodes and encourage increased cycling use within the City of Hamilton.

An important component of the study is the creation of SAC, composed of professional and technical staff representing key government agencies, key businesses involved in or affected by cycling, citizens’ organizations and associations of cyclists and those promoting cycling for a variety of reasons.

We recognize that your time is valuable, and therefore participation will not require a great time commitment. We propose to have the TAC serve as a “sounding board” at key points in the project.

- The first point of contact is the meeting to which you are being invited now, to dialogue with others present and provide comments as we start the project.
- At the second point of contact we will offer an opportunity for you to comment on the evaluation process and the preferred alternative for the network and related issues, prior to going to the second set of Public Information Centres (PICs).
- Third, prior to project’s findings going to council we would offer another point of contact.

The Master Plan approach to examining and eventually defining and building cycling lane network relies on a combination of technical analysis, public and stakeholder input and detailed route-by-route assessments. Ultimately, the definition of a cycling network for Hamilton must be equitable to all users of the road or trails. Your input is vital in developing the ultimate cycling network, and promotion of its use as well as public education.
The Stakeholder meeting will take place as follows:

**DATE:** November 20, 2008  
**TIME:** 9 a.m. to 12 p.m.,  
**PLACE:** 77 James St. N, Room 400 A in an open house format.  
**DIRECTIONS:** The City Centre is the former Eaton Centre at the intersection of York Blvd & James St.

To find the room it is easiest to access the Centre via York Blvd - right where the pedestrian bridge spans York Blvd. At street level take the elevator up to the 4th floor (ground floor is floor 2) and the reception staff there will direct you to Room 400A. If you come across the pedestrian bridge from the parking garage, turn right as you enter the building - and there take the elevators to the 4th floor.

Please respond whether you will be coming or not to Donnett Riley via e-mail at Donnett.Riley@hamilton.ca or via phone at 905-546-2424 ext. 2383 no later than Thursday, November 13, 2008. If you are unable to attend please send someone in your place.

We hope that you will be able to contribute to the creation of the cycling network for City of Hamilton.

If you have any questions or require any additional information please contact me at Margaret.Fazio@hamilton.ca or via phone at 905-546-2424 ext. 5103. For current information on the project I invite you to look at the City website under www.hamilton.ca/cycling and clicking on “Cycling Master Plan”.

I look forward to working with you on this project.

Yours truly,

*Margaret Fazio, B.Sc., C.C.E.P.*

*Project Manager, Environmental Planning  
Capital Planning and Implementation Division  
Public Works Department  
City of Hamilton  
320 - 77 James Street North  
Hamilton, ON, Canada L8R 2K3  
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 5103  
Fax: 905-546-4435  
E-mail: Margaret.Fazio@hamilton.ca*

*Hamilton Public Works ~ Providing services that bring our City to life!*
October 30, 2008

Dear Sir/Madam:

Re: Cycling Master Plan – “Shifting Gears”.

We are pleased to advise that the City of Hamilton and their consultants Ecoplans Limited and McCormick Rankin Corporation are initiating a City-wide Cycling Master Plan, according to the Municipal Engineers Association’s Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Process (2002, as amended in 2007).

The Class EA process requires the proponent, in this case the City of Hamilton, to review older master plans, and to implement cycling infrastructure as directed by the Growth Related Infrastructure Development Strategy (GRIDS) and the City-wide Transportation Master Plan (TMP, 2007). At a minimum, this study will address Phases 1 and 2 of the Municipal Class EA – Master Plan process. For this project, four Public Information Centres will be held in November 2008, please see attached sheet for specific dates and locations, throughout the City, to solicit input from the public on existing plans, conditions and objectives. The second set of Public Information Centres will be held at a later date to present alternatives, an evaluation of the alternatives and the preferred network.

We will be developing conceptual plans in order to address any relevant issues which are encountered during the Class EA. This information will ultimately be presented to the public.

Our purpose in contacting your agency is two fold. First, we wish to advise you of the initiation of this project and second, to ask your co-operation in providing any input you feel is relevant to the project. To that end, we request you provide us with any information and/or identify any issues you and your organization has relating to this study. Please send your comments (if any) directly to the undersigned. These issues will be considered as part of this Master Plan, as per the Municipal Class EA process.

We appreciate your input on this project.

Sincerely,

Margaret Fazio, B.Sc, C.C.E.P.
Project Manager - Environmental Planning
APPENDIX III:

DISPLAY PANELS
Shifting Gears
Hamilton’s Cycling Master Plan

Welcome

Public Information Centre #1
Phase 1 of the Municipal Class EA process
- information gathering

We are asking for your input. Please submit your ideas on the comment sheets provided.

This project is being conducted by the City of Hamilton with the assistance of two consulting firms: Ecoplans Limited and McCormick Rankin Corporation.
Class EA Requirement

This study is following the approved environmental planning process for Master Plans under the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (June 2000, as amended in 2007) (Class EA). The intent of the Master Plan is to investigate how to better connect cycling systems together in a regional-scale network, improve connections to transit nodes and encourage cycling use within the City of Hamilton.

This process will meet Phases 1 and 2 of the Class EA planning process that includes:

- Phase 1 - Identify the problems or opportunities
- Phase 2 - Identify alternative solutions to address the problem and establish the preferred solution taking into account public and review agency input

Under the Class EA there are four project schedules, with each schedule having different requirements to fulfill the environmental planning process. This Master Plan is intended:

- to fulfill the Class EA requirements for any Schedule A, A+ and B Projects that are identified
- to outline additional work that will be required for any Schedule C Projects that are identified

Upon completion of this study, a Master Plan report will be completed and filed for public review.

Following that, individual studies for the identified Schedule C Projects can commence.
EXHIBIT A.2  
MUNICIPAL CLASS EA PLANNING AND DESIGN PROCESS

NOTE: This flow chart is to be read in conjunction with Part A of the Municipal Class EA

PHASE 1  PROBLEM OR OPPORTUNITY  
1. IDENTIFY PROBLEM OR OPPORTUNITY
2. DISCRETIONARY PUBLIC CONSULTATION TO REVIEW PROBLEM OR OPPORTUNITY
3. IDENTIFY ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS TO PROBLEM OR OPPORTUNITY
4. SELECT SCHEDULE (APPENDIX I)
5. INVENTORY NATURAL, SOCIAL, ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT
6. IDENTIFY IMPACT OF ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS ON THE ENVIRONMENT, AND MITIGATING MEASURES
7. EVALUATE ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS: IDENTIFY RECOMMENDED SOLUTIONS
8. CONSULT REVIEW AGENCIES AND PUBLIC re: PROBLEM OR OPPORTUNITY AND ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS
9. SELECT PREFERRED SOLUTION
10. REVIEW AND CONFIRM CHOICE OF SCHEDULE

PHASE 2  ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS  
1. IDENTIFY ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS TO PROBLEM OR OPPORTUNITY
2. INVENTORY NATURAL, SOCIAL, ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT
3. IDENTIFY IMPACT OF ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS ON THE ENVIRONMENT, AND MITIGATING MEASURES
4. EVALUATE ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS: IDENTIFY RECOMMENDED SOLUTIONS
5. CONSULT REVIEW AGENCIES AND PUBLIC re: PROBLEM OR OPPORTUNITY AND ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS
6. SELECT PREFERRED SOLUTION
7. REVIEW AND CONFIRM CHOICE OF SCHEDULE

PHASE 3  ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPTS FOR PREFERRED SOLUTION  
1. IDENTIFY ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPTS FOR PREFERRED SOLUTION
2. DETAIL INVENTORY OF NATURAL, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT
3. IDENTIFY IMPACT OF ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPTS ON ENVIRONMENT, AND MITIGATING MEASURES
4. EVALUATE ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPTS: IDENTIFY RECOMMENDED DESIGN
5. CONSULT REVIEW AGENCIES AND PREVIOUSLY INTERESTED AND DIRECTLY AFFECTED PUBLIC
6. SELECT PREFERRED DESIGN
7. REVIEW ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE & CHOICE OF SCHEDULE
8. PRELIMINARY FINALIZATION OF PREFERRED DESIGN

PHASE 4  ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY REPORT  
1. COMPLETE ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY REPORT (ESR)
2. ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY REPORT (ESR) PLACED ON PUBLIC RECORD
3. NOTICE OF COMPLETION TO REVIEW AGENCIES AND PUBLIC
4. COPY OF NOTICE OF COMPLETION TO MOE-EA BRANCH
5. OPPORTUNITY TO REQUEST MINISTER WITHIN 30 DAYS OF NOTIFICATION TO REQUEST AN ORDER
6. COPY OF NOTICE OF COMPLETION TO review AGENCIES AND PUBLIC
7. INVENTORY NATURAL, SOCIAL, ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT
8. PRELIMINARY FINALIZATION OF PREFERRED DESIGN

PHASE 5  IMPLEMENTATION  
1. COMPLETE CONTRACT DRAWINGS AND TENDER DOCUMENTS
2. PROCEED TO CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION
3. MONITOR FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROVISIONS AND COMMITMENTS

NOTE:  
- INDICATES POSSIBLE EVENTS
- INDICATES MANDATORY EVENTS
- INDICATES PROBABLE EVENTS
- MANDATORY PUBLIC CONTACT POINTS (See Section A.3 Consultation)
- DECISION POINTS ON CHOICE OF SCHEDULE
- OPTIONAL

PART II ORDER (See Section A.2.8)
The City’s current Cycling Master Plan, *Shifting Gears*, was issued in 1999. This document requires updating. The new cycling plan will address:

- Where cycling facilities such as bike lanes are needed
- Other types of cycling infrastructure such as bike parking
- Educational programs
- Cycling promotional initiatives

The **timeline and methodology** of this new cycling master plan is as follows:

- **Identifying opportunities and concerns:**
  - Public Information Centre #1 (Nov. 2008, four locations)
  - Stakeholders meeting (Nov. 2008)
  - Hamilton Cycling Committee meeting (Dec. 2008)

- **Review the recommended plan:**
  - Public Information Centre #2 (early 2009, two locations)
  - Stakeholders and Cycling Committee comments

- **Finalize the study and present to Council (summer 2009)**

- **Filing of the study as a completed Environmental Assessment (summer/fall 2009)**
Implementation of the 1999 “Shifting Gears” Report

The City’s current Cycling Master Plan, Shifting Gears, includes a list of projects to be implemented to 2008. These include:

- Bike lanes on York Blvd – Locke St to the Burlington border **(implemented)**
- Paved shoulders on Centre Rd – Carlisle Rd to Parkside Dr **(almost completed)**
- Bike lanes on King St – Dundurn St to Longwood Rd **(partial implementation)**
- Bike lanes on Aberdeen Av/Longwood Rd – Studholme to Main St **(partial implementation, complete in 2009)**
- Multi-use path (rail trail) Studholme Rd to Ewen Rd over Hwy 403 **(in progress)**
- Bike lanes on Main St – Osler Dr to Wilson St hill **(completed and extended along Wilson St)**
- Multi-use path (rail trail) – Dundurn St to Ancaster, including a bridge over Hwy 403 **(implemented)**
- Bike lanes on Ferguson Av – King St to Young St **(implemented and extended northerly to Simcoe St)**
- Bike route east/west on the mountain between Fennell Av and Mohawk Rd **(implemented)**
- Bike lanes on Stone Church Rd/Paramount Dr – Garth St to Mud St **(almost completed, complete in 2009)**
- Multi-use path (rail trail) from the LINC southerly to the Haldimand border **(implemented)**
- Bike lanes on King St – Lawrence Rd to Queenston Rd **(partial implementation)**

There are also projects that have not been implemented. These include:

- Bike lanes on Hatt St – Ogilvie St to Market St
- Bike lanes on King St scaling the escarpment to Greensville
- Bike facility on Gage Av – Lawrence Rd to Barton St
- Bike lanes on Woodward Av – Melvin Av to Beach Blvd
- Bike facility on Queenston Rd/Hwy 8 – east of King St

Additional facilities have been constructed in the past 10 years that are not in the current Cycling Master Plan such as bike lanes on Sterling St, Upper Paradise Rd and North Service Rd.
Map B - Proposed Bicycle Infrastructure Improvements 1999 - 2008

1. King Street - Longwood to Dundurn
2. Downtown Streets - Downtown Transportation Plan (DTP)
3. King Street East - Lawrence to Queenston (City of Stoney Creek)
4. Main Street West - Ancaster boundary to Hamilton-Brantford trail
5. Centre Road - Flamborough (not shown)
6. Stone Church Road / Paramount Drive - Garth to Mud
7. York Boulevard - Plains to Locke
8. South Mountain Area Streets - South Mountain Transportation Plan (SMTS)
9. Central Escarpment - Vicinity of Jolley Cut
10. Woodward Avenue - Maltby to Beach
11. Queenston Road - King to Jones
12. Former Highway # 8 - Bond to Bullecks Corners
13. Escarpment Rail Trail - Forest to Wentworth & Trail Access - Ottawa St / Lawrence Rd
14. Hamilton/Brantford Rail Trail - Old Ancaster to Glenisle
15. Escarpment Rail Trail / Caledonia Trail - Arbou to Caledonia trail
16. Harbour’s Edge Trail - York just east of High Level Bridge
17. Red Hill Valley Trail - Trail Access
18. Radial Line / Chedoke Trail - Halson to Dundurn
19. Locke Street - Main to King
20. Ferguson Avenue - Forest to King
21. Hatt Street - Market to Main
22. Olympic Drive / Valley Road - Cootes to Watkins
23. Longwood Road - Aberdeen to Main
24. Aberdeen Avenue - Southdown to Longwood
25. Hadden Avenue / Main Street - Intersection
26. Coope Avenue - Lawrence to Burton
27. Highway # 6 - Sydenham to Milgrove
28. Bikeways in Meadowlands Plan - Secondary Plan (Town of Ancaster)
29. Churchill Park - Marion to Glen
30. Victoria Park - Strathcona to Locke
31. Rymer Road - Glenlaker to Upper Paradise
32. Highway # 6 (Flamborough) - Concession Road 4 to Parkside (see Map A)
33. Bendamere Avenue / South Bend Road - Rice to Mountain Brow
34. East 25th Street - Concession to Limeridge Mall
Opportunity Statement

This study will develop a schedule for the implementation of cycling infrastructure as well as state what the ultimate cycling network for the City of Hamilton shall look like. Also, this study will identify strategies for other action areas including cycling education, promotion and end of trip facilities (bike parking, showers, etc.).

Goals of the Study

• A comprehensive network for both commuter and recreational cyclists.
• Convenient access to this network for all residents.
• Separate bike facilities on streets with large traffic volumes and faster speeds.
• Shared facilities on low traffic volume streets (bike lanes not required).
• A consistent design to ensure familiarity for everyone, thus maximizing safety.
• Public education programs for all road users to maximize safety.
• Cycling promotion to increase cycling in Hamilton.
• An all season network.
Where do you ride?
What areas of the Network are a priority to implement for you?
Designing Cycling Facilities

Bikeways
There are four cycling facility designs that the City of Hamilton prefers to utilize:

- Multi-use paths (off-street, rural & urban)

- Reserved Bike Lanes (on-street, urban)

- Signed Bike Routes (on-street, urban), and

- Paved Shoulders (on-road, rural)

Which of these cycling facilities do you feel safest using?

Note that the design standards do not include an option of bike lanes above the curb (beside the sidewalk). This design is to be avoided as it may lead to conflicts at intersections and driveways due to poor visibility.

The City is working to improve the design of sewer grates, with a standard design that is bike friendly and concrete collars that prevent potholes at grates.
Collision Data

Collision data for the City of Hamilton was analyzed for the 10 year period from August’98 to August’08. There are approximately 155 collisions involving cyclists each year, including an average of one fatality annually. Collision data will be incorporated into decisions regarding the location of new cycling facilities and implementation priorities.

The map below shows collision locations for the 10 year period for a large portion of the Hamilton urban area, with the collisions marked as black diamonds.
Bike Parking

The City employs the following strategies to provide bike parking:

• Post & ring racks along sidewalks in commercial areas

• Multi-ring bike racks on sidewalks in high demand locations – as a contracted arrangement which includes street advertizing

• Enclosed bike parking, providing a higher degree of security, primarily for commuters at areas with concentrated employment and at transit hubs, with significant funding provided by Metrolinx. The City also provides for combined cycling/transit trips with bike racks on the entire HSR fleet of 210 busses.

The City would like to recognize employers that provide excellent bike parking facilities for employees, students and visitors.

The City states cycling guidelines in documents such as the Official Plan and provides comment to commercial development applications recommending the provision of bike parking.
Two Options for the Ultimate Cycling Network

There are two possible options for the City to employ in planning the ultimate cycling network.

Option A:
Include cycling infrastructure on all major streets within the urban boundary – arterial streets and many collector streets. Low volume urban streets would not require special facilities such as bike lanes. In rural areas, the general application is proposed to be paved shoulders for many rural roads.

Option B:
Identify primary corridors that require cycling facilities. This strategy would build on the network identified in the Transportation Master Plan and add any critical corridors not already identified.

Either of these strategies would be integrated with the general road construction program for the City. Additional funds would be allocated for high priority streets through the Annual Bicycle Routes Improvement Program.

Which of these strategies do you prefer? Why?

Are there other strategies?
Criteria for the Review of Alternatives

In order to develop a priority list for cycling infrastructure investment, criteria need to be established to compare the various projects being considered and to select preferred routes when various options exist in close proximity.

The proposed criteria include:
• Directness of the route
• Significance as a “missing link” in the network
• Cost
• Safety/collision history
• Perceived safety
• Property limitations
• Proximity to other cycling facilities
• Road reconstruction schedules

Do you agree with this list?
Are there other factors to consider?
Cycling Promotion

Education and Advertising are two key ways to promote a safe and well utilized cycling network. Strategies include:

- The City’s bike route map of existing cycling infrastructure, available “in print” and on the web.
- Programs through schools so children learn how to safely operate a bicycle
- Bike education courses for adults such as CAN-BIKE
- Media coverage of cycling safety
- Special campaigns using billboards, etc.
- General cycling information and accommodation for cyclists at special events i.e. festivals

Please note any other promotional ideas that you feel the City should invest more effort in.
Thank You for attending.

Please fill in a comment sheet and encourage others to provide comments using the website or email.

web: [www.hamilton.ca/ShiftingGears](http://www.hamilton.ca/ShiftingGears)
email: [cycling@hamilton.ca](mailto:cycling@hamilton.ca)

If you have left us contact information you will be notified of the second round of Public Information Centres (2 locations) in early 2009. The dates and times of these sessions will also be published in the media. The information presented in these sessions will also be posted on the above website.
APPENDIX IV:

PIC COMMENT SHEET
We would appreciate your comments with respect to the questions below and/or in regards to any other issues which you feel are relevant to this study.

Please either drop your completed comment sheet in the box provided or mail/fax it by December 2, 2008 to:

J.A. (Sandy) Nairn, MCIP, RPP
Consultant Project Manager
Ecoplans Limited
2655 North Sheridan Way
Mississauga, Ontario
L5K 2P8
Phone: (905) 823-4988
Fax: (905) 823-2669

Daryl Bender
Project Manager, Alternative Transportation
Public Works
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Ste. 320
Hamilton, Ontario
L8R 2K3
Phone: (905) 546-2424 Ext. 2066
Fax: (905) 540-5926

Please check here if a response is not required. □

GENERAL

1. What type of cyclist would you consider yourself? Check all that apply.
   Commuter □     Recreational □     Utilitarian (i.e. For running errands) □

2. Where do you ride?

3. What areas of the network are a priority to implement for you? And why?

ROUTE TYPES

4. Which of these cycling facilities do you feel safest using?
   Multi-Use Paths □     Signed Bike Route (shared with autos) □
   Reserved Bike Lane □     Paved Shoulders □

5. Why?
STRATEGIES: OPTION A & OPTION B

6. Which of these strategies do you prefer?
   Option A - bike lanes/facilities on all major streets ☐
   Option B - bike lanes/facilities on a select network of streets ☐

7. Why?

8. Are there other strategies?

CRITERIA FOR THE REVIEW OF ALTERNATIVES

9. Do you agree with the criteria listed?

10. Are there other factors to consider?

PROMOTION AND EDUCATION

11. Please note any other promotional and/or educational ideas that you feel the City should invest more effort in.

OTHER COMMENTS

Thank you for your participation. Comments and information regarding this study are being collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, and solely for the purpose of conducting the environmental assessment. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record.

If you would like to be put on the project mailing list in order to be informed of future developments during the project's duration, please complete the following:

NAME:

ADDRESS: ___________________________ POSTAL CODE: ____________

EMAIL: ____________________________

PREFERRED METHOD OF CONSULTATION: MAIL ☐ EMAIL ☐
APPENDIX V:

PUBLIC COMMENTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRACKING CODE</th>
<th>What type of cyclist would you consider yourself?</th>
<th>Where do you ride?</th>
<th>What areas of the network are a priority to implement for you?</th>
<th>Which of these cycling facilities do you feel safest using? And why?</th>
<th>Which of these strategies do you prefer? Why?</th>
<th>Are there other strategies?</th>
<th>Do you agree with the criteria listed?</th>
<th>Are there other factors to consider</th>
<th>Please note any other promotional ideas that you feel the city should invest more effort in</th>
<th>Other Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-1</td>
<td>☐ Commuter ☐ Recreational ☐ Utilitarian</td>
<td>Downtown to McMaster everyday. Within downtown, Lakeshore/Harbourfront trail.</td>
<td>A bike-friendly route from the downtown to McMaster/Westdale i.e. bike lanes from 403 (Dundurn) to at least John St.</td>
<td>☐ Multi-Use Path ☐ Reserved Bike Lane ☐ Signed Bike Route ☐ Paved Shoulder</td>
<td>☐ Option A ☐ Option B</td>
<td>Option A is not an option. Quality over quantity.</td>
<td>Large projects on a select few streets is the only way to go.</td>
<td>Fine. I do not think directness of route should be a main priority.</td>
<td>Again I think other cities success shows quality over quantity. The bike lanes in Montreal are a good example.</td>
<td>Education to drivers? Not parking in bike lanes, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-2</td>
<td>☐ Commuter ☐ Recreational ☐ Utilitarian</td>
<td>King St E, Bayfront Trail, York St E, and most areas around downtown and the Westdale/McMaster area.</td>
<td>York St, King St, and Main St.</td>
<td>☐ Multi-Use Path ☐ Reserved Bike Lane ☐ Signed Bike Route ☐ Paved Shoulder</td>
<td>☐ Option A ☐ Option B</td>
<td>Most direct access routes to major amenities in Hamilton such as Downtown core, Westdale, Stoney Creek, the Escarpment and downtown.</td>
<td>Metrolynx based system with bike racks or increasing bus frequency with more bike rack strategies.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>None at the moment.</td>
<td>Brownfield redevelopment better transit connections b/w downtown core and Westdale/McMaster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-3</td>
<td>☐ Commuter ☐ Recreational ☐ Utilitarian</td>
<td>Between Westdale and downtown and on the rail trail and waterfront trail.</td>
<td>Direct routes on major roads that are fast and safe. I will not commute by bicycle on back streets where I have to stop every block or two for a stop sign. If you want me to leave my car at home you have to make cycling fast, safe, and convenient.</td>
<td>☐ Multi-Use Path ☐ Reserved Bike Lane ☐ Signed Bike Route ☐ Paved Shoulder</td>
<td>☐ Option A ☐ Option B</td>
<td>If you go to a town like Holland, Michigan you will see that this approach is very effective in getting people onto bicycles. Option B is ad hoc and will not get people cycling.</td>
<td>Require bike lanes on all new streets then retrofit existing streets.</td>
<td>Directness of the route is key. Collision history should receive little weight because if you provide proper bike lands, collisions will go down.</td>
<td>Connection between places where people live and where they work.</td>
<td>Educate motorists about respecting cyclists but also educate cyclists to obey the law. 98% of cyclists run stop signs, drive the wrong way down one-way streets, etc. They should be ticketed because they give cycling a bad name and create ill will with motorists. I have had three close calls with motor vehicles. Two were city trucks and one was a city police car. That pretty much sums up how cycle-unfriendly this city is. I hope you take this opportunity to fix the problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-4</td>
<td>☐ Commuter ☐ Recreational ☐ Utilitarian</td>
<td>City center, recreational trails.</td>
<td>City center, as these lanes are key element to safe travel in the core.</td>
<td>☐ Multi-Use Path ☐ Reserved Bike Lane ☐ Signed Bike Route ☐ Paved Shoulder</td>
<td>☐ Option A ☐ Option B</td>
<td>I commute and prefer safe access to all major streets.</td>
<td>Combination of A/B. Major streets in city center and select network in periphery.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Volume of traffic?</td>
<td>Signage or advertising to share the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-5</td>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A knee injury has prevented me from cycling. Prior to that I was a 12 month commuter and aspire to get back to that. I'll answer as if I'm still commuting.</td>
<td>For work – primarily in the downtown core but extending occasionally to Dundas and East Hamilton.</td>
<td>I'd like to see designated bike lanes on King and Main. Seasoned Toronto courier friends find these routes scary.</td>
<td>Option A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi-Use Path
Reserved Bike Lane
Signed Bike Route
Paved Shoulder
Less concern for autos.

Option B
Except for King and Main which I think should have designated lanes for the many that would use them if they were created...but I prefer...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-6</th>
<th>Commuter</th>
<th>Recreational</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Queen/Aberdeen area to Churchill Park, up Chedoke trail connecting to Ancaster/Dundas, to Burlington via York Blvd, to Dundurn Plaza area. | Longwood bike lanes (Aberdeen to King) → provide save connection over 403 between downtown and west Hamilton. Rail trail connection over 403 from Fortino's to Aberdeen → provide save connection over 403 between downtown and west Hamilton. Any north/south bike route between the 403 and downtown → there is no good way to travel north/south in this area during busy times of the day. A way of travelling east/west in the lower city → there really is no good way to travel to the east from where I live. Some way over the QEW to access the beach trail. | Multi-Use Path
Reserved Bike Lane
Signed Bike Route
Paved Shoulder
Paths avoid conflicts with cars. Reserved bike lanes at least remind drivers to share the road. Paved shoulders are great for rural roads with high speed traffic.

Option A
Option B
I prefer to see good quality connected networks that connect large areas of the city. I don't realistically see networks on all major streets. | Yes. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-7</th>
<th>Commuter</th>
<th>Recreational</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Streets – main and secondary, mostly below the escarpment. Trails – for recreation. | Trail connections over QEW, LINC, 403. Safe, quick, routes across city. | Multi-Use Path
Reserved Bike Lane
Signed Bike Route
Paved Shoulder
Main streets are such because | Option A
Option B
Main streets are such because |

Remove cars from designated streets. Pedestrian/cyclists only. | Yes. |

A way to safely go up/down escarpment. S type path for cycles.

Bike parking in city lots, garages. | Yes. |
<p>| P-8 | ☑ Commuter ☑ Recreational ☑ Utilitarian | Westdale, West Hamilton, Dundas, RBG, James St N via waterfront | Access to downtown from west end. Currently I rarely bike downtown (from Westdale) because the direct routes are unpleasant and feel dangerous while the safe/pleasant routes are out of the way and zig zag and hit many stop signs. | ☐ Multi-Use Path ☐ Reserved Bike Lane ☐ Signed Bike Route ☐ Paved Shoulder | ☐ Option A ☐ Option B | Largely yes. I would emphasize the perceived safety of the route. Simplicity of route should be considered along with directness. The most direct route might be discouraging convoluted. Enforcement of traffic laws for cyclists. Cyclists will not be regarded as valid users of the roads while most cyclists flagrantly run signs, ride on the sidewalks, etc. | ☐ Multi-Use Path ☐ Reserved Bike Lane ☐ Signed Bike Route ☐ Paved Shoulder | Signed bike routes could offer safer routes such as the addition of physical barriers and some consideration should be given to the physical capability of the route to accommodate bikes and cars, ex. Is the road wide enough? | ☐ Option A ☐ Option B | Specifying routes increased cycle traffic, cultures and awareness for auto users. | Shared use of right away along CNR east-west rail connecting Bayfront to east end. |
| P-9 | ☑ Commuter ☑ Recreational ☑ Utilitarian | Mostly Westdale to central downtown. Westdale to west mountain via radial/Chedoke trail and Westdale to Dundas/Ancaster via Brantford Rail Trail. | Longwood Road South and Aberdeen Ave is a problem area and deceivingly so because of the partial/incomplete bike lane system. Nothing for westbound traffic on Aberdeen and Corktown Park to Eastrly Rail Trail. | ☐ Multi-Use Path ☐ Reserved Bike Lane ☐ Signed Bike Route ☐ Paved Shoulder | ☐ Option A ☐ Option B | Specifying routes increased cycle traffic, cultures and awareness for auto users. | ☐ Multi-Use Path ☐ Reserved Bike Lane ☐ Signed Bike Route ☐ Paved Shoulder | Signed bike routes could offer safer routes such as the addition of physical barriers and some consideration should be given to the physical capability of the route to accommodate bikes and cars, ex. Is the road wide enough? | ☐ Option A ☐ Option B | Need to consider having bike routes paved. Margin of enforcement of traffic laws for cyclists. Cyclists will not be regarded as valid users of the roads while most cyclists flagrantly run signs, ride on the sidewalks, etc. | ☐ Multi-Use Path ☐ Reserved Bike Lane ☐ Signed Bike Route ☐ Paved Shoulder | ☐ Option A ☐ Option B | Enforce the bylaw forbidding cyclists on the sidewalks. |
| P-10 | ☑ Commuter ☑ Recreational ☑ Utilitarian | Commuting: East-west along York/Wilson/Common (this takes some defensive cycling!) Recreational: Escarpment rail trails | East west commuter routes across the lower city. There are no current contiguous routes with adequate bike-changing lanes (Barton/King/Main are dangerous, inadequate). Look at your accident map. Lots of people are having trouble getting across the city. | ☐ Multi-Use Path ☐ Reserved Bike Lane ☐ Signed Bike Route ☐ Paved Shoulder | ☐ Option A ☐ Option B | Mostly. They don't recognize the existing inequality between access to competing modes of transport. Have something to sell first! Ok, advertise that cyclist have every right to be on the road as cars. I've been the victim of so much road rage just being on the road! | ☐ Multi-Use Path ☐ Reserved Bike Lane ☐ Signed Bike Route ☐ Paved Shoulder | Only if the shoulder lane is wide enough to pass cyclists without changing lanes | ☐ Option A ☐ Option B | Need to consider having bike routes paved. Margin of enforcement of traffic laws for cyclists. Cyclists will not be regarded as valid users of the roads while most cyclists flagrantly run signs, ride on the sidewalks, etc. | ☐ Multi-Use Path ☐ Reserved Bike Lane ☐ Signed Bike Route ☐ Paved Shoulder | ☐ Option A ☐ Option B | Enforce the bylaw forbidding cyclists on the sidewalks. |
| P-11 | ☑ Commuter ☑ Recreational ☑ Utilitarian | Everywhere | None specifically. | ☐ Multi-Use Path ☐ Reserved Bike Lane ☐ Signed Bike Route | ☐ Option A ☐ Option B | Need to consider having bike routes paved. Margin of enforcement of traffic laws for cyclists. Cyclists will not be regarded as valid users of the roads while most cyclists flagrantly run signs, ride on the sidewalks, etc. | ☐ Multi-Use Path ☐ Reserved Bike Lane ☐ Signed Bike Route | ☐ Option A ☐ Option B | Largely yes. I would emphasize the perceived safety of the route. Simplicity of route should be considered along with directness. The most direct route might be discouraging convoluted. Enforcement of traffic laws for cyclists. Cyclists will not be regarded as valid users of the roads while most cyclists flagrantly run signs, ride on the sidewalks, etc. | ☐ Multi-Use Path ☐ Reserved Bike Lane ☐ Signed Bike Route | ☐ Option A ☐ Option B | Enforce the bylaw forbidding cyclists on the sidewalks. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-12</th>
<th>Commuter</th>
<th>Recreational</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I do not have a drivers license. I bike everywhere. My daily commute is from Dundum Plaza area to Mac. My other primary destination is downtown (from Dundas).</td>
<td>I'd like to see a better east-west (Mac to downtown) route.</td>
<td>The shortest route. Cyclist have the same rights to get through the city as cars.</td>
<td>Paved Shoulder Only if paved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-13</td>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown, West Hamilton, Waterfront trail, Locke St S (business and Ryerson school), Westdale (to the university)...to Dundas</td>
<td>Bikes are the most efficient form of transportation for distances under 4km and shorter distance bike trips are the most accessible for people of all ages. The population density downtown, SW Hamilton (below escarpment) and Westdale means that there are lots of amenities and recreational opportunities that would be accessible to many people – and the fact that amenities are close to each other and to residents means that a bike errand doesn't mean you have to be in tip top physical shape.</td>
<td>There are many lost opportunities for bicycle enhancements during road reconstruction because the enhancements &quot;aren't in the plan&quot;. Bike lanes/shoulders should be on all major streets so they are &quot;in the plans&quot; and there is no longer an excuse.</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path Reserved Bike Lane Signed Bike Route Paved Shoulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-14</td>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost everywhere in the city. Off-road in Dundas and other areas.</td>
<td>Main Street – the speed of traffic and no bike lanes is frightening. Downtown</td>
<td>Much use are best because I don't have to deal with cars. Reserved bike lanes are helpful but having some physical protection (not just painted pavement) would make me feel more secure.</td>
<td>Reserved bike lanes tend to be located on busy streets and car drivers are not respectful of cyclists and are often distracted. I also like to travel by bike with my children and I feel much less safe with them in on-road environments. An on-road bike lane that is separated from traffic by some means (grade, barriers, boulevard, etc.) would feel much safer to me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | | | | | | - Bike to work day - "Cyclovia" like in Bogota where major street(s) are closed to motorized traffic on Sunday's and holidays. I would like to see this on Bay St N to Bayford Park | Better Bike facilities on Locke St, Bike lanes on Dundurn St (road surface Dundurn so this is useful), Bike lanes on Bay St N, Connect bike lanes east of Locke on York, Create treatment of pavement/barriers/grade separation boulevard to separate cyclists from on street vehicles. Also, better, consistent signage, ex. to provide direction to cyclists or to navigate areas, ex. there is some directional signage in Dundas. Cyclists and especially newcomers to the city shouldn't be expected to have a bicycle map with them all the time. | - Heavier emphasis on bike rights and rules on drivers license tests. | I know many people who would love to ride their bikes to work and recreationally but do not because they feel it is so very
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- Mostly – high density traffic and parking and often limited visibility due to buildings at corners.
- Multi use paths are great but are limited as to where they take you. Obviously Reserved bike lanes often stop suddenly – in which case I prefer to ride without bike lanes so that my riding is consistent and predictable to drivers. Also bike lanes sometimes go too closely to parked cars, making me nervous for “door prizes”.
- Lanes that are on the main streets often disappear making it awkward to integrate back into regular traffic – perhaps lanes on all major streets would provide more continuity?
- Pedestrians understand the safest ways to co-exist and that people understand the laws.
- Overlooked (especially when project are done in stages).
- Unsafe. Lets stop bowing down to the car.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-15</th>
<th>Commuter ☒</th>
<th>Recreational ☒</th>
<th>Utilitarian ☒</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Westdale Wastvels Cycling Group – mostly west Hamilton, Dundas, Ancaster, etc.</td>
<td>2. Around McMaster</td>
<td>3. To/from downtown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Need to make viable connections, also “continuous loops”</td>
<td>2. Connect Westdale to downtown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Use Path ☐</td>
<td>Reserved Bike Lane ☐</td>
<td>Signed Bike Route ☐</td>
<td>Paved Shoulder ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A ☒</td>
<td>Option B ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimately Hamilton should be a top cycling city because it is geographically beautiful. Yes. Plus: attractiveness of the route – keep it in mind. Also, should be direct!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Lights = safety</td>
<td>2. Bike Lanes need to be wide enough, ex. York Blvd they’re too narrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Roundabouts are very good – also mini roundabouts in city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Have a vision to create big cycling loops, ex. Round the bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Contraflow lanes on lesser street, ex. Hunter St. good!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The completed projects are great! They make cycling better!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-16</th>
<th>Commuter ☒</th>
<th>Recreational ☐</th>
<th>Utilitarian ☒</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locke St S to Bayfront, Locke St S to McMaster University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike lanes on main routes, continuous bike routes, currently bike lanes just stop → ie. Main St W over 403 bridge, King St over 403 bridge. Need maintenance of bike lanes in winter, keep them plowed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Use Path ☐</td>
<td>Reserved Bike Lane ☐</td>
<td>Signed Bike Route ☐</td>
<td>Paved Shoulder ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A ☒</td>
<td>Option B ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikers have more choices of routes to travel, currently marked routes feel secondary to car traffic, send bikers out of the way. Yes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- # of people/bikers who would use route if implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ease of maintenance → does it flood over in rain? Easy for snow removal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More posted signs and maps to denote where bike routes are. Education for automobile drivers re: sharing the road with cyclists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like a safe way to cross 403 from Locke St South commuting to Mac re. pedestrian, bike bridge over 403. Currently if bike to Mac from Locke South have to cross 403 on/off ramps; don’t feel safe doing this traveling with kids.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-17</th>
<th>Commuter ☒</th>
<th>Recreational ☒</th>
<th>Utilitarian ☒</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ancaster – rural roads, Ancaster to downtown Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garner Rd Ancaster – residential area has been/is building up and high school (Bishop Tomos) and Walmart – allows travel from Medowlands to Duff Corners (Walmart area)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Use Path ☐</td>
<td>Reserved Bike Lane ☐</td>
<td>Signed Bike Route ☐</td>
<td>Paved Shoulder ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A ☒</td>
<td>Option B ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows for a variety of routes to get from 1 place to another Yes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bike lanes and paved shoulders must be maintained (ie. cleared and pavement kept repaired and smoothed, not patched here and there – too bumpy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I would like to see bike lanes/paved shoulders on Hwy 53-Garner Rd Ancaster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-18</td>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>Excellent visual material: well organized, easy to read. Share the road strategies; information, education, signage, traffic, calming devices and enforcement of Hamilton bylaws and M.V. Act.</td>
<td>Public PIC #1 Comment Sheets Hamilton Cycling Master Plan. Excellent visual material: well organized, easy to read. Share the road strategies; information, education, signage, traffic, calming devices and enforcement of Hamilton bylaws and M.V. Act. Congratulations!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-19</td>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>Bike trails for the most part, I tried cycling in Hamilton when I first moved here a few years ago, but have found the drivers more aggressive and unaccustomed to having cyclists on the road then where I've lived before (Toronto).</td>
<td>Bike trails for the most part, I tried cycling in Hamilton when I first moved here a few years ago, but have found the drivers more aggressive and unaccustomed to having cyclists on the road then where I've lived before (Toronto). Major roads that follow the pre-existing major commuting patterns of the city. Bike lanes on selected streets could connect to transporration nodes. Bike racks!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-20</td>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>The proposal for a walk/bike trail through Innovation park is a fantastic one. Some way for cyclists to cross the 403 without having to navigate the highways of main and King would be really fantastic. More bike posts on Main and King Streets for security. Mostly I have to lock my bike to handrails or a garbage can.</td>
<td>The proposal for a walk/bike trail through Innovation park is a fantastic one. Some way for cyclists to cross the 403 without having to navigate the highways of main and King would be really fantastic. More bike posts on Main and King Streets for security. Mostly I have to lock my bike to handrails or a garbage can.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-21</td>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>At this point, trails only (inc. multi use paths).</td>
<td>At this point, trails only (inc. multi use paths).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-22</td>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-23</td>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-24</td>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Chedoke Trail
- Hamilton to Ancaster
- Bayfront Park (Pier 4)
- Around the Bay on surface streets
- Thru city on surface streets

From Westdale to my places of work, MUMC, Hamilton General, and St. Joseph’s Hospital, my wife’s art studio on James St, the market, and other places of recreation and shopping. The off-road trails (waterfront, rail trail to Brantford, escarpment rail trail) for pleasure.

Better 403 crossings! Specifically, 1. Reserved bike lanes on Longwood and Aberdeen. Also connect Longwood to Chatham through McMaster Innovation Park 2. Separation pillars on King St bridge. Extend bike lane west at least to Longwood 3. Trail from Macklin to Cathedral of Christ the King (under 403 via Key Drage Park) 4. Connect Hamilton-Brantford Rail Trail to Aberdeen over EDR bridge 5. Also bridge from Locke St. N to Waterfront trail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Reserved Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed Bike Route</td>
<td>Paved Shoulder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because autos and bikes are too dissimilar to really comfortably share the same space, I find cycling on a busy street without curbed lanes stressful and I find driving on such a street especially stressful. Separation is better for both.

I think that Hamilton’s spectacular network of off-road trails should be expanded a much as possible.

Yes.

Better bicycle parking facilities.

Turning the downtown streets back to two-way would be wonderful for cyclists, not to mention pedestrians, businesses, residents, visitors, and anyone else who sees the downtown as a place to go to, not one to go through.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commuter</th>
<th>Recreational</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anywhere in southern Ontario – Hamilton to London, Fergus, Port Dover, Lake Erie shorelines, Lake Ontario to Toronto, Niagara Falls, St. Kils</td>
<td>Safe route from Mountain west/central to Bay Front Park, Waterfront trail, Hwy 20 Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Multi-Use Path | Reserved Bike Lane |
| Signed Bike Route | Paved Shoulder |

Cyclists must be given a visible

Make sure all infrastructure is cycle friendly. Top examples: sewer grates, induction

Fine, but what is the priority?

No more education/promotion. The only effective education/promotion is action on infrastructure

We do not need more studies. In the past they have been used as an excuse to avoid real improvements. Follow Metrolinx strategy: quick wins
Motorists are usually unaware of signed routes, multi use paths lead to conflict with pedestrians. place on all streets to use it safely. A select network would not be convenient or visible enough. loop lights, lighting. improvements. followed by a long term action strategy.

### Additional Attachment:

**Bike and Pedestrian Trail Issues**
1. Connect the escarpment rail trail to the Caledonia rail trail at Albion Falls area over top of LINC, via Darntnal Rd bridge re-fit (cheaper then separate overpass)
2. Connect the Beachway waterfront trail to the north end of the Red Hill Valley trails and complete construction of the trail from Barton St N to that connection (bridge required over QEW). See also #5.
3. Possibly re-route trail at escarpment edge near Albion Falls and RHVP to lessen the incline of current route.
4. Possibly re-route trail north of rail line at King St to lessen incline of current route.
5. Complete construction of trails thru valley north of Barton St thru Rennie St Landfill with connection at the end of Brampton St to the bridge over QEW to Beachway waterfront trail system. See also #2.
6. See aerial photo of Beach area (at Beach Rd and QEW). Old unused rail trail between the two water ponds – construction is underway at this site but for what purpose?

### Additional Attachment:

**Bike Meeting Nov 11**
- Disconnected bike paths need to be linked, ex. King St E – Lawerence Rd area
- Escarpment access. All stairs should have the bike “trough” at side Wentworth, James, Dundurn
- More stairway crossings. At Queen St upper Sherman, Gauge, Ottawa St’s
- Connect waterfront trial to east Hamilton neighbourhoods with bike path along Woodward Ave – under QEW at Eastport, Beach Blvd.
- Bike Path along old Rail Bridge over 403 in west Hamilton. To connect Aberdeen area to Westdale and Branford rail trail.
- Stop conversion of 1 way streets to 2 way. 1 way streets easier to negotiate on a bike. Example – left turns, and traffic has more room to pass.
- In general, the newest areas of the city are the worst for cycling. Access to new suburban areas is usually limited to a few intersections on major roads. Cyclists are forces onto busy main road because side streets no longer connect

### Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-28</th>
<th>Commuter</th>
<th>Recreational</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
<th>Downtown to Dundas – where I ride the most</th>
<th>Multi-Use Path</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Management of the lanes (routes), ex. in winter can they be cleared of snow?</th>
<th>Include in education efforts some of the laws regarding cycling (ie. when to take a full lane), rights of cyclists (ie. cycling in construction). Perhaps teach kids different signals where they don’t have to remove their hands from handle bars. Its very dangerous. Also can teach non-cyclists that bike trailers often contain children. They are very vulnerable to being at bumper level.</th>
<th>Would like to see one continuous path from west to east (Dundas to Stoney Creek), lower city</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reserved Bike Lane</td>
<td>Signed Bike Route</td>
<td>Paved Shoulder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-29</td>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
<td>Escarpment crossings and access</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>Option B</td>
<td>Provide safe bike routes and they will promote themselves.</td>
<td>See attached page.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reserved Bike Lane</td>
<td>Signed Bike Route</td>
<td>Paved Shoulder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-30</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>Dofasco 2000 Trail, rail trail, waterfront trail, to work at King St, Hwy 8, Millen Rd. Any new road that is being reconstructed should have bike lanes. <strong>Multi-Use Path</strong> - Reserved Bike Lane - Signed Bike Route - Paved Shoulder. I try to obey safety bike rules, but some people in cars think bikes should be on the sidewalk. “Safest” alerts motorists that bikes could be using roadway. <strong>Option A</strong> - Option B - They are badly needed. Cannot have enough bike lanes. Educate people driving cars and bikes. Yes. Children need to be educated at school. Red Hill Valley trail is not for recreation anymore. Waterfront trail from Stoney Creek to St. Catharines should never be on the Service Rd without bike lanes. Bike lanes should never be crossing from side to side of any street.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-31</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>Rail trails, rural roads (Flamborough). Off road trails, rural roads with wide shoulders. <strong>Multi-Use Path</strong> - Reserved Bike Lane - Signed Bike Route - Paved Shoulder. I do not enjoy the danger and noise and stress associated with cycling close to traffic. <strong>Option A</strong> - Option B - Focus $ and resources to do an excellent job on a smaller number of routes. Focus on off road routes to encourage families to get children interested in cycling at an earlier age. I would add the criteria: “Would you feel that your 8 year old child could cycle that route safely?” Make route maps more readily available. Thanks for showing us what is in the plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-32</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>- Waterfront trail - Along base of the escarpment to rail trails and escarpment stairs, east and west - Around the bay - Mountain routes - Stone Church - Mountain brow, etc. I marked this on the map. <strong>Multi-Use Path</strong> - Reserved Bike Lane - Signed Bike Route - Paved Shoulder. Paved shoulder or bike lane allows room to be away from cars and feel safe. <strong>Option A</strong> - Option B - Not feasible on all streets - Select streets being upgraded should be considered for paved shoulders or bike lanes. <strong>Option A</strong> - Option B - A select network would allow for greater connection between different sections of the city. Yes especially safety especially with paved shoulders and marked bike lanes. Inform students with school programs and provide students with safe storage to encourage students to ride to school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>Waterfront trail mainly between Oakville and Vineland. <strong>Multi-Use Path</strong> - Reserved Bike Lane - Signed Bike Route - Paved Shoulder. Paved shoulders allow room for both cyclists and automobiles. Reserved bike lanes to alert motorists to presence of cyclists. <strong>Option A</strong> - Option B - A select network would allow for greater connection between different sections of the city. Yes especially safety especially with paved shoulders and marked bike lanes. Inform students with school programs and provide students with safe storage to encourage students to ride to school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public PIC #1 Comment Sheets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Cycling Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-35</th>
<th>Commuter</th>
<th>Recreational</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Storm sewer grading Why 32 x 32’ Why not 12 x 36</td>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Multi-Use Path Signed Bike Route Paved Shoulder Safest because it alerts motorists about cyclists.</td>
<td>Option B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-36</th>
<th>Commuter</th>
<th>Recreational</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Commute from Dundas to east Hamilton, recreational in various parts of the city</td>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Main east-west corridors through lower city – King, Main, Cannon, Wilson, and Barton from McMaster to Stoney Creek</td>
<td>Option B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Multi-Use Path Reserved Bike Lane Signed Bike Route Paved Shoulder Dedicated space seems to be the only thing most motorists will respect!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Option A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Option B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Priority should be on arterial roads, not side streets. Start with King, Main, Cannon, Wilson and Barton, with east-west on Mountain and appropriate north-south connections throughout.</td>
<td>Maintain one-way streets rather then convert to two-way. In the absence of bike lanes, one way streets are much safer and more comfortable to ride on.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-37</th>
<th>Commuter</th>
<th>Recreational</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image11.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Dundas area as well as commute from Dundas to downtown Hamilton and east Mountain. Dundas to waterfront (Princess point, beach strip, Burlington side of bay). Rail trails to Copetown from Dundas as well as Wentworth, Chedoke trail.</td>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image12.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Connectivity of existing bike lane to allow safe, quick access across Hamilton and between upper and lower city.</td>
<td>Option B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image13.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Multi-Use Path Reserved Bike Lane Signed Bike Route Paved Shoulder Paved shoulder/signed routes do not provide enough education and expectation on drivers the responsibility to share the road with cyclists. Drivers from my experience can be very aggressive.</td>
<td>High accidents in lower city. Main, King, Cannon, Barton, Wilson need bike lanes to accommodate current demand.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image14.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Option A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image15.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Option B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image16.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Density – where more people will benefit/use should be given higher priority.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-38</th>
<th>Commuter</th>
<th>Recreational</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image17.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Chedoke Trail, San Pedro neighbourhood, Bayfront Trail and Mountview School.</td>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>Where schools are located so children have a route or shorter route to ride on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image18.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Scenic Drive and Sanatorium/Rice.</td>
<td>Option B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image19.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Multi-Use Path Reserved Bike Lane Signed Bike Route * not to many cars Paved Shoulder Because I feel like bicyclists can be safe. And feel like they have their own lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image20.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-39</td>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Chedoke Rail Trail, Scenic Drive, Aberdeen, Longwood, Bayfront trail, Hunter, James, John, Bay, Fennel, etc.</td>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rural roads – Jerseyville, Book, Sydenham Hill, etc.</td>
<td>- Improve the network in the downtown Hamilton</td>
<td>- Longwood-Aberdeen to King; restripe Bay-Cannon to Barton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Reserved Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-40</th>
<th>Commuter</th>
<th>Recreational</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Some local riding to shops, banks, library, etc.</td>
<td>1. Some local riding to shops, banks, library, etc.</td>
<td>2. Ride with a club where rides are planned and start anywhere from Tubaenbg to Brantford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The network should allow cyclists to complete a ride and not have to backtrack. An example is the trail that goes on York Rd from Hwy 102 to Highway 6. The only option is back and forth.</td>
<td>- Cyclists need access to all locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Reserved Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-41</th>
<th>Commuter</th>
<th>Recreational</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- None – concerned citizen and motorist (farmer)</td>
<td>Some roads designation as bike travel routes are very hazardous due to narrow pavement with no shoulder and extremely heavy traffic volume including large trucks.</td>
<td>- Bike use for pleasure should be encouraged on “secondary” roads but unfortunately most are not very wide, have poor pavement, and in some cases have limitations such as hills and curves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Reserved Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-42</th>
<th>Commuter</th>
<th>Recreational</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cootes Paradise to Bay Front Park</td>
<td>Cootes Paradise to Bay Front Park</td>
<td>- Multi-use Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-44</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-45</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-46</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-47</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Public PIC #1 Comment Sheets**

**Hamilton Cycling Master Plan**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commute downtown for work. Marked shared laneways a bonus on the Queen St. hill or W 5th access</th>
<th>Commuting by cycling must be more accessible for running errands and commuting, direct access as easily as it is to use a car to do the same tasks.</th>
<th>Transportation within city. Cycling safety reminding automobile drivers to consider and watch for cyclists on the road.</th>
<th>by automobiles drivers. I do all that I can to make myself visible and heard, but it still happens.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

P-48

- Downtown, Westdale; Central; Central Mountain; East Mountain

Connectivity between downtown and Westdale; a route through central Hamilton, north of Main; greater connectivity between central Hamilton and escarpment; a direct route across the mountain, preferably lanes on Mohawk

- Multi-Use Path
- Reserved Bike Lane
- Signed Bike Route
- Paved Shoulder

With bike lanes, the motorist knows s/he has to share the road. On-road routes can be okay if there's on-street parking (though doors are a hazard) if traffic is calmed, or if it is a side-street (though stop signs and meandering routes suck).

No. Cost should be at the bottom of the list. Certainly it should be below safety. Bikes hardly get any funding, even though they are a significant mode.

P-49

- From David Avenue (Mohawk and Fennell) to Redeemer University College (commute to work)
- To Canadian Tire and Fortino's (Mall Road)
- To Escarpment/rail trails

- Mohawk Rd – especially between Stone Church and Magnolia (or Rice) (Bike lane ends at Link with heavy traffic in the stretch)
- Carefully painted lanes at intersection of Mohawk, Stone Church, and Golf Links
- Bike routes along Rymal Rd between Redeemer University College and Upper James (a colleague of mine bikes this route year round and there is potential for student traffic from Redeemer)
- Stone Church Rd between Garth and Upper James (alternate route)

- Multi-Use Path
- Reserved Bike Lane
- Signed Bike Route
- Paved Shoulder

It might be too expensive to implement routes on all major streets.

Back street bike routes which have priority crossing of major cross streets (ex. there is a bike route along South bend which jogs to a stop light at Upper James and crosses West Fifth at a light, etc. But some of these lights can be long waits.)

Yes. Educating drivers about making space for bikes (perhaps this is provincial designation)
| P-50 | ✧ Commuter  ☐ Recreational  ☑ Utilitarian Upper Mountain, Rymal Rd, West 5th, NOT Upper James because too much heavy traffic and no lanes on U. Wentworth – Rymal Rd to Concession
<p>| Rymal Rd because its wide street already, and I'm biking on sidewalk because I'm not feeling safe on the street without lanes. In summer time I use it often and its beautiful for biking. The YMCA is being built and I could bike there to exercise instead of driving. | ☐ Multi-Use Path ✧ Reserved Bike Lane ☑ Signed Bike Route ☐ Paved Shoulder No obstacles from others and I feel safe and it is seen by me and by the drivers the most. | ☐ Option A ✧ Option B Mountain has already wide streets and lots of residences exist and one being built - Avoid King St because lots of traffic moving too fast and not enough room to feel safe on. Main St – one way – McMaster – City Hall – include! - McNab St to convert between Burlington and Robertson - Lanes leading to all major commercial destinations? But need better, clearer rules about traffic rules/accidents - Police involvement in potential accidents on private properties, ex. large shopping plazas - Consider making a requirement for all shopping destinations to have adequate bike parking facilities Use different or more visible signs for signalling bike lanes to drivers, ex. bright colours and/or bigger? Need to consider bike parking which allows - Lanes leading to all major destinations? I'm glad to see more focus on improving cycling infrastructure in the last year. As an avid cyclist - I love being able to ride to work, but I fully understand why many people are scared of sharing the roads with cars. Safely cycling in mixed traffic without dedicated lanes requires a high level of situational awareness and certainly poses many risks. It is always a little disconcerting to ride along the road with the full realization that if just one driver is not paying attention and drifts a little too close to the curb - you're going flying - and there's not a thing you can do to prevent it. This is why having dedicated space on the road for bikes is so important when trying to get people out of their cars and onto their bikes. And one more semi-related |
| P-51 | ☐ Commuter  ☑ Recreational  ☑ Utilitarian I commute 3-4 times per week from Queen/Aberdeen area to Guelph Line in Burlington (20km one way). I normally ride for recreation on weekends along the water front trails, in Dundas &amp; Waterdown. I ride for utilitarian purposes from my home to the downtown core, Locke St, Westdale to do shopping, etc. | The priority for me is to implement the network within the downtown core, as well as on main routes in &amp; out of the downtown area from the surrounding neighborhoods and crossing the core East/West &amp; North/South. The reason for this is mostly due to traffic patterns. In the surrounding residential areas, the traffic volume is low &amp; speeds are slow. Cyclists can easily share the road with cars with minimal risk, so there is no need for extensive cycling infrastructure within these areas. BUT, just as cars require, there needs to be | ☐ Multi-Use Path ✧ Reserved Bike Lane ☑ Signed Bike Route ☐ Paved Shoulder Multi-use paths are fine in purely recreational areas (like the waterfront trail), but for commuters and utilitarian riders the speed difference between bikes &amp; pedestrians is too high. If I warn them with a bell or horn, they typically will step to the wrong side in front of me. If I don't warn them, then I get past ok, but the pedestrians are often scared by the bike passing so quickly. When commuting I normally ride at a steady pace of ~30 km/hr. I find that the signed bike routes on any busy streets are ineffective at creating any sort of driver | ☐ Option A ✧ Option B Same reasons as I described above. Bikes don't need a dedicated route every 2 blocks. But the routes that there are need to be efficient. I will happily add a few blocks to my route if it means I can cruise for a longer stretch without stop signs, dangerous traffic, etc. But neither will I chose a bike route if it is a long, slow and winding way of getting to the same place as Yes. Especially the significance as a missing link. This is currently one of the biggest problems I encounter with the existing network in Hamilton. I also agree with having a separate point for &quot;perceived&quot; safety - as a key component to getting more people on bikes is that they feel safe doing so. This perceived safety is also important to getting bikes | Make sure we do both. Educate all drivers about bike lane signing and how to share the road. Include in licence education. Driving instructors education should include cycling signing information |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficient &amp; safe routes that can be taken into the core, and across the city in both North/South, and East/West directions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A couple of examples from my experience:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Riding from Queen &amp; Aberdeen to Burlington in the morning. I take Homewood (paralleling Aberdeen) west to Dundurn - no problems. I take Dundurn south all the way to York - no real shoulder or space for bikes, but car speeds are low, so not bad. I ride along York until it becomes Plains Rd - Much improved now that there is a dedicated bike lane. Before this summer - it was frightening. Car speeds are very high, and I have no doubt that getting hit from behind on this street would result in severe injury or death for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Riding to the Farmer's Market on a Saturday morning - with a 3 year old in a trailer behind me. I head east on Aberdeen to Hess and then head south to downtown - no problems. But once I get downtown - how do I get to the core? Do I ride Main or King - not likely as the vehicle speeds are high. Cannon, York, Hunter? Nope - all awareness - if that is the intent. As are the &quot;shared lane&quot; symbols on the pavement. Whether there are signs or not - if I'm blocking the way of a car and preventing them from passing me - they will either ride very close behind me, or squeeze past with only inches to spare between their mirrors and my elbows. This is why I prefer either signed AND dedicated lanes (like York Blvd), or roads that simply have a wider shoulder area marked with a white line so I can stay out of the way of the cars except when approaching intersections and turning lanes where it is logical for me to claim the lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed bike routes on side streets are helpful - if they do indeed connect with a good network of larger dedicated paths or lanes. At the present time, I find that following the signed routes often leads to confusing dead ends, or busy arterial roads with no bike lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The main roads:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>off of the sidewalks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many less confident cyclists chose to ride on the sidewalks as they feel safer - when in reality it is likely more dangerous as the cars do not expect to see fast moving cyclists coming into intersections off of sidewalks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comment - it may be worth also considering the impact of electric scooters (not to be confused with gas powered scooters which requiring licensing). With the recent high gas prices this summer I saw many more people riding electric scooters - either on the sidewalks, or dangerously slow in the middle of the traffic lanes. In many cases I would actually be riding faster on my bike, but with the low operating costs and availability of these scooters I think it is inevitable that they will become more prevalent. These riders will also benefit from dedicated bike lanes - as their scooters are really not fast enough to mix with vehicular traffic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
either the wrong direction, or too busy for a slow moving bike/trailer combo. Therefore I will usually reluctantly chose the sidewalks to navigate around the core.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-52</th>
<th>Commuter</th>
<th>Recreational</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Mountain down East Rail Trail to Bayfront Park to Chedoke trail via Longwood. From Chedoke trail, Scenic to Sanitornium to Up Paradise to Stone Church → back home. Approx 35-40 km ride.</td>
<td>North-south dedicated bike lane routes for central and east mountain as currently I use Up Ottawa which isn’t very safe. If the Central Mountain had a North-South route and Jolley Cut had bike facility, I would then like to consider cycling for work commuting purposes.</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Option A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B is more realistic for implementation given budget considerations and that for so many major streets it would next to impossible to incorporate bike facilities such as dedicated bike lanes.</td>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>Signed Bike Route</td>
<td>Paved Shoulder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Attachment:
Re: Jolley Cut Funding

There were a few other items that I thought of that I could have voiced at the public session the other night:

- I didn’t look if someone mentioned it, but there is a need for some biking facility on Mountain Brow from Mohawk Rd to the new stairs at Margate Ave. Given the current condition of the road and that there’s no budget construction for it until at least 2013, perhaps the most economical way to improve things for pedestrians (there’s no sidewalks here) and cyclists would be a multi-use trail along the escarpment edge.

- Maintenance issue – East Rail Trail from Wentworth St entrance up the hill for a few hundred feet, the current trail surface condition is much rougher relative to the rest of the trail. For mountain bikers, no issue, but I certainly have seen families with strollers, wagons, trikes and even motorized wheelchairs who struggle with this section of the trail which has deteriorated over the years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-53</th>
<th>Commuter</th>
<th>Recreational</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown, West Mountain, Ancaster, Dundas, Flamborough</td>
<td>Downtown – volume and speed of traffic, lack of connected network</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Option A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Bike Lane</td>
<td>Reserved Bike Lane</td>
<td>Signed Bike Route</td>
<td>Paved Shoulder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-54</th>
<th>Commuter</th>
<th>Recreational</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hwy #8 between Fruitland and Grimsby. Hwy #6/McNeilly to Confederation Park.</td>
<td>Areas where you are presently forces to ride on a road as there is not a sidewalk available or cycle path to follow.</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Option A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Bike Lane</td>
<td>Signed Bike Route</td>
<td>Paved Shoulder</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. The most critical short term objective in Hamilton’s cycling plan should be to support the low-income population who are dependent on cycling as their main means of transportation. A survey conducted by Environment Hamilton in the summer of 2006 collected transportation information from 3215 homes in North Hamilton (north of Cannon, and mostly north of Barton) and found that a third of the households include people who use bikes as their main means of transportation. In the 3215 homes that translated into over 5500 no-choice cyclists. Serving this cycling population will require a shift from the current emphasis on recreational riders. We should make this our top priority.

2. Current cycling infrastructure is virtually non-existent north of Cannon Street, except in the Bayfront Park area. East-west travel is particularly difficult in the area north of Cannon – aggravated by the fact that only Barton and Burlington (neither of them safe routes) are continuous through that area. At the same time, much of the industrial land in this area is under-utilized and vehicle use on the existing roadways (as a result of job losses) is significantly less than most streets were designed to accommodate, so there should be lots of opportunity to identify and specify significant improvements to cycling routes.

3. At the master plan workshop I viewed a map showing the location of reported cycling/vehicle collisions over the last 15 years. What jumped out for me was the overwhelming concentration of these collisions in central and north Hamilton, including very large numbers on Barton Street, Main, King, Cannon and Wilson. I suspect the collision locations coincide quite closely with the lowest-income areas of the city. I believe this confirms the need for an immediate focus on cycling facilities that encourage and financially support the use of helmets and lights – items that I rarely see on cyclists in these areas. The public medical costs of not using helmets and lights far outweighs the minor cost of providing these items free to low-income residents. Safe cycling training in schools and community centres is another obvious front-line need, especially in low-income areas. Every so often, the local police department conducts a crackdown on offences by cyclists, but unfortunately little attention or effort is focused on removing the reasons for these offenses, and the campaigns appear to be about burning up fine revenues than actually reducing injury incidence. A safety blitz that actually encouraged cycling would be a much more effective use of tax dollars.

4. At the master plan workshop I viewed a map showing the location of reported cycling/vehicle collisions over the last 15 years. What jumped out for me was the overwhelming concentration of these collisions in central and north Hamilton, including very large numbers on Barton Street, Main, King, Cannon and Wilson. I suspect the collision locations coincide quite closely with the lowest-income areas of the city. I believe this confirms the need for an immediate focus on cycling facilities that encourage and financially support the use of helmets and lights – items that I rarely see on cyclists in these areas. The public medical costs of not using helmets and lights far outweighs the minor cost of providing these items free to low-income residents. Safe cycling training in schools and community centres is another obvious front-line need, especially in low-income areas. Every so often, the local police department conducts a crackdown on offences by cyclists, but unfortunately little attention or effort is focused on removing the reasons for these offenses, and the campaigns appear to be about burning up fine revenues than actually reducing injury incidence. A safety blitz that actually encouraged cycling would be a much more effective use of tax dollars.

5. The single simplest step that could be taken to improve cycling, and especially cycling safety, in Hamilton is the establishment of a city-wide 30 kilometre speed limit. A proposal is under consideration for such a limit in the North End neighbourhood – and apparently is being held up because of the fear of officials that neighbourhoods across the city will jump at the chance to obtain similar rules in their areas.

6. There is huge opposition to speeding among the general public (although it seems to disappear when many of these folks get behind the wheel themselves) for the simple reason that speed maims and kills. Speeding vehicles are also noisier and produce more pollution. The standard approach has been the installation of many more stop signs – which help slow things down, but also increase air emissions. A far better solution would be speed bumps – with a design that allows for smooth passage by cyclists.

7. The addition of bike racks on the buses has been a big step forward. Consideration could be given to providing free rides up the escarpment for persons with a bicycle who get on at certain stops just before the climb begins – on the understanding that the cyclist will exit the bus at the first stop on top of the escarpment.

8. Proposals were made during the transportation master plan for the establishment of one or more incline railways along the escarpment. These would greatly encourage both cyclists and pedestrians to leave their motor vehicles at home. They would also make a big contribution to improving the image of the city and probably would attract additional tourism to Hamilton.

9. The cycling races that were held in Hamilton a few years ago were an excellent initiative. Even if we can’t get an internationally significant event each year, there should be at least one weekend set aside each year for a similar event – perhaps as a province-wide initiative. The tourist dollars alone would easily justify such an effort, and the pit for Hamilton’s image would be huge. Long distance cycling events – often as charity rides – and attracting large numbers of riders. Hamilton has several major trails – waterfront, escarpment trail, Chedoke radial line, west Hamilton rail, etc – and it shouldn’t be difficult to tie several of these together into a major local recreational cycling event – perhaps spring and fall. Events like these, especially ones geared to families and more casual riders, will help give the confidence and experience to more Hamiltonians and convince them to do more cycle commuting.

10. Most city bike lanes are discontinuous. Examples include Lawrence Road bike lanes that end just before King Street, a few hundred metres before other lanes emerge at King and Pottfuff – only to disappear again in the middle of a block east of Nash. Safe cycling crossings of the Red Hill Parkway should be installed at both King and Queenston. I utilise the one at Barton Street, but it is hazardous because drivers almost always fail to look to the east as they exit from the Parkway to Barton. This problem also faces pedestrians in all the exit locations for the valley expressway (I’m not familiar with the situation on the Linc but wouldn’t be surprised if the same problems exist there). These hazards must be addressed. I don’t know all the methods available, but one would be a slightly raised pedestrian/cyclist crossing across the exit, together with more signage.

11. The above problem is aggravated by road designs that encourage faster right turns. While these are intended to move vehicle traffic more quickly, they significantly increase the hazard for cyclists proceeding straight through the intersection as well as for pedestrians.

12. I have now encountered numerous locations where a raised lip occurs between streets and the entrance ways to malls, commercial areas, etc. The lip is about 1 inch high and if the cyclist doesn’t hit it at exactly 90 degrees, he/she may fall. Two of the three falls I’ve had in the past five years have come at these locations. This appears to be a misconceived road construction standard and it needs to be changed. For an example, examine the entrance way off Barton to the commercial mall at Barton and Centennial (the one with Food Basics in it). All three entrances off Barton to the commercial mall at Barton and Centennial have the same problem.

13. I’m a commuter, recreational and utility cyclist on-street...I ride off-road and do extended travel by bike...I also do mixed-mode commuting (bike-train or bike-bus).

14. I have been a lot of places by bike. In the Hamilton context, I actively ride all over the city. On a weekly basis, I ride on the off-street MUP’s, dirt trails and many city side-streets and arterial roads. I live in downtown Hamilton, so I’m in that area daily, but I also run errands outside of my neighbourhood quiet a lot and do about 20 hours of local cycling a week, averaged over the entire year.

15. As a cyclist, I feel that many (most?) of the city's arterial streets have been optimized for the speed and flow of car traffic, at the expense of all the other road users, and also at the expense of public safety in a general sense. Many arterial streets have a lot of intersections and dangerous traffic patterns. I feel this is true no matter what mode of use is the one being looked at. I can list some specific examples if that would be helpful, but here I’ll just make the general point that most of the arterial streets seem to be quite dangerous for cars as well. The dangers are there for cyclists and pedestrians by virtue of the general level of danger. Streets are typically not well planned, and on streets where I find it unsafe to cycle, I generally don’t feel safe walking or driving along these same streets – and more to the point, I’ve personally seen many many accidents along these same routes. As a cyclist, things are probably made riskier on busier roads while travelling using any other mode of travel. I have also experienced several collisions a year as a cyclist, and most of these incidents seem to have been highly influenced by poor road design. In addition, the existing cycling-specific infrastructure isn’t typically useful either, and most of it makes me feel more unsafe to be biking than if it weren’t there. Striped bike lanes tend to terminate abruptly right at dangerous points, routes don’t connect well, physical barriers for bicycles exist on almost every route, signals are not marked, messages are not sent, MUP’s lack post shapes for usage guidelines, many on-street lanes are much too narrow (and encourage cars to pass even closer than on unpainted roads) and where lanes exist they often indicate unsafe flows (ie., contraflow, awkward lane positioning, poor visibility) and risky movement patterns. Most don’t solve any real problems.
4. In my opinion, all of these route types are ok in places, but rarely called for on a properly developed road. I tend to view these kinds of things favourably only when selectively used and properly and fully implemented.

5. I'm pretty comfortable as a cyclist as long as I think cars are moving safely and can also see me. Of all the possible infrastructure types, in my experience bike lanes are probably the least effective at actually improving real safety (on most routes), as they tend to create a lot of issues around intersections and they can encourage cars to crowd cyclists or ignore the presence of bikes. I have been hit or had close calls in striped lanes with much greater frequency than on any other type of road. However, I do acknowledge that bike lanes are psychologically low-stress types of road routes for most cyclists to ride on. That is really great for encouraging biking in places where actual risks are low. I don't feel that much of the Hamilton context is well-suited for on-street lanes, as I believe there are abundant real dangers for cyclists that bike lanes are incredibly poor at addressing. I also don't like to see routes on paved shoulders in any scenario where there are intersections. My take is that the desire to add paved shoulders is a strong indication that the traffic speeds and volumes are too great for the level of visibility and number of lanes available, which are more primary things to address.

6. Of these two choices, I would vote for A. It's better to rethink the whole system if that is the implication of that option.

7. Road design needs to carefully consider safety in general, and to incorporate the reality of cyclists (and pedestrians) and not only emphasizing theoretical car speeds as if accidents aren't the tradeoff. Given that road infrastructural choices leave a long legacy, it's wise to choose good design as things are being built.

8. Yes...if the choice is whether or not to add striped bike lanes in Hamilton, I think that there are more fundamental considerations than simply adding bike lanes and leaving everything else the same. Bike lanes may or may not directly address the causes of local safety problems, as they could possibly inadvertently address the effects of accidents (i.e., bike happens to be hit in a poor visibility location) and not the causes (poor visibility in that location), just depending on how precisely accidents are happening. Bike lanes also appear to address the factors in only a tiny percentage of accident types (collisions are very rare with a car overtaking a cycle when both are travelling straight), but may increase other kinds of risks (turning accidents, lane-change accidents, signal problems, missing signage, poor visibility, traffic volumes and speed differentials, etc.). As a strategy, I view striped bike lanes (in isolation) as being the "low-hanging fruit" of creating a bicycle friendly community. They don't work well, but they are also cheap and very obvious projects. More meaningful measures would include:

- bicycle facilities that include road design on non-major streets. Ie., designated bicycle boulevards, and the linking of routes along naturally quieter streets, creation of alternative routes, other such options.
- many, many dangerous roads would be also adequately fixed for cyclists if the car traffic flows, speeds and road conditions were the thing being directly reconsidered (switch one-way streets over to two-way, reduce lanes, narrow roads, remove lanes, install medians etc., and bicycles could integrate normally without special measures in many cases)
- traffic volume and speed reductions
- develop traffic-calmed districts
- traffic controls that prioritize cyclists, yield signs and stop signs for cars, and painted cross-over lanes where bike routes and car routes cross
- HOV lanes / shared bus/bike lanes
- additional parking for bicycles
- permanently closing some of the grid to cars, dead-ending streets, etc
- extra-narrow sub 10' curb lanes
- the unsignaled shared space approach
- sharrows

9. These seem like reasonable criteria, in combination. Taken in isolation, I think most of these items could backfire badly as a way of approaching planning. For example, if the "perceived safety" goal is pursued in isolation without real safety improvements, things will be less safe but feel more safe, and maybe the problems get worse instead of better. Logic would dictate that if this means attracting less-experienced cyclists into dangerous situations, or if it means reducing psychological stress on cyclists without reducing real danger, that's a bad idea which intuition says may lead to increased injuries. For example, a bike lane that won't have any statistical impact on safety but it gets more cyclists and newer cyclists to ride in a less visible part of a bad road and not be seen by turning cars...that would be extremely negative as an isolated goal.

Here is a perfect real-world example of this concept. The principal of isolated goals is the approach taken with the bike lane that exists on the bridge at Main St over the 403. Feels safer but is far more dangerous all because of the bike infrastructure. There is an issue with high car speeds and very low visibility at this intersection. Adding a bike lane in this case actually has made things worse. The bike lane takes up the southern vehicular lane on the bridge span and now actually exacerbates a safety issue to do with cycle visibility to the fast-moving cars (if that is defined as creating a situation where eastbound cars no longer even have to look back and yield/merge into what otherwise might have been a lane of motorized traffic). Without the currently installed bike lane, the cars entering that road from the highway would at least need a yield sign, and drivers would need to look for bicycles. I think that missing yield sign is pretty much the actual called-for piece of infrastructure -- but it wouldn't feel as if it was much safer for bikes.

The way this bike lane has been developed, both bike and cars are signalled to BOTH proceed with neither stream of traffic having a yield or stop, and they cross at the worst low-visibility point, and bikes are indicated to be in the exact wrong place, and cars are signalled to not look. From a planning perspective, this situation would check-off multiple criteria on the list of criteria, but any practical person would evaluate these implemented measures as a failure if the one goal is real safety, which has diminished. Ditto the same problem for trouble-spots along most of the other bike lanes in the city. In other words, these criteria are fine...as long as they are all in balance. Projects emphasizing one or two of these goals and ignoring others are useless, in my opinion.

10. Other factors to consider:
- It would make sense to prioritize projects against realistic timelines and with respect for the projection for the numbers of cars still on the road, and population living in various areas. For example, there are ideas for infrastructure changes that wouldn't make much sense for 45 years down the line if fewer people will be fewer driving cars at that time. In other words, perhaps there should be a ladder of interventions that begin with more car-bike physical
separations (for now) and over time progressively moving towards further and further physical integration of these two modes as time advances

- It also makes sense to analyze planned improvements with a view to the analogous experiences of other physically similar cities. Some ideas don’t work, and we can see that by injury rates in places where those ideas have been tried, etc. Some ideas have been blunders that make things worse. Some ideas are successful. From viewing this presentation, I feel that the city is probably planning on pursuing striped bike lanes. These sorts of things have been well-studied by now. This strategy might be demonstrably a waste of effort and resources that could be dedicated to really useful changes.

- integration of dirt trail and off-road routes – adding facilities and crossing over points where off-road trails cross roads, and to connect unpaved trails across pavement links, adding routes that lead into these areas

- tourism/economic potential - integration with transit, scenery, other points of interest (which might have nothing to do with the locations of existing arterial routes)

- make infrastructure that is cheap to maintain, and automatically works in all seasons (like, can you see white bike-lane striping in the snow?) and is environmentally friendly and uses materials that are easily recycled and non-toxic

- consider right versus day in terms of creating visible and effective infrastructure – for example, careful consideration of what will work in dark areas or where visibility is poor

- prioritize for routes that are most efficient for cyclists (i.e., not a lot of traffic lights, fewer hills)

- prioritize projects in areas with the greatest population density and the largest amount of congestion, rather than working to have an ideal overall network that is evenly spatially distributed, I feel that the network should be naturally denser and more developed where there are more cyclist trips to be made, and more destinations to be accessed

- we should favour plans that are easily understood by motorists as well, and that are in harmony with the signage and conventions in use across other communities

- we should favour projects that have the potential to reduce driving habits the most (facilities should be along roads used for short driving trips by lots of people)

- we should roll out improvements that build from and extend existing infrastructure rather than doing isolated segments which are disconnected

- The city should produce an official process that users can use to record accident data, close-calls and road issues.

- The city should create signage and infrastructure that is directed at educating motorists as to the rights of cyclists, like “change lanes to pass” or “cyclists use full lane”, or “yield to cyclists”, or “watch for cyclists at crossing” etc.

- The city should promote itself as a cycling destination for tourists

- The city should create a process by which to closely monitor the cycling infrastructure at the level of detail needed for safe cycling

Eliminate Hamilton bylaw prohibiting riding two abreast, maintenance far more critical for cycling than for motoring - consider weekly assessing as per London ON in the past, ensure trail design avoids barriers like steps.

Re: Hamilton Hwy 5 & Waterdown Rd and connections between (and Hwy 5 into Burlington).

Re: Waterdown Hwy 5 & Waterdown Rd and connections between (and Hwy 5 into Burlington).

Re: Over 403 at Main/Longwood, Dundurn crossings, Herkimer/Charlton

Better connection of Kirkendall to Westdale - a pedestrian-only bridge over 403, Safer crossings of Dundurn at Melbourne/Frid/Chatham, Bike lanes on Herkimer/Charlton

CP trail over 403.

Have City offer bike courses.

Sent an article about bikes on sidewalks and asked to resolve ebikes - they should be permitted.

Re: King at Red Hill Valley Parkway & Lawrence at Ottawa

Bike lanes over Red Hill Valley Parkway on King & crossing of rail beside Lawrence around Kensington

Sydenham and Hwy 8 hills.

Re: Nebo & on all of Nymat too (easterly)

Nebo bike lane, Stone Church to Twenty Rd at least – and then paved shoulders

Missing sections on Centre Rd including hill north of Concession 8 and continue north of Carlisle, the main streets in Waterdown too, and all of Carlisle Rd. More paved shoulders everywhere rural.

Racks on buses are costly and HSR money should be used to improve service for transit. Cyclists need to get off sidewalks. Push for more public awareness for motorcyclists too.

Light rail is the best mobility option - including sidewalks everywhere. Cycling too dangerous in the winter (along with autos and busses).

Re: Cootes into Dundas

Extend it westerly into the core of Dundas.
The Crown Point Community Planning Team (CPCPT) is submitting the following concerns to The City of Hamilton. Thank you for the opportunity to share our concerns and ideas about cycling opportunities in Hamilton for the revised Cycling Master Plan.

Our concerns and ideas for cycling infrastructure are not limited to this geographic area, but include the cycling opportunities connected to this area, primarily in Ward 4. Good cycling infrastructure is important to us because many of us commute to work or school, ride for health and leisure or bicycle for utilitarian reasons. We also understand that the rising cost of motor vehicles and fuel will force many people out of their cars and onto public transit or bicycles. Having safe, affordable options is only fair to those who can’t afford, or choose not to drive cars.

1) Access to the Waterfront
A safe, family-friendly route is needed for residents to enjoy Hamilton’s waterfront. Some Crown Point residents take Parkdale North past Burlington St., a right on the service road and jump on a sidewalk/path over to Eastport Drive and under the QEW. Others take Woodward Ave north with heavy truck traffic and risk being hit.

We would like to see a designated bicycle path - physically separated from traffic with a curb or cement divider - on Woodward Ave from Melvin Avenue to Van Wagner’s Beach Road. We would like to see this bike lane be part of a complete streetscaping project that includes tree lined buffer and accommodation for bicycles and pedestrians on Woodward.

2) The Pipe Line
The old “pipe line” path heads northeast from Ottawa and Main and extends as an official public path to Barton and Strathearn and unofficially all the way to Woodward Ave at Globe Park. This area could be a great multi-use path if the curb cutaways were complete. Detours around sections of the path that are interrupted by buildings or parking lots could be signed. This path could be a family-friendly alternative to the Lakefront. A safe Woodward Avenue access point would be needed to complete this route.

3) Gage Ave designated bike lane
The Lawrence Road designated bike lane is well-used and handy for zipping east-west across Ward 4. It is unfortunate this lane appears and disappears at the corner of Lawrence and Gage. If cyclists are travelling west on Lawrence and turn right onto Gage Avenue, the bike lane disappears and the car lanes double in width. Traffic flow is not heavy enough to require two car lanes on Gage from Lawrence to Main Street. Also, this would give the city an opportunity to properly streetscape Gage Ave, the entrances to Gage Park, and provide much needed space for transit users waiting for the bus on the east side of Gage street between Lawrence and Main. Right now transit users are wedged on a narrow strip between a chain-link fence and the curb. Not comfortable or appealing or safe.

Option 1: Removing chain link fence around Gage Park and creating a multi use path on the edge of the park for cyclists and pedestrians.
Option 2: Eliminate a North/South car lane on Gage Ave. from Melvin Avenue to Van Wagner’s Beach Road.

These ideas are consistent with the City’s proposed traffic calming sites in the Shifting Gears Masterplan. This would also provide an opportunity to install proper transit shelters.

4) Major EAST/WEST Cycling Routes
Option 1: Cannon and Wilson - Designated lane physically separated from car traffic going both East and West where possible. (Cannon becomes two-way after Sherman).
Where Wilson ends at Sherman, cyclists can go both north and south, therefore a signed bike route on Sherman (from Barton to Cumberland) would be appropriate.
Option 2: Designated cycling lanes on King and Main streets, physically separated from traffic.
Cyclists can’t be pushed to quiet streets all the time. It discourages cyclists who don’t have time for inconvenience. The reality is, many cyclists brave there way up King and Main Streets despite the high risk, because these are the most direct east/west routes across town.

5) Speed Limit on Major East/West routes
Traffic regularly drives 60km/h to hit the timed traffic lights. Often, cars travel between 70 - 75km/h making it dangerous for everyone. We would like to see the posted speed limit lowered and speed limits enforced on King and Main streets.

6) Bicycle Parking
Busy commercial areas such as Ottawa St., Kenilworth Ave., Queenston Rd, Barton St., etc. should have ample bicycle parking. The redevelopment of Centre Mall provides a great opportunity to include these in design/re-design of the mall
including on Barton St. and the parking lots inside.

These following areas require bicycle parking:
- Parkdale Arena/Pool and Park - both at the rec center (off of the parking lot, near the entrance, near the outdoor play structures
- Gage Park - near the parking lot and by children's play structures, the Childrens Museum (to accommodate at list 50 bikes)
- Hospitals and medical clinics throughout the city
- All smaller community parks should have at least 10

We would like to see bicycle parking spaces required in all new development or redevelopments.

7) Our Mighty Mountain
A huge barrier to cyclists is the escarpment. Free bicycle shuttle on HSR buses from lower to upper mountain would cost the city nothing and remove the barrier for cyclists that aren't able to tackle the "mountain".

8) King St. over Kenilworth
Cars do not yield to cyclists or pedestrians using the bridge on King Street over Kenilworth Ave. We would like to see clearly painted crosswalks on the north and south ramps. Also a Stop Line is needed for cars on the ramp leaving Kenilworth going north and exiting on King St.

9) Sign Bicycle Routes
We would like to see unsigned bicycle routes designated as signed routes. This would reinforce the message that bicycles are sharing the road. Specifically, Barton St. and Central Ave. (from Cochrane to Graham).

10) Extend Designated Bike Lane
We would like to see the designated bike lane on King Street East extend from Nash Rd to Centennial Parkway.

11) The Red Hill Valley Trail Network
Part of the RHV Trail Network is paved and the pavement has eroded creating a dangerous situation on some escarpment descents. The escarpment rail trail is frequently filled with broken bottles and debris especially in the Victoria St. area. We would love to see a sweeper go through this area regularly.

12) Dedicated Bike Lane Debris
There is a concern that dedicated bike lanes are often filled with debris. Normally car tires will throw the debris to the side which means it is collected in the bike lane. Dedicated lanes would work better if they had regular street sweeping and the surfaces were maintained.

13) Share the Road program
We would like to see The City of Hamilton expand programs for safe cycling. Also, a Share the Road campaign targeting both cyclists and car drivers might make the roads safer for everyone.

Thank you for considering our concerns. We look forward to learning about how Hamilton responds to these ideas.

Sincerely,

The undersigned members of the Crown Point Community Planning Team.

P-78  Re: Charlton/Herkimer
      Bike lanes (Queen to Locke) as there is lots of room and AM congestion slows down cyclists.

P-79  Re: Grant & Gage
      Grant connecting Ham Brant MUP to Cootes MUP & rail line Cumberland/Gage Park to Barton.

P-80  Re: Barton at Ottawa
      Bike racks through to Kenilworth and in the new Centre Mall.

P-81  Bike lanes on King/Main (dn).

P-82  Re: Mud/Pritchard
      Mt Albion - connects MUPs and E Mtn to Highlands.

P-83  1. I would consider myself an avid recreational rider.
      2. I ride upwards of 10000km a year around the Hamilton area. Most of my rides start from my home in Dundas and climb the escarpment via Valley Road or Wilson Street. From there I will ride the roads in Flamborough from the Halton Region to Cambridge Galt and in the Ancaster area from Brantford/Caledonia towards the Niagara Region. If there is a road in the surrounding area I have probably been on it. I also commute to work in Burlington about 3-4 times a month during the riding season. For this commute I use the Cootes drive multi-use path to get me into Westdale and onto the new York Blvd. bike lanes which gets me into Burlington.
      3. My primary concern is having a safe route out of the urban core to the rural areas. Once on the rural roads the risks are reduced from a combination lower traffic volume and drivers having more patience.
4. To leave the urban core I would prefer bike lanes and paved shoulders.
5. Both of these options give a cyclist more room to maneuver and also give motorists more room to continue on their way. Multi-use paths just create a whole new series of problems by mixing fast cyclists with walkers, joggers, baby strollers and pets. In that case I would much rather toll with a vehicle.
6. In my wildest dreams I would love to have bike facilities on all major streets, but I realize this is not a fiscally responsible dream. I think the citizens of Hamilton would be better served with a well thought out network of bike facilities (lanes, paved shoulders) and use any extra monies to resurface roads that are in desperate need of repair.
7. Answered in No. 6
8. Another important thing is education! We need to educate both cyclists and motorists about the rules of the road. I am tired of driver’s tell me to get the hell off the road, passing too close, passing aggressively, honking horns, yelling obscenities and in general being idiots. I follow the rules as best I can, stopping at street lights and stop signs, signaling my turns and utilizing bike lanes when it is safe to do so.
9. I agree
10. 11. I think it would be a good idea if the city got together with the Spectator and took out a full page add, maybe the Spectator could donate the space, and promote safe cycling. This could be an educational type add stating the basics for both cyclists and motorists. Cyclists must learn to use signals, stop at traffic lights, ride on the correct side of the road and to basically ride in a stable manner. Motorists must learn that cyclists have a right to be on the road and that we have a right to take the entire lane if you deem it necessary. And for everyone to show a bit of patience and enjoy the beautiful summer weather!
12. Comments
   • Roads in need of re-surfacing (numerous dangerous pot holes and cracks)
     i. Flamborough Concession 4, Brock Road to Lynden Road
     ii. Flamborough Concession 6, Middletown Road to Highway Number 8
     iii. York Boulevard, Dundurn to Plains Road (the section pasted the high level bridge is especially bad)
     iv. Sydenham Road, Rock Chapel to Highway 5
     v. Wilson Street from Sulphur Springs to Meadowbrook Drive.
     vi. Shaver Road, Book Road to Garner Road.
   • Additional paved shoulders
     i. Southcote Road, Golf Links Road to Garner Road
     ii. York Road, Watson Lane to Valley Road with extension to Highway 6.
     iii. Flamborough Concession 5, Millgrove Sideroad to Brock Road
   • The down bound bike lane on Wilson Street needs to be repaired in the area of Harpers Garden centre. There are a number of cracks and holes that limit the use of the bike path. The up bound lane is in the same condition, but speeds up bound are much slower then down bound. An avid cyclist can attain speeds in excess of 50km/h and catching crack or hole at that speed can be quite catastrophic. I have already had on wheel destroyed on that stretch of road and was quite lucky not to crash.
   • The Wilson Street bike lanes need to be extended through the Ancaster downtown core and the current lanes from Fiddlers Green Road to Halston Road need re-surfacing.
   • When using tar and gravel on roads the city should specify a finer grader gravel, such as what was used on Rock Chapel. This creates a much nicer riding surface for cyclists and motorists alike.
   • Traffic signals need to be adjusted to better detect a cyclist to minimize the number of signal cycles that a cyclist must wait before getting a green light. This would also reduce the amount of red light running by cyclists.

P-84 Re: Mountain More bike lanes.
P-85 Re: Sydenham Hill in Dundas Organize an annual downhill cycling race.
APPENDIX VI:

STAKEHOLDER AND AGENCY COMMENTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRACKING CODE</th>
<th>What type of cyclist would you consider yourself?</th>
<th>Where do you ride?</th>
<th>What areas of the network are a priority to implement for you? And why?</th>
<th>Which of these cycling facilities do you feel safest using? And why?</th>
<th>Which of these strategies do you prefer? Why?</th>
<th>Are there other strategies?</th>
<th>Do you agree with the criteria listed?</th>
<th>Are there other factors to consider</th>
<th>Please note any other promotional ideas that you feel the city should invest more effort in</th>
<th>Other Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-1 HCC</td>
<td>Commuter ☐ Recreational ☐ Utilitarian</td>
<td>Stoney Creek to Downtown Hamilton to McMaster/Dundas area. Also to Barton/Ottawa (frequent) and Barton/Centennial</td>
<td>North of Cannon because there are hundreds of low income cyclists (who have to cycle) with virtually no cycling facilities, Bayfront all the way into Stoney Creek.</td>
<td>☐ Multi-Use Path ☐ Reserved Bike Lane ☐ Signed Bike Route ☐ Paved Shoulder</td>
<td>☐ Option A ☐ Option B</td>
<td>Air pollution on major streets is too high for safe use.</td>
<td>Speed reduction devices for vehicles – speed bumps would be welcomed on residential streets, are cheaper and more air friendly than signage/lights.</td>
<td>Central issue is reducing GHGs – in a rational world cycling should be a priority over cars.</td>
<td>Cycling society – provide free helmets, especially in low income areas and free lights for low-income bikers</td>
<td>Escarpment crossing – free or discounted HSR service for bikes or incline railway type facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-2 Mohawk College</td>
<td>Commuter ☐ Recreational ☐ Utilitarian</td>
<td>Comuting typically from out of Dundas (bottom of escarpment) and to Mohawk College which is on Fennell Avenue and West 5th (on the mountain); Recreationally → rail trails, quiet roads outside of Dundas, Greensville and Ancaster.</td>
<td>- Easier access up the mountain and crossing Queen Street - in and around Mohawk College there is no bike lanes so biking is a challenge – four lane road, fast moving traffic, large volumes (College &amp; Hilstfield, Strathallan College)</td>
<td>☐ Multi-Use Path ☐ Reserved Bike Lane ☐ Signed Bike Route ☐ Paved Shoulder</td>
<td>☐ Option A ☐ Option B</td>
<td>The major streets are the most direct and cycling needs to be more direct, however, option B would be useful when trying to access the major roads.</td>
<td>Actual bike paths (not sidewalks or part of the road) that are inviting and encouraging people to bike.</td>
<td>Yes – as long as under ‘missing link’ also considers the escarpment as moving up or down is a challenge</td>
<td>Populations that would actually use these paths/routes</td>
<td>When the world cycling event was in town, biking came to the forefront – maybe another event like this? (Small scale?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-3 HHSC</td>
<td>Commuter ☐ Recreational ☐ Utilitarian</td>
<td>Mostly from St. Joseph’s Hospital to Chedoke Hospital. I walk nearly everywhere else. I would prefer to ride my bike, but I don’t feel safe on my bike due to the absence of bike lanes and traffic finding bikes to be a “pain” and concern about my bike being stolen.</td>
<td>For hospitals (HHS 4 sites plus St. Joe’s) staff to be able to commute by bike to their hospital. New buildings are being built at the General and the staff are concerned that there won’t be safe routes to get there.</td>
<td>☐ Multi-Use Path ☐ Reserved Bike Lane ☐ Signed Bike Route ☐ Paved Shoulder</td>
<td>☐ Option A ☐ Option B</td>
<td>The more streets that have secure/dedicated bike lanes, the safer people will feel and the more people will cycle.</td>
<td>To increase safety mostly on the busy streets, please consider putting in a “bumper strip” along the border of the bike lane. This could also incorporate the reflectors as well. This would give cars an auditory reminder if they are crossing.</td>
<td>Yes, plus more bike lanes needed on downtown streets do more people will commute to work.</td>
<td>Have a parent or teacher at each school, champion cycling to school, and get secure bike parking at the schools.</td>
<td>Your project is so valuable! It will benefit us all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-4 HCC</td>
<td>Commuter ☐ Recreational ☐ Utilitarian</td>
<td>Hamilton Mountain (mostly Stone Church), Rail Trails</td>
<td>Rural development would be great. A lot of cyclists train on the rural roads. More safety features would be good.</td>
<td>☐ Multi-Use Path ☐ Reserved Bike Lane ☐ Signed Bike Route ☐ Paved Shoulder</td>
<td>☐ Option A ☐ Option B</td>
<td>There are more multi-</td>
<td>Paved shoulders on all rural roads would be a great addition as rural roads are rebuilt/upgraded.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Consider provisions for crossing the escarpment, particularly in the central city area between</td>
<td>Take advantage of TV and other media for promoting safe cycling and educate both motorists and cyclists – community TV may be good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder and Agency PIC #1 Comments</td>
<td>Hamilton Cycling Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S-5 McMaster University</strong></td>
<td><strong>Commuter</strong></td>
<td><strong>Recreational</strong></td>
<td><strong>Utilitarian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street and Main Street from Queen to McMaster</td>
<td>King and Main - Major roads that are very direct east to west - Fast moving traffic to compete with - Lots of pot holes, sunken sewer grates etc. especially on Main Street - Hard to merge over all 4 lanes to turn left</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Reserved Bike Lane</td>
<td>Paved Shoulder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gives room to swerve around holes and wobbles when starting after a stop sign or light - Gives fast moving autos knowledge of possible cyclists</td>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>Option B</td>
<td>I would feel that 'major streets' are 'major' because lots of people use them. Main and King are major because they follow processes of city design. Major streets that people use should allow people of all modes to use Lanes that allow two way bike traffic on one-way streets between Main and King at key areas so there is not as much back-track.</td>
<td>Seems that Main, King, York, Cannon and Barton are most direct (probably because of E-W travel) and also shows most collisions along those streets. From what I have seen there was lots at road construction along Main and King but no bike lane in or planned Destinations? Groceries stores, pharmacies etc. (maybe consider) Education. Possible signs at major intersections where cyclists turn left &quot;watch for cyclists merging&quot; especially on Main and King when cyclists must merge across 4/5 lanes to turn.</td>
<td>Hold stakeholder meeting at Mac for student to attend and staff and faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S-6 HCC</strong></td>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Around the Hamilton Bay Area. I have ridden 40,000 km in the last 4 years. I am a former racer and still an avid cyclist. I ride around the bay all winter to keep my shape.</td>
<td>Option B would be logical and economical. Trying to connect the city from East to West without too many stops if possible. Sewer grades must point in the proper direction.</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Reserved Bike Lane</td>
<td>Paved Shoulder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both are good but you still need to ride defensive and be watchful.</td>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>Option B</td>
<td>Make bike lanes where we can. To save money, some of our streets are narrow so it may no be possible to widen roads. You may be able to cut lanes through parks or the escarpment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Keep paths lightened, some obstructions removed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S-7 HCC</strong></td>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East/West in lower city through Ward 4 West to downtown Escarpment trails Woodward Avenue to Waterfront</td>
<td>1. On street designated lane SEPARATED FROM TRAFFIC by a physical barrier on Woodward Avenue from Melvin to the Lake. 2. On street designated lanes on Gaige to Lawrence to Main and signage from Main to</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Reserved Bike Lane</td>
<td>Signed Bike Route</td>
<td>Paved Shoulder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use path because there are no cars Reserved bike lanes because they are physically separated</td>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>Option B</td>
<td>Option A because people use them anyways. They are the most direct way to travel. A combination of these options where it is more suitable. This is a good list.</td>
<td>The HSR factors in completing “directness” of routes. Cycling master plan needs to consider bike racks as options for “Share the Road” campaign, well invested Permeating!</td>
<td>Rural roads need paved shoulders. We need free transit from last HSR stop at bottom of mountain to first stop at top.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-8 HCC</td>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
<td>Barton.</td>
<td>Mult-Use Path</td>
<td>Signed Bike Route</td>
<td>Paved Shoulder</td>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>Option B</td>
<td>Two way dedicated bike only lanes on Main commuter routes such as in Holland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I ride mostly country roads around Hamilton and city streets and trails to get there.</td>
<td>I find that there are great cycling areas and routes, such as rail trails and rural roads but connection routes are lacking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-9 HCC</td>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
<td>Niagara Area. Provincial Tours (waterfront trail)</td>
<td>Mult-Use Path</td>
<td>Signed Bike Route</td>
<td>Paved Shoulder</td>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>Option B</td>
<td>Both – all routes are cycling routes (except routes prohibited from cycling). Certain origins and destinations from cyclists. Budget resources may demand that priorities be identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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### Stakeholder and Agency PIC #1 Comments
#### Hamilton Cycling Master Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S-10 HSR</th>
<th>The Transit Division has the following comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 12-month availability of bike racks on buses supports your study goal of promoting cycling thru all seasons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cycling education undertaken by staff from Alternative Transportation or TDM sections should include instruction on the safe and proper use of bus bike racks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• With respect to criteria for alternatives, perhaps an assessment of the impact of on-street bike lanes on lane #1 vehicular traffic may benefit transit, since it is a default user of lane #1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• As use of the on-street bike lanes increase, what is the potential for increased conflicts at bus stops, when buses enter the bike lane, stop, dwell and exit the bike lane? - can potential conflicts be mitigated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bike racks installed on boulevards and sidewalks should ensure that pedestrian and personal mobility device movements are not conflicted with, particularly in the vicinity of bus stops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HSR currently has criteria, as to the size of bike and presence of loose articles, to help the bus Operator determine if a customer will be allowed to load their bike on the rack - perhaps another criteria could be that only those cyclists wearing a helmet are entitled to use the bus racks - would this support the safety education components of your program? - would Public Health see this as a way to reduce head injuries that HSR could assist with? - would HSR end up with an enforcement role that would cause sufficient problems to negate the head injury reduction potential?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You had mentioned a comment (from the Cycling Committee I believe) that the idea of letting cyclists ride up the escarpment accesses for free, between the last bus stop at the bottom of the escarpment to the first bus stop at the top, should be explored. HSR currently has several classes of customer who can ride the bus without paying a fare. If TDM and Alt. Transp bureaus both saw this as having an overall positive impact on the city’s two-tier transp system, I’m sure it could be explored in further detail with HSR management. Council would have to approve any changes to HSR fare regulations.

We regularly have to store bikes in our lost and found office. This phenomena started shortly after the system-wide introduction of the bus racks, and appears to be increasing. Only a small percentage of bikes are ever claimed from HSR by their owners, prior to HSR transferring the bikes to the Police Service for custody. This leads us to conclude that bike thieves are now utilizing the bike/HSR combo to obtain transp to most areas of the city. I would imagine that most of these bike thieves are not wearing helmets, so perhaps adding the helmet to the HSR criteria on who can use the racks may help to reduce this nuisance.

Any funding opportunities that the TDM and ALT Transp offices can leverage, with respect to supporting on-going maintenance activities & permit fees for the bus racks, given their future role as an integral part of the city's transp system, is something that the Transit Division would certainly like to explore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S-11 GO Transit</th>
<th>See attached.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower city between Dundurn and Centennial</td>
<td>Connections where traffic volumes are high and visibility is limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B</td>
<td>When streets are being reconstructed it is frustrating when bike facilities are not included</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S-12 HCC</th>
<th>Commuter</th>
<th>Recreational</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East end Hamilton/Stoney Creek - East end Hamilton to Waterfront Trail to Burlington - East end Hamilton to Barton/Wentworth St N</td>
<td>Adding to the entire Bicycle Network is great. For me a priority would be East Hamilton/Stoney Creek</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path Reserved Bike Lane Signed Bike Route Paved Shoulder Multi-use paths are easy to ride and you do not have to worry about vehicular traffic</td>
<td>Option A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B</td>
<td>I prefer bike corridors with the ability to add any road to have bike facilities on it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S-13 HCC</th>
<th>Commuter</th>
<th>Recreational</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everywhere in region. Woodward (around the bay), dedicated east/west and north/south cycling</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path Reserved Bike Lane Signed Bike Route Paved Shoulder</td>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B</td>
<td>It gives best</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-15 HCC</td>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-16 HCC</td>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-17 HCC</td>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-18 HCC</td>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-19 HCC</td>
<td>Commuter 50150 Recreational</td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
<td>See attached map. Usually to work and back, but often take longer than normal routes. Also from work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Stakeholder and Agency PIC #1 Comments

#### Hamilton Cycling Master Plan

| S-20 HCC | 1) Pave gravel shoulders if cycling lanes are not possible  
|  
| 2) Along with Share the Road signs, paint arrows from the edge of the pavement for 1 metre with arrow pointing towards the centre line  
|  
| 3) Children whose families cannot afford to buy bikes, benefactors or agencies buy bikes and allow children to borrow bikes during a specified time frame  
|  
| 4) Give employers a tax credit of $20/month for their workers who regularly use a bike to cycle to and from work from home. Reasonable expenses incurred by an employee for bicycle related improvements, repair and storage.  
|  
| Implementation as it proceeds will be on the League of America Bicyclists website (bikeleague.org)  
|  
| Option A 29 cyclists  
|  
| * Connectivity to and from subdivisions to and from city centers or other transportation nodes. |

| S-21 HCC | The Hamilton Cycling Committee (HCC) understands that the submission they made to the Hamilton Transportation Master Plan process (July 16, 2007; City response June 26, 2008) will be received as part of the study. Additionally, the HCC would like to convey the following ideas to the Cycling Master Plan study at this stage of the project, with the first round of PICs completed.  

1) Regarding the cycling network and the options presented in the PICs, the committee feels that a middle ground should be seriously considered - instead of either Option A or Option B. This middle ground is suggested to ensure a completed network with reasonable connectivity is completed as soon as possible. Ultimately a finer network of cycling corridors is desired, so it is asked that the City plan to include cycling facilities in most road reconstruction and new roadways, unless there is a strong justification to not include them.  

2) The HCC feels that bike lanes are a far better facility to accommodate cyclists, over shared lanes, on arterials and collector roads. Paved shoulders would be an excellent standard to incorporate into all rural road construction/reconstruction.  

3) Areas of focus for bike lanes or paved shoulders include: connections to Waterdown (Hwy 5 and York Rd), Carlisle Rd/Safari Rd (Waterloo border to Halton border), Brock Rd, Freeland Rd, Hwy 6 north of Freeland, the Sulphur Springs/Weirs Lane/Crooks Hollow Rd/Harvest Rd/Sydenham Rd loop, Governor’s Rd to Sulphur Springs Rd, Creighton Rd/Market St, Osler Dr, Dundurn St, Bay St, Claremont Access, Jolley Cut, Queen St south of Main St and Beckett Dr, two lower city east/west corridors connecting Dundurn St to Stoney Creek neighbourhoods (northerly near/on Barton and southerly), north/south connections in the east end of the lower city, further improve the crossing of the canal lift bridge, West Jackson St in Ancaster to Garner Rd, W 5th connection to Twenty Rd, a corridor by Upper James connecting Rymal/W5th to the airport, Scenic Dr/Fennell Ave, Concession St, Mountain Brow Blvd (Concession St to Mohawk Rd), Upper Ottawa St, Upper Wentworth St (Mohawk to the LINC), the Arbou Rd bridge over the LINC, Rymal Rd to Hendershot Rd, Pritchard Rd, First Rd East, First Rd West (and connections to Greenhill Ave to King St and to Paramount Dr along the brow), Green Mountain Rd crossing Upper Centennial Parkway, and an escarpment crossing at the Devil’s Punch Bowl.  

4) More bike parking is needed in every area of the city, provided by the City, other public institutions and private companies/developments.  

5) More education of auto drivers and cyclists is needed. Please investigate cycling education with the Boards of Education – grade 4 and grade 5 students.  

Thank you for this opportunity to submit comment.  

The Hamilton Cycling Committee. |

| S-22 Ancaster Cycle | Re: Ancaster Bike Racks  
| Offer racks (like compound design) in vicinity of bike shops, specific to the nearby bike shop. |

| S-23 Hamilton Police | ☑ Commuter ☑ Recreational ☑ Utilitarian  
| Dundas to Central Hamilton, Rail trial, Waterfront  
| All city streets should be rider friendly. More people will leave their cars at home.  
| ☑ Multi-Use Path ☑ Reserved Bike Lane ☑ Paved Shoulder  
| Waterfront and Rail trail  
| ☑ Option A ☑ Option B  
| So all people will ride.  
| Trails throughout the city.  
<p>| Yes. No. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S-24 Hamilton Police</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Hamilton Police Service has reviewed the stated document and in principal agrees with the need to go “Green” and to examine alternative means of Transportation. In regards to Police input concerning the stated plan we are first and foremost in the business of Traffic Safety. Traffic Safety is subsequently broken down into two components: Education and Enforcement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hamilton Police Service in it's Traffic Safety Strategy Plan 2009, has many programs in effect that enlighten the public. We make use of targeted media releases, and community interaction through neighbourhood meetings and school visits, to get the message to specific users and the general public. Bicycle safety is but one of the target programs in the Traffic Safety Strategy Plan 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enforcement:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The second part of the Hamilton Police Services Traffic Safety Strategy Plan 2009 is enforcement. Enforcement is the component that seems to focus the publics' attention, which they relate to Police Duty. The following are the number of bicycle related “Tickets” that members of the HPS have issued over the past several years:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 = 80 Provincial Offence Notices (PONs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 = 65 PONs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 = 198 PONs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 = 203 PONs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 = 381 PONs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 = 103 PONs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In six (6) years members of the HPS have issued 1030 PONs, which is on average 171 PONs a year. Breaking this down further based on an eight month bicycling season we have, on average, 21 PONs are issued per month of the eight month bicycling season.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As you can see the enforcement numbers are not excessive, suggesting HPS Officers are using their discretion when it comes to Bicycle enforcement. Infractions of the Highway Traffic Act of Ontario (HTA) and City of Hamilton By-Laws as they relate to Bicycles are many, but again Officers are choosing to educate and issue a warning, rather than to enforce the letter of the law. In regards to specifics of the Cycling Master Plan, the HPS could not possibly comment on each section of Bike Lane, Bike Trail, or Shared Lane as it pertains to enforcement, that would be a document that would consist of volumes. Additional lanes, paths and trails will no doubt change the way we police and respond to calls for service. Sadly, such quiet and picturesque areas draw the less savory of characters, resulting in crimes of opportunity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In regards to safety, the Hamilton Police Service only recommends that all measures be taken to limit the interaction of bicycles and other vehicles on major roads within the City. No matter how safe and correct a cyclist is performing they are ALWAYS going to be on the receiving end when they get mixed up with a motor vehicle. In regards to the cycling questionnaire, it has been sent out via e-mail to our members. Their responses will be sent directly to the appropriate person at City Hall. I don’t anticipate a large response prior to the February 20th deadline we assigned it. I would expect a response from the members who patrol on bicycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for including the HPS in your research. If you require anything further from the Traffic Branch, please feel free to contact me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S-11

From: Bender, Daryl [Daryl.Bender@hamilton.ca]
Sent: December 11, 2008 4:23 PM
To: Jennifer Niece
Cc: Nairn, Sandy; Fazio, Margaret; TOE, Assistant Environmental Planner; Christiani, Catherine
Subject: RE: Cycling Master Plan-GO Transit comments

Jennifer,
Much appreciated, thanks.

Daryl Bender B.E.S.
Project Manager, Alternative Transportation
Traffic Engineering Section
Public Works
City of Hamilton
905-546-2424 x 2066

-----Original Message-----
From: Jennifer Niece [mailto:jennifer.niece@gotransit.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 11, 2008 4:07 PM
To: Bender, Daryl
Subject: Cycling Master Plan-GO Transit comments

Hi Daryl,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the City of Hamilton's Cycling Master Plan. GO Transit submits the following comments based on the PIC information boards and other relevant background studies posted on the City's website in November. We look forward to working with you to ensure a continuous, safe, and attractive pedestrian and cycling network leading to GO Transit services in the City of Hamilton.

GO Transit is taking steps to increase the pedestrian and cycling friendliness of its station areas and providing higher quality bicycle parking. Obviously having appropriate pedestrian and cycling connections through the city and leading to GO stations is an essential complement to our station-based improvements if we are to succeed in attracting people to travel to our stations by bicycle. In addition, by April 2009 all GO Buses will be equipped with bike racks which will increase the need for bicycle facilities along corridors served by GO Buses to enable passengers to safely access those bus routes with their bicycles.

To this end, we encourage the City of Hamilton to consider the following GO service locations as key destinations to be served with bicycle routes:

1) Hamilton GO Centre (Hunter and James)
2) McMaster University bus terminal
3) Stoney Creek park & ride lot (Nash Rd. N. on west side near Barton St.)
4) King Street and Main Street between John St. and McMaster University (which are served by GO buses)
5) The former Liuna Station location on James Street North (future rail services are being considered for this area)

All of these locations are already reasonably well served by the City's existing system of on-road bike routes, with some limited portions providing full bicycle lanes. Enticing more people to choose cycling as a mode of travel would require these on-road bike routes to be upgraded to full
bicycle lanes in both directions of travel (one direction on one-way streets) to provide a higher
level of perceived security for cyclists. Our preference is for “Option A” presented which we feel
would provide the most complete cycling network - the bicycle lanes recently installed on York
Street which are separated from motor vehicle traffic by a wide hatched area are a
particularly good design. Further separation using curbs or bollards in selected locations is also
a strategy the city may wish to consider.

More specifically, there appears to be a need for a continuous north-south route through the
downtown area. James St. or John St. should be considered for full bike lanes for this purpose.

GO supports the addition of any bicycle lanes that provide continuous travel for long distances
through the City, creating a strong grid network that enables cyclists to travel without frequent
diversions or zig-zags to move through the City. This could include extending the existing King
Street and Main Street bike routes further east, and upgrading them to be full bike lanes. A
high proportion of GO Transit customers travel to the Hunter St. GO Centre from the south and
the east. Full bike lane connections crossing the escarpment, and providing access from the east
would also be very valuable.

Particular attention should be given to interchanges with major highways - the 403 and Red Hill
Creek Expressway being key. We recommend that expressway crossings be given special
attention to increase driver awareness/visibility of pedestrians and cyclists, and that opportunities
be explored to make these crossings more amenable to both cycling and walking.

GO Transit encourages the City of Hamilton to continue its program to provide secure bicycle
parking in bicycle cages. From the customer comments we have received, it is clear that the
lack of secure bicycle parking (e.g. lockers or cages) is a deterrent to people cycling to our
stations. We are working to remedy this on our property, but we presume that this may be an
issue for many other types of utilitarian cycling trips throughout Hamilton.

Finally, with respect to the criteria for prioritizing bike lanes (and specifically the criteria regarding
cost), GO Transit is open to discussions with the City of Hamilton to cost-share the capital costs
of bicycle and pedestrian facilities that provide high quality connections to our services.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. I look forward to seeing the next draft of
the plan.

Best Regards,
Jennifer

Jennifer Niece, M.A. (Planning)
Transportation Planner
Transportation Planning & Development
GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
(416)869-3600 x 5460
Jennifer.Niece@gotransit.com

This e-mail message is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and is
confidential, subject to copyright and may be legally privileged. Any unauthorized review, use or
disclosure is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete all
copies of the e-mail together with any attachments.

***************************************************************
APPENDIX VII:

PIC AND STAKEHOLDER MAPS

*Available Upon Request*
APPENDIX VIII:

OTHER COMMUNITY COMMENT DATA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRACKING CODE</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OC-1</td>
<td>Re: CP rail trail Over Hwy 403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC-2</td>
<td>Avoid busy traffic streets for cycling - car exhaust is doing more harm than first thought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC-3</td>
<td>Re: Park Dun Park E bike lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC-4</td>
<td>Re: Wilson, Ancaster Left turn lanes at Rousseaux.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC-5</td>
<td>Re: Garth Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC-6</td>
<td>Re: Steel Mills Area Cycling design in industrial area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC-7</td>
<td>Re: Jolley Cut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC-8</td>
<td>NYC Ninth Ave bike lane (two-way on one side) and Broadway esplanade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC-9</td>
<td>Re: Bay St, Area Water to downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC-10</td>
<td>Re: RHV MUP Some areas too steep by escarpment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC-11</td>
<td>Re: King, Lawrence King over RHVP, asphalt on lawrence at London (groove).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC-12</td>
<td>Re: Downtown More BLs to access core, more bike parking, remove stop signs on Cumberland and paint BLs, Sherman south to Cumberland, Cannon/Wilson/York.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC-13</td>
<td>Showers at schools/etc for cyclists, and bike parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC-14</td>
<td>Re: Windermere Basin Loop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC-15</td>
<td>Re: Victoria Park And crossing streets in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC-16</td>
<td>Re: Jerseyville Rd Paved Shoulders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC-17</td>
<td>Re: Bay St, Stuart St Bike lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC-18</td>
<td>Re: Barton Bike lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC-19</td>
<td>Re: Sanders Bike lanes please and traffic calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC-20</td>
<td>Re: E/W in lower city north of Main Alleys as bike routes and other areas too?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC-21</td>
<td>Re: Wilson/Cannon Bike lanes please – and Victoria to the general and educate drivers that bikes are traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC-22</td>
<td>Better design for children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC-23</td>
<td>West of 403 to downtown and Bay (Main to Bayfront Park)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC-24</td>
<td>Re: Dundurn, York, Wilson, King Wb, Gage to Mac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC-25</td>
<td>Re: Dundas racks Racks at University Mall, Osler/Governors Mall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC-26</td>
<td>Re: King (Stirling to Forsyth) and truck route? BLs on King by Haddon (get bikes off sidewalk) &amp; a white line on Haddon approach, traffic by daycare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC-27</td>
<td>Re: Lyndon-Harrissburg rail trail City surplus land – not in Trails Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC-28</td>
<td>Re: King/Macklin Get bikes off sidewalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC-29</td>
<td>Re: King/Haddon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OC-30  Re: McMaster
Educate cyclists w signs leaving Mac "fine for riding on sidewalk"

OC-31  Re: Dewitt access
A down bound bike lane on this access. Currently one way outbound for autos.

OC-32  Re: Ferguson tunnel
Tunnel lighting, brush clearing at entrance, curb cut, signage

OC-33  Below are my ideas for improving the cycling network in Hamilton. They are mainly based on my experience cycling from home to work. I have not reviewed other master plans to see if these ideas are already being considered (you can get Ted to do that).

   Small things to do NOW:
- Pedestrian/cycling connection at the north end of Columbia Drive – this is literally a hole in the fence. I can barely squeeze my bike and panniers through it. The path on the Mohawk campus is a foot path. The sight lines are obscured by trees/vines/bushes. There is no curb cut to get onto Columbia Drive. This route is shown on the bikeway map. Put some design effort into fixing this connection. It won’t cost very much money and will fix a very ugly and dysfunctional connection. Request that Mohawk College provide a multi-use trail connection from the end of Columbia Street to Governors Boulevard. Provide low-level pedestrian lighting that will not disturb the neighbours.
- Aberdeen Avenue – while it is being resurfaced, give it a road diet to provide bike lanes. The two-lane off-ramp from 403 EB could have a through lane and a left-turn lane at Longwood, allowing one of the through lanes on Aberdeen east of Longwood to be dropped. Convert Aberdeen to 2 through lanes, a 2WLTL and bike lanes to at least Dundurn. I would be bold and actually provide this cross section to Queen Street.
- Pave the Chedoke Radial Trail from Dundurn to the Chedoke stairs so that it can be maintained in the winter. This provides an important winter connection across the escarpment to downtown. Alternatives are to ride on Beckett or James Mountain – I’d rather take the stairs. Beddoe is a good route to Westdale but Dundurn or Hillcrest/Mountain Ave are the routes to downtown thus require paving of a portion of the Radial Trail

   Short term:
- Find a north-south and an east-west route through the downtown that actually work for cyclists. None of the current routes on the bikeway map work well, mainly because of the frequency of stop signs, one-way streets. I was riding up Locke Street from Barton southbound and then realized that this bike route didn’t work because of a one-way section. I had to find my way over to Queen, but there were no signs to help out and lots of one-way streets (see signage strategy below).
- Drop a lane (or two) from Bay Street, particularly between Jackson and Cannon. The right-turn lanes and lane balance/continuity along this section make it very difficult to ride a bike through. Even in a car, one cannot remain in one lane from Jackson to Cannon – one change at least is required. Perhaps add a left-side bike lane? Bay is a great connection with the exception of the Jackson to Cannon section.
- There are too many stop signs on the bike routes to make them functional for a cyclist. Change the stop signs to yield control traffic circles (not roundabouts, just traffic circles). Markand contraflow is great, but too many stop signs. I think Bendamere/South Bend needs only 4 traffic circles to get rid of the stop-controlled intersections.
- On the bicycle routes, make sure there is bicycle detection that works where they cross arterial roadways – either a marked loop or push button accessible to a cyclist without getting off the bike. Do an audit with the signal maintenance staff to see which intersections need to be fixed.
- Fix any pathways through parks that provide a connection or link in a bicycle route. For example, the path through the park joining Bendamere to South Bend does not have curb cuts and pathways that allow one to enter/exit the roadway in the correct position for continuing on the road. It is confusing who would have right-of-way if trying to cross to the path.
- Come up with a bike route signage strategy that works and actually provides useful information (communicate the network’s connectedness, destinations and distances or travel time) This takes staff resources to come up with a plan and co-ordinate between the on and off-road portions.
- Squeeze the lane widths on Golf Links and get in a bike lane from Scenic/Upper Horning to Halsan

   Short to Mid-term:
- Review all 4-lane roadways and convert to 3 lanes plus bike lanes. I think Mohawk from Scenic/Upper Horning could function without 4 lanes to at least West 5th.

   Ongoing:
- All road project should explicitly consider the needs of cyclists. Even if it is not in the master plan, the roads should be “complete streets”. For example, why is the City of Burlington including bike lanes on the plans for Waterdown Road by the City of Hamilton is not? This does not make sense.
- Perform on-going quality audits. The bike lane on Wilson is no longer useable because of the poor quality of the pavement, yet the travel lanes were resurfaced while the bike lanes were not.

If I think of anything else, I’ll let you know.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

The City of Hamilton (the City) is undertaking a review of the previous Cycling Master Plan (“Shifting Gears”) and conducting a comprehensive City-wide study of the Cycling Network in order to implement and expand upon the recommendations made in the Growth Related Infrastructure Development Strategy (GRIDS) and the City-wide Transportation Master Plan (2007). The study will investigate how to better connect cycling systems together in a city-scale network, improve connections to transit nodes and encourage cycling use within the City of Hamilton.

This study is following the approved environmental planning process for Master Plans under the Municipal Engineers Association’s Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (June 2000, as amended in 2007) with the opportunity for public input throughout the study. The Master Plan is intended to fulfill the Class EA requirements for Schedule B Projects that are identified and to outline additional work that will be required for any Schedule C Projects that are identified. Upon completion of the study a Master Plan report will be completed and filed for public review.

This report documents the results of the second round of Public Information Centres for the Hamilton Cycling Master Plan Update study.

2.0 PURPOSE

Public Information Centres (PICs) are informal meetings where area residents and other interested parties are provided the opportunity to review planning and project information. PICs are a key part of consultation programs and are designed to involve stakeholders early and throughout the EA process to identify concerns and provide opportunities for input.

The first round of PICs for the project were held in November 2008 at 4 venues within the City of Hamilton – Downtown Hamilton, Stoney Creek, Ancaster and West Hamilton. The first round of PICs provided an opportunity for the public, interest groups, agencies and stakeholders to review existing conditions and provide preliminary input. The second round of PICs was held in order to present the findings of the study and the preferred alternatives.

3.0 LOCATION, DATE, TIME

The second round of PICs was held as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuesday, April 14, 2009</th>
<th>Thursday, April 16, 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Board of Education 100 Main Street West Hamilton, ON</td>
<td>Sackville Hill Seniors Recreation Centre 780 Upper Wentworth Street Hamilton, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 to 8:00 p.m.</td>
<td>6:00 to 8:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to low attendance during the first round of PICs, the PIC venues in Stoney Creek and Ancaster were eliminated.
4.0 NOTIFICATION

A notice regarding the study commencement and PIC #1 was published in local newspapers as follows:

- The Hamilton Spectator        April 3, 2009  April 10, 2009
- Ancaster News                  April 3, 2009  April 10, 2009
- Dundas Star News               April 3, 2009  April 10, 2009
- Mountain News                  April 3, 2009  April 10, 2009
- Stoney Creek News              April 3, 2009  April 10, 2009
- Glanbrook Gazette              April 3, 2009  April 10, 2009
- Flamborough Review             April 3, 2009  April 10, 2009
- View Magazine                  April 2-8, 2009 Edition

The City of Hamilton also posted the notice on the project website (www.hamilton.ca/shiftinggears). A copy of the Ontario Government Notice newspaper advertisement is included in Appendix IX.

Notice of PIC #2 was distributed via mail or email (depending on preference) to those on the public contact list on March 30, 2009 (mail) and March 31, 2009 (email). A stakeholder / agency letter and notice of PIC #2 was distributed via mail or email (depending on preference) to those on the stakeholder / agency contact list on March 30, 2009 (mail) and March 31, 2009 (email).

Copies of the letters and emails are included in Appendix X.

5.0 STAFF ATTENDANCE

The following key City and Consultant staff were in attendance at the PICs:

- Margaret Fazio, City of Hamilton, Environmental Planning
- Matt Robson, City of Hamilton, Environmental Planning
- Daryl Bender, City of Hamilton, Traffic Engineering
- Hart Solomon, City of Hamilton, Traffic Engineering (Downtown Hamilton venue only)
- Rich Shebib, City of Hamilton, Traffic Engineering (West Hamilton venue only)
- Sandy Nairn, Ecoplans Limited, Consultant Environmental Planner
- Catherine Christiani, Ecoplans Limited, Junior Environmental Planner

6.0 MATERIAL DISPLAYED

The following panels were displayed at the PICs, Stakeholder meeting and on the project website:

1. Welcome (text)
2. Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Process (flow chart)
3. Class Environmental Assessment Requirements (text)
4. Study Timeline and Methodology (text and photo)
5. Existing Urban Facilities (map)
6. Existing Rural Facilities (map)
7. Opportunity Statement and Study Objective (text and photo)
8. Public Information Centre #1 Feedback (text and graphs)
9. Cycling Facility Types (text and graphics)
10. Collision Data (text and graphs)
11. The Propose Cycling Network – Facility Network Evaluation (text and chart)
12. The Proposed Cycling Network – Implementation (text and photo)
13. Existing and Planned Urban Facilities (map)
14. Existing and Planned Rural Facilities (map)
15. Evaluation of Alternatives (text and chart)
16. The Review of Alternatives – Criteria (text)
17. The Review of Alternatives – Results/Facility Recommendations (text and chart)
18. The Review of Alternatives – Results/Proposed Projects (text and chart)
19. Cycling Education and Promotion (text and photo)
20. Bike Parking (text and photos)
21. Thank You/Next Steps (text)

A reduced sized copy of the display panels is provided in Appendix XI.

7.0 FORMAT

Individuals attending the PICs were asked to sign the register. They were informed of the availability of comment sheets, which they were encouraged to complete. Staff was available to answer questions and provide information regarding the study. If individuals wished to take comment sheets home, they were requested to provide their responses to the appropriate contacts outlined on the comment sheet by April 30, 2009.

A reduced sized copy of the comment sheet is provided in Appendix XII.

8.0 SUMMARY OF ATTENDANCE AND COMMENTS RECEIVED

8.1 Public Information Centres

Approximately 43 people attended the second round of PICs. Table 1 provides a breakdown of attendance and comments received by PIC date/venue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/ Location</th>
<th>Total Attendance</th>
<th>Written Comments Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 14 2009</td>
<td>Downtown Hamilton</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 16 2009</td>
<td>West Hamilton</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the PICs, public input was encouraged and facilitated through the project website, the project team email address (cycling@hamilton.ca) and the project team contact information listed in each newspaper notification. A breakdown of the submissions received by the deadline for comments on PIC #2 materials (April 30, 2009) is provided in Table 2:
### TABLE 2. SUMMARY OF PUBLIC INPUT / SUBMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Comments</th>
<th># Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All comments were reviewed and information was provided where requested. All legible names and addresses from the comment sheets were added to the study email and/or mailing list (as indicated) and will be advised of any future consultation events.

### 8.2 Stakeholder and Agency Comments

Stakeholders and Agencies were also invited to submit comments on the PIC material. 6 sets of written comments from stakeholders and agencies were received in total. Those whom submitted comments included the Chedoke Hospital Rehabilitation Resource Centre, the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority, the Grand River Conservation Authority, the Ministry of Transportation (Highway Engineering, Planning & Design – Hamilton, Niagara), the Niagara Escarpment Commission and the Regional Niagara Cycling Committee. All comments were reviewed and information was provided where requested.

### 9.0 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

Comments were received at the PICs through discussion and comment sheets. The comments received have been summarized and are presented in Table 3 and Table 4. The summarized comments also include those comments received by the comment deadline.

It should be noted that the following is a broad generalization of specific suggestions. They have been listed in no particular order.

### TABLE 3. SUMMARY OF PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS RECEIVED

- The plan is comprehensive and impressive
- There are no routes through Downtown Hamilton
- Bike lanes are favoured over signed routes
- More bike lanes are needed in Downtown Hamilton
- More north-south connections are needed
- Create a dedicated east-west cycling corridor
- More bike parking/secure storage is needed, particularly in commercial areas
- Maintain curb lanes and paved shoulders so they are free of potholes and debris
- Bike lanes should be physically separated from traffic, particularly along high speed/high volume roads
- Implement traffic calming and other safety measures for cyclists, such as reduced speed limits for cars, traffic lights which detect the presence of cyclists, bike boxes at traffic lights and cyclist crossings
- Prioritize routes for snow clearing
TABLE 3. SUMMARY OF PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS RECEIVED

- Provide protected bike parking at public events and festivals
- Improve escarpment accesses. They are in poor condition.
- Route and community connectivity are important
- Multi-use paths aren’t practical for commuter cyclists
- Produce more destination/distance signage aimed at cyclists
- Implement the plan as soon as possible
- Include kids cycling skills training in Parks and Recreation Summer Day Camp programs
- Target cycling promotion at students and other likely cyclists
- Promote active living and active transportation
- Research/visit other national and internationally renowned bike cities, such as Ottawa, Portland, Vancouver, Seattle and New York
- Plan more multi-use paths
- Paint directional arrows in bike lanes
- Clarification was needed on how the priority listing was devised, what the construction schedule for projects will be and what routes will be implemented
- Analyze safety issues along all routes
- Incorporate cyclists and their needs into rapid transit corridors, stops and stations
- Consider implementing a community bike share program
- All escarpment stairs should have bike troughs
- Include bike lanes on all new roads
- Paved shoulders on all rural roads
- General requests for more information, ex. cycling maps, promotion materials, PIC 2 materials, etc.
- Requests for bike lanes on Rymal Rd., West 5th, Queen St., James St. N, Kennilworth Ave., Evans Rd., Locke St., Kerns Rd., Main St. and King St.
- Requests for maintenance (repaving, pothole filling, debris cleanup, improved signage, safety improvements, etc.) on John St. S, Sherman Access, Stonechurch Rd., Longwood Hill, Claremont Access, Golf Links Rd., Jerseyville Rd (west of Shaver Rd), York Blvd Bridge, Upper Wentworth St (opposite from East 24th St), and Jolley Cut
- Requests for paved shoulders along Lyden Rd., Jerseyville Rd., Fiddlers Green Rd. and Book Rd.
- The following routes should be given higher priority: Highway 403 and QEW crossings at Woodward Ave, Connecting the Bayfront Trail to the Lake Ontario Trail, Pritchard Rd, Queensdale Ave, all escarpment crossings (particularly the Jolley Cut and Claremont Access improvements)
- The following routes should be given lower priority: King (between Sterling St and Longwood Rd) and Highland Rd (between Winterberry Dr and First Rd E)
- Barton St. would be a better route then Cannon St.
- Improve the connection between the Ancaster Senior Achievement Centre and the Jerseyville Rail Trail

The complete verbatim public and stakeholder comments received can be found in Appendix XIII.

TABLE 4. SUMMARY OF AGENCY COMMENTS RECEIVED

- The plan is comprehensive and impressive
- Limited accessibility to trails and paths for those with disabilities. Escarpment crossings should be more accessible
- Wish to coordinate with City efforts
- Requests for more information on cycling infrastructure (on- and off-street) proposed for Provincial roads and in areas within the Niagara Escarpment Plan
- Suggested revisions to the evaluation criteria
### TABLE 4. SUMMARY OF AGENCY COMMENTS RECEIVED

- Clarification on the EA process being followed
- General comments on maintenance issues and preferred route improvements
- Ontario Regulation 150/06 permits may be required for certain works
- Development permits may be required for works within the NEP
- Cycling infrastructure should not be placed on King Road in Burlington

All of the agency comments received can be found in **Appendix XIV**.
APPENDIX IX:

NOTICE OF PIC #2
THE STUDY
The City of Hamilton has initiated the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) – Master Planning process for the review of the previous Cycling Master Plan (“Shifting Gears”). This Master Plan study has been investigating how to better connect cycling systems together in a city-wide network, improve connections to transit nodes and encourage cycling use within the City of Hamilton.

The Master Plan is intended to fulfill the Class EA requirements for Schedule B Projects that are identified and to outline additional work that will be required for any Schedule C Projects that are identified.

THE PROCESS
This study is following the approved environmental planning process for Master Plans under the Municipal Engineers Association’s Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (June 2000, as amended in 2007). Upon completion of the study, a Master Plan report will be completed and filed for public review and comment.

PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE
Stakeholder consultation is an important part of the Class EA process. Therefore the 2nd Public Information Centre will be held to present the findings of the study and the preferred alternatives.

Tuesday, April 14, 2009
6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Hamilton – Wentworth District School Board
100 Main St. W, Hamilton,
Lower Auditorium

Thursday, April 16, 2009
6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Sackville Hill Seniors Recreation Centre
780 Upper Wentworth Street,
Hamilton

PUBLIC COMMENTS INVITED
There is an opportunity at any time during this process for interested persons to review outstanding issues and bring concerns to the attention of the Project Managers. If you have any questions or comments or wish to be added to the study mailing list, please contact:

Daryl Bender
Project Manager, Alternative Transportation
Public Works
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North
Ste 320, Hamilton, Ontario, L8R 2K3
Phone (905) 546-2424 ext 2066
Email cycling@hamilton.ca

J.A. (Sandy) Nairn, MCIP, RPP
Consultant Project Manager
Ecoplans Limited
2655 North Sheridan Way
Mississauga, Ontario, L5K 2P8
Phone (905) 823-4988
Fax (905) 823-2669
Email snairn@ecoplans.com

Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record.

This Notice issued on April 3, 2009 and April 10, 2009
APPENDIX X:

PUBLIC, STAKEHOLDER AND AGENCY PIC #2 NOTIFICATION LETTERS AND EMAILS
March 27, 2009

To whom it may concern:

Subject: City Wide Cycling Master Plan – Phase 2, Public Information Centre #2 Invitation

This letter is to inform your agency that the City of Hamilton has held a set of four Public Information Centres (PIC) during Phase 1 – Information Gathering Phase of the City-Wide Cycling Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Master Plan. We will be holding a second set of PICs for Phase 2 of the above project on April 14th and 16th, 2009. More detailed information concerning these PICs has been enclosed.

The City of Hamilton staff and their consultants will provide information on the evaluation methodology and the expanded, proposed, prioritized network implementation schedule at the above April PICs. The new network will consist of a variety of alternative designs of cycling facilities, as follows:

- Multi-use paths (off-street, rural & urban),
- Reserved Bike Lanes (on-street, urban)
- Signed Bike Routes (on-street, urban), and
- Paved Shoulders (on-road, rural)

In order to accommodate Reserved Bike Lanes this project has considered removal of parking, reduction of traffic lanes, and traffic lane re-designation as well as other alternatives.

The information that will be presented at the April 14th and 16th PICs will be posted on the webpage (www.hamilton.ca/ShiftingGears) just prior to these dates. Please feel free to provide your comments regarding the project to me at 905-546-2424 ext 5103, by email at Margaret.Fazio@hamilton.ca, or alternatively by contacting Daryl Bender as per the attached notice.

Yours truly,

Margaret Fazio, B.Sc.
Project Manager
Environmental Planning

Encl.
THE STUDY
The City of Hamilton has initiated the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) – Master Planning process for the review of the previous Cycling Master Plan (“Shifting Gears”). This Master Plan study has been investigating how to better connect cycling systems together in a city-wide network, improve connections to transit nodes and encourage cycling use within the City of Hamilton.

The Master Plan is intended to fulfill the Class EA requirements for Schedule B Projects that are identified and to outline additional work that will be required for any Schedule C Projects that are identified.

THE PROCESS
This study is following the approved environmental planning process for Master Plans under the Municipal Engineers Association’s Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (June 2000, as amended in 2007).

Upon completion of the study, a Master Plan report will be completed and filed for public review and comment.

PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE
Stakeholder consultation is an important part of the Class EA process. Therefore the 2nd Public Information Centre will be held to present the findings of the study and the preferred alternatives.

Tuesday, April 14, 2009
6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Hamilton – Wentworth District School Board
100 Main St. W, Hamilton,
Lower Auditorium

Thursday, April 16, 2009
6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Sackville Hill Seniors Recreation Centre
780 Upper Wentworth Street,
Hamilton

PUBLIC COMMENTS INVITED
There is an opportunity at any time during this process for interested persons to review outstanding issues and bring concerns to the attention of the Project Managers. If you have any questions or comments or wish to be added to the study mailing list, please contact:

Daryl Bender
Project Manager, Alternative Transportation
Public Works
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North
Ste 320, Hamilton, Ontario, L8R 2K3
Phone (905) 546-2424 ext 2066
Email cycling@hamilton.ca

J.A. (Sandy) Nairn, MCIP, RPP
Consultant Project Manager
Ecoplans Limited
2655 North Sheridan Way
Mississauga, Ontario, L5K 2P8
Phone (905) 823-4988
Fax (905) 823-2669
Email snairn@ecoplans.com

Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record.

This Notice issued on April 3, 2009 and April 10, 2009
From: TOE, Assistant Environmental Planner
Sent: Tuesday, March 31, 2009 10:07 AM
To: Fazio, Margaret
Subject: City of Hamilton Cycling Master Plan-Public Information Centre (PIC) #2 Notice

Please see attached Agency Letter and Notice for the City of Hamilton's Cycling Master Plan PIC #2.

Regards,

Matt Robson
Assistant Environmental Planner
Environmental Planning

Capital Planning and Implementation Division
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
Tel: 905-546-2424 ext. 2433
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: spostud@hamilton.ca
Please see attached Agency Letter and Notice for the City of Hamilton's Cycling Master Plan PIC #2.
March 27, 2009

To whom it may concern:

Subject: City Wide Cycling Master Plan – Phase 2,
   Public Information Centre #2 Invitation

This letter is to inform your agency that the City of Hamilton has held a set of four Public
Information Centres (PIC) during Phase 1 – Information Gathering Phase of the City-Wide
Cycling Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Master Plan. We will be
holding a second set of PICs for Phase 2 of the above project on April 14th and 16th, 2009.
More detailed information concerning these PICs has been enclosed.

The City of Hamilton staff and their consultants will provide information on the evaluation
methodology and the expanded, proposed, prioritized network implementation schedule at
the above April PICs. The new network will consist of a variety of alternative designs of
cycling facilities, as follows:

- Multi-use paths (off-street, rural & urban),
- Reserved Bike Lanes (on-street, urban)
- Signed Bike Routes (on-street, urban), and
- Paved Shoulders (on-road, rural)

In order to accommodate Reserved Bike Lanes this project has considered removal of
parking, reduction of traffic lanes, and traffic lane re-designation as well as other
alternatives.

The information that will be presented at the April 14th and 16th PICs will be posted on the
webpage (www.hamilton.ca/ShiftingGears) just prior to these dates. Please feel free to
provide your comments regarding the project to me at 905-546-2424 ext 5103, by email at
Margaret.Fazio@hamilton.ca, or alternatively by contacting Daryl Bender as per the
attached notice.

Yours truly,

Margaret Fazio, B.Sc.
Project Manager
Environmental Planning

Encl.
THE STUDY
The City of Hamilton has initiated the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) – Master Planning process for the review of the previous Cycling Master Plan (“Shifting Gears”). This Master Plan study has been investigating how to better connect cycling systems together in a city-wide network, improve connections to transit nodes and encourage cycling use within the City of Hamilton.

The Master Plan is intended to fulfill the Class EA requirements for Schedule B Projects that are identified and to outline additional work that will be required for any Schedule C Projects that are identified.

THE PROCESS
This study is following the approved environmental planning process for Master Plans under the Municipal Engineers Association’s Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (June 2000, as amended in 2007). Upon completion of the study, a Master Plan report will be completed and filed for public review and comment.

PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE
Stakeholder consultation is an important part of the Class EA process. Therefore the 2nd Public Information Centre will be held to present the findings of the study and the preferred alternatives.

Tuesday, April 14, 2009
6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Hamilton – Wentworth District School Board
100 Main St. W, Hamilton,
Lower Auditorium

Thursday, April 16, 2009
6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Sackville Hill Seniors Recreation Centre
780 Upper Wentworth Street,
Hamilton

PUBLIC COMMENTS INVITED
There is an opportunity at any time during this process for interested persons to review outstanding issues and bring concerns to the attention of the Project Managers. If you have any questions or comments or wish to be added to the study mailing list, please contact:

Daryl Bender
Project Manager, Alternative Transportation
Public Works
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North
Ste 320, Hamilton, Ontario, L8R 2K3
Phone (905) 546-2424 ext 2066
Email cycling@hamilton.ca

J.A. (Sandy) Nairn, MCIP, RPP
Consultant Project Manager
Ecoplans Limited
2655 North Sheridan Way
Mississauga, Ontario, L5K 2P8
Phone (905) 823-4988
Fax (905) 823-2669
Email snairn@ecoplans.com

Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record.

This Notice issued on April 3, 2009 and April 10, 2009
TOE, Assistant Environmental Planner

From: TOE, Assistant Environmental Planner
Sent: Tuesday, March 31, 2009 10:12 AM
To: Fazio, Margaret
Subject: City of Hamilton Cycling Master Plan-Public Information Centre (PIC) #2 Notice

Please see attached Notice for the City of Hamilton's Cycling Master Plan PIC #2.

Regards,

Matt Robson
Assistant Environmental Planner
Environmental Planning

Capital Planning and Implementation Division
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
Tel: 905-546-2424 ext. 2433
Fax: 905-546-4435
Email: spostud@hamilton.ca

3/31/2009
Please see attached Notice for the City of Hamilton's Cycling Master Plan PIC #2.

Regards,

Matt Rieben
Assistant Environmental Planner
Environmental Planning

Capital Planning and Implementation Division
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
Tel 905-546-2000 ext. 2063
Fax 905-546-6405
Email: matr@hamilton.ca
CITY-WIDE CYCLING MASTER PLAN
NOTICE OF PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #2
MUNICIPAL CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

THE STUDY
The City of Hamilton has initiated the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) – Master Planning process for the review of the previous Cycling Master Plan (“Shifting Gears”). This Master Plan study has been investigating how to better connect cycling systems together in a city-wide network, improve connections to transit nodes and encourage cycling use within the City of Hamilton.

The Master Plan is intended to fulfill the Class EA requirements for Schedule B Projects that are identified and to outline additional work that will be required for any Schedule C Projects that are identified.

THE PROCESS
This study is following the approved environmental planning process for Master Plans under the Municipal Engineers Association’s Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (June 2000, as amended in 2007). Upon completion of the study, a Master Plan report will be completed and filed for public review and comment.

PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE
Stakeholder consultation is an important part of the Class EA process. Therefore the 2nd Public Information Centre will be held to present the findings of the study and the preferred alternatives.

Tuesday, April 14, 2009
6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Hamilton – Wentworth District School Board
100 Main St. W, Hamilton,
Lower Auditorium

Thursday, April 16, 2009
6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Sackville Hill Seniors Recreation Centre
780 Upper Wentworth Street,
Hamilton

PUBLIC COMMENTS INVITED
There is an opportunity at any time during this process for interested persons to review outstanding issues and bring concerns to the attention of the Project Managers. If you have any questions or comments or wish to be added to the study mailing list, please contact:

Daryl Bender
Project Manager, Alternative Transportation
Public Works
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North
Ste 320, Hamilton, Ontario, L8R 2K3
Phone (905) 546-2424 ext 2066
Email cycling@hamilton.ca

J.A. (Sandy) Nairn, MCIP, RPP
Consultant Project Manager
Ecoplans Limited
2655 North Sheridan Way
Mississauga, Ontario, L5K 2P8
Phone (905) 823-4988
Fax (905) 823-2669
Email snairn@ecoplans.com

Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record.

This Notice issued on April 3, 2009 and April 10, 2009
APPENDIX XI:

PIC #2 DISPLAY PANELS
Shifting Gears
Hamilton’s Cycling Master Plan

Welcome

Public Information Centre #2
Phase 2 of the Municipal Class EA process
- The “Preferred Solution” for implementation

We are asking for your feedback. Please submit your comments on the sheets provided.

This project is being conducted by the City of Hamilton with the assistance of two consulting firms: Ecoplans Limited and McCormick Rankin Corporation.
Class EA Requirement

This study is following the approved environmental planning process for Master Plans under the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (June 2000, as amended in 2007) (Class EA). This study will propose a comprehensive cycling network for both commuter and recreational cyclists and a schedule for the implementation of this network. Also, this study will propose strategies to encourage cycling through efforts including education programs, promotion and end of trip facilities (bike parking, shower facilities, etc.).

This process will meet Phases 1 and 2 of the Class EA planning process that includes:

- Phase 1 - Identify the problems or opportunities
- Phase 2 - Identify alternative solutions to address the problem and establish the preferred solution taking into account public and review agency input

Under the Class EA there are four project schedules, with each schedule having different requirements to fulfill the environmental planning process. This Master Plan is intended to:

- fulfill the Class EA requirements for any Schedule A, A+ and B Projects that are identified
- outline additional work that will be required for any Schedule C Projects that are identified

Upon completion of this study, a Master Plan report will be completed and filed for public review. Implementation of projects will then proceed to detailed design, and should any significant issues arise they will be discussed with the area Councillor. Note that any Schedule B or C Projects not identified as such in this Master Plan will require assessment through a future Cycling Master Plan update or through individual studies.

NOTE:
Construction of cycling facilities within existing rights-of-way are pre-approved under the EA Act (Schedule A+ activities). Projects include:

- **Road Diets** to accommodate a bike lane(s) by taking away a traffic lane on a street, and restriping the road for a bike lane(s). Although these projects are pre-approved under the EA Act, the City may consider a formal consultation process when implementing these projects prior to construction.

- **Road Widening**s to accommodate cycling facilities are considered Schedule A+ activities unless they require additional road right-of-way in which case they would be considered Schedule B projects if less than $2.2 M or Schedule C projects if they are greater than $2.2 M.
The City’s current Cycling Master Plan, *Shifting Gears*, was issued in 1999. This document is being updated through this study. The new cycling plan addresses:

- Where cycling facilities such as bike lanes are needed and the schedule for their implementation
- Other types of cycling infrastructure such as bike parking
- Educational programs
- Cycling promotional initiatives

The *timeline and methodology* of this new cycling master plan is as follows:

- Identifying opportunities and concerns:
  - Public Information Centre #1 (Nov. 2008, four locations)
  - Stakeholders meeting (Nov. 2008)
  - Hamilton Cycling Committee meeting (Dec. 2008)
- Review the recommended plan:
  - Public Information Centre #2 (April 2009, two locations)
  - Stakeholders and Cycling Committee comments - electronically
- Finalize the study and present to Council (June 2009)
- Filing of the Cycling Master Plan (summer/fall 2009)
Opportunity Statement

This study will propose a comprehensive cycling network for both commuter and recreational cyclists and will include initial prioritization of the network. Also, this study will propose strategies to encourage cycling through efforts including education programs, promotion and end of trip facilities (bike parking, shower facilities, etc.).

Objectives of the Study

• Develop a comprehensive cycling network through the expansion of on-street and off-street cycling facilities – including escarpment crossings, for both commuter and recreational cyclists.
• Ensure consistency in design, providing separate facilities on streets with large traffic volumes and high speeds and shared facilities on streets with low traffic volumes
• Provide convenient and all-season access to all residential and employment areas and transit nodes
• Develop initial prioritization of the expanded cycling network
• Review public education programs and promotional initiatives to foster cycling in Hamilton.
Public Information Centre (PIC) #1 Feedback

Feedback was received from just over 100 people through the PICs, emails, Stakeholder meeting and through the Cycling Committee; with commuter, recreational and utilitarian cyclists all well represented.

Where people cycle:
• Downtown area and recreational trails account for about 60% of cycling
• Dundas and the Mountain each account for about 10% of cycling.
• Other areas were identified less frequently (including rural areas).

Cycling Facility Design:
• Both Reserved Bike Lanes and Multi-use Paths were preferred primarily for safety

Cycling Network Strategy:
• Relatively even split between providing “bike lanes everywhere” versus developing a “primary corridors network”.
• The Cycling Committee favoured a “primary corridors network” to ensure a comprehensive network is established as a priority.

Criteria for Assessing Alternatives:
• Most respondents agreed with the criteria that was presented
• “Proximity to major origins & destinations” was added based on feedback received.
Designing Cycling Facilities

Bikeways
There are four cycling facility designs that the City of Hamilton prefers to utilize:

- Multi-use paths (off-street, rural & urban)

- Reserved Bike Lanes (on-street, urban)

- Signed Bike Routes (on-street, urban), and

- Paved Shoulders (on-road, rural)

Note:
The City considers the design where a bike lane(s) is positioned above the curb (beside the sidewalk) as the least preferred option. This design may cause conflicts at intersections and driveways due to poor visibility.

The City has approved a standard sewer grate design that is cycling friendly. The City continues to resolve a standard design for sewer grate collars that better prevents asphalt settling around sewer grates.
Collision Data

Police reported collision data for the City of Hamilton was analyzed for the 10 year period from August’98 to August’08. There are approximately 155 collisions involving cyclists each year, including an average of one fatality annually. Collision data will be incorporated into decisions regarding the location of new cycling facilities and implementation priorities.

The map below shows collision locations for the 10 year period for a large portion of the Hamilton urban area, with the collisions marked as black diamonds.

Cycling Crashes as Reported by Ontario Hospitals (2002/03)

Source: Ontario InjuryCompass, 2002/03)
Cycling Master Plan

The Proposed Cycling Network

As this project is following a Class Environmental Assessment process, various alternatives were considered including:

- “Status Quo”
- “Primary Corridors Network”
- “Provide Bike Facilities on All Major Streets”.

The proposed plan is to proceed with the “Primary Corridors Network” to ensure comprehensive connectivity throughout the City (urban & rural). The comparison of alternatives is presented in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Status Quo</th>
<th>Primary Corridors Network</th>
<th>Bike Facilities on All Major Streets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network Continuity</td>
<td>- No changes to the existing cycling network – continuity does not improve</td>
<td>- Improve network continuity on primary corridors</td>
<td>- Improves network continuity, although achieved slower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>- No improvements to the safety of the existing cycling network</td>
<td>- Improves safety by providing improved cycling network</td>
<td>- Improves safety by providing improved cycling network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>- Lower cost, maintain existing network only</td>
<td>- Higher cost to implement</td>
<td>- Highest cost to implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>Least Preferred - Does not address Study Objectives</td>
<td>Most Preferred - Addresses Study Objectives</td>
<td>Less Preferred - High cost reduces effective implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Completing primary cycling corridors as a priority, both on-road and off-road, will encourage cycling. Planning studies indicate that major cycling facilities should be spaced no further than 2 km apart in urban areas (The Big Move, Metrolinx 2008). Such a network cannot be built immediately, but will develop through annual improvements.
The Proposed Cycling Network

Cycling infrastructure is implemented in four ways:

- Specific cycling projects (typically retrofits on existing streets)
- Open Space trail construction
- Annual roadway reconstruction and rehabilitation
- Roadway projects as part of new development

In addition to routes shown in the following map, it is recognized that a larger network of cycling facilities is desirable and many of these are identified, thus there is specific text in the new Cycling Master Plan that reads: “in addition to the routes identified in this plan, every roadway project in the City shall investigate the inclusion of cycling facilities”.

![Image of a meeting with people discussing cycling infrastructure plans]
Evaluation of Alternatives

A review of the various alternative types of cycling facilities was undertaken and evaluated against the criteria identified in this project. The results of this evaluation are presented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Status Quo</th>
<th>Multi-Use Paths (away from the curb / off-street, rural &amp; urban)</th>
<th>Reserved Bike Lanes (on-street, urban)</th>
<th>Signed Bike Routes (on-street Urban)</th>
<th>Paved Shoulders On-road, Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network Continuity</td>
<td>- No major changes to the existing cycling network – continuity does not improve</td>
<td>- Can improve network continuity</td>
<td>- Can improve network continuity</td>
<td>Can improve network continuity</td>
<td>- Can improve network continuity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety / Collision History</td>
<td>- No improvements to the safety of the existing cycling network</td>
<td>- Improves safety by providing dedicated facility away from road traffic</td>
<td>- Improves safety by providing dedicated bike lane</td>
<td>- Appropriate for lower traffic volume streets</td>
<td>- Improves safety by providing paved shoulder for bikes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand for Cycling</td>
<td>- Does not address demand for cycling routes</td>
<td>- Addresses moderate demand for cycling off-street (primarily recreational)</td>
<td>- Addresses high demand for cycling within urban area (commuter, recreational)</td>
<td>- Addresses high demand for cycling within urban area</td>
<td>- Addresses moderate demand for cycling within rural areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>- Lower cost, maintain existing network only</td>
<td>- Higher cost to implement dedicated facility on separate right-of-way</td>
<td>- Higher cost to implement although dependent on available right-of-way width</td>
<td>- Low cost to implement (e.g. signage)</td>
<td>- Higher cost to implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Limitations</td>
<td>- No property impacts</td>
<td>- Higher potential for property impacts unless ownership is already City of Hamilton</td>
<td>- Variable impacts, depending on available property within right-of-way</td>
<td>- No property impacts as pavement width not affected</td>
<td>- Variable impacts, depending on available property within right-of-way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Reconstruction Schedules</td>
<td>- No impact to road reconstruction schedules</td>
<td>- Not applicable</td>
<td>- Increases priority and lowers project cost if project can be combined with road reconstruction</td>
<td>- Road reconstruction has less impact on project priority and project cost since signage is low cost to implement</td>
<td>- Increases priority and lowers project cost if project can be combined with road reconstruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Status Quo does not address the objectives of the study, therefore it is not carried forward. An effective City-wide cycling network is made up of a combination of Multi-Use Paths, Reserved Bike Lanes, Signed Bike Routes and Paved Shoulders dependant on site specific conditions.
Cycling Master Plan

The Review of Alternatives - Criteria

In order to develop a priority list for cycling infrastructure investment, the following criteria were used:

**Justification**
- Network Continuity - significance as a “missing link” in the network
  - projects were rated as having a high or low degree of continuity
- Safety/collision history
  - projects were weighted based on collisions per km
- Demand for cycling
  - projects were rated based on proximity to major origins & destination
  - projects were rated based on “community demand” from input from PIC #1 and existing City cycling plans

**Constraints**
- Cost
  - an estimated cost for each project was developed
- Property limitations
  - projects were assigned a cost estimate if property is anticipated to be acquired

With the ranking developed based on the above criteria, an initial prioritization of the **schedule of implementation** was developed incorporating road reconstruction schedules and consideration of recreation demand/tourism. Issues that arise during detailed design such as utility impacts and unforeseen property issues will further impact this schedule.
The Review of Alternatives – Results

As a master plan, the review of route options that were investigated includes many routes with a variety of design concepts for implementation. Some highlights:

- A total of approximately 500 cycling route segments of various lengths were investigated.
- Based on an initial prioritization, the preferred design solution for over 350 of these segments is some form of on-street cycling facility (see table below) and about 100 segments are multi-use paths.

Analysis of these segments recommends:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Recommendations</th>
<th># of Segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike Lanes on existing asphalt by adjusting or narrowing lane widths</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Lanes on existing asphalt by adjusting or removing on-street parking</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Lanes with special widening of asphalt or with reconstruction</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Lanes with road diets (taking away a traffic lane on a street)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared on-street (not signed)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared on-street (signed)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved shoulders by widening the asphalt</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrofit a bicycle facility for existing stairs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a new escarpment stairway</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that corridors being considered for Rapid Transit and Ministry of Transportation (MTO) roads were identified but excluded from analysis given potential conflicts, timing or jurisdiction.
## The Review of Alternatives - Results

The following is an initial prioritization list of proposed projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Design Concept</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>EA Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Longwood</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>BL on existing - Cline to Longwood ONLY (150m)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>road diet - BL EB on Bs, 3 auto, osp off es</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>Pritchard</td>
<td>First Rd E</td>
<td>4900</td>
<td>BL on existing &amp; 1s osp</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filman</td>
<td>Rousseaux</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>shared on-street - signed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Simcoe</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>shared on-street - signed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Charlton</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>shared on-street - signed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson/Hwy 2</td>
<td>Fiddler's Green</td>
<td>Hwy 52</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>BL in recon widening</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locke</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>BL on road diet north of Hunter, no BL at this time S of Hunter</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>BL on recon</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>2550</td>
<td>BL on existing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohawk</td>
<td>Scenic</td>
<td>Up Paradise</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>BL in recon widening</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arvin/Milburn</td>
<td>Brockley</td>
<td>Grey's</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>shared on-street - signed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rymal</td>
<td>Pritchard</td>
<td>Up Centennial</td>
<td>3980</td>
<td>BL w recon/dev</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>BL on 2way conversion</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jolley Cut</td>
<td>St Joseph</td>
<td>Concession</td>
<td>1410</td>
<td>BL onbound on existing (downbound if possible)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson/Hwy 2</td>
<td>Rousseaux</td>
<td>Halson</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>BL in recon widening</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Church</td>
<td>Garth</td>
<td>Up James</td>
<td>1645</td>
<td>BL on recon</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>Halton</td>
<td>Fruitland</td>
<td>3950</td>
<td>BL on existing</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>road diet - BL WB on Bs, 3 auto, osp off pk Na</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E24th</td>
<td>Concession</td>
<td>Mall Rd</td>
<td>2110</td>
<td>shared on-street - signed</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>2860</td>
<td>BL on road diet - LTL</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barline</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>Markland</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>BL on existing - S9 road - maintain 24hr parking on Es</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rifle Range/ Westbourne</td>
<td>Sands</td>
<td>south of Main</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>shared on-street - signed</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont Access</td>
<td>Inverness</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>BL on existing</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Rd W</td>
<td>Glover Mn Rd</td>
<td>Rymal</td>
<td>3875</td>
<td>BL &amp; existing MUP at Highbury</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic</td>
<td>Mohawk</td>
<td>Chateau</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>BL on existing</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatt</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>BL on existing - reduce osp to 1 side</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>Nash</td>
<td>Battlefield</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>BL on recon</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundas</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Cootes</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>BL on existing</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenston/Hwy 8</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Dewitt</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>BL in widening</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohawk</td>
<td>Old Mohawk</td>
<td>Scenic</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>BL on existing - narrow lanes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon</td>
<td>Queen</td>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>road diet Cannon, BL on existing on Britannia</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill Park Trail</td>
<td>Dalewood</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>shared on-street - signed</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatt</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>BL on existing - reduce osp to 1 side</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbour &amp; Anchor Roads</td>
<td>Arbour - SC northerly</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>shared on-street - signed</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>in Trails MP*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Markland</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>BL on road diet and reduce osp</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studholme</td>
<td>west end</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>BL on existing E of Baddeko</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Blvd</td>
<td>under QEW</td>
<td>Van Wagners</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>BL on road diet</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melvin</td>
<td>Strathhearn/Shelby</td>
<td>RHW MUP</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>road diet - parking 1 side Parkdale to Woodward, other section E</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogilvie</td>
<td>South St</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>BL on existing - Hatt to South</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osler</td>
<td>Spencer Creek</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>BL on existing - narrow curb lanes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon/Britania</td>
<td>Kenworth</td>
<td>Strathhearn/Shelby</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>road diet Cannon, BL on existing on Britannia</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Park</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>shared on-street - signed</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creighton</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Governor's</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>BL on existing</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longwood</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>BL on existing - eliminate osp</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>Kenworth</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>road diet - osp</td>
<td>%s</td>
<td>of TMLT if needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Links</td>
<td>Holton</td>
<td>Southhoute</td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>BL on existing - narrow lanes</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winterberry</td>
<td>Old Mud</td>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>BL on existing</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodward</td>
<td>Beach Blvd</td>
<td>Melvin</td>
<td>2525</td>
<td>BL on road diet - TMLT</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herkimer</td>
<td>Dundurn</td>
<td>MacNab</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>BL on road diet - BL existing (consider road diet to N W of Locke)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlton</td>
<td>Dundurn</td>
<td>Queen</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>BL on existing - No tway</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Sq</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Hatt</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>BL on existing</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerseyville</td>
<td>Shaver</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>2850</td>
<td>BL on recon widening</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 5th</td>
<td>Stone Church</td>
<td>Rymal</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>BL on recon</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruitland</td>
<td>North Service</td>
<td>Hwy 8</td>
<td>2425</td>
<td>BL on dev</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic</td>
<td>Chateau</td>
<td>Up Paradise</td>
<td>2270</td>
<td>BL on existing - construct sidewalk along brow</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon</td>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>road diet - osp</td>
<td>%s</td>
<td>of TMLT if needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Creighton</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>BL on existing - reduce osp to 1 side for 1 block</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>York/Hatt</td>
<td>Spencer Creek</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>BL on existing - narrow curb lanes</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td>Dock Service Rd</td>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>BL on existing - narrow curb lanes</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longwood</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>BL on road diet</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlton</td>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>BL on existing - note narrow er E of Walnut</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York EB</td>
<td>Dundurn</td>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>BL on existing - narrow curb lanes</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 5th</td>
<td>Gateview</td>
<td>Fennel</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>road diet for 4 lanes</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic</td>
<td>Up Paradise</td>
<td>Garth</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>BL &amp; SW on existing with paint</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>Forsyth</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>BL on road diet - keep parking both sides</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td>West Park</td>
<td>Cootes</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>BL on existing</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>Strachan</td>
<td>Cannon</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>BL on road diet - Barton to Cannon</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York WB</td>
<td>Queen</td>
<td>Dundurn</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>BL on existing - narrow curb lanes</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frid/Shallow</td>
<td>Longwood</td>
<td>Dundurn</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>BL on dev</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*grey shading indicates one-way*
Cycling Education & Promotion

Education and Advertising are two key ways to promote a safe and well utilized cycling network. Strategies include:

• Ensure cycling issues such as routes and end-of-trip facilities are addressed in the City’s new Official Plan, e.g. bike parking & showers
• Continue promotion of existing facilities (parking, etc.) on the City website.
• Design promotion programs for all cycling abilities from would-be cyclists to experienced – for both recreation and commuting.
• Design promotion for all ages of cyclists and utilize other organization’s networks to promote cycling – including schools.
• Continue the free availability of the City’s bike route map of existing cycling infrastructure, in both “print” and on the web
• Continue to incorporate wayfinding signage along cycling facilities
• Ensure all City Departments work together to encourage cycling e.g. Public Health promoting bike helmets for ALL cyclists
• Expand programs that promote cycling as a viable commuter option such as the Commuter Challenge, etc.
• Offer cycling education and safety courses for adults and youth - such as CAN-BIKE and Cyclemania.
• Pursue media coverage of cycling safety from all road-user perspectives and special campaigns using billboards, etc.
• Provide cycling information and accommodation for cyclists at festivals and other events
• Organize special cycling events – including races
• Initiate communication with the Ministry of Transportation to expand the cycling component in driver education materials.
• Promote Hamilton as a cyclist-friendly city - “Hamilton - Bike City”.
Bike Parking

The City employs the following strategies to provide bike parking:

• Post & ring racks along sidewalks in commercial areas

• Multi-ring bike racks on sidewalks in high demand locations – as a contracted arrangement which includes street advertizing

• Enclosed bike parking, providing a higher degree of security, primarily for commuters at areas with concentrated employment and at transit hubs, with significant funding provided by Metrolinx. The City also provides for combined cycling/transit trips with bike racks on the entire HSR fleet of 210 busses.

The City would like to recognize employers that provide excellent bike parking facilities for employees, students and visitors.

The City states cycling guidelines in documents such as the Official Plan and provides comment to commercial development applications recommending the provision of bike parking.
Next Steps:
This is a critical stage for feedback on the new Cycling Master Plan for the City of Hamilton. Should you have comments, please ensure we have received them by Thursday April 23.

Thank You for attending.

Please submit any comments on the forms provided and encourage others to provide feedback using the website or email.

web: [www.hamilton.ca/ShiftingGears](http://www.hamilton.ca/ShiftingGears)
email: [cycling@hamilton.ca](mailto:cycling@hamilton.ca)

The Cycling Master Plan is planned to be presented to Council in June 2009. With Council approval, the City will have a well defined list of projects for implementation and citizens and Council will have a good understanding of the financial requirements.

The information presented on these panels is posted on the above website.
APPENDIX XII:

PIC #2 COMMENT SHEET
PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #2 – April 2009

We would appreciate your comments with respect to the questions below and/or in regards to any other issues which you feel are relevant to this study.

Please either drop your completed comment sheet in the box provided or mail/fax it by April 30, 2009 to:

J.A. (Sandy) Nairn, MCIP, RPP
Consultant Project Manager
Ecoplans Limited
2555 North Sheridan Way
Mississauga, Ontario
L5K 2P8
Phone: (905) 823-4988
Fax: (905) 823-2669

Daryl Bender
Project Manager, Alternative Transportation
Public Works
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Ste. 320
Hamilton, Ontario
L6R 2K3
Phone: (905) 546-2424, Ext. 2066
Fax: (905) 540-5926

Please check here if a response is not required.

Thank you for your participation. Comments and information regarding this study are being collected to assist the City of Hamilton in meeting the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. They will be maintained on file for use during the study and may be included in study documentation. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record.

If you would like to be put on the project mailing list in order to be informed of future developments during the project's duration, please complete the following:

NAME: ___________________________________________
ADDRESS: ___________________________________________
POSTAL CODE: ______________
EMAIL: ___________________________________________

PREFERRED METHOD OF CONSULTATION: MAIL ☐ EMAIL ☐
APPENDIX XIII:

PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRACKING CODE</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| P-1 | 1. Signage – perhaps add cycle logo to street signs (as they are replaced) – example is Vancouver. Toronto numbered route system is confusing to infrequent user (ie. don’t use as an example).  
2. Priority in lanes should be given to crossing 403 highway and crossing QEW at Woodward Ave.  
3. Encourage GO Transit to take bikes at all times of the day including rush hour.  
4. More bike ring and posts especially along commercial streets – Locke, Main, King, Dundurn.  
5. Keep up pressure to increase use of bikes by targeting large potential cycling communities – students at Mohawk and McMaster, city employees, out of town commuters. |
| P-2 | I appreciate this opportunity to review and comment. I have no criticism or endorsement worth noting, but am encouraged by the scope of the proposals. My comment, as a senior in my 70’s and on behalf of fellow seniors less able to cycle, is that there be acknowledgement of the likely growth in E-bikes, and also in the steady growth in use of 3 and 4 wheeled battery-powered scooters and the rights they may have to take advantage of improved facilities. |
| P-3 | You can see a lot of thought has been put into this – so thank you. Questions:  
- Its great to have the multi-use trail at Waterfront shovelled all winter. Will the MUT from Scenic Dr. past Chedoke be eventually shovelled?  
- Why isn’t the Red Hill Expressway being used to route large trucks to Burlington St? (Main and King seem to still be the route). These huge trucks are just so dangerous for cyclists! I wonder if Barton St wouldn’t be a better route than Cannon?  
- Hopefully we’ll eventually have physically separated bike lanes. Thanks for all your efforts. |
| P-4 | Project looks good. I hope the money comes through. I ride a lot and would love more paved shoulders on busy rural type roads (ie. Jerseyville, Rymal, Fiddlers). I am disappointed with the rebuilding of Jerseyville Rd west of Shaver’s Rd. The widening is awesome but at the most dangerous pint – the “S” bend – the shoulders disappear! Not a safe place for kids to ride to the new soccer fields. |
| P-5 | Kenilworth Avenue really needs to have bike lanes running along it from Barton to Main or further south to Lawrence. The street is in a “slum” condition because of lack of pedestrian use, closed businesses and neglect. By putting in bike lanes there would be greater interest in using it as an access N to S; promoting business to move in and greater pedestrian use and ultimately urban development and beautification. This street really needs to be considered (Kenilworth Ave). |
| P-6 | I would like to recommend that Lyden Rd be considered for a rural route. It could accommodate residents of Lyden as well as connecting Jerseyville Rd with Highway 8. I would like to see more linkage of routes. I wonder why a 100m section of bike lane was built as an island. Could Queen to Longwood not have been done at the same time? Bike lane on York is great however the merge at the end of the bridge needs to remain on road, not going up onto sidewalk. |
| P-7 | Secure bike parking should be more accessible – daily access. Municipal York St. parking lot. Interested in taking any information to Mohawk College to promote cycling, ie. secure parking. Do you have any literature – economic considerations, etc. |
| P-8 | - Simple signs, for instance in and out of McMaster, that simply state: No riding on sidewalks. Just a judge mallet with the fee (fine) like we do for littering.  
- Resurface Longwood hill soon – it is unsafe now  
- Connecting Bayfront to Lake Ontario trail should be #1 priority  
- City staff should keep in mind what the ultimate cycling system would look like as the city develops especially rural areas becoming urban ie. Waterdown – cycling routes that continue through these new areas that have over/under passes around major roads. Consult Orange County Florida for an example. |
| P-9 | I witnessed a cyclist injured by a vehicle in the Westdale area. I am extremely excited and pleased to see Hamilton making safety a prime concern. The ideas are smart and have wished Hamilton to learn from what Ottawa has to offer (bike lanes, paths extensively). Thank you! And thanks for our input. |
| P-10 | Suggestion: Install a “secure” bike locking facility like the one at the York St. Parking Garage (near library) but install one at the GO station. |
| P-11 | Strathcona neighbourhood cannot yet access Key Drage Park without leaving Ward 1. The proposed access from Christ the King Cathedral to Key Drage is a necessary connection. This would connect Princess Point to King St in a way that would avoid a tremendous climb up from PP. |
| P-12 | I suggest you build a floating bike lane across/over some part of Cootes on Hamilton Harbour. This would be a real novelty for the city – bike over the water! Tourists would love it. Also, during major public events such as those at Bayfront Park, there could be a large fenced off bike parking area with security people. I saw this used in Vancouver for their Folk Festival. Wonderful idea to encourage bike riding. |
| P-13 | I would like to see in some areas where the pavement is made wider to create a much safer bike lane for cyclists, also to reduce speed limits in some areas to make it safer. I don’t like to see bike lanes where there is rapid transit. Bike lanes are great because it’s a means of transportation and cuts down on motor vehicles, which cuts down pollution to help save the environment. |
| P-14 | Please consider physical separation of cycle lanes from motor vehicles on high speed/high volume roads (eg. York Blvd). Please consider bike lanes at signalized intersections on signed bike routes. Ensure “active” traffic lights (ie. those with induction loops in pavement) can detect cycles. This is a significant problem on several signed bike routes (eg. Herkimer at Dundurn, Wilson and Main West). |
| P-15 | Proposed changes are good but entirely insufficient to reach the proposed mode splits in the transportation master plan. There is a need to do something on Main and King, such as a 2-way conversion with bike lanes. There is also a lack of north-south connections in the priority projects. Dundurn is good but the stretch from King to Main should be bike-laned with the rest in order to maintain continuity on that street. |
| P-16 | I see that there are proposed additions of bike lanes in downtown like on Dundurn, Caroline, etc. but I am a little disappointed that none of them connect through across King and Main. This will ultimately restrict flow through these areas. Recognizing that there are likely infrastructure restrictions on streets like Dundurn, are their any other options? What about taking away one of the lanes on Locke between King and Main and making a two way bike lane? |
| P-17 | GREAT STUDY AND RECOMMENDATIONS! GO FOR IT AND MAKE HAMILTON BIKE CITY. Some minor suggestions (no particular order): |
|   | - “Continue to incorporate wayfinding signage” should be changed to “Upgrade and improve” wayfinding signage. Current signage is inadequate or lacking in many locations. Add more destination/distance signage. |
|   | - Include an “audit” annual fund of $100,000 to 200,000 to upgrade existing bikeways and links. |
|   | - Include kids cycling skills training in Parks n’ Rec Summer Day Camp programs – see Toronto award winning program. |
|   | - Focus safety on “collision” prevention, not “injury prevention” (ie. helmet use – important but does not address causes). Public Health, an example other than “helmet use” should be add. Surely they have a greater interest in active living and active transportation than just helmets. |
|   | - Festivals should be required to provide valet bicycle parking as part of the permitting – Burlington is considering this. |
|   | - “Unlayer” city website. Cycling should be one level down if the City is serious about promoting it (OK, so the whole website needs to be redesigned). |
|   | - Signed routes are not good enough if they do not include addressing stop signs through traffic calming and dealing meaningfully with arterial road crossings (median refuges, bike boxes, signal bike detection). |
|   | - Include a policy to provide paved shoulders on all rural roads with AADT of 2500 vpd or more to benefit safety of all users, help maintain pavement condition, control erosion. |
|   | - Include bike lanes on all new collector (residential and industrial) roads. |
|   | - The rapid transit corridor(s) MUST account for pedestrians and cyclists even to the detriment of motorists, if required. Its unsatisfactory for this study to defer to the rapid transit study. It should make clear policy recommendations to incorporate cyclists into the rapid transit corridors stops and stations. |
|   | - Add link thru psych hospital – they’re doing a new master plan and upgrades so talk to them now – link to signal at the top of James Mountain where the bust stops and there is the... |
access to the hospital – thru the hospital and adjacent properties to come out at the signal at Hillfield Strathaller (may need a short section of wider s/w on north side of Fennel on south side along Hillfield Strathaller frontage to corner of Fennel/Garth. At Fennel/Garth, modify signal phasing to provide a protected ped/bike crossing phasing with contraflow on extension of Fennel (west of Garth – can’t remember street name) on to Scenic.

P-18 Providing bike lanes, try narrowing lane width – very interesting given the part that many roads/esp. in rural areas are not even 2.2 feet wide (the minimum requirement for 2 lane traffic). Removing on street parking to create bike spots makes no sense when we consider that we already have a deficit of parking spots in many areas – taking traffic lanes to make bike lanes will create hazards due to intensifying the traffic in remaining lanes. Many rural roads designated as bike routes are narrow, in very bad repair (with no change in sight) because of the way city politicians are misusing funds from the upper levels of government intended for service and infrastructure improvements and construction. A lot of these same roads have no shoulder at all, causing pedestrians (and sometimes cyclists) to jump into ditches full of water, etc. (because roadside drainage has been neglected). Cycling for some is a necessary activity, to others it is recreation but both require roads that are actually suitable for the purpose not just a colored line on a map that does not reflect the real conditions that exist in the real world.

P-19 1. I understand your need to “spread” the money/bike paths however when I look at the collision data map, I see the collisions are extremely heavy in the lower city. I have come to understand that people in the lower city use “active transportation” – bikes, bus and walking and need to be need to be encouraged and recognized to do that! Poverty is of course one reason – cars are expensive! But also, in a high density area, many CHOOSE active transportation. For this reason, I respectfully think there should be MORE bike lanes in the urban core. Our city NEEDS to encourage bus, bike and walking, and some of this is in the new Urban Official Plan therefore some difference between recreational biking and active transportation needs to be made. Along with this plan, business, schools, public buildings, theatres need to encourage ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION IN THE CORE. More money should be spent on the urban core!

2. North End: Many of the residents commute to the downtown using bus, bike and feet. There are no bike routes (almost)!
   a. Strachan is a bike route from Ferguson to the Bayfront Park
   b. Burlington St E enters the E.E. as a bike route, turns into Ferguson, Dock Service and again into the Waterfront. There are no routes THROUGH!
   James N between Strachan and the Bay (Guise?) would be an excellent bike route to consider for future development.

3. Even though I made several fairly lengthy comments, congratulations on this extensive plan.

P-20 The position of Alternative Transportation Co-ordinator should be made permanent rather then contract as the need to implement the Plan. The connectivity of the network needs to be maintained. The Red Hill Trails (north of Barton) where the trail goes north under the tracks the grade needs to be eased as it is currently too steep.

P-21 Hamilton is headed in the right direction with this master plan. The April 16th info session was presented very well and I thought seeing it for the first time is well though out taking many variables and the future in mind. I am pro cycling and approve fully of the proposed plans including the initial prioritization list. I wish they could happen yesterday but Rome wasn’t built in a day but the planners believed they could. I applaud Daryl and his team for moving Hamilton forward toward an increase in cycling activity. As a city we seem to move slow but I am convinced that if the infrastructure is well thought out and planned, then the community will respond. Hamilton needs more cycling and I am impressed and excited with the plans so far.

*a priority in my mind is a dedicated E-W biking only corridor. Well done. Keep up the great work.

P-22 I am pleased to see all the developments taking place. Great work is being done. Keep up the good work.

P-23 Very well thought out. More signs showing the trails, waterfalls, etc. Looking forward to the Red Hill Trail linking to the Beach. Would like to see the mountain brow from Henderson Hospital to the east mountain with more paved sidewalks for bike paths to be widened. An area to lock their valuables when you want to shop or eat downtown. Thank you so much for the information and the hard work in providing a safe environment and bike paths to cycle around the city.

P-24 I applaud the efforts to make biking more doable in the city. Two things that need attention which improve safety greatly. Maintain the curb lanes so they are free of debris. On the Claremont as an example, I have had to call numerous times about the obstacles on the side of this road. Also, many of the curb lanes are so marked with pot holes or raise catch basins a rider is forced to move into vehicular traffic lanes to avoid these obstacles.

P-25 Concern 1 – Over years of construction and reconstruction the accesses continue to have poor or no consideration for bikes. A: The Sherman Cut is potentially deadly at the top, with narrow surface and deep ditches. B: The Jolley Cut has only a beat up sidewalk. C: The Claremont is plenty wide but has no markings. D & E: West 5th and Queen Street have no cycling provisions. Cyclists need to be able to ride up and down the hill safely.
Concern 2 – We have nice recreational trails in places but people trying to commute or cross the city are not interested in following side streets with many stop signs and a lack of continuity. We need cycling routes that get us places.

* Another shame is that the path from John St S up to the top of the Claremont is derelict, yet has big potential.

P-26
1. Thank you for all you do to make cycling easier and more fun in and around Hamilton.
2. Am very pleased with mountain east-west connection on Queensdale Ave! But sad not to see it on priority list.
3. Please prioritize Jolley Cut (or other) downtown/mountain access. Stairs without troughs are difficult to navigate and merging with traffic at high speeds feels extremely unsafe.

*The mountain is in need of east-west route! Stone Church is far away, other option is not particularly direct.

P-27
Hello, Both my husband and I are unable to attend the cycling master plan session this evening. But I would still like to request (if not already present in the plan) that bike lanes be planned for Rymal Road. For people living south of Rymal, the existence of St. Elizabeth Village and other gated communities between Garth and West 5th means that is it not possible to bike on back roads instead of Rymal. We live south of Rymal, and my husband bikes to work along Rymal (his workplace is right on Rymal). Bike lanes would make his commute much safer. I am aware that Stonechurch Rd has bike lanes, but to bike out to Stonechurch and then back to Rymal again would almost double his daily commute. That is unrealistic. Please let me know if you have questions. I would also like to be kept informed about the status of planned bike lanes in Hamilton, and especially on the West Mountain. Respectfully.

P-28
Hi Darryl, I was unable to attend the meetings about the cycling master plan but I have studied the Shifting Gears website. Looks great! Just a question/request: is there anything being done to add bike lanes through the downtown core along Main and King? Most cyclists opt to use the sidewalk illegally because they feel unsafe on the road. As an avid cyclist who commutes on my bike twice a week (hope to increase the frequency soon!) I’d like to see a safe route for cyclists through the high density downtown. Thanks for all the great work you are doing.

P-29
Hi Daryl, I was unable to attend the open house regarding the shifting gears plan, but I’ve looked at the online panels. I have a question about the 70 priority projects listed on one of the panels. Are those projects all slated to go ahead, or will the list be whittled down? It’s a great list and would be amazing if all 70 were to get the go-ahead. Cheers.

Is there a timeline for construction of the priority projects? I saw the map after reading Ryans blog on RTH. This city will function a whole lot better once we develop this new plan. Great work!

P-30
Thanks for sending the request for advice on cycling master plan 2nd round of sessions. I attended the first round in Ancaster, was unable to attend second round. Feedback #1 - I am delighted to see that a cycling plan is moving ahead at all! This is great. Feedback #2 – I’m sure that we cyclists all have our favoured routes and hotspots for suggested improvements. I cannot interpret your chart called proposed initial prioritization, to know what is going to happen first. My own suggestion would be: a) develop the rail lands path to join Aberdeen Rd area with Westdale and West Hamilton, including over the 403 access, b) develop a bike lane going through the downtown both east and west. At the moment once you get to Dundurn coming east, you are on your own and need to get over to side streets which are safer than Main St, but mean a lot of stopping, crossing traffic and zigzagging between streets and c) develop a more direct cross-city bike lane across the mountain – for example upgrade Stonechurch Rd so that the potholes in sections do not knock you off your bike and make the Limeridge rd route more direct – I’ve lost the route numerous times when it changes streets... Regards.

P-32
Hello Hamiltonians, Very excited for directions around our transportation networks. Concerned by the statement below (from Cycling Master Plan, Public Information Centre No.#2 - April, 2009): “The City considers the design where a bike lane(s) is positioned above the curb (beside the sidewalk) as the least preferred option. This design may cause conflicts at intersections and driveways due to poor visibility.” I’m not sure exactly what this means, but I am sure what I would like to see, as a year-round cycling commuter. In my experience, anything less than a physical barrier (on busy routes) will only bring us to a state our more progressive international counterparts have already experienced, struggled with, and moved beyond. Why not learn from their experiences, and leap-frog the learning curve? It will be a change, but Hamilton is quickly becoming the kind of city people love to live in, and getting the cycling plan right would only further that progress.

Great resources, and my thoughts summarized much more eloquently: http://www.streetfilms.org/archives/physically-separated-bike-lanes/; and
Hi, I still urge the city to reinstall the curb on the east side of the street opposite East 24th on Upper Wentworth as it is extremely dangerous to not have one for bikers, wheelchairs, strollers and skateboarders, especially since it is part of the bike path and there is a clearly marked bike path sign on the other side. The rationale I was given was that the city wants to discourage people from crossing there and prefers people cross at the lights, which is completely illogical and counter to human nature as it is obvious people will not walk several hundred metres in the wrong direction just to get across the street (especially since there is also a bus stop there). I think this was a gross oversight following the refurbishing of Upper Wentworth not to consider the safety of non-car traffic on that section of the road given that there are a lot of young families and also elderly (Sackville Hill is just up the street) and I have yet to see a single accident as a result (due to the timing of the lights at Mohawk and Franklin Rd.). Also, just ahead of the summer, plenty of people head there to play soccer, go to the pool and play tennis. Again, it is extremely dangerous to bike westbound along East 24th precisely because there is no curb on the other side. Thanks for your attention to this matter (and it really should not have taken months to address this). Sincerely yours.

Hi Daryl,

Your report looks very thorough and exciting. My only feedback is that I wish all of these improvements could happen immediately. I look forward to riding my bike more often on safer routes.

Attention Daryl and Sandy, As an avid cyclist, I find this extremely important, however I’m unable to attend the public info meetings. I have lived in Hamilton (Waterdown) for 9 years and find it extremely difficult to get around on a bicycle. Coming from the City of Ottawa, which in my opinion has the best bike path system in Canada, I find myself driving more often. Everyone agrees that if we had a better bike path system, people would be more active (healthier), less vehicles would congest our streets and pollute our air and Hamiltonians would then start respecting their community better, as they would be living in it instead of driving past it. I’m unaware of the Cycling Master Plan, but I would hope that it includes a separate Bike Path system linking communities together, including Waterdown and Burlington, or Waterdown and Downtown Hamilton. I’m a firefighter in Burlington and I see that the designated bike lanes are not safe and motorists, especially the young and elderly, don’t respect cyclist in them. Having a complete separate paved bike path will allow for a larger diversity to use their bikes. As it is now only the brave, slightly experienced cyclist that use the bike lanes, I would recommend that the committee take a trip to Ottawa, tour their bike paths and see how the independent bike system is used by thousands of people everyday, all year around. I could bike from the suburbs of Ottawa to downtown without ever being on a dangerous road. Hamilton reminds me a lot like Ottawa, the age of the houses, buildings, the history of the 2 towns and that they are both so equally nestled in an active environment.

Keep up the good work. This is an extremely important subject that has great rewards. The impact on the lifestyles of all Hamiltonians can be changed for ever. Thank you.

Hey Daryl--I had to run on Tues night so I didn't get a chance to fill out the comments form. So here are a couple of emailed comments:

* it makes sense to keep bicycle traffic off King and Main St., but there are many destinations on these two streets (and more will come with the LRT if it's built). People coming from north of downtown and particularly south of downtown (the Durand neighbourhood) seem to lack a good north-south route to connect with these destinations between Bay and Wellington.

* I have had a scary family cycling experience on Book Rd and would love to see paved shoulders on it

Thanks. It was great to see you at the PIC! Excellent work.

Dear Mr. Bender, Although the concept of a community bike share program for the city of Hamilton has been in my mind since I first moved to Hamilton two years ago, I only became aware of a venue to share my ideas for the program with the city a few days ago upon reading about it in 'Raise the Hammer'. Although I made an appointment to speak with the mayor two years ago, I have never received a phone call. So, I placed the idea on the back shelf and engaged in other pursuits.

I have recently been caught up to date with the developments which have been happening with Hamilton's 'Switching gears' program. I was somewhat dismayed to learn that there was a meeting on the topic a few weeks ago in the Sackville Hill community centre, about a three minute walk away from my house. It seems that I have fallen far behind on the developments of what has been happening in the cycling community in Hamilton. It also seems that this is the last chance I will have for this year to comment on the 'Switching gears' plan which the city has. I admit that I am unclear as to whether April 30th is the cut off date and submissions should be made before today's date, or by today's date. I feel that community bicycles are a

http://www.livablestreets.com/streetswiki/physically-separated-bike-lanes. Thanks for listening, and for your time and efforts shaping our Hamilton.
concept whose time has come. I have recently been made aware of a bike share program introduced in our neighboring city of Waterloo, which received a great deal of municipal and corporate funding. The Waterloo program is similar to those in Europe which is essentially a card-slot bicycle rental station with hourly rates. The proposal for a Bike share program I have been working on is different in that it would be funded, owned and maintained by the municipality and supported partially through advertising revenues as well as user fees. I do not see this as being a venue for profit as much as a utility for public use such as street lamps or bus shelters.

I understand that I am too late to present this idea to Hamilton city council. Also, the proposal is incomplete. I still have a lot of work and a lot of research to do before the proposal will be ready for presentation. However, I would like to ask if you could look at it and make any recommendations before I present it to Metrolinx. I would greatly appreciate and value your input.

Thank you.

Good afternoon Daryl, I have just become aware of the new updates to the cycling plan on the city website. For your consideration may I submit the following feedback if it is not too late! I am delighted to see the cycling plan moving forward and it was encouraging to review the proposed initiatives. Seeing the progress instills a fresh breath of optimism that city planners will safety on the mountain access routes by providing bike lanes, specifically upbound, is necessary in my opinion. I was delighted to see the Jolley Cut upbound lane placed fairly high on the priority list. It will do a lot to improve safety on that segment for the many cyclists I see using it in addition to myself. Uphill cyclists cause challenges for vehicles on that roadway, particularly when busy, so this will improve comfort for motorized traffic as well. Everybody will win if mountain access facilities are improved.

Overall the number of dedicated bike lanes on the proposed project list is impressive. While a progressive style of road design with cycling facilities on every major artery remains a best case scenario, at least there is a serious intention to complete a logical and connected network. I would feel a truly renewed pride in Hamilton once increased pedestrian/cycling planning is factored into roadwork from the beginning. Nevertheless I agree with the reasoning that a select network will allow rapid implementations to proceed along key routes, and will quickly begin to correct the discontinuous smattering of facilities. A bike route detour is useless if it veers away from your intended destination and is part of an incomplete network. For these reasons I have not once had a reason to use the green bike route signage. Please continue your efforts to relieve the cycling dead-zone on the east mountain. Thank you for your recommendations there, such as Upper Ottawa. This of course leaves many arteries, such as Upper Gage and Main Street, where defensive cycling will remain necessary - using a whole lane to mitigate motor vehicles that pass unsafely, and to avoid badly deteriorated pavement. I am still hopeful that once the LRT designs are finalized, either Main or King will have a cycle lane proposed. There is a lot of shopping on those streets and it will provide benefits even with the Wilson/Cannon implementation. As evidenced by many cities, including Vancouver, Portland, and even New York, cycling will continue to increase into this century. I recently saw a slideshow of Portland's cycling network and it is a beautifully done. Hamilton would do well to emulate some of the more successful cities where the effort was invested. Although it is purely subjective observation, I do see more and more cyclists out and about each year. I want to thank the Shifting Gears staff for these incredible efforts and please keep up the good work! I look forward to watching these initiatives develop! Sincerely yours.

Hello, I am writing to comment on the Hamilton Cycling Master Plan, which I came across at raisethehammer.org. My partner and I are currently living in Toronto, but have bought a house in Hamilton (downtown) and are very excited to move their this summer. Although we can afford to have car’s, we chose to buy a house without a driveway, and we will be trying to get around with alternative forms of transportation, chiefly the bicycle. I am a little nervous about this, as it seems that Hamilton is not a very bike-friendly place, but I am desperately hoping that we can get there. We have some experiences in Toronto, where cycling is not so common, but we have a lot of support for any initiatives that bring more bike lanes, and allow biking to feel and actually be more safe in Hamilton. Of a more specific nature, I would say that it is important to get a complete east-west lane in place, and it would be great if that could happen on either King or Main streets. I have been biking in Toronto for years, but I have never felt as nervously there as I did the day that cycled Main St in Hamilton! That highway needs to be slowed down! A bike lane would go a long way into helping that. Thanks for your time.

Hi Daryl, You may remember me from your McMaster ACT days. I was just reviewing the new plans for the cycling routes in Hamilton. While it is terrific to see so many changes I must admit that I am deeply disappointed. It is clear to me that as long as cyclists are forced to take major detours to avoid Main and King Hamilton is not taking a sustainable, healthy commuting lifestyle seriously. We have the opportunity to take a leadership role in Ontario but it seems this will not happen. We need cycling paths along main and king so that people
commuting east to west can do so via the shortest route. I really hope that this will be possible. I am fully aware that you are pushing for the best that you can get for cyclists. But it is sad that cycling safely along main and king will still not be possible. Thanks.

P-41

Hi Daryl, I was checking out a new route to cycle to work today from Dundas to the office at 1447 Upper Ottawa and have a few suggestions that I hope are included on the master plan. I came up the Wilson St hill from Dundas (the bikelanes on the bottom half are great!). I then turned left onto Rousseau and right on McNiven to connect to the bike lane on Golf Links. There is no bike lane on McNiven and it is a little steep and could really use a bike lane to connect the existing route. Is this in the master plan?

Also, the "shared lane" sign along the middle of golf links needs to be refreshed and revised. The current marking on the pavement is really worn out and positioned only to the right where the cyclist would be. The sign should extend horizontally (like the HCC magnets) across the entire lane so cars and cyclists are aware and say something like "reduced speed shared lane". And finally the missing link on Stonechurch between Garth and Upper James is quite dangerous since the bike lane ends and the shoulder in not paved and the paved road is narrow and only two lanes. Until the bike lane is complete in this section (I assume that this is on the master plan) it should be a shared lane with the above recommended sign on the pavement.

What do you think?

P-42

Hi Daryl, I'm writing to commend you on the excellent work done on updating Shifting Gears. It's wonderful to see cycling infrastructure back on the city's radar. My only comments are:

1. Cycling infrastructure really does work. When cities that have low cycling rates build good, continuous facilities, the rate of cycling increases significantly - and growing ridership itself is a self-fulfilling prophecy to conclude that cycling infrastructure "doesn't" actually draw riders. The emphasis should be on creating a "continuous" network as quickly as possible - one major discontinuity breaks the whole network.

Again, thanks for all the excellent work. I'm encouraged just knowing that you're involved with this. Kind Regards.

Hi, Re: the cycling master plan, I have a few areas of feedback:

As commuters, my husband and I used to own two cars. We have sold them both and now get around entirely by foot, bike and public transport by choice. One is that on major arteries it's still very unsafe to bike without a barrier by the bike lane or speed reduction. I vastly prefer bike lanes separated by some sort of barrier, especially on major streets. It's very frustrating not being able to use the major arteries by bike because of fear of getting run over. Given the speed of the major arteries, being hit by a car on one of them is much more dangerous than on a two-way street with slower traffic flow. Two, will there ever be a program in place in Hamilton where the city will install bike racks upon request for both residential and commercial neighbourhoods? When I lived in Toronto they would install them where requested free of charge. That would certainly be helpful at my workplace sidewalk as well as residential areas. Overall I appreciate the work done in this, but I still find Hamilton impossible to bike in much of the time because of the speed and safety issues on the main roads. It's no problem along routes like Hunter Street to the GO station, but for any significant distance it really needs to be far friendlier, safer, and more obvious and accessible. Thanks.

Dear Daryl, I have not been able to participate in the recent consultations about planning for cycling in Hamilton, but I have reviewed the material now available on the web. I would like to...
add one very important point that may have been mentioned at the meetings but which did not find its way into print. I might add that the following observation is based on my experience of exactly 40 years of commuting by bike, in eight different cities (Cambridge; Columbus, Ohio; Kingston, Ont.; Vancouver; Toronto; London, England; Canberra, Australia; Hamilton). Some of those cities (notably Canberra) had a good network of bike lanes. And, yes, I commute by bike in winter.

There are many things that can make cycling more attractive and safer. The most basic is that the surface of the road, close to the curb, be free of potholes. These are dangerous in any weather, and especially when rainy, since pools and puddles may hide them. I might add that it is almost as dangerous to have cracks that run parallel to the curb, as is the case on Aberdeen, travelling west, just before the resurfaced stretch under the railroad bridge. Cyclists are much more vulnerable to potholes than motorists are, for obvious reasons. Moreover, they cannot safely swerve to avoid them. These are obvious points, but enormously important. The implication is that, if the City wishes to make cycling safer the first thing that they should try to do is monitor and fix near-curb potholes, especially on major routes and—or those that cyclists use. Thank you for hearing me out!

Dear Daryl, I hope all is well in Hamilton and that your new job is rewarding. We have had fun in Sydney, exploring a lot, but NOT BIKING FOR 8 MONTHS!!! Because Sydney isn’t bike friendly... The beaches are great tho. Thank you for e-mailing me about the new bike plan. It’s a bit hard to get all the details from here, but below are a few points I wished to raise.

1. Overall, the plan looks very good. I like the prioritizing and the linked budgeting. I worry though about the lack of schedule. Obviously, this way one is never off schedule and I do see the logic of a plan separate from one with dates, but it still worries me.

2. A somewhat related issue is looking at the plan from a cyclist angle. To some degree the plan already does it by looking at the current volume of cycling in the city. I would like to see two other planning angles. First, what safe routes, if created, or made 100% safe, would generate the highest increase in cycling? Second, I think it’s important that we microinspect routes. When I arrived in Sydney and saw the bike map, I thought there were some good routes. The trouble is some horrible missing links. That is, one can boast 30 km of a new bike route, but a single suicide intersection would make me decide not to use it. I suggest that we rate current and planned routes and ensure they are 100% safe. Doing bits and mileage will not achieve what we really need.

3. Can we get a few key bike routes getting the highest priority for snow clearing? There are two obvious routes to start with, the Cootes and waterfront, both busy also in the winter with all kind of commuters (also runners, rollerbladers and walkers). Many people do not take seriously alternative transportation because it is not currently available in the winter in Hamilton though it is in other towns such as Madison, Wisconsin, which gets as much snow as Hamilton. A commitment from the city that key routes receive equal priority as main roads can go a long way to increasing year around alternative commuting.

4. Can we add bike parking in a more rigid way: I had talked to Brian McHattie about copying Vancouver in requiring bike parking as part of new building permits and renovation. The same can go for public places and schools.

These are my points for now. I’ll be happy to discuss them further. Good luck with implementing the plan (before retirement). Best wishes.

Hello Daryl, It was great to see you at the recent PIC @ City hall in Hamilton. I have a few observations to share as I mentioned to you at the PIC. The figures were a little difficult to read, I suggest that you use “Existing and Proposed” rather than “Primary”. As far as legibility, normally, new/future initiatives are dashed lines and existing solid. For each trail type, you should use the same colour of solid/ dashed lines. This makes it far simpler to read, i.e., you can classify each type and use a range of colours rather than rely on width of lines. Although I did not specifically check, I assume you worked with the data sheets from the”Hamilton Recreational Trails Master Plan” we did. We identified numerous on street links on data sheets with “red font”. Hopefully you have been able to fully assess the merits of these recommended links. I think you will find that they were well thought out. Hart reviewed them on a preliminary basis, most were thought to have merit and were subject to more detailed study during the course of your now current work.

Overall, the work looks good and I am pleased to see this advance. I presume you know that [redacted] are doing a study for Burlington currently. I suggest you look at the links we had for north Burlington/ Flamborough. I saw some on the panels but did not take the time to look at all of these. Please keep me on your circulation list. Thanks again for making this a good Community to ride and commute in!!!

Hi Daryl, I finally found the time to review the document. I appreciate greatly your work in this area. One area of concern is cycling from Waterdown to Burlington. From the east part of
Waterdown, the only way to get to Kerns Road is a 60km/h stretch of road that finds people often driving 80km/h or over. Once you pass Evans Road approaching Kerns Road, the speed increases to 80 km/h AND the paved shoulder disappears. As a result, I want to suggest re-prioritizing to include at least the 200m between Evans Road and Kerns Road. I have been run off the road on more than one occasion attempting to commute to and from work. Here are some options I had in mind:

- Have the city decrease the speed limit to 60km/h in this section until they have passed Kerns Road.
- Add 1m or more on the south side of the road.
- Post Share the road signs on both sides of the road from Kerns Road into Waterdown

Thanks again for your work.

P-49 Personally, I find that signed bike routes are useless (or worse than useless since they are ignored by cars & might lull cyclists into a false sense of security). At the minimum, you need reserved bike lanes & on busy streets there need to be physical barriers bet cars & cyclists.

P-50 Was there any mention to providing a down bound bike lane for Dewitt Hill? Was there any mention to improving Pritchard Rd between Mud & Stone Church Rd? Thank you.

P-51 Darryl, Couple of questions regarding your priority list. I have reviewed it quickly and have noticed a couple of projects that are not on this plan: What about Locke St., between King and Main - contraflow lane, road diet? Also, what about King St. from Longwood to Macklin (contraflow lane?). I also have a question, as how you propose to place bike lanes on Charlton between Queen and Dundurn when the on street parking alternates sides, as well as using both sides of the street on Sundays (from Locke to Dundurn). These are just a few of the questions I may have, if I get a chance I may review it in further detail. Or if you would want to discuss further, please feel free to contact me. Thank you.

P-52 I am interested in seeing the Cycling Master Plan. Can I be forwarded a copy of the draft or whatever form it is in? I believe it is on the City website, is that right Daryl? Thanks.

P-53 Hi Daryl, I am wondering if you can tell me how the bridge from westdale over the 403 to the bottom of chedoke golf course fits in? I cannot seem to find it on the chart.

I also have feedback: I feel strongly from experience of commuting and recreational riding for 13 years in Hamilton: Signs on bike routes make no difference to safety of bikers, in order to be considered a bike route something must have at minimum a line separating it from traffic. I suggest that it be strongly recommended to cyclists that if there is more than one lane moving in their direction that they use the whole lane. This is much safer and requires no repainting, moving lanes, or widening roads for those locations where it is appropriate. All of the one-way streets can be travelled this way with much greater safety to the cyclist because their movements are similar and therefore more predictable to the traffic around them. Also, bike lanes that end suddenly where traffic merges or exits causes serious confusion and therefore decreases safety. Please let's remove or at least not implement any more opposite one ways for bikes like on Markland St. I think this is an accident waiting to happen. Traffic does not look the other way because there are no cars coming that way. It is contrary to all of the things we have been taught in driver safety. Where is King St W from Longwood to Macklin? To me this is a much higher priority than all of the rest of King St W because I see bikers all the time trying to zip across, against traffic from the grocery store to ride wrong way down King St W for the couple blocks from Longwood to Macklin. Anyway, there is a little of my feedback from my experience.

P-54 Hello, I write to suggest a concrete block divider between the roadway and sidewalk going down/up the Jolley Cut. Pedestrian access between the Mountain Brow and downtown are few and far between. The most direct is the Jolley Cut sidewalk but it has few serious shortcomings, namely a feeling of security Prom vehicular traffic moving at fast speeds. Walking that stretch where your only inches away from cars and trucks is totally hair raising and oppressive. In winter you are constantly getting hit with slush and thinking, wow, if any of these cars or buses start to slide my way I'm toast. The top portion is cut off from traffic and is a pleasant experience but then all of a sudden you're OUT THERE all exposed and vulnerable, harassed really. The stairs at James and Wentworth, while safe for women during the day, do not provide the perception of security during the evening. The Jolley Cut sidewalk provides security in this respect but the traffic is off putting. Thanks for your consideration.

P-55 1. As a lifelong cyclist and taxpayer, I strongly support improving and adding to the existing bicycle network.
2. I recommend more multiuse pathways (paved where appropriate or possible) for year-round use (and snow cleared…)
3. More designated bicycle lanes on the roadway (designated space helps with safety by separating cars from bicycles more then a shared space)
4. I strongly support paved shoulders designated for bicycles (wheel chairs), walking, etc. where there aren't designated bicycle lanes on the roadway. (shoulders should be snow cleared)
5. I strongly support 'traffic calming' measures including slowing speed limits. (the difference in speeds between motor vehicle traffic and bicycles is primarily a safety hazard)

6. Much more should be done to encourage children and teens to bicycle and especially to school and recreation centers. The area/roadways around schools, recreation centres, etc. should be controlled and adjusted for bicycle safety. If children and teens continue to bicycle, they will be inclined to cycle as adults and be more safety conscious of others when they drive!

7. Education – police should pullover/educate car drivers who pass too closely. Also, some bus drivers are dangerous!!

Hi Daryl, I was in checking the cycling masterplan stuff on the city website today and noticed a section I had not seen before. It's an initial listing of 70 "prioritized" cycling projects. I have not been to any of the open houses, so this may not be news to some of you. The information can be found at the following link:

http://www.myhamilton.ca/myhamilton/CityandGovernment/CityDepartments/PublicWorks/TrafficEngineeringAndOperations/Cycling/shiftinggears.htm

Scroll down to "panel 12" and the list of projects will pop up. I was surprised and disappointed at some of the projects on the list and offer the following comments. Note that these comments are my own and are not intended to represent the committee: The number 1 priority is a 150m stretch of King, between Stirling and Longwood. Actually, despite the project's name, it's only Longwood to Cline, and an orphan stretch at that (no bike lane connecting to either end). Why is a 150m stretch our top priority?? It's not very inspiring to me, and kind of embarrassing. Perhaps this relates to ease of implementation(?) Also, another short section of King, 725m from Forsyth to Stirling is identified as the number 68 priority – why not combine these projects for a more meaningful impact?

The number 2 priority is a 1900m stretch from Wilson, from Ferguson to Sherman. This is great, but where do cyclists go from there? Again what message are we sending in terms of cycling as a respected and valued (as opposed to marginalized) means of transportation? The next two projects are ranked so high, I assume, because they appear relatively easy to implement. Number 3 is Highland Road from Pritchard to First Road East. I definitely agree that Highland from Pritchard to Winterberry needs remediation with the inclusion of bike lanes. This is a very dangerous stretch of road. However, the section from Winterberry to First Road East is very wide (veeery wide). Though there is a moderate amount of traffic on that road, there is not usually competition for road space since the roadway is so wide and there are four-way stop signs at virtually every intersection to mitigate speed. Installing a bike lane on most of Highland (except for the aforementioned Pritchard to 1st Road East section) looks like it would take a crew a few hours to implement. Also, Pritchard must be one of the most dangerous roads in the city, yet it does not appear on the top 70 list. I understand that extension of Trinity Church Road is in the works, so using Upper Mount Albion Road might be an option – we need to flag the necessity of keeping through bike access on this road. Here's another flag: if Upper Mount Albion Road is no longer through, the traffic light at Rymal must remain. Similarly, once the bridge over the Linc at Arbour/Anchor Roads is complete, we may need a signal on Stone Church to allow cyclist crossing. Number 4, Filman Road from Rousseau to the 403 overpass is another curious inclusion in terms of it being a priority project, and the project is not even a bike lane. It's a "shared on-street – signed" facility. There is virtually no traffic on this very wide road. What exactly does this project - the fourth highest cycling implementation project in the city entail? Signage? It is not till you get down to number 15 that we finally get to an escarpment crossing: the Jolley Cut from St. Joseph's to Concession Street. In my opinion, this should be a top priority. That the escarpment crossings are so dangerous and inadequate for cyclists should concern the city from a liability perspective too. It was only a short time ago that a cyclist died on the Jolley Cut. Cyclists are wholly without a safe way up the escarpment in the entire central city. Shameful. Similarly, bike lanes on the Claremont Access are identified as a number 24 priority. Given the multiple up-bound and down-bound lanes on this "inner-city highway", this should also be an easily implementable project, and one that should be given the highest priority.

Other General comments:

Connectivity has been identified as a key gap in the Hamilton cycling network, yet the average length of the bike facilities being proposed is only 1316m. The median length is an even more pathetic 940m. In looking at the proposed projects, the length of the projects on the priority list breaks down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of bike facility</th>
<th>Number of segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;500m</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501m-999m</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000m-1999m</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000m-2999m</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I know that some of these small projects are linking existing infrastructure or filling some gaps, but this is the exception, not the norm. Approximately 83% of our identified priority projects are less than 2 km in length. The literature suggests that a “bikeable” distance for the average person is 5 km. If we really want to effect lifestyle changes and encourage biking, we need a priority list where some serious infrastructure improvements are implemented. One of the reasons for endorsing the primary network approach was the feeling that a meaningful network would be established. Implementing a network in such a piecemeal fashion suggests this process is seriously flawed. That two escarpment crossings have been identified is great, that they are only ranked 15th and 24th on the list of prioritization is unacceptable. Also, how can cyclists be safe when improvements to the network are being done in segments of 940m, at the end of which cyclists are left on their own trying to navigate the downtown core or busy mountain streets. In terms of implementation, I notice that some of the “projects” are listed in multiple phases. Why would King Street from Stirling to Longwood be a priority 1, while King Street from Forsyth to Stirling is only a priority 66? Surely this is actually the same “project” with different implementation schedules. Why not combine the work to maximize efficiencies and improve conditions for cyclists. There are many such examples on the list, including Scenic (#26 Mohawk to Chateau; #56 Chateau to Upper Paradise; #65 Upper Paradise to Garth).

I admit that I was cross referencing this work with a 2005 cycling map, so I hope some of my comments are not out of line. Cycling committee members, there is still time to comment on this list. Please feel free to add (or disagree) with my comments.

The President of the Strathcona Community Council sent your contact names regarding the Master Plan. It occurred to me that you could provide some insight into issues related to cycling safety along the section of York Boulevard between Dundurn Street and Plains Road. I drive that area every day and also work in area adjacent to that section York Boulevard. Last year, I regularly observed a cyclist riding the “wrong way” in the north bound lanes. That only presented a danger when a cyclist riding in the opposite direction came to pass on the section by the Cemetery. Fortunately, no driver was travelling into the City in the curb lane when the passing occurred. To date, I observe no directional arrows to alert riders, or joggers for that matter, that travelling the "wrong" way represents a dangerous practice: not enough room exists to safely pass.

The two lane driving section of the road between the High Level Bridge and Plains Road contains other challenges. Lots of room exists for riders, joggers, etc. However, on a regular daily basis slow moving vehicles (lawm cutting tractors, tractors, and backhoes), especially from the City of Hamilton and my employer travel that stretch to the great irritation of other drivers. My co-workers have reported numerous incidents where drivers have passed in the cycling lane with the usual string of curse words. In at least one case the driver passed quickly and then veered in front of the backhoe operator causing him to almost lose control of the backhoe.

Faced with these dangerous circumstances, some operators, including a backhoe from the City of Hamilton, are driving in the bicycle lane. If this represents an acceptable practice, the City of Hamilton should provide the appropriate signage. On the other hand, if, as I suspect, you believe it dangerous, then you should contact other departments to address this issue. One day a serious accident may occur. The City may have to review the speed limit - a limit which the police have never enforced. As annoying as it may seem to drivers including me, a 40 to 50 Km/hour limit may be necessary if no other measures exist to allow drivers, work vehicles, and cyclists to share the road. Thanks for taking the time to read this.

For the primary attention of Ms Wilma Groen, Recreation Co-ordinator of Ancaster Senior Achievement Centre ...

1- The advertised meeting held Thursday, April 16 2009 at the Sackville Hill Seniors Recreation Centre invited "stakeholder consultation" - a good opportunity, I thought, to question a possibility of a more direct link than currently exists (see Para 2) between ASAC and the truly exceptional, jewel of a bike route commonly referred to by us as the 'Jerseyville Rail Trail'. Thus, I left word of this proposal, verbally only, with one of the Meeting's organizers; hence this note to you.

2- At this time, from the ASAC location, we have a choice of two 5 km approaches to or from the Trail: a) takes us 2½ km westward along #2 Hwy (a non-designated bike route we prefer to avoid), to or from its intersection with Sunnynridge Road; b) obliges us to ride north on Alberton Road (that's OK), then to ply a switchback of hills for 2½ km before we can access the Trail.
3- I believe there is (or was at one time) a road allowance heading northward, from just a smidgin east of the currently active Alberton-cum-Jerseyville Road intersection. Ideally, if this could be opened up to the Trail, a multiple of benefits would accrue, such as: i) access to the Trail from ASAC would fall within 3 km; ii) aging members of ASAC, timid of riding their bikes on #2 Hwy, reluctant to ride the Jerseyville Road roller-coaster, could more likely be encouraged to get to the Trail to savour its unique attractiveness; iii) the newly-formed hikers' group, I'm pretty sure, would also relish the Trail's becoming accessible within a morning's hike from the Centre; iv) as a one-time casualty of a Bruce Trail hike, in dire need of para-medic rescue, I'm concerned that, to my knowledge, the 6 km stretch of Trail between #52 Hwy and Field Road has no mid-point access for emergency vehicles, despite there being some rather hazardous, unfenced and precipitous drops from either side of the Trail; v) members from the Dundas, Copetown and even Lynden areas may well find they could cycle to ASAC for the Centre's various activities, and leave their 4-wheel vehicles at home; vi) my next proposal, now that HSR has equipped all its buses with bike-racks, may be to ask that ASAC be served by Bus; already, we've had cyclists coming up from Stoney Creek, by bus, to Duff's Corners, then biking the remaining 3 km to ASAC.

4- What is my interest? 12 years ago, I founded the ThursdayBikers, to ride exclusively from ASAC within a 12½ km radius of the Centre. Our rides cover an average of 25km, which has proved to be a fair and acceptable distance for our coterie, mainly, of seniors. At last count attendance averaged 9, but would range up to 15, and beyond that on occasions. To date, a significant number of healthy bike-riding seniors, seen to be in pretty good shape, is indeed rewarding to all who participate.

P-59 Hi Daryl, I live on Herkimer and work at King and Bay and I do ride my bike to work. I have always felt there needed to be more bike lanes that go south to north (and vice versa) into the core and bike lanes that connected to each other. Kudos for a job well on the Master Plan. It is too bad that there is not a bike lane on Main street, surely the city could take away 1 of the 5 lanes. If there is anything I can do to help let me know. Have a great day!
APPENDIX XIV:

AGENCY COMMENTS
Now is the time for more details. We are on the home stretch with an updated Cycling Master Plan. Anything you want to flag? I assume you are referring to some details of trail amenities?

www.hamilton.ca/ShiftingGears

Regards,
Daryl

thank you so much!

By the way, I spoke with Dale Wood this week, good chat about trails, paths and bikeways and the needs of persons with disabilities. The study currently being undertaken piqued my interest in what was not being looked at. Dale was helpful and advised of other options to let their consultants know about deficits and limitations for those with disabilities wishing to use trails and paths etc. Thought I’d share this with you.
To: Bender, Daryl  
Subject: HAMILTON CYCLING COMMITTEE  

Hi Daryl, are you the chap who provided me with copies of the Hamilton Bike Routes, Trails and Parks map for handout?

If you are, might I request an additional 50 copies? I can pick up from your office or you might send through the city interoffice mail system to my other office at the Hamilton Public Library, Central, 3rd floor (Disability Information Service Helpline). Thanks in advance for your kind assistance.

regards,  

"An inclusive and accessible community in which to live is not a privilege, it is a right we should all enjoy."

Hamilton Health Sciences

This information is directed in confidence solely to the person named above and may not otherwise be distributed, copied or disclosed. Therefore, this information should be considered strictly confidential. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately via a return email for further direction. Thank you for your assistance.
From: Fazio, Margaret [mailto:Margaret.Fazio@hamilton.ca]
Sent: April 29, 2009 9:46 AM
To: Smith, Katherine
Cc: Nairn, Sandy; Riley, Donnett; TOE, Assistant Environmental Planner
Subject: RE: Hamilton cycling master plan inquiry

Thank you very much, Kathy.

-----Original Message-----
From: Smith, Katherine [mailto:ksmith@npca.ca]
Sent: April 29, 2009 8:36 AM
To: Fazio, Margaret
Cc: Nairn, Sandy; Riley, Donnett; TOE, Assistant Environmental Planner
Subject: RE: Hamilton cycling master plan inquiry

Hi Margaret,
My interest is in this particular project. It is not necessary to add me to your mailing list for all of your EA projects.
Thanks, Kathy

Kathy Smith  OALA CSLA
Conservation Planner
Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority
250 Thorold Rd.W, Welland, ON L3C 3W2
Tel: (905) 788-3135 ext 258   Fax: (905) 788-1121
CELEBRATING 50 YEARS OF CONSERVATION
email ksmith@npca.ca   website www.npca.ca

From: Fazio, Margaret [mailto:Margaret.Fazio@hamilton.ca]
Sent: Tuesday, April 28, 2009 10:34 AM
To: Smith, Katherine
Cc: Nairn, Sandy; Riley, Donnett; TOE, Assistant Environmental Planner
Subject: FW: Hamilton cycling master plan inquiry

Hi Kathy,

I am co-lead in the above project. I have been forwarded correspondence, below, and have a question for you.
Is your involvement related only to this project or should your name be added to our standard mailing list, i.e. to be contacted for all our Environmental Assessment projects? We have two other contacts for your organization.

Thank you,
Margaret

Margaret Fazio, B.Sc., C.C.E.P.
-----Original Message-----

From: Nairn, Sandy [mailto:SNairn@ecoplans.com]
Sent: April 13, 2009 9:10 AM
To: Smith, Katherine
Cc: Bender, Daryl
Subject: RE: Hamilton cycling master plan inquiry

Kathy,

Thank you for your interest in this study. The information to be presented at the Open House sessions this week will be posted on the City of Hamilton website shortly so please check back later this week. The site is located at www.hamilton.ca/ShiftingGears.

Please feel free to call me at the number below or provide further written comments once you have had a chance to review the PIC information.

Best Regards,

Sandy

-----Original Message-----

From: Smith, Katherine [mailto:ksmith@npca.ca]
Sent: April 6, 2009 10:18 AM
To: cycling@hamilton.ca; Nairn, Sandy
Subject: Hamilton cycling master plan inquiry

Re: Stakeholder consultation for the 2nd Public Information Centre

We are interested in your Class EA process but unable to attend your April 14 and 16 sessions. Do you have information you could circulate to us via email of what will be presented at these sessions?
Our Binbrook Conservation Area supports cycling activities and cyclists would benefit knowing they could access our day-use park. How can we connect to this cycling masterplan?

For further information in regards to this enquiry, and to send information to our office feel free to contact me at your convenience.

Best regards for your study,

**Kathy Smith**  OALA  CSLA  
Conservation Planner  
Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority  
250 Thorold Rd.W, Welland, ON L3C 3W2  
Tel: (905) 788-3135 ext 258  Fax: (905) 788-1121  
*CELEBRATING 50 YEARS OF CONSERVATION*  
email ksmith@npca.ca  website www.npca.ca
Hi Daryl,

A few comments:

No cycling is permitted on Highway 6 as it is a special controlled access highway (Class 3). The section to the north (south of Freelton) that is shown must be removed from the city's map. Ontario has the safest roads in Canada. To maintain our excellent safety record, the Highway Traffic Act, RSO 1990, Regulation 630 prohibits bicycles to ride on all the controlled access highways listed in the Act.

Any new bicycle facilities which cross lands designated as controlled access highways or special controlled access highways will require approval from the ministry in the form of an encroachment permit.

Regarding Highway's 5 & 8, the City should not show them as bike routes since they are MTO's facilities and not Hamilton's. This is also dangerous as it may lead cyclist to believe these high speed highways are considered safe for cycling and give a false sense of security. However, the Ministry is willing to work with the City to determine the best options for encouraging active transportation in these areas.

Where designated bicycle facilities are justified on a provincial highway or crossing a provincial highway, MTO's Ontario Bikeways Planning and Design Guidelines should be used (available from MTO's online library). Please note that MTO is currently undergoing a review and update of the 1996 Guidelines, as well as MTO's active transportation policy. Details can be provided by Robert Dolezel at 416-585-7286.

MTO currently has a RFP under call for the detail design to rehabilitate 6 QEW structures in Stoney Creek. You can contact John Lam, Senior Structural Engineer, at 416-235-5509, who can provide you with more information.

MTO is also currently doing a study on integration of cyclists and pedestrians at interchanges. The results of the study are expected this Fall. The City of Hamilton is encouraged to contact Amy Ibrahim at 905-704-3111 to provide input (see attached) if you have not already done so.

Shawn

From: Bender, Daryl [mailto:Daryl.Bender@hamilton.ca]
Sent: May 5, 2009 4:08 PM
To: Smith, Shawn (MTO)
Subject: FW: City of Hamilton Cycling Master Plan Update

Shawn,

I am glad you sent an email. We were in the process of drafting specific information details to the MTO when you sent the email below. The following is a list of projects in the Cycling Master Plan that have a "relation" with MTO facilities. Note that the list states whether the facility is existing or proposed. This list was also submitted to the MTO Active Transportation Inventory Study that is being conducted by MMM. Most are crossings, but not all. A few critical connections have been flagged in **bold**.

NOMO path means "no motorized traffic" path.
For a map to envision this network more clearly, please check out the PIC#2 info panels on the website [www.hamilton.ca/Shiftinggears](http://www.hamilton.ca/Shiftinggears) (which I think you have already reviewed).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Road(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastport</td>
<td>QEW</td>
<td>NOMO path or bike lanes (under QEW) by canal</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Blvd</td>
<td>QEW</td>
<td>NOMO path or bike lanes (under QEW) south end of Skyway</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Hill Valley Trail</td>
<td>QEW</td>
<td>NOMO path over QEW by RHVP</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial Parkway</td>
<td>QEW</td>
<td>NOMO path over QEW through interchange</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays Rd</td>
<td>QEW</td>
<td>bike lanes over QEW</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millen Rd</td>
<td>QEW</td>
<td>bike lanes over QEW</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruitland Rd</td>
<td>QEW</td>
<td>bike lanes through interchange</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glover Rd</td>
<td>QEW</td>
<td>bike lanes over QEW</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winona Rd</td>
<td>QEW</td>
<td>bike lanes over QEW</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifty Rd</td>
<td>QEW</td>
<td>bike lanes through interchange</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Guelph Rd</td>
<td>Hwy 403/Hwy 6</td>
<td>paved shoulders under Hwy 403</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Blvd</td>
<td>Hwy 403/Hwy 6</td>
<td>bike lanes through interchange</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront Trail by Cootes</td>
<td>Hwy 403/Hwy 6</td>
<td>NOMO path under Hwy 403 by Desjardin canal</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Drage Park Trail</td>
<td>Hwy 403/Hwy 6</td>
<td>NOMO path under Hwy 403 by Kay Drage/Macklin St</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King St</td>
<td>Hwy 403/Hwy 6</td>
<td>bike lanes over Hwy 403 crossing on ramp</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St</td>
<td>Hwy 403/Hwy 6</td>
<td>bike lanes over Hwy 403 crossing off ramp</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longwood Rd</td>
<td>Hwy 403/Hwy 6</td>
<td>bike lanes over Hwy 403</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP rail trail</td>
<td>Hwy 403/Hwy 6</td>
<td>NOMO path over Hwy 403</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chedoke Rail Trail</td>
<td>Hwy 403/Hwy 6</td>
<td>NOMO path over Hwy 403; confirmed that the Bruce Trail uses this same crossing</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Links Rd</td>
<td>Hwy 403/Hwy 6</td>
<td>bike lanes over Hwy 403</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southcote Rd</td>
<td>Hwy 403/Hwy 6</td>
<td>bike lanes over Hwy 403</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiddler's Green Rd</td>
<td>Hwy 403</td>
<td>bike lanes over Hwy 403</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Dr</td>
<td>Hwy 403</td>
<td>bike lanes over Hwy 403</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson St</td>
<td>Hwy 403</td>
<td>bike lanes over Hwy 403 through interchange</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaver Rd</td>
<td>Hwy 403</td>
<td>bike lanes over Hwy 403</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydro Corridor NOMO</td>
<td>Hwy 403</td>
<td>NOMO path over Hwy 403</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaFarge Trail</td>
<td>Hwy 6</td>
<td>confirming that it continues north of Gore Rd &amp; cross Hwy 6 using Maddaugh Rd</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freelton Rd/Conc 11E</td>
<td>Hwy 6</td>
<td>paved shoulders crossing #6 - are signals proposed?</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle Rd/Edgewood Rd</td>
<td>Hwy 6</td>
<td>paved shoulders crossing #6 through existing signals - note short parallel NOMO path along west side of #6</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millgrove Rd/Conc 6E</td>
<td>Hwy 6</td>
<td>paved shoulders crossing #6 through existing signals</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkside Dr/Conc 4W/proposed Waterdown bypass</td>
<td>Hwy 6</td>
<td>paved shoulders crossing #6 through existing signals &amp; NOMO path along the proposed bypass</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterdown NOMO</td>
<td>Hwy 6</td>
<td>NOMO path under #6 along creek</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 5</td>
<td>Hwy 6</td>
<td>paved shoulders crossing #6 through proposed interchange</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Trail</td>
<td>Hwy 6</td>
<td>hiking trail in tunnel under #6 - new tunnel as part of current construction</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Rd</td>
<td>Hwy 6</td>
<td>paved shoulders crossing #6 through proposed interchange (almost completed)</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garner Rd</td>
<td>Hwy 6</td>
<td>bike lanes under Hwy 6</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydro Corridor NOMO</td>
<td>Hwy 6</td>
<td>NOMO path crossing Hwy 6 just south of Garner Rd</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Rd</td>
<td>Hwy 6/Airport Access Rd</td>
<td>NOMO path at intersection - assume Airport Access Rd is a City roadway, but please confirm</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Church Rd</td>
<td>Hwy 6</td>
<td>paved shoulders over #6</td>
<td>Existing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 6 corridor</td>
<td>Hwy 6</td>
<td>NOMO path or paved shoulders on #6 - connecting Mount Hope to Caledonia</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 6</td>
<td>Hwy 5</td>
<td>paved shoulders crossing #6 through proposed interchange</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 5 corridor</td>
<td>Hwy 5</td>
<td>paved shoulders along Hwy 5 from Sydenham Rd to Hwy 6 - continue as bike lanes on Dundas St (City road) east of #6</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydenham Rd/Millgrove Rd</td>
<td>Hwy 5</td>
<td>paved shoulders crossing #5 (possible future signals?)</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock Rd</td>
<td>Hwy 5</td>
<td>paved shoulders crossing #5 through existing signals</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 5 corridor</td>
<td>Hwy 5</td>
<td>NOMO path along the south side of #5 - Old Brock</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 8 corridor</td>
<td>Hwy 8</td>
<td>NOMO path or paved shoulders along Hwy 8 from Waterloo Region border to Hwy 5 - &amp; continue on Old Hwy 8 (City road) southeast of #5</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safari Rd/Conc 7W</td>
<td>Hwy 8</td>
<td>paved shoulders crossing #6 at west end of Sheffield</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide us with your comments on this list of existing and proposed cycling facilities.

Thanks in advance,

Daryl Bender B.E.S.
Project Manager, Alternative Transportation
Traffic Engineering Section
Public Works
City of Hamilton
905-546-2424 x 2066

-----Original Message-----
From: Smith, Shawn (MTO) [mailto:Shawn.Smith@ontario.ca]
Sent: Monday, April 20, 2009 3:02 PM
To: TOE, Assistant Environmental Planner; cycling
Subject: RE: City of Hamilton Cycling Master Plan Update

Hi Daryl,

Can you please provide more information about this note:

“Note that corridors being considered for Rapid Transit and Ministry of Transportation (MTO) roads were identified but excluded from analysis given potential conflicts, timing or jurisdiction.”

Is there any request for bicycle infrastructure on MTO roads?

Thanks,
Shawn

Shawn Smith, P.Eng. - Project Engineer
Highway Engineering | Planning & Design, Hamilton-Niagara
Provincial Highways Management Division | Ministry of Transportation
4th Floor, Building D, 1201 Wilson Ave. | Downview ON, M3M 1J8
Tel: 416.235.3598 | Fax: 416.235.3576

From: TOE, Assistant Environmental Planner [mailto:spostud@hamilton.ca]
Sent: April 20, 2009 9:24 AM
To: Bender, Daryl
Subject: City of Hamilton Cycling Master Plan Update

To whom it may concern,

You have received this email because you had some communication with the City of Hamilton regarding the Cycling Master Plan study that is currently underway. There were two Public Information Centres held last week where we received some comment. Please note that the information that was presented at these meetings has been posted on the City website at www.hamilton.ca/Shiftinggears under the title "Public Information Centre #2".

If you have any comment on this information - or even questions - please send an email as described on the webpage.

We look forward to any feedback you may have,

Daryl Bender B.E.S.
Project Manager, Alternative Transportation
From: Bender, Daryl [Daryl.Bender@hamilton.ca] on behalf of cycling [cycling@hamilton.ca]
Sent: May 5, 2009 6:26 PM
To: Pravitz, Frank (MTO)
Subject: RE: Hamilton Bicycle Master Plan proposal

Attachments: Pravitz comments SC resident.doc

Frank,
Thanks for reviewing the information. I will give you a call to discuss.

Regards,

Daryl Bender B.E.S.
Project Manager, Alternative Transportation
Traffic Engineering Section
Public Works
City of Hamilton
905-546-2424 x 2066

-----Original Message-----
From: Pravitz, Frank (MTO) [mailto:Frank.Pravitz@ontario.ca]
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2009 1:57 PM
To: cycling
Subject: Hamilton Bicycle Master Plan proposal

Hello Daryl:

I am e-mailing you some comments on the proposed Hamilton bicycle plan.

Comments are based largely as a resident in Stoney Creek, but in part as a member of the Regional Niagara Cycling Committee.

I would invite you to contact me so we can spend a little time going over the comments, as some might be a little unclear.

You can contact me at
work (905) 704-2712
home (905) 662-6984

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on this important initiative.

Frank Pravitz
Comments on the Proposed Hamilton Cycling Network Plan
Frank Pravitz, April 21, 2009

Overall

Approach / Criteria to Review of the Bike Network
  o Connections, mobility, access
  o East to West
  o East vs West
  o Escarpment
  o Utilitarian and recreational
  o Effective use of trails and potential trails
  o Signage
  o Inter-modal connections
  o Connections to Niagara + Rural Road Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Grays/Centennial Park access to Service Rd. &amp; Frances Ave (G)(K)</td>
<td>Heavily used by cyclists, no shoulders, listed on map as bike route, easily overlooked, dangerous, Waterfront route is not a real alternative</td>
<td>Primary Priority Pave shoulders &amp; sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Nash assess across Red Hill to Centennial Park Ped/Cycling Bridge Trail (H)</td>
<td>No effective crossing from east to Centennial Park bridge</td>
<td>Red Hill Bridge at the end of Nash that could be used as a trail connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Stoney Creek Lake St unclear ?? / Green</td>
<td>Loose End</td>
<td>Perhaps a new connection to Centennial Park over the QEW on Lake, Green etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D RNBC Mud Rd connection (I)</td>
<td>No effective Mud Road connection north</td>
<td>Pave shoulders to Eleventh from Niagara on Mud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Red Hill crossing</td>
<td>Major disconnect from east to west side of brow of the Niagara Escarpment Red Hill Expressway</td>
<td>Need a Ped/Cycling Bridge / would be spectacular / thought there was a PIC on this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Trails by Rails</td>
<td>Where is it feasible</td>
<td>Climb up escarpment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Grays Road Diet</td>
<td>Secondary Plan</td>
<td>Primary Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Kenora bike lanes</td>
<td>Kenora is not a bike route &amp; is a quieter alternative to Nash</td>
<td>Retrofit bike lanes, add bike lanes through park area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Green Mountain / Fifth shared use</td>
<td>Quiet Rd, good connections, close to urban areas for rec. cyclists</td>
<td>Bike Route / Share the Road signs min. / Long-term pave shoulders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Cootes Paradise / RBG</td>
<td>Possible extension of</td>
<td>Partner to design a round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project proposal</td>
<td>Princess Point trail</td>
<td>trip multi-purpose path around Cootes Paradise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Service Roads</td>
<td>At QEW should be paved for utilitarian cyclists, particularly in connection to Grays</td>
<td>Pave shoulders along unpaved portions of the North Service Road, consider paving South Service Road as they make effective bicycle highways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Connections to Brantford near Rail Trail</td>
<td>Wider issues of identifying suitable cycling roads even though they are unsigned</td>
<td>Clarify bike routes vs signage vs public mapping products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Trail Standards &amp; Classification</td>
<td>Existing and proposed, Appears to be secondary plan trail routes that are not well defined</td>
<td>Paved vs unpaved, utilitarian uses vs recreational uses, many potential trails identified and purpose and objectives need to be clarified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 Loose Ends</td>
<td>Lots of them, intent not clear wrt connections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 Climbs up escarpment</td>
<td>Important and unclear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 Millen</td>
<td>Under construction, map does not effectively indicate that it is an existing bike lane</td>
<td>Clarify if new bike lanes will be added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 Ridge Rd</td>
<td>Plan not clear</td>
<td>Shoulder should be paved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 Hwy 8 Corridor</td>
<td>Road Diet / ?? / a mess</td>
<td>How will Hwy 8 be addressed east of Queenston?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 Queenston corridor</td>
<td>Esp over Red Hill – what is the status? / proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Comments**
- Great Plan, improves bicycle mobility, connections and accessibility
- As a resident of Stoney Creek, comments are biased towards the east.
- As a member of the Regional Niagara Cycling Committee, comments make reference to linkages.
- East to West connection particularly relies on Barton Street. To make this effective, Barton will need bicycle lanes – is this in the proposal? How will this occur?
- West end is more developed then the east end.
- Escarpment climbs are a challenge. There are a number of proposals in the east where options are limited to very steep climbs. However, the proposals are not very clear, particularly wrt where there are not existing roads, and for the secondary plan. Perhaps a trails by rails option might be feasible.
Some instances where recreational trail systems supplant possible improvements to utilitarian connections, particularly along the service road.

Trail systems are not clear in denoting the suitability of trails for various forms of cycling. Some of the proposed routes, particularly in the secondary plan, do not make this clear. I am surprised that the proposed crossing of the QEW is marked in Green, rather then as a trail. I thought it was funded and ready for construction.

It is not clear what the signage policy will be relative to the proposed, or even existing network. I would assume that a designated route should be signed – however, while shared use bike routes are signed in Hamilton, they are not signed in Stoney Creek. Hamilton does not appear to provide mapping information on other suitable routes for cycling in the city or – in particular – rural routes, where there are larger numbers of recreational cyclists.

I am glad to see that there are proposals for bicycle parking. However, the slides are not clear on where this might occur. For example, do you propose to work with Go Transit to provide bicycle parking at the Train Station(s), at the Nash bus station, or inter-modal facilities under discussion along the QEW?

Connections with Niagara are generally good. However, I would suggest paving the shoulders along Mud from Niagara to eleventh. Hwy 8 is somewhat problematic since considerable resurfacing has been occurring without fully paved shoulders,
April 27, 2009

Daryl Bender
Project Manager, Alternative Transportation
Public Works
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Ste 320
Hamilton, ON
L8R 2K3

Dear Mr. Bender,

Re: City Wide Cycling Master Plan

The Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) has reviewed the information provided via the City of Hamilton website from the 2nd Public Information Centre pertaining to the City of Hamilton City Wide Cycling Plan. GRCA staff support this initiative to reduce traffic congestion and encourage cycling as an alternative mode of transportation.

Based on our review of the current implementation strategy lands regulated by the GRCA are not affected by this project within the first phase of implementation (i.e. first $2.5 million dollars of spending). Once the project expands into our area of jurisdiction it is understood that all upgrades are planned along existing roadways.

Please be aware that if upgrades or improvements to these roadways occur in areas regulated by the GRCA including by not limited to water crossings, a permit may be required from our office as per our Policies for the Administration of the Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alteration to Shorelines and Watercourses Regulation (Ontario Regulation 150/06).

We trust these comments are of assistance. Should you have any further questions please do not hesitate to contact Lisa-Beth Bulford at 519-622-2763 x2292.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Fred Natlochny
Supervisor of Resource Planning
Grand River Conservation Authority

N:\Watershed Resources Planning\Resource Planning\Hamilton\2008\EA
April 30, 2009

Margaret Fazio
Project Manager
Environmental Planning
City of Hamilton
320-77 James Street North
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3

Dear Ms. Fazio:

RE: City Wide Cycling Master Plan - Shifting Gears – Phase 2
File: ER HW 30; and
Hamilton Trails Draft Master Plan File: CPM 04
King Road Burlington File: ER HW 1307

Thank you for notifying the Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC) regarding the above noted initiative.

In principle, the proposed project would appear to support the objectives of the Niagara Escarpment Plan: “To provide for adequate public access to the Niagara Escarpment…” and to provide adequate opportunities for outdoor recreation” provided that there would be no negative or cumulative negative effects on the Escarpment environment.

Comments:

The Cycling Master Plan for Hamilton proposes facilities within the Niagara Escarpment Plan. The majority of the cycling alternatives appear to be proposed in concert with the road system including reserved bike lanes, signed bike routes and paved shoulders. The master plan also proposes the use of multiuse paths (off street, rural and urban) and as such we have included a copy of the comments made by the NEC in a letter of December 20, 2006 regarding the Hamilton Trails Draft Master Plan.

The information provided at the Cycling Master Plan Public (CMP) Information Centre of April 2009 included a Map as well as other documentation. This included a chart called ‘Review of Alternatives’ identifying the initial prioritization of proposed projects. The chart lists only projects associated with some of the roads and does not identify any multi use path development or changes to existing paths.
Regarding the proposed CMP we offer the following general comments:

1. Cycling alternatives in conjunction with the road system; As there appear to be a number of roads within the NEP which might be impacted by the introduction of widenings of the pavement or right of way to accommodate cycling lanes or routes; the NEC requests the City provide a separate map identifying the parts of the proposed network, within the NEP, where physical changes to roads are proposed. We would note works on Mineral Springs Road, King Road in Burlington and all roads crossing the Escarpment are of concern. There is no concern for matters such as the addition of signs or alterations to lane paint lines on existing roads.

2. Regarding multi use paths; the attached NEC letter of December 20, 2006 on the Draft Trails Master Plan (TMP), sets out our comments and concerns regarding the construction of multi use paths within areas of the Escarpment. The trail types in the TMP present widths up to 6 metres and hard surfaces that may not be compatible with areas of the Plan. As the Cycling Master Plan does not identify whether the multiuse trails, identified on the Shifting Gears April 2009 Map, would require widening and/or a change in surfacing to ‘fit’ into the cycling system we would direct the City to our December 20th 2006 letter for comments on this part of the CMP. The NEC has not received any response to our December 2006 letter on the TMP and as such the status of the TMP is unknown.

Our review of the CMP Map indicates two areas where road related facilities are proposed, within the NEP, but no road exists to our knowledge; please clarify. We do note however in these same areas Bruce Trail and Rail Trail routes exist; see green Primary Network demarcation at Lake Avenue Drive and on a section west of Centennial Parkway.

We would therefore ask that the City, within the context of the CMP, identify the multiuse trail types (width and surface) and locations where changes are proposed within the NEP and forward this information to the undersigned for review and comment. As with the road network alternatives the information we seek is with regard to development of trails such as widening of existing trails or new development to determine the impact if any on the NEP lands.

3. Is it the intention that any of the projects identified within the CMP will require a separate Class EA process? If so, could you please identify those for us, so that if we have concerns regarding those projects that those concerns could be dealt with later in the process.

4. Development permits may be required for works within the NEP.

5. We would also note specific concern for the proposed Primary Network (lane, route etc..) connections identified for King Road, within the NEP, in the City of
Burlington. The NEC has provided ongoing comments regarding our serious concern with the impact of proposed widening or realignment of King Road. As such we cannot, at this time, support the inclusion of cycling infrastructure on that section of King Road within the NEP lands in the CMP.

Conclusion:

To ensure that any infrastructure improvements associated with the Ultimate Bicycle Network Master Plan proposed within the Niagara Escarpment Plan Area are consistent with the NEP, NEC staff requests that the City of Hamilton provide the information requested herein. Once we have received that information we will provide detailed comments on the Master Plan. Further we request to remain on the mailing list and that the City of Hamilton continue to provide the NEC with information regarding this project, including a draft of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Master Plan.

Should you have any further questions, please contact the undersigned at (905) 877-3794, or by email at kathryn.pounder@ontario.ca or Linda Laflamme at (905) 877-6312, or by email at linda.laflamme@ontario.ca

Sincerely,

Kathryn Pounder
Senior Strategic Advisor

Copy: Lloyd Ferguson, NEC Commissioner (Hamilton)
Ken Whitbread, Manager NEC
Nancy Mott-Allen, Senior Strategic Advisor
Linda Laflamme, Landscape Architect
David Johnston, Planner
Martin Kilian, Planner

Attachment: December 20, 2006 letter to Mr. Steve Barnhart City of Hamilton
December 20, 2006

Mr. Steve Barnhart
Open Space Development and Park Planning
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North
Suite 320
Hamilton, Ontario
L8R 2K3

Dear Mr. Barnhart:

RE: PROPOSED HAMILTON TRAILS MASTER PLAN
DRAFT DOCUMENT
FINAL DRAFT
NEC File: CPM 04

The Niagara Escarpment Commission is in receipt of the Hamilton Trails Master Plan Draft Document and we are pleased to provide the following comments for your consideration.

The Hamilton Trails Master Plan herein referred to as Hamilton TMP has identified proposed trails and features within the boundaries of lands regulated under the Niagara Escarpment Planning and Development Act (NEPDA) and are therefore, subject to the Act and the Niagara Escarpment Plan (NEP). Where the NEP applies, the principle purpose of the Plan would guide any development proposed, that is:

“The purpose of the Plan is to provide for the maintenance of the Niagara Escarpment and the land in its vicinity substantially as a continuous natural environment, and to ensure only such development occurs as is compatible with that natural environment.”

Section 2.2.4 of the TMP quotes and discusses sections of the NEP regarding the following land use designations:

- Escarpment Natural Area
- Escarpment Protection Area
• Escarpment Rural Area
• Escarpment Urban Area

Each of these designations is defined in more detail under the NEP and includes area specific Objectives, Criteria and Permitted Uses for each designation; these are quoted in part only within the TMP. The objectives for all of the land uses include the maintenance of natural features, open landscape character and cultural heritage features.

Based on our review of the Hamilton Trails Master Plan we understand the City proposes:

• To present a comprehensive plan for a multi use off road recreational trail system throughout the City;
• A system that is linked to both current and proposed off-street as well as on street systems;
• To connect significant environmental, cultural features and parks while preserving their natural heritage values and ecological functions;
• Intends to create a multi-purpose system that, to the extent practical, caters to the broadest range of users; in essence universally accessible as much as possible;
• The TMP guide trail system development and management throughout the City from the present to the future;
• To provide clear direction and decision making capabilities to guide the trail development;
• Some elements that are conceptual such as the provision of an incline rail and gondola facilities to provide access along steep areas of the Escarpment corridor; and
• That the TMP does not address equestrian and mechanized trail uses such as snowmobiling and all terrain vehicles.

Further that the Master Plan:

• Involved public as well as agency consultation;
• Included a review of Provincial Planning documents such as the Greenbelt Plan, the Growth Plan, the Niagara Escarpment Plan, the Provincial Policy Statement, the Ontario Trails Strategy and other documents concerning planning considerations.
• Is not necessarily the concluding step as;
  1. Parts of the Master Plan would require Environmental Assessments and/or agency approval such as the NEC regarding compliance with the NEPDA and NEP.
  2. The City intends to incorporate Trails Policies into the City’s New Official Plan, Secondary Plans and the Transportation Master Plan.

The TMP provides the following synopsis at the end of Section 2.2.4 Niagara Escarpment Plan:

Page 33

“If the Trails Master Plan uses Parts 1 and 2 of the Niagara Escarpment Plan as a guide in its development, trail development should conform to the land use
policy designations and development criteria of the Niagara Escarpment Plan. Subject to review with the Niagara Escarpment Commission, some trail projects may require development permits.”

And on Page 34
“The municipality commits to plan and manage the lands in conformity with the policies of the Niagara Escarpment Parks and Open Space System.”

The goal of developing and managing the system in accordance with the NEP is in keeping with the Plan and Act and we would be pleased to continue liaison with City staff to resolve any Master Plan Study matters relating to the NEPDA and NEP. The comments and recommendations that follow represent a phased approach as some matters of Policy must be resolved and site visits undertaken by staff before finalizing our comments. We would note that the first draft of the TMP did not include any of the trail maps or the gondola/Incline rail proposal.

Comments and Recommendations:

The Master Plan presents new or widened trails and proposed structures within the lands designated under the NEP; this will be the focus of the comments herein. The NEC is cognizant of the value in the City developing a Master Plan to guide trail development and of the importance of accessibility for trail systems particularly those within the urban context. The Master Plan however proposes elements that may not meet the permitted uses under the Plan or are of concern to the NEC due to potential impact to the Escarpment natural environment.

Endorsement of the Master Plan by the Commission would require the Trails Master Plan be in accordance with the NEP and NEPDA. For some specific matters this will require further review by staff, field visits and a report to the Commission. In order to respond within the requested timeframe we have identified the following matters of concern, requested revisions and areas where additional investigation or review is required before final comment/position by the NEC can be provided.

1. Section 2.2.2 Niagara Escarpment Plan; the statement at the bottom of page 31 is essentially correct regarding amendments and Permit requirements however the interpretation of when an amendment or Permit is required is determined by the NEC; the agency responsible for implementing the Provincial Plan. As such site visits are necessary at this time in order that we might clarify where an amendment or Permit would be necessary.

Further within the section on the Niagara Escarpment UNESCO Biosphere Reserve 2.3.1 reference is made to the Escarpment Natural Area representing the landscape and ecosystem set aside for conservation; this is followed by the statement “The Trails Master Plan makes provision for sustainable recreation development while trail management provisions provide logistical support”. We concur these areas are set aside and as such one of the more significant concerns for the NEC is the proposal for multi use recreational trails in Natural Areas and whether the ecosystem
can sustain the impact of construction and the increased use accorded to a trail type. The impact of the trails, particularly those 4 metres and wider, may not meet the policies and criteria of the NEP. Site investigation at this early stage will hopefully provide some guidance to the City on where the trail type may be restricted and require changes to the TMP.

2. With regard to the Niagara Escarpment Parks and Open Space System please see the attached comments provided by Neil Hester, Senior Strategic Advisor/NEC; attachment #1. Trail types and facilities must meet the intent of any existing NEP approved Parks and Open Space Master Plan and where no Master Plan exists one may be required prior to approval of the trail location and type.

3. Section 2.4.7 Waterfalls and Cascades of Hamilton; there is no reference to the NEC being included in the process to review proposed trails, upgraded trails or facilities to provide better access to serve the tourism and recreation component of the TMP. It appears most of the waterfalls and cascades are within the NEP Natural Area Designation and as such environmental issues or impact relating to access on the Escarpment must be reviewed at a detailed level. Further the NEC would need to be included in the review process to ensure proposed facilities meet the requirements of the NEP. At this time, based on the information at hand, the NEC is unable to endorse this section of the TMP. *** see discussion item at the conclusion of these comments.

4. Section 2.5.1 the Hamilton Cycling Master Plan survey indicates the central portion of the Niagara Escarpment and major highways are considered significant barriers to cyclists and it is further noted cyclists seek access to the Niagara Escarpment. Where possible the NEC may consider the creation of new or widened trails for cyclists but only where there will be no negative or cumulative negative effects on the Escarpment natural environment.

5. Section 2.5.4 Hamilton Street Railway; the proposed trail expansion noted in this section will require field review. The incline rail line, proposed from the toe of the Escarpment at James Street falls under the purview of a Policy matter. Kathryn Pounder, Senior Planner for the NEC has provided some information on this as per the attached memorandum; attachment # 2. As noted further information on the proposal is required. Subsequently a report to our Commission will likely be needed and potentially an amendment to the Plan. It should be noted that the submission of an amendment does not necessarily result in its approval. *** see discussion item at the conclusion of these comments.

6. Section 2.5.6 Beckett Drive Gondola; see item 5.herein and the attached memorandum from Kathryn Pounder. The proposed gondola falls under the same review process as the incline rail line.
7. We understand from your email, of November 22\textsuperscript{nd}, that the gondola and incline rail line have not yet been assessed in a detailed manner. However under the NEP and NEPDA should the Trails Master Plan be endorsed by the NEC and it included the incline rail line and/or the gondola we would effectively be approving these matters in principle and we are unable to do so based on the current level of information and the requirement for further evaluation and consideration by the NEC. *** see discussion item at the conclusion of these comments.

8. Section 2.5.5 Chedoke Mountain Bike Park; the location and details on the types of facilities proposed will need further review by staff of the NEC before commenting. If the use meets those allowed within the NEP a Development Permit would be required.

9. 2.5.7 Environmental Assessment Studies; EA's associated with lands within the NEP are required to be circulated to the NEC for comment. The last line in this section of the TMP is of concern: “The Master Plan will serve to document the need and justification for these projects which require further Environmental Assessment Act approval.” Should the NEC approve the Trails Master Plan in principle we would not necessarily be prepared to accept the TMP study as the complete documentation necessary on the need and justification for the project. This is particularly the case for the incline rail line/gondola proposals and for the trails where alternative routes have not been discussed.

10. Section 3.3 Design Issues; the Niagara Escarpment is noted as one of three barriers which limit the ability to develop trail opportunities across the natural features. We concur with this statement but perhaps not in the same tenor as the City. The physical barrier of the natural areas within the Escarpment does require passage of pedestrians be carefully planned so as to ensure the Escarpment natural environment is not compromised. As part of the trail planning the City Hamilton has selected many routes that utilize old rail corridors or road beds where the natural condition has already been changed; generally this approach is in keeping with the NEP. There are specific areas in the Design Standards proposed that do not either meet the NEP or would require further information; an overview of these items is as follows:
   - Gondola and Incline rail line; see comments above.
   - Hubs at trail intersection; impacts to the natural environment are of concern.
   - Respecting the Natural Environment; the report notes consultation had occurred with the NEC where natural areas would be impacted by facilities and the comments reflected in the Master Plan. To clarify, the location of the trails/trail types on the maps as well as
parts of the Master Plan were not circulated to the NEC in the previous submission. The majority of the comments herein are based on the NEC’s first review of this new information and we have many concerns.

- Site specific design issues regarding the Red Hill Creek; further clarification is required as to the design issues relating to the NEP.

11. Section 4.0 Trail Standards – the NEC cannot support the use of 6 metre wide hard surface trails such as asphalt or concrete in areas designated Escarpment Natural Area. Where trails are proposed in designated Escarpment Natural Areas 4 metre granular surface trails would be considered if the impact to natural terrain and habitat was considered by the NEC to be in keeping with the NEP, was minimal, and appropriately mitigated.

12. Widening of existing trails will be considered by the NEC only where there is minimal impact to the natural environment. As an example widening of rail trails within the remnant rail bed where the natural condition has not been reinstated. Prior to detailed design consultation with the NEC is recommended and, subject to the extent of the impact, a Permit from the NEC may be required.

13. Where new trails, trail hubs, accessible outlooks are proposed, and permitted under the NEP a Permit shall be required.

14. Section 5 Master Plan; this section of the report contains maps of the individual trails with trail types within the individual wards, a description of the individual Ward trails (existing & proposed) and attributes within a chart format. The maps do not include the NEP boundary or designations and this has posed some difficulty in cross referencing TMP trail routes to the NEP. A review of each Ward map (22+) and the trail routes contained within the NEP corridor are currently being reviewed by Planning staff. The comments, details and requirements for site visits will be forwarded under separate cover.

**Discussion Item ***:**

The request had been made by the City that the NEC consider some matters within the TMP as conceptual only acknowledging that further study, EA, NEP Amendments and Permits are among the matters to be addressed in the future should the City of Hamilton determine they wish to pursue the design and implementation of these conceptual facilities. The NEC is prepared to work with the City to provide wording, to be included within specific sections of the TMP, where a clause clearly stating the concept/facility has not been endorsed by the NEC in the approval in principle of the Trails Master Plan. Should you wish to pursue this matter we would be pleased to meet with you to review suitable text.
Without this level of comfort concerning certain issues the NEC will not sign off on the document.

We trust that these comments will be of assistance. Should you wish to contact NEC staff to discuss the comments, please contact the undersigned at 905-877-4026 or Linda Laflamme at 905-877-6312.

Sincerely,

Ken Whitbread
Manager
Niagara Escarpment Commission

c: Brian McHattie, NEC Commissioner
    Linda Laflamme, Landscape Architect
    Kathryn Pounder, Senior Planner
    Neil Hester, Senior Strategic Advisor
    Martin Kilian, Planner
To: Linda Laflamme

From: Neil Hester,  
    Senior Strategic Advisor  
    Niagara Escarpment Commission

Date: November 27, 2006

Re: Hamilton Trails Master Plan (TMP)

POLICY MATTERS

The following provides an overview of trail related uses that are permitted in various NEP (Niagara Escarpment Plan) designations. This list should be checked against the actual policies in the NEP, as it may be incomplete.

1. Permitted uses:

   Escarpment Natural Area:  
   • non-intensive recreation uses such as trail activities,  
   • the Bruce Trail Corridor, BT (Bruce Trail) trail related constructions, BT ORAs (Overnight Rest Areas) and BT Access Points for Bruce Trail users,  
   • uses permitted in Park or Open Space Master/Management Plans.

   Escarpment Protection Area:  
   • non-intensive recreation uses such as trail activities,  
   • the Bruce Trail Corridor, BT trail related constructions, BT ORAs and BT Access Points for Bruce Trail users,  
   • uses permitted in Park or Open Space Master/Management Plans,  
   • in non-agricultural areas, trail uses.

   Escarpment Rural Area:  
   • non-intensive recreation uses such as trail activities,  
   • the Bruce Trail Corridor, BT trail related constructions, BT ORAs and BT Access Points for Bruce Trail users,  
   • uses permitted in Park or Open Space Master/Management Plans  
   • in non-agricultural areas, trail uses

   Mineral Resource Extraction Area  
   • recreational uses (such as trail activities)
In principle, the above uses are permitted, but the key question is what type of new trails (single track, pedestrian, multi-use- paved etc.) are we prepared to “endorse” at this time? The answer may be that we cannot, at this time, provide a blanket approval or endorsement of the proposed “Multi-use Recreational Trail”, without knowing the specifics of the trail use, its width, and the negative effects that the widening, surfacing or other improvements (of existing trails) or the construction of new multi-use trails would have on the Escarpment environment. There simply isn’t enough detailed information presented in the TMP for us to endorse all of the proposed multi-use trail routes.

NEPOSS (Niagara Escarpment Parks and Open Space System) MATTERS

- The TMP can not be considered as a Master/Management Plan in the context of NEP Policy 3.1.6.
- The TMP could be stronger in respect to the Bruce Trail policies in the NEP (Policy 3.2)
- The TMP should identify the existing (secured) Bruce Trail, and the “Optimum Route” of the Bruce Trail (as delineated by the BTA) This mapping can be obtained from the BTA.
- Are side trails (Bruce Trail side trails) mapped? If not, some consideration should be given to mapping them.
- How does the Trails Plan differentiate between Bruce Trail Access Points, and Trail Hubs, or Bike Route hubs?
- It seems that the “hubs” have a strong bicycle focus instead of a pedestrian or hiker focus.
- Why are parking areas for trailheads not shown (e.g. for waterfall access)?
- Are the parking areas identified on the maps existing, proposed or a combination of the two?
- Is there a land acquisition plan or strategy associated with the TMP? It would be good to know where the City proposes to buy land to expand the Trail system or to provide parking. Is there an acquisition budget? Does the City intend to map out its proposed acquisition areas?
- What priority does the city place on securing a permanent route for the Bruce Trail as compared to its own multi-use trails? This is a key objective of the NEP.
- The City is assuming it can run 4.m wide multi-use trails through all NEPOSS parks. This may not be allowed in current approved park master plans. There hasn’t been time to check all of the approved park plans (but this is an exercise that I would recommend that the City do).
- Any proposed trails within NEPOSS parks, must be in conformity with approved plans for those parks. If the trails are not currently “approved” in the existing plans, than the Park Master Plan will have to be amended. This amendment will have to be “approved” by the NEC and MNR. It cannot simply be agreed to by the City and the park agency.
It is important to know that the OHT (Ontario Heritage Trust) is a partner by virtue of its ownership of all Bruce Trail lands, (Fee simple) and the conservation easements that it holds for trail purposes. These are trail lands that are not held by CAs or the City or RBG.

It is also important to know that the MNR (Ministry of Natural Resources), and not the NEC has the primary responsibility for NEPOSS implementation. The City may wish to contact MNR (Peterborough) staff responsible for NEPOSS.

Interpretation and signage. This should follow visual identity guidelines in the NEPOSS Parks Manual. Essentially;

- The city should be interpreting provincial ANSIs wherever trails pass through these areas
- The city should be identifying all of its NEPOSS parks as part of the NEPOSS system with common NEPOSS signage.

Any proposals to add or change trail uses in NEPOSS parks (such as the mountain bike trails proposed for Iroquoia Heights, shown on Figure20a) cannot simply be done “Subject to discussion with H.C.A. If this represents a change in trail uses that the approved Park Master Plan does not address, then an amendment to the Park Master Plan is required, including review by the NEC and MNR and approval by MNR).

The City’s TMP is not considered to be a NEPOSS master/management plan under Part 3 of the NEP.

Other issues /Questions

1. Where are the proposed “hubs” located?
2. What priority is the City giving to the Bruce Trail?
3. Are there route alternatives? Could the multi-use trail be routed elsewhere to avoid the most sensitive natural environments in the NEP area?

Without more detailed investigation and more specific site information it would be very difficult for me to recommend that the Commission endorse all of the proposed trails in this TMP at this point. We should work further with City staff to obtain better and more detailed information regarding environmental impacts, trail routes and widths wherever the TMP proposes to “improve” an existing trail or to develop a new multi-use recreational trail.(within the NEP on lands designated as Escarpment Natural, Protection, and Rural designations, and on public lands in NEPOSS).

Prepared by:
Neil Hester, November 27, 2006
MEMO

TO: Linda Laflamme
FROM: Kathy Pounder
C: Ken Whitbread
RE: Escarpment Natural Areas permit
   “Non intensive recreational uses”
DATE: November 23, 2006

If the motorized tracks or rail gondola is interpreted as a recreational use: The NEP permits only Non-intensive recreational uses -“Non intensive” is not defined, but the description also states …such as nature viewing and trail activities except motorized vehicle trails or the use of motorized trail vehicles. I would say that a motorized track or rail gondola and inclined rail service would require an amendment to the NEP. It may be acceptable to amend the Plan for such a use if there are no or acceptable environmental effects and given the objectives of the NEP – “To provide for adequate public access to the Niagara Escarpment and “To provide adequate public opportunities for public recreation;”

It might be argued that a motorized track or rail gondola is a transportation use. There is no definition of transportation in the plan but “a simple dictionary definition is “being conveyed from place to place”. There is a definition of utility and it is defined to include ….a public transportation system …or any other similar works necessary to the public interest…If this use is interpreted as a transportation and utility work the NEP permits “essential transportation and utility uses.” Essential is defined as that which is deemed necessary in the public interest after all alternatives have been considered.” This is generally left up to the NEC to determine. The applicant would be asked to provide alternative routes and options for the use and the NEC would decide.
I believe that the interpretation of the use as a recreational use rather than a transportation or utility is preferred. The use that I believe is most comparable to these types of uses is a ski tow. Ski tows have only been permitted in Escarpment Recreation Areas not in Escarpment Natural Areas.

Given these competing interpretations of how we would categorize the use, once we have a better description of the use we may have to prepare a report for the Commission on this question alone.

If it was agreed that the gondola or rail trail needed an amendment – then we would advise Hamilton that the Master Plan could not be approved until that had occurred.

With regard to trails, “Non-intensive” – trails are permitted by the NEP in Escarpment Natural Areas. There is no definition of “intensive”. If the scale of the trails is interpreted to be too large then it could be described as intensive and then we would advise them that they would need a NEP amendment for that use as well. But generally I would say that applying the Development criteria to the trail would be the most appropriate approach and this would involve evaluating all sections of the proposed trail – some might have to be relocated, others trail connections not used. The Development Criteria that appear to be most relevant are:

See section 2.2 1(a) (b) (c) (d), 4., 8., Sec. 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 2.13 and 2.14

-If there is little or no impact, all of the above criteria will be satisfied and the development is acceptable.

-If there is impact – identify the impact and balance it against the designation objectives which also encourages recreation , and make a recommendation to Commission on the balance.

-A trail through Lowndes Quarry might be possible a) when the quarry is rehabilitated or b) through an area which is not proposed for extraction if it was adequately fenced etc., and acceptable to the owners. It is outside the NEP Area and therefore not a matter that I would comment on.

I hope this helps…