– AGENDA –

Strathcona Transportation Management Plan (TMP)
Citizens Liaison Committee (CLC)

Meeting #2
February 27, 2012, 7:00-9:00
Erskine Presbyterian Church, 19 Pearl Street North

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. “Carshare” Presentation and Q&A
3. Background and Problem / Opportunity Statement
4. Evaluation Criteria
5. Evaluation of Alternative Solutions for major arterials and Preliminary Preferred Solutions and discussion
6. Operational Process
7. Other issues requiring review with the MTO
8. Other Miscellaneous Issues
9. Questions?
10. Outline of next steps
11. Adjournment
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.
Looking to free up some room in your garage? Want to help others do the same? If you strive to drive less but you still need to use a car on occasion, carsharing may be the right alternative for you to owning a personal vehicle or a great way to add a second family vehicle without actually having to buy one. Community CarShare is a non-profit carsharing co-operative, which provides access to vehicles without the costs of ownership.

Community CarShare is the umbrella name for the non-profit cooperative which includes Grand River, Hamilton, and Niagara. Operating in the Waterloo Region since 1998, Grand River CarShare began as a grassroots co-operative, and in 2009, expanded to Hamilton as Hamilton CarShare. Niagara CarShare is expected to launch in the Niagara region in 2012.

Community CarShare provides 24 hour, self-serve access to a fleet of cars that are placed within close proximity to your home or place of employment. This means that no matter where you are, you can still have the comfort of knowing you have access to a vehicle when you need one without the costs of ownership. This will allow you to reduce your ecological footprint by driving less and increase your vitality by using more active forms of transportation, all while saving money on transportation costs.

As a cooperative we care about improving the communities in which we operate by providing a sustainable transportation option for the future, and as a non-profit we strive to keep our rates low to save you money. We are member owned, so this means you will have a voice in how your carshare is operated.

If you would like more information on becoming a member please visit our website at www.HamiltonCarShare.ca or email us at info@HamiltonCarShare.ca.
What’s your reason?
• Save money and time
• End the hassles of ownership
• Make smarter mobility choices
• Invest in a local green enterprise
• Enjoy the benefits of membership

Your fleet is waiting:
• Self-serve stations 24/7
• Located at home, work and play in Hamilton and Waterloo Region
• Variety of vehicles to fit your needs
• Clean, economical and ready to go

www.HamiltonCarShare.ca
info@HamiltonCarShare.ca
905-543-4411
Join It
Fill out an application online, or call the office. After an orientation, you’ll be all set!

Choose It
Walk? Bike? Transit? CarShare! Use your wheels with wisdom and make the greenest transportation choice for every trip.

Size It
Select the vehicle that meets your needs for each trip. Go efficient, or go for cargo capacity!

Book It
Make reservations online or by phone. Our vehicle stations are self-serve 24/7, with locations across the community.

Drive It
Use your member key to access the car, and off you go! Return the car to its station when your reservation ends.

Charge It
Pay-As-You-Drive with credit card or cash. Receive a monthly invoice with each trip listed. All rates include gas and maintenance.

Dig It
Carsharing can save you money, reduce pollution and improve our community!

Grow It
Connect the CarShare with your employer, school, place of worship, family and friends. Help out at events and invest in debentures.

Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fees when you JOIN:</th>
<th>CLASSIC PLAN</th>
<th>SIMPLE PLAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Fee:</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit:</td>
<td>$400 First Driver</td>
<td>$100 Additional Driver(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Deposit:</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Deposits are Fully Refundable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rates when you DRIVE:</th>
<th>CLASSIC PLAN</th>
<th>SIMPLE PLAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insurance: Monthly</td>
<td>$19</td>
<td>$9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday:</td>
<td>$4.00/hr</td>
<td>$9/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend:</td>
<td>$4.50/hr</td>
<td>$9/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nights: 11pm-7am</td>
<td>$1/hr</td>
<td>$5/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance:</td>
<td>$0.30/km</td>
<td>100km/Day FREE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Save even more with 24-hour rates. Access vehicles in Ottawa and Quebec with roaming!

Gas is Included
Internet reservations are free. Reservations via our 24-hour call centre cost $1.

* Visit our website or call our office for complete rate and fee structure details, including any current promotional discounts, if available. Rates are subject to change. Surcharges may apply during periods of high gas prices or for use of premium vehicles. Prices do not include taxes. Non-driving associate memberships are available for only $10.

Your fleet is waiting, Join Today!
www.HamiltonCarShare.ca
info@HamiltonCarShare.ca
905-543-4411
Welcome to the Citizen Liaison Committee (CLC) for the Strathcona Transportation Management Plan (TMP) and Secondary Plan, with tonight’s focus on the TMP.

Please sign-in and review the presented material. Comments can be submitted on the provided comment sheets.
Purpose of this CLC Meeting is to:

- provide a brief summary of previous comments received from the neighbourhood;
- present the evaluation of alternative solutions
- elicit discussion on the preliminary preferred alternatives
PREVIOUS CONSULTATION

• Community Advisory Group Meeting #1 July 28, 2008
• Residents Meeting, March 25, 2009 (Potential)
• Restart Project – Fall 2011
• Citizen’s Liaison Committee #1, September 29, 2011 (TMP and Secondary Plan)
• Public Information Centre (PIC) #1, November 8, 2011
The five phases of the Class EA process include:

**Phase 1**  Problems and Opportunities – Identification and description of problems to be addressed or opportunities to be realized.

**Phase 2**  Alternative Solutions - Identify alternative solutions considering the existing environment and establish a preferred solution taking into account public and agency input.

**Phase 3**  Alternative Design Concepts for Preferred Solutions - Examine alternative methods of implementing the preferred solution based on the existing environment, public and agency input, and environmental effects.

**Phase 4**  Environmental Study Report - Document a summary of the rationale and the planning, design, and consultation process established through Phases 1 to 3.

**Phase 5**  Project Implementation

This study will identify any future projects within the study area and is being conducted in accordance with the requirements of Phases 1 and 2 of the Class EA (MEA, amended 2007), which is an open public process under the Environmental Assessment Act. The study results can serve as direct input into any subsequent Class EA studies that may be identified in the master plan. The Strathcona TMP will define the problems and opportunities, consider and evaluate solutions, and identify an optimum transportation system within the Strathcona Neighbourhood.

The Master Plan process allows for the development of long range plans which integrate the infrastructure requirements for existing and future land uses with environmental assessment planning principles, including public and agency consultation.
RESULTS FROM PREVIOUS CONSULTATIONS

• Issues identified for key corridors (Main, King, York, Dundurn, Locke, and Queen)
  
  ➢ Pedestrian safety
  
  ➢ Cycling Safety
  
  ➢ Vehicle speeds
  
  ➢ Transit access
PROBLEM/OPPORTUNITY STATEMENT

1. There is an opportunity to capitalize on some of the excess road capacity on the major routes and give that space back to improve either transit, landscaping, parking, cycling and/or pedestrian facilities.

2. There is a need to improve the pedestrian environment particularly in the crossing of major arterial roads.

3. There is an opportunity to expand the trail system in the study area connecting major points of interest.
EVALUATION CRITERIA

- Evaluation carried out assessing the impact on the following main factors:
  Pedestrians, Cyclists, Drivers, Parking, Transit Passengers, Urban Design, Costs

- Evaluation summarized by ‘pies’

  Poor  Neutral  Good  Excellent

- Pedestrians – safety, walking environment, encourages walking
  - Poor – sub-standard sidewalk widths and/or wide crossings (4+ lanes)
  - Neutral – adequate sidewalk widths and/or reasonable crossing distance (3 lanes max.)
  - Good – wider than minimum sidewalks and/or crossing distance of 2 lanes only
  - Excellent – wide sidewalks and/or minor crossing (1 lane only)
**EVALUATION CRITERIA (Continued)**

- **Cyclists – safety, cycling environment, encourages cycling**
  - Poor – no cycling facilities or reduced safety
  - Neutral – minimal improvements (shared sharrow lane)
  - Good – general improvement (on-street cycling lane)
  - Excellent – major improvements (separated cycling lane by barrier or within boulevard)

- **Drivers – capacity, speed, intersection operations**
  - Poor – road congestion, significant delay
  - Neutral – road at capacity in peak periods, some delay
  - Good – sufficient capacity, no significant delay
  - Excellent – excess road capacity or significant reduction in congestion

- **Parking – net gain / loss of parking spaces**
  - Poor – significant loss of parking spaces
  - Neutral – no loss/gain of parking spaces
  - Good – slight increase in the number of parking spaces (that are needed)
  - Excellent – significant increase in the number of parking spaces (that are needed)
EVALUATION CRITERIA (Continued)

- Transit Passengers – transit access, transit travel time
  - Poor – reduction in service or significant slowing of operations
  - Neutral – minimal/no change in service or bus speeds
  - Good – minor improvements (HOV lanes, operational reliability, improved access)
  - Excellent – major improvements (transit only lanes, significantly safer pedestrian access)

- Urban Design – Streetscaping, landscaping
  - Poor – little or no space available for landscaping
  - Neutral – some space available for (hanging baskets, planters)
  - Good – landscape areas, benches, planters possible at bump outs
  - Excellent – major improvements (large areas for landscaping, benches, planters, decoration)

- Costs
  - Poor – high cost ($$$)
  - Neutral – Medium ($$)
  - Good – Relatively minor ($) 
  - Excellent – No cost
EVALUATION CRITERIA (Continued)

• Socio-Economic
  ➢ Natural Environment
  ➢ Archaeology
  ➢ Built Heritage

All socio-economic evaluation in the alternatives would be neutral as there are no impacts to the built or natural heritage as a result of any of the alternatives (subject to preliminary alternatives’ approval)
ALTERNATIVE PLANNING SOLUTIONS – INTERSECTION OF MAIN AND DUNDURN)

- <refer to two Main/Dundurn Drawings>
- Addresses eastside pedestrian crossing and South Bound Left turn vehicles with pavement markings – for discussion purposes
- Pedestrian crossing distances reduced
- These options require further consultation with the Ministry of Transportation, Ontario, before a final plan is produced.
ALTERNATIVE PLANNING SOLUTIONS – MISC.

- Car Pooling
  - Potential at Dundurn Castle Park Parking Lot (Pilot Project) – to be implemented with specific users within existing parking lot, by the Transportation Demand Management staff.
  - Potential at Fortino’s Plaza – ongoing discussions

- Connection of the neighbourhood to Kay Drage Park via a trail – ongoing

- Carshare – as per earlier discussion

- Bikeshare – City initiative introduction and feedback to earlier send
ALTERNATIVE PLANNING SOLUTIONS – HWY No. 403 RAMPS

• <refer to Highway 403 ramp drawings>

• 1 or 2 Options – for discussion purposes

• Will require refinement through further consultation with the Ministry of Transportation Ontario (MTO)
OPERATIONAL ISSUES

• A number of operational issues were raised by the public including:
  • Signalized pedestrian crossings
  • Warning signage
  • Signal timings
  • Pavement markings
  • Traffic control
  • Traffic calming
  • Parking
• These issues will be considered by the Traffic Operations Department. Justification calculations and policy adherence will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
• Accessibility for Ontarians with Disability Act (AODA) Compliance to be carried out with all new designs and re-constructions. Pedestrian Mobility Plan – ongoing and City Wide Lighting Study are to be consulted.
# DUNDURN STREET EVALUATION

## EVALUATION FACTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Transit Passengers</th>
<th>Urban Design</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>EA Requirements</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimal sidewalk, No cycling facilities</td>
<td>Excess capacity between York and King; congested between King and Main</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No existing on-street parking</td>
<td>Good operating speeds for buses</td>
<td>Little room for streetscaping; existing young trees on west side</td>
<td>No cost</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ALTERNATIVE

### Do Nothing (King St. to Main St.)

- No existing on-street parking.
- No net loss or gain
- Good operating speeds for buses
- Little room for streetscaping; existing young trees on west side
- No cost

### Alternative A1-Remove 1 of the 2 Traffic Lanes & Convert to On-street Parking Lanes (Where merited)

- Between King and Main ~50 parking spaces
- A net gain of ~95 parking spaces
- Little change in transit operations
- Potential for additional streetscaping between parking; existing young trees on west side remain
- Initial capital cost estimated at $700,000 (High Cost)

- Schedule B

---

Dundurn - 1 of 3
### EVALUATION FACTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Transit Passengers</th>
<th>Urban Design</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>EA Requirements</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved sidewalk safety due to bicycle lane buffer</td>
<td>Inadequate road capacity between King and Main. Travel Time (seconds): Northbound Northbound AM – 317 PM – 216 Southbound AM – 315 PM – 401</td>
<td>No net loss or gain</td>
<td>Little change in transit operations Once LRT is implemented, lane reduction on Dundurn is not possible</td>
<td>No change; existing young trees on west side</td>
<td>Initial capital cost estimated at $123,000 (Medium cost)</td>
<td>Schedule B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CURRENT PROCESS ONLY**

### ALTERNATIVE

**Alternative A2-Remove 1 Lane of Traffic & Convert to On-street Bike Lanes**

(King St. to Main St.)

Improved sidewalk path provided Inadequate road capacity between King and Main. Travel Time (seconds): Northbound Northbound AM – 317 PM – 216 Southbound AM – 315 PM – 401 No net loss or gain Little change in transit operations; reduce crossing width for passengers Minor potential for improving landscaping; existing young trees on west side remain Initial capital cost estimated at $685,000 (High cost) Winter maintenance problematic (need to remove and not store snow on boulevard)

**CURRENT PROCESS ONLY**

**Alternative A3-Remove 1 Lane of Traffic & Convert to Boulevard Bike Trail**

(King St. to Main St.)

Winter maintenance problematic (need to remove and not store snow on boulevard)
### EVALUATION FACTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Transit Passengers</th>
<th>Urban Design</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>EA Requirements</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improved sidewalk safety due to bicycle lane buffer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-street bicycle lanes provided – improved safety and network continuity upstream and downstream</td>
<td>Adequate capacity between York and King; congested between King and Main</td>
<td>No net loss or gain</td>
<td>Maintains current level of service</td>
<td>Existing young trees could be replaced with more extensive landscaping on west side</td>
<td>Additional property required</td>
<td>Initial capital costs estimated at $380,000 – not including cost for property acquisition. (Medium Cost)</td>
<td>Schedule B</td>
<td>This alternative is the Preliminary Preferred between King and Main. As a lane reduction is not feasible, additional property would be required (therefore it is a long term alternative only and is subject to budget approval process)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Improved sidewalk safety on the west side, east side remains inadequate** | | | | | | | | |
| Boulevard bicycle trail provided – improved safety – lack of network continuity | Adequate capacity between York and King; congested between King and Main | No net loss or gain | Maintains current level of service | Existing young trees on west side would be removed; minor potential for improving landscaping | Initial capital costs estimated at $54,000 – not including cost for property acquisition. (Minor Cost) | Schedule C | Because of property impacts (potential to achieve this Alternative through site plan control also, should a site plan change application be received) | CURRENT PROCESS ONLY |

### ALTERNATIVE

**Alternative B1 – Add Bike Lanes on Each Side & Keep Existing East Curb**

(King St. to Main St.)

- Improved sidewalk safety on the west side, east side remains inadequate
- Boulevard bicycle trail provided – improved safety – lack of network continuity
- Adequate capacity between York and King; congested between King and Main

**CURRENT PROCESS ONLY**

- No net loss or gain
- Maintains current level of service
- Boulevard bicycle trail provided – improved safety – lack of network continuity

**Alternative B2 – Add Bicycle Trail to West Side & Keep Existing Lanes and Curbs**

(King St. to Main St.)

- Improved sidewalk safety on the west side, east side remains inadequate
- Boulevard bicycle trail provided – improved safety – lack of network continuity
- Adequate capacity between York and King; congested between King and Main

**CURRENT PROCESS ONLY**

- No net loss or gain
- Maintains current level of service
- Boulevard bicycle trail provided – improved safety – lack of network continuity

### LEGEND:

- Existing Curb
- Proposed Curb
- Existing Sidewalk
- Widened Sidewalk
- Proposed Sidewalk or Bike Track
## EVALUATION FACTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Transit Passengers</th>
<th>Urban Design</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>EA Process</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimal sidewalk, wide crossing (4/5 lanes)</td>
<td>No cycling facilities</td>
<td>Excess capacity</td>
<td>Excess supply of ~29 parking spaces (off-peak)</td>
<td>Good operating speeds for buses; wide crossing for passengers</td>
<td>Little room for streetscoping</td>
<td>No cost</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Travel Time (seconds): AM – 109 PM – 122</td>
<td>No net loss or gain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some improvement on south side &amp; reduced crossing distance (3/4 lanes)</td>
<td>No cycling facilities</td>
<td>Adequate road capacity</td>
<td>~70 parking spaces proposed for a net gain of 41 parking spaces</td>
<td>Little change in transit operations, reduced crossing widths for passengers</td>
<td>Potential for streetscaping on south side (bump-outs between parking) Potential for shade tree and benches, etc.</td>
<td>Initial capital cost estimated at $73,000 (Medium cost) + potential utility impacts</td>
<td>Schedule B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Travel Time (seconds): AM – 114 PM – 186</td>
<td>No significant increase in travel time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ALTERNATIVE

**Do Nothing (Queen to Locke)**

- **King St.**
  - EVALUATION
    - Cost: None
    - EA Process: None
    - Overall: CURRENT PROCESS ONLY

**Alternative A1-Remove 1 Lane of Traffic & Convert to An On-street Parking Lane (Queen to Locke)**

- **King St.**
  - EVALUATION
    - Cost: Preliminary preferred alternative should the bus-only lane trial-project not continue
      - Road widening not feasible due to property taking
      - King St. is the proposed LRT route in the long term
    - EA Process: Schedule B
    - Overall: CURRENT PROCESS ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North Row</th>
<th>South Row</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td>Cyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some improvement (buffer from traffic) on south side, but no reduction in crossing width</td>
<td>On-road bike facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Travel Time (seconds):**
- AM: 114
- PM: 186

- No significant increase in travel time

---

**EVALUATION FACTOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Transit Passengers</th>
<th>Urban Design</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>EA Process</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Net loss of ~29 parking spaces</td>
<td>Little change in transit operations, reduced crossing width for passengers</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Initial capital cost estimated at $11,000 (Minor cost). Could be more if curbs or bollards used as separator (curbs estimated at $56,000).</td>
<td>Schedule B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Travel Time (seconds):**
- AM: 114
- PM: 186

- No significant increase in travel time

---

**ALTERNATIVE**

**Alternative A2 - Remove 1 Lane of Traffic & Convert to a Two-way Bike Lane**

(Queen to Locke)

**Alternative A3 - Remove 1 Lane of Traffic & Convert to a Boulevard Bike Trail**

(Queen to Locke)

---

**CURRENT PROCESS ONLY**

- Initial capital cost estimated at $1,026,000 (High cost).
- Potential utility impacts

---

**ALTERNATIVE**

- Initial capital cost estimated at $11,000 (Minor cost).
- Could be more if curbs or bollards used as separator (curbs estimated at $58,000).

---

**CURRENT PROCESS ONLY**

- No significant increase in travel time
### EVALUATION FACTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Transit Passengers</th>
<th>Urban Design</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>EA Process</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No cycling facilities</td>
<td>Excess capacity</td>
<td>Excess capacity</td>
<td>Excess capacity</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Initial capital cost estimated at $10,500 (Minor cost).</td>
<td>Schedule B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time (seconds): Unable to model (slightly worse than existing)</td>
<td>Net loss of ~29 parking spaces</td>
<td>Little change in bus speed; wide crossing for passengers (difficult to enforce)</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ALTERNATIVE

**Alternative B**: Convert the north lane to a Bus/HOV lane, keep 4/5-lanes

(Queen to Locke)

![Diagram](Locke to Hwy 403)

**Alternative C**: Convert King Street to a 2-way Street

(Queen to Locke)

![Diagram](Locke to Hwy 403)

**CURRENT PROCESS ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Transit Passengers</th>
<th>Urban Design</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>EA Process</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for median islands to reduce crossing from 5-lanes to 2</td>
<td>No cycling facilities</td>
<td>Adequate road capacity</td>
<td>Adequate road capacity</td>
<td>Incompatible with LRT plan</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Initial capital cost estimated $1,040,000 (Very high cost) + utility relocation costs</td>
<td>Schedule C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This alternative not modelled. Would likely require conversion of Main Street to a 2-way street</td>
<td>Net loss of ~29 parking spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td>Network wide impacts would need to be studied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LEGEND:

- Existing Curb
- Proposed Curb
- Existing Sidewalk
- Widened Sidewalk
- Proposed Sidewalk or Bike Track
## Locke Street Evaluation

### Evaluation Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Transit Passengers</th>
<th>Urban Design</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>EA Requirements</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimal sidewalk</td>
<td>No cycling facilities</td>
<td>Excess capacity</td>
<td>No existing on-street parking</td>
<td>No transit service</td>
<td>Little room for streetscaping</td>
<td>No cost</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety improvement</td>
<td>Wider sidewalks</td>
<td>Adequate road capacity</td>
<td>Between Main and King – 16 parking spaces</td>
<td>No transit service</td>
<td>Minor Potential for streetscaping</td>
<td>Initial capital cost estimated at $245,500 (Medium cost) + possible utility relocations</td>
<td>Schedule B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor safety improvement</td>
<td>On-road bike facilities</td>
<td>Adequate road capacity</td>
<td>No net loss or gain</td>
<td>No transit service</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Initial capital cost estimated at $3,000 (Minor cost)</td>
<td>Schedule B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Alternative (Main to King only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>WEST ROW</th>
<th>EAST ROW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do Nothing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative A1</td>
<td>Remove one of the two 1-way lanes and implement Wider sidewalks and parking bays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative A2</td>
<td>Remove 1 Lane of Traffic &amp; Convert to two-way Bike Lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EVALUATION FACTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Transit Passengers</th>
<th>Urban Design</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>EA Requirements</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wider sidewalk, Safety improved</td>
<td>No cycling facilities, but wider lane available (for northbound only)</td>
<td>Adequate road capacity</td>
<td>No net loss or gain</td>
<td>No transit service</td>
<td>Minor potential for improving landscaping</td>
<td>Initial capital cost estimated at $261,500 (High cost) + possible utility relocations</td>
<td>Schedule B</td>
<td>CURRENT PROCESS ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider sidewalk, Bike lanes provided buffer from vehicular traffic, Safety improved</td>
<td>On-street cycling facilities, improved safety; however NB bicycles share with road traffic</td>
<td>Adequate road capacity</td>
<td>No net loss or gain</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Minor potential for improving landscaping</td>
<td>Initial capital cost estimated at $253,500 (High cost)</td>
<td>Schedule B</td>
<td>CURRENT PROCESS ONLY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALTERNATIVE (Main to King only)**

- **Alternative A3-Remove 1 Lane of Traffic & Implement Wider Sidewalks**
  - Wider sidewalk, Bike lanes provided buffer from vehicular traffic, Safety improved
  - On-street cycling facilities, improved safety; however NB bicycles share with road traffic
  - Adequate road capacity
  - No net loss or gain
  - Minor potential for improving landscaping
  - Initial capital cost estimated at $253,500 (High cost)
  - Schedule B

- **Alternative A4-Remove 1 Lane of Traffic & Implement a Sharrow Lane & a bike lane**
  - Wider sidewalk, Bike lanes provided buffer from vehicular traffic, Safety improved
  - On-street cycling facilities, improved safety; however NB bicycles share with road traffic
  - Adequate road capacity
  - No net loss or gain
  - Minor potential for improving landscaping
  - Initial capital cost estimated at $253,500 (High cost)
  - Schedule B
### Evaluation Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Transit Passengers</th>
<th>Urban Design</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>EA Requirements</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor safety improvement</td>
<td>On-road bike facilities improved safety, separation from traffic</td>
<td>Adequate road capacity</td>
<td>No net loss or gain</td>
<td>No transit service</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Initial capital cost estimated at $27,000 (Minor cost)</td>
<td>Schedule B</td>
<td>Preliminary preferred alternative (subject to budget approval process)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Travel Time (seconds): AM – 88 PM – 92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Widening not feasible due to property taking costs and impacts on the residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No significant change in travel times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Also consider auto two-way conversion and move of bike lane to Pearl St as part of City-wide TMP before implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole street is used for pedestrians</td>
<td>On-street cycling facilities – no separation from vehicles, however, much slower speeds</td>
<td>Adequate road capacity</td>
<td>No net loss or gain</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td>Initial capital cost estimated at $200,000 (High cost)</td>
<td>Schedule B</td>
<td>(However, extra design and consultation required. Therefore Schedule C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not modelled - lower speeds typical for this design</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Alternative (Main to King only)

**Alternative A5 - Remove 1 Lane of Traffic & Implement bike lanes (Main to King)**

- **Current Process Only**
  - Whole street is used for pedestrians
  - Safety potentially improved; however, residents would have no curb protection in front of house

- **Schedule B**
  - Preliminary preferred alternative (subject to budget approval process)
  - Widening not feasible due to property taking costs and impacts on the residents
  - Also consider auto two-way conversion and move of bike lane to Pearl St as part of City-wide TMP before implementation

**Alternative B - Convert to a “Naked” Street**

- **Schedule C**

---

**Legend:**
- Existing Curb
- Proposed Curb
- Existing Sidewalk
- Widened Sidewalk
- Proposed Sidewalk or Bike Track
# MAIN STREET EVALUATION

## Pedestrians, Cyclists, Drivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimal sidewalk, wide crossing (5 lanes)</th>
<th>No cycling facilities</th>
<th>Safety issue associated with narrow lanes and high speeds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excess capacity, no congestion.</td>
<td>Travel Time (seconds): AM – 98 PM – 113</td>
<td>Existing supply of ~31 parking spaces (off-peak)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No net loss or gain</td>
<td>No change in travel time</td>
<td>Little change in transit operations, reduced crossing width for passengers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Parking, Transit Passengers, Urban Design, Cost, EA Requirements, Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimal sidewalk, wide crossing (5 lanes)</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Transit Passengers</th>
<th>Urban Design</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>EA Requirements</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No cycling facilities</td>
<td>Good operating speeds for buses; wide crossing for passengers</td>
<td>Little room for streetscaping</td>
<td>No cost</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Scale:

- 1-4: Low
- 5-7: Medium
- 8-10: High

## Minimal sidewalk, wide crossing (5 lanes)

- **Travel Time (seconds):**
  - AM: 98
  - PM: 113

## Minimal sidewalk, wide crossing (5 lanes)

- **Travel Time (seconds):**
  - AM: 108
  - PM: 118

## Minimal sidewalk, wide crossing (5 lanes)

- **Travel Time (seconds):**
  - AM: 108
  - PM: 118

## Evaluation Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Transit Passengers</th>
<th>Urban Design</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>EA Requirements</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimal sidewalk, wide crossing (5 lanes)</td>
<td>No cycling facilities</td>
<td>Safety issue associated with narrow lanes and high speeds</td>
<td>Excess capacity, no congestion.</td>
<td>Good operating speeds for buses; wide crossing for passengers</td>
<td>Little room for streetscaping</td>
<td>No cost</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Schedule A

- Minor potential for streetscaping on north side (between parking) including shade trees and benches, etc.

## Schedule B

- Initial capital cost estimated at $74,000 (Medium cost)

## Schedule C

- Initial capital cost estimated at $11,000 (Minor cost). Could be more if curbs / bollards used as separator (estimated at $58,000).

## Schedule D

- Initial capital cost estimated at $31,000.

## Schedule E

- No significant change in transit operations, reduced crossing width for passengers.

## Schedule F

- Loss of ~31 parking spaces.

## Schedule G

- Little change in transit operations, reduced crossing width for passengers.

## Schedule H

- Initial capital cost estimated at $11,000 (Minor cost).

## Schedule I

- Little change in transit operations, reduced crossing width for passengers.

## Schedule J

- Initial capital cost estimated at $31,000.

## Schedule K

- No significant change in transit operations, reduced crossing width for passengers.

## Schedule L

- Loss of ~31 parking spaces.

## Schedule M

- Little change in transit operations, reduced crossing width for passengers.

## Schedule N

- Initial capital cost estimated at $11,000 (Minor cost).

## Schedule O

- Little change in transit operations, reduced crossing width for passengers.

## Schedule P

- Initial capital cost estimated at $31,000.

## Schedule Q

- No significant change in transit operations, reduced crossing width for passengers.

## Schedule R

- Loss of ~31 parking spaces.

## Schedule S

- Little change in transit operations, reduced crossing width for passengers.

## Schedule T

- Initial capital cost estimated at $11,000 (Minor cost).

## Schedule U

- Little change in transit operations, reduced crossing width for passengers.

## Schedule V

- Initial capital cost estimated at $31,000.

## Schedule W

- No significant change in transit operations, reduced crossing width for passengers.

## Schedule X

- Loss of ~31 parking spaces.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION FACTOR</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE (Dundurn St to Queen St)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td>Boulevard trail provided Winter maintenance problematic for the trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclists</td>
<td>Adequate road capacity, no congestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers</td>
<td>Travel Time (seconds): AM – 108 PM – 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>No significant change in travel time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Passengers</td>
<td>Little change in transit operations, reduced crossing width for passengers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design</td>
<td>Minor potential for improving landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Initial capital cost estimated at $1,038,000 (High cost)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA Requirements</td>
<td>Winter maintenance problematic (unable to store snow in boulevard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Schedule B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CURRENT PROCESS ONLY**

| Pedestrians       | Improved sidewalk safety & reduced crossing width |
| Cyclists          | Urban brail possible |
| Drivers           | Adequate road capacity, no congestion. |
| Parking           | Travel Time (seconds): AM – 108 PM – 118 |
| Transit Passengers| No significant change in travel time |
| Urban Design      | Little change in transit operations, reduced crossing width for passengers |
| Cost              | Potential for improving landscaping including shade trees and benches, etc. |
| EA Requirements   | Initial capital cost estimated at $841,000 (High cost) + utility relocation costs |
| Overall           | Preliminary preferred alternative (subject to budget approval process) - requires further approvals from MTO for the section west of Dundurn St. |

**CURRENT PROCESS ONLY**

| Pedestrians       | No change Minimal sidewalk, wide crossing (5 lanes) |
| Cyclists          | No cycling facilities Safety issue associated with high speeds and narrow lanes |
| Drivers           | Adequate road capacity, no congestion. |
| Parking           | Travel Time (seconds): AM – 108 PM – 118 |
| Transit Passengers| Loss of –31 parking spaces |
| Urban Design      | No change in bus speed; wide crossing for passengers (difficult to enforce) |
| Cost              | Initial capital cost estimated at $11,000 (Minor cost) |
| EA Requirements   | Schedule A+ |
| Overall           | Alternative B- Convert the south lane to a Bus/HOV lane, keep 5-lanes |

**CURRENT PROCESS ONLY**
### EVALUATION FACTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Transit Passengers</th>
<th>Urban Design</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>EA Requirements</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for median islands to reduce crossing from 5-lanes to 2</td>
<td>No cycling facilities</td>
<td>Adequate road capacity</td>
<td>Loss of ~31 parking spaces</td>
<td>2-way service would improve access</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Initial capital cost estimated $1,053,000 (Very high cost)</td>
<td>Schedule B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALTERNATIVE (Dundurn St. to Queen St.)**

- **LEGEND:**
  - Existing Curb
  - Proposed Curb
  - Existing Sidewalk
  - Widened Sidewalk
  - Proposed Sidewalk or Bike Track
## MARGARET STREET EVALUATION

### EVALUATION FACTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum sidewalks</td>
<td>No cycling facilities</td>
<td>Excess capacity, no congestion.</td>
<td>Existing supply of ~33 parking spaces</td>
<td>No bus route, no impacts</td>
<td>Room for streetscaping on boulevard.</td>
<td>No cost</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Excess capacity, no congestion.**
- **Existing supply of ~33 parking spaces**
- **No bus route, no impacts**
- **Room for streetscaping on boulevard.**
- **No cost**
- **None**

### ALTERNATIVE (Main St. To King St.)

#### Do Nothing

- **Cost:** None
- **EA Requirements:** None

#### Alternative A1 - Proposed Wider Sidewalk

- **Cost:** Schedule B
- **EA Requirements:** Preliminary preferred alternative – however, benefits are minor compared with do-nothing (subject to budget approval process)

---

*Main - 1 of 2*
# Evaluation Factor

## Alternative (Main St. To King St.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Urban Design</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>EA Requirements</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum sidewalks</td>
<td>On-road bike facilities &lt;br&gt;This road not included in City’s Cycling Master Plan</td>
<td>Excess capacity, no congestion.</td>
<td>Existing supply of ~33 parking spaces</td>
<td>No bus route, no impacts</td>
<td>Room for streetscaping on boulevard.</td>
<td>Initial capital cost estimated at $10,000 (Medium cost). Could be more if curbs / bollards used as separator (estimated at $28,000).</td>
<td>Schedule B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- Existing Curb
- Proposed Curb
- Existing Sidewalk
- Widened Sidewalk
- Proposed Sidewalk or Bike Track

**Diagram:**
- **Alternative A2-On-street Bike Lanes**
- **Alternative A3-Sharrow Lanes**

**Notes:**
- Excess capacity, no congestion.
- Existing supply of ~33 parking spaces
- No net loss or gain but clearly marked
- Room for streetscaping on boulevard.
- Initial capital cost estimated at $5,000 (Minor cost) Could be more if curbs / bollards used as separator (estimated at $28,000).
### EVALUATION FACTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Transit Passengers</th>
<th>Urban Design</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>EA Requirements</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimal sidewalk</td>
<td>No cycling facilities</td>
<td>Excess capacity</td>
<td>Existing supply of ~33 parking spaces (off-peak only)</td>
<td>Good transit operating speeds for buses</td>
<td>Little room for streetscaping</td>
<td>No cost</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This road not included in City’s Cycling Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Travel Time (seconds): AM – 153 PM – 139</td>
<td>Future land use plans identify need for additional parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some safety improvement &amp; reduced crossing distance</td>
<td>No cycling facilities</td>
<td>Adequate road capacity</td>
<td>~55 parking spaces proposed along east side for a net gain of ~35 all-day parking spaces</td>
<td>Little change in transit operating speed, reduced crossing width for passengers</td>
<td>Potential for streetscaping between parking bays</td>
<td>Initial capital cost estimated at $322,000 (Medium cost) + potential utilities</td>
<td>Schedule B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Travel Time (seconds): AM – 153 PM – 144</td>
<td>Potential for off-peak parking on west side</td>
<td>Satisfies future land use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CURRENT PROCESS ONLY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALTERNATIVE (Main St. To York Blvd.)**

- **Do Nothing**
  - WEST ROW
  - VARIES
  - SOUTHBOUND LANE
  - EAST ROW
  - BUFFER
- **Main to King**
  - WEST ROW
  - VARIES
  - SOUTHBOUND LANE
  - EAST ROW
  - BUFFER
- **King to York**
  - WEST ROW
  - VARIES
  - SOUTHBOUND LANE
  - EAST ROW
  - BUFFER

Alternative A1: Remove 1 of a Traffic Lane & Implement a wider sidewalk and streetscaping and on-street parking where merited

Main to King:
- Potential for two-way conversion subject to City-wide Transportation Master Plan (TMP) analysis, before implementation

King to York:
- Potential for two-way conversion subject to City-wide Transportation Master Plan (TMP) analysis, before implementation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION FACTOR</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE (Main St. To York Blvd.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EVALUATION FACTOR</strong></td>
<td><strong>ALTERNATIVE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td>Cyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor safety improvement on east side but no reduction in crossing width</td>
<td>Adequate road capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved sidewalk safety &amp; reduced crossing width</td>
<td>Boulevard trail provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal sidewalk facilities</td>
<td>No cycling facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alternative A2-Remove 1 of a Traffic Lane & Implement On-street bicycle lanes (2-way) either on one side of the street or both sides**

**Alternative A3- Removal of a Traffic Lane & Convert to Boulevard Bike Trail**

**Alternative B- Implement Traffic Calming**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION FACTOR</th>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Transit Passengers</th>
<th>Urban Design</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>EA Requirements</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for median islands to reduce 3-lane crossing</td>
<td>No cycling facilities</td>
<td>Adequate road capacity</td>
<td>Not modelled explicitly</td>
<td>~71 parking spaces proposed for a net gain of ~38 parking spaces</td>
<td>2-way service would improve access</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Initial capital cost estimated as $741,000 (Very high cost) + utility costs</td>
<td>Schedule C</td>
<td>Network wide impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATION FACTOR</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Transit Passengers</td>
<td>Urban Design</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>EA Requirements</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTERNATIVE (Main St. To York Blvd.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative C- Convert Queen Street to A 2-way street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGEND:**
- Existing curb
- Proposed curb
- Existing sidewalk
- Widened sidewalk
- Proposed sidewalk or bike track
### York Boulevard Evaluation

#### Evaluation Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Urban Design</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>EA Requirements</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide crossing (6 lanes)</td>
<td>No dedicated cycling facilities</td>
<td>Excess capacity in interim – 6 lanes required post implementation of LRT on King Street</td>
<td>No existing on-street parking.</td>
<td>Good operating speeds for buses; wide crossing for passengers</td>
<td>Highly landscaped with trees/shrubs</td>
<td>No cost</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some areas have sharrow lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement in an already good pedestrian environment &amp; reduced crossing distance</td>
<td>No dedicated cycling facilities</td>
<td>Inadequate road capacity post LRT</td>
<td>~200 parking spaces for a net gain of ~200 parking spaces</td>
<td>Little change in transit operations, reduced crossing width for passengers</td>
<td>Further opportunity for streetscaping (already adequate)</td>
<td>Initial capital cost estimated at $155,000 (Medium cost)</td>
<td>Schedule B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharrow lanes removed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small safety improvement due to bicycle lane buffer but no reduction in crossing width</td>
<td>Inadequate road capacity post LRT</td>
<td>Travel time (seconds): Eastbound AM – 221 PM – 341 Westbound: AM – 107 PM – 144 Increased delay eastbound</td>
<td>No net loss or gain</td>
<td>Little change in transit operations, no reduction on crossing width for passengers</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Initial capital cost estimated at $158,500 (Medium cost). Could be more if curbs or bollards used as separator (estimated at $99,500 for curbs)</td>
<td>Schedule B</td>
<td>Preliminary preferred (subject to budget approval process) - Could work in the interim, long term (post LRT) 6 lanes are be required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Alternative (Dundurn St. To Queen St.)

**Do Nothing**
- No net loss or gain
- Little change in transit operations, reduced crossing width for passengers
- Current process adequate

**Alternative A1 - Remove 2 of 6 Lanes & Implement wider Streetscaping & on-street Parking where merited**
- Schedule B
- Initial capital cost estimated at $155,000 (Medium cost)
- Could be more if curbs or bollards used as separator (estimated at $99,500 for curbs)
- Preliminary preferred (subject to budget approval process) - Could work in the interim, long term (post LRT) 6 lanes are be required

**Alternative A2 - Remove 2 of 6 Lanes & Implement On-street Bicycle Lanes with Separation from Traffic Lanes**
- Schedule B
- Preliminary preferred (subject to budget approval process) - Could work in the interim, long term (post LRT) 6 lanes are be required
## EVALUATION FACTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Transit Passengers</th>
<th>Urban Design</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>EA Requirements</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change in sidewalk width – buffered from vehicular traffic</td>
<td>Boulevard trail provided</td>
<td>Inadequate road capacity post LRT</td>
<td>No net loss or gain</td>
<td>Little change in transit operations; reduced crossing width for passengers</td>
<td>Further opportunity for landscaping (already sufficient)</td>
<td>Initial capital cost estimated at $1,107,000 (High cost)</td>
<td>Schedule B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### No change in pedestrian environment of safety

- No dedicated cycling facilities
- Excess capacity in interim – 6 lanes required post implementation of LRT on King Street

- Travel time (seconds):
  - Eastbound AM – 119
  - PM – 171
  - Westbound AM – 99
  - PM – 137

- No net loss or gain
- Little change in bus speed, better schedule adherence; wide crossing for passengers (difficult to enforce)

- No change
- Initial capital cost estimated at $22,000 (Minor cost)

- Schedule B

### Wide crossing (6 lanes)

- No dedicated cycling facilities
- Some areas already have sharrow lanes

- Excess capacity in interim – 6 lanes required post implementation of LRT on King Street

- Travel time (seconds):
  - Eastbound AM – 119
  - PM – 171
  - Westbound AM – 99
  - PM – 137

- No existing on-street parking
- No net loss or gain
- Good operating speeds for buses; wide crossing for passengers

- Highly landscaped with trees/shrubs

- Initial capital cost estimated at $79,000 (Minor / medium cost)

- Schedule B

### Wide Dedicated

- Excess capacity in
- No existing
- Good
- Reduced
- Initial capital

- Schedule B
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION FACTOR</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE (Dundurn St. To Queen St.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrians</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cyclists</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crossing (6 lanes)</td>
<td>cycling facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cycling facilities desirable (because of speeds), not possible throughout corridor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Passengers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EA Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- □ Existing Curb
- ■ Proposed Curb
- = Existing Sidewalk
- — widened Sidewalk
- —— Proposed Sidewalk or Bike Track

**Alternative C2 – Maintain 6 lanes, add bicycle lanes by narrowing planted median**
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

• **Main Street** – Option A4, Remove 1 through lane of traffic and use the space to widen sidewalks, but subject to further discussions with the Ministry of Transportation.

• **King Street** – Option B, Remove 1 lane of traffic and convert to a Transit-only lane (interim – pilot – intended for June 2012-June 2013). Option A1(Parking and bump outs)– to be implemented if Option B fails. Ultimate plan is to implement LRT and remove 2 lanes of traffic – subject to further studies and funding from the Province of Ontario.

• **York Boulevard** – Option A2, Remove 1 lane of traffic and convert to bicycle lane (interim). Ultimate plan is to revert back to 6-lanes when LRT is implemented on King Street. Part of the Public Art Master Plan – to be implemented to further benefit the pedestrian experience.
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

• **Dundurn Street** – Between York Boulevard and King Street, bicycle lanes being implemented in 2012. Between King Street and Main Street, additional property required to construct a multi-use path on the west side.

• **Locke Street** – Option A5, Paint on bike lanes, without improving the side walk (interim), Option B - Convert to a “Naked Street” – ultimate preliminary preferred alternative, with further study required.

• **Queen Street** – Option A1, Remove 1 of 3 traffic lanes and implement a wider sidewalk (with streetscaping) and on-street bay parking where merited.
DISCUSSION

Your Turn!
NEXT STEPS

• Receive and review comments
• Follow up with speed survey and pedestrian counts at Locke Street, York Blvd. and others.
• Update preferred alternatives accordingly.
• Optional: Follow up with CLC via e-mail.
• Present to Community at PIC #2
• Prepare Draft Project File Report
• Submit to Council for approval
• Notice of Completion and 30 Day Public Review (opportunity for a Part II order to the Minister of Environment).
City of Hamilton, Public Works Department  
Environment & Sustainable Infrastructure Division  
Meeting Minutes

MEETING:  Strathcona Transportation Management Plan - CLC #3 Meeting

1  
DATE & TIME:  February 27, 2012  7:00 to 9:00 p.m.
LOCATION:  Erskine Church, 19 Pearl Street North, Hamilton
CHAIRS:  Margaret Fazio - Project Manager, Environmental Planning, Transportation Planning Section, Public Works Department – (PW)
          Stephen Keen - HDR Corporation
ATTENDEES:  Jocelyn Strutt – Planner, Community Planning and Design, Planning and Economic Development (PED).
            Laurie McNair - Technician, Transportation Planning - PW
            Sharyl Spring – Hamilton CarShare
            David McLaughn – Citizen
            Dawn Graham – Strathcona Community Council
            Jennifer Dawson – Strathcona Community Council
            Aurelia Shaw – Citizen
            Dale Brown – Ward 1 Office
            Brian McHattie – Ward 1 Councillor, City of Hamilton
REGRETS:  Jason Leach, Randy Kay, Chris White, Maggie Hughes, Deirdre Pike, Beatrice Ekwa Ekoko
MINUTE RECORDER  Laurie McNair

OBJECTIVE  Discuss Strathcona TMP proposed alternative solutions and their evaluation prior to finalization, before sharing the information with the greater public at a Public Information Centre.

2  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Car Share Presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Currently there are four (4) Car Share cars available in Hamilton, two of which are in close proximity to Strathcona neighbourhood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ In Hamilton, Car Share has so far, and hopes to obtain “in kind’ parking spaces for Car Share locations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ CLC members were asked to provide ideas/ areas to help Car Share location or facilitate “in kind” spots for locations in Strathcona – at the meeting and as a follow up with their neighbours.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Discussion ensued about “rules of engagement” for initiating a Car Share location, signing up for Car Share in Hamilton. Usually 25-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
30 people need to sign up/pay into the system in order for a new location/car to become available.

- Staff would like to see a location that could serve the northern portion of the neighbourhood better.
- For more information about Car Share one can look at their website, as follows:
  - [http://communitycarshare.ca/](http://communitycarshare.ca/)

### Evaluation of Alternatives – per major street

2. The problem and opportunity statement has been confirmed and has not changed since our last meeting and Public Information Centre.

- All major streets that were evaluated are a result of direct public and staff input.

- Urban Braille is a “made in Hamilton” solution to guiding those who are sight impaired. In order to implement it a minimum width of 2.5m sidewalk is needed on King St for LRT; 1.96m (exclusive of curb) required elsewhere as the absolute minimum, but would be ideal to have it wider.

- City staff members have taken to heart the request to accommodate future Rapid Transit (Light Rail Transit - LRT) through the neighborhood, i.e. not preclude it from coming, by building permanent structures/making changes that will cost a lot to take out once LRT is given the go ahead to proceed. Considering the uncertainty of whether and when LRT, City staff have been asked to provide solutions to issues between now and when LRT is implemented.

- For this reason the overall evaluation process includes considerations of whether or not some alternative solutions would contradict/interfere with LRT later on.

3. **Main Street (Highway 403 to Queen Street)**

- Substandard lane widths (3.0m and sometimes less).

- Moving infrastructure will increase costs.

- Costs greater than $2.4 million will trigger Schedule C Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process.
All available options were discussed, including “Do Nothing”, putting bike lanes on the street, amending one side of the street only – north or south.

We are able to provide an additional amenity only if one lane of traffic is taken away – due to lack of space.

Existing built form along Main has minimal setbacks, therefore widening the road to accommodate sidewalks is cost prohibitive and will impact many buildings along the roadway. Therefore, Option A4 is not considered a viable option.

Within the transportation model used, there are certain growth assumptions that staff have followed from the LRT EA process. This has resulted in an understanding that in the west-east direction there is room to remove two traffic lanes somewhere along major corridors within the neighbourhood. This could allow for one late removal on Main and York Blvd. each, right now, with an understanding that LRT would need the York lane back, once operational.

Option A1 is the Preliminary Preferred Alternative: increasing sidewalk width on both sides of the street, in order to provide pedestrian amenities, and accommodate Urban Braille and enhanced streetscaping, such as benches, planters and garbage cans.

Benefits: enhanced pedestrian realm and create space to accommodate pedestrians and amenities on both sides of Main St.

In order to accommodate this change, street utilities, such as light posts, fire hydrants, and connections to sewers would need to be relocated to the new curb lines. The cost of this alternative would therefore be high due to high cost of relocation of infrastructure.

Bike Lanes would not be provided in this scenario, although were considered. Pedestrian needs are higher in the hierarchy of priority for the City, in accordance with the City’s Transportation Master Plan, and there is only space to accommodate one or the other mode in each direction. Bikes are accommodated on other adjacent streets.

The preliminary preferred alternative is aligned with the proposed future land use.

Two way conversion was considered, but deemed to be beyond the scope of a neighbourhood study, due to potential impacts on the queuing from/to HWY403 – just on the boundary of the study area,
and due to impacts to adjoining neighbourhoods. Main St. conversion may be better studied under the umbrella of a city-initiated transportation master plan instead.

- Consultation with Ministry of Transportation Ontario has indicated that any proposed road narrowing/removal of lanes in the preliminary preferred alternative (in fact, in all but Do Nothing alternative) would require more detailed modeling, and a large study where the City would be required to ID show the proposed changes would impact traffic flow on the connected Highway off ramps (from Toronto and from Brantford).

- MTO has jurisdiction over any works proposed within close proximity of its highway off and on ramps. NOTE: an exact distance from HWY 403 – of MTO influence was never established. The discussions included the intersection with Dundurn, where it was established that any changes west or east of the intersections would be subject to modeling and closer scrutiny by MTO prior to consenting to any changes.

-Clr. McHattie requested that staff’s contact with MTO be provided to him, for discussions at his level and follow up.

-Stephen Keen explained that in his experience the request from MTO is very common, and followed by MTO staff themselves when making changes to the highway system in Ontario. He also mentioned that in his estimate it may take a study of one year, which would include modeling and consultation timing with MTO, to resolve this particular issue, and as a separate project.

-It will be a recommendation of this study to pursue this as a separate EA process.

-Margaret Fazio explained that we have chosen not to pursue detailed modeling within the Strathcona TMP, so as not to hold up the Secondary Planning process with the lengthy approvals, and increase project budget at this point in time.

-Outcome: Confirm MTO area of influence to determine viability of Main St Alternative and inclusion off Main St in the TMP.

4. **King Street – HWY 403 to Queen Street.**

- Current status of King Street: Transit lane pilot project – hoping to get Council’s approval soon - due to start in September 2012, and ending September 2013.

- The success of this pilot will dictate the shot-term options for King
Street.

- If the pilot is successful then the preferred alternative would continue to allow for the Traffic Only lane to continue.

- If the pilot is not successful then the preferred next interim step would be to introduce an on-street parking lane on the north side of the street. This would provide a buffer for pedestrians along one side of the street, and much needed parking for businesses along the corridor. Currently there is parking along this part of the roadway, with time restrictions.

- LRT project does not currently propose to widen the sidewalks within our study area, but King Street is the intended B Line for the future LRT corridor, with trains running in both directions, and taking away two lanes of traffic.

- The King Street to HWY 403 onramp location was discussed. The site visit and discussions with the Ministry of Transportation Ontario (MTO) was relayed.

- MTO will incorporate changes to the pedestrian crossing across the ramp into their current construction project. They will amend the crossing to be compliant with the Ontarians with Disabilities Act, by putting in ramps instead of the existing steps and cut curbs. The changes will include a better bike curb cut as well. Margaret Fazio will continue to follow up with MTO re: timing.

- Pedestrians still cannot have the right of way, at the 403 on-ramp crossing, as is the case at all other similar crossings. Putting in a signalized crossing here would also prove to be dangerous for motorists, and painting markings for pedestrians would provide a false sense of security. Therefore, there will be no markings across the on-ramp to delineate pedestrian space.

- MTO staff members have committed to provide a guide where the requirements for putting up a “watch for pedestrians” sign would be forwarded to City, for consideration. Unless we can demonstrate that this is a unique situation where such a sign would be merited, putting such a sign would not be permitted, due to the precedent setting nature of such an act, across all pedestrian crossings in Ontario. Margaret Fazio will continue to follow up with MTO re: timing.

- Pedestrians have to wait for a gap in traffic in order to cross at the 403 on-ramp, and they have expressed difficulty in determining which lane vehicles are in. There is also a lot of crossing over
close to the on-ramp. MTO staff suggested that the City consider separating traffic earlier on, to facilitate crossing at this location. City will pursue this issue within this study. City staff members are in the process of doing so. CLC members were reminded that any changes introduced here, too, will be subject to MTO approval.

5. **Dundurn Street – between King St. and Main St.**

- All alternatives were handed out, and the main focus was on the preferred alternative discussion (Option B2: Add Bicycle Trail to West Side & Keep Existing Lanes and Curbs (Main St to King St Only)).

- Roadway must be widened in order to facilitate the requirements of the Cycling Master Plan (to improve pedestrian safety and accommodate a bike lane in both directions). This requires taking of private property. Properties on the east side would remain as they are, and a bike lane can be accommodated, but the west side of the roadway would be widened to accommodate a bike lane for travel in the opposite direction.

- Discussion followed regarding the ongoing discussions with Loblaws Corporation, regarding any impacts and potential changes on/to their property in this regard. There is the intent to discuss a mid-block intersection with Loblaws Corp. staff, as that would ultimately be what’s needed when LRT is implemented. CLC expressed their understanding about accommodation of cycling amenities in this corridor and recognized the lack of space in which to do this in.

- Discussions with CBS property on the corner of Dundurn and King was mentioned, to explain that both property owners need to work together in order to really improve pedestrian space at this intersection. Discussions with CBS are ongoing via Clr. McHattie’s office, but within this TMP.

- CLC members expressed that they understand that this corridor does not offer a lot of space and that it is a challenge.

**Dundurn Street – York Blvd. to King St.**

Bike Lanes will be implemented this year, along this corridor, as planned under the Cycling Master Plan. 1 Lane of traffic will be removed and thus the space will be created to implement 1.5m bike lanes in both directions.

The CLC members were happy about the upcoming change.
6. **Locke Street –Main St. to King St.**

- The close proximity of buildings to the roadway and the narrowness of the right of way provide a challenge as to how best to fit all the necessary amenities within the available space.

- There was a need for increased pedestrian space/safety and the Cycling Master Plan recognizes this portion of Locke Street as an important link in the cycling network.

- All considered options were shown to the CLC, but the discussion revolved around the short term preliminary preferred alternative: 1) short term – leaving the curb as is, removing a lane of traffic (traffic counts indicate that this will not decrease the level of service), which would create the necessary space for cycling lanes in both directions.

- Vehicular traffic will continue to move one way – northbound only.

- The east bike lane will move along vehicular traffic, but the west side lane will be counter-flow. Signage along the intersections will be finalized in the detailed design process. Bike lanes are to be separated from vehicles by bollards. The presence of bike lanes adjacent to the sidewalk will provide additional space for pedestrians, and a greater separation from vehicular traffic, and thus benefit pedestrians, without widening the right of way. Widening of the right of way was not carried forward as a full alternative due to the close proximity of the buildings along this corridor, to the sidewalk. Widening of the road would require buying up most of the buildings/make it unsafe to step out of some of the doorways.

- Discussion took place regarding various short term options and their impacts.

- Margaret Fazio explained that the roadway is not scheduled for reconstruction beyond 20 years from now. It is more fiscally responsible to coordinate the construction of the road surface with that of the underground infrastructure.

- The long term solution is to wait for co-ordination with reconstruction of the roadway. The preliminary preferred alternative would be to consider two scenarios: 1) naked street design – all curbs and lines and divisions to be removed from the roadway, making it un-conventional, and fairly innovative in North America. There are some examples of this in Europe, with success full implementation, where the lack of markings causes everyone to
slow down and become more aware of the other road users, including cars. It was recognized that additional consultation and research would need to be conducted prior to design and construction of this concept along this roadway. The CLC members indicated that the design was innovative and were interested in the City pursuing it further in the future.

7. **York Boulevard – Queen Street to RBG lands.**

Many issues identified during the project process were listed and discussed.

- Pedestrians seemed to have wide enough sidewalks along the corridor, although it was recognized that further study is going to be taking place in the Spring and Summer of this year, to investigate compliance with AODA regarding mid-block crossings between Queen St. and Ray St.; a crossing between HWY 403 and Dundurn, due to a request for connectivity from Hamilton Cemetery staff and Dundurn castle staff, as well as due to a lack of pedestrian crossings all the way into Burlington.

- In order to improve the pedestrian experience in this corridor, the City’s Public Art Master Plan identifies York as a location for future public art. Also, the Secondary Plan process will be hiring an Urban Design consultant to provide urban design guidelines for major arterials in their study area. The CLC members agreed that improvement of the pedestrian experience in this corridor is much needed.

- The preliminary preferred alternative for cycling was discussed, where a lane of traffic may have to be taken away and roadway restriped to accommodate the missing length of cycling lanes. It was noted, that this space would be needed once LRT is implemented due to overflow of traffic from King St. therefore is a temporary/short term solution.

- CLC members’ comment seemed favourable in making this change for now and seeing what can be done to keep it in the future.

- The intersection improvements at York Blvd. and Queen Street were presented.

8. **Queen Street – King St. to York St.**

- Current uses and future uses of the roadway were discussed in relation to spill over from neighbouring businesses and residences.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Future land use was discussed, and the potential for appropriate intensification along the corridor was identified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The preliminary preferred alternative (Option A1 - Remove 1 of a Traffic Lane &amp; Implement a wider sidewalk and streetscaping and on-street parking where merited) proposes a widened sidewalk to accommodate the current and future needs of pedestrians, to be completed at next road reconstruction, due to high cost of moving infrastructure connections.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An increase of parking spaces along the corridor would help provide additional safety for pedestrians on East side and discussion needed 55 additional parking spaces for the neighbourhood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9.</th>
<th><strong>Bike Share &amp; Carpool, Cemetery By-law</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Margaret Fazio talked about the City of Hamilton’s efforts to plan for a bike share, much like other large cities in Canada – ex: Toronto and Montreal. She asked CLC members to think about and provide suggestions for potential desirable bike share locations, from their perspective and to talk to their neighbours about it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Margaret Fazio also talked about the efforts being made to identify /incorporate designated carpools into the study/neighbourhood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Margaret Fazio also talked about the discussions with Royal Botanical Gardens and City of Burlington, regarding considerations of trail and pedestrian connectivity in that part of the study area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CLC members expressed their appreciation that the City and consultant are considering not just physical changes to the roadways but also societal/ behavioural changes and alternatives to the single occupancy vehicle mode of transportation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Margaret Fazio provided copies of the City of Hamilton By-law and “Etiquette” hand out, which are currently under review and can be also found on the City website:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Next Steps**

- Meeting minutes will be sent out for comment and CLC members are encouraged to send in ideas for Car Share lots and Bike Share station locations, to help with the program’s implementation processes.

- Next meeting: regarding the Secondary Planning process, is scheduled to take place on March 19, 2012. Jocelyn Strutt provided agenda hand outs for the upcoming meeting.

- Neighbourhood Bus Pass to be sent to Margaret Fazio

- Old Neighbourhood Bus Pass from Boulder Colorado to be sent to Margaret Fazio

- MTO contact information to be sent to Councillor McHattie’s office.
Cemetery Etiquette

Cemeteries are sacred places where the dead are laid to rest with dignity; therefore, visitors are expected to behave respectfully. Use the following as a guide when visiting a cemetery.

- Observe all posted rules.
- Hamilton Municipal Cemeteries are open to visitors between 8:00 a.m. and sundown. Stay out of cemeteries after dark. Not only is it disrespectful, but you may also trip and injure yourself or inadvertently damage monuments or markers.
- Keep noise to a minimum. Most people that you will encounter on cemetery grounds are mourning the death of a loved one. Shouting or laughing loudly is inappropriate and hurtful.
- Whenever possible, stay on the roadway. Try to avoid walking on the graves to the best of your ability. If you wish to visit a particular grave, use the monument located at the head of a grave and the foot-marker placed at the foot of the grave as a guide for walking on the path between graves.
- If you see a funeral or other service in progress, leave the vicinity as quickly and quietly as possible.
- Maintain supervision of your children and teach them to respect the dead. Ensure that your children walk on the roadway. Do not allow your children to touch or climb on tombstones, as many of these are very old.
- Do not bring alcohol, firearms or entertainment items into a cemetery.
- Pets are required to be leashed and accompanied by the owner. Keep your pet under control and clean up after it. Do not allow your pet to roam over graves; rather keep it on the roadway.
- Do not litter. This includes cigarette butts. Take away any trash that you bring with you or deposit it in the garbage receptacles placed on the grounds.
- Do not interfere with the plants or wildlife that inhabit the cemetery. Do not pick or damage flowers on cemetery grounds or adorning a grave. Families have taken the time and money to plant a memorial garden for their loved one. It is greatly upsetting for them to visit the grave and find flowers picked or damaged.
- Do not remove any wreaths or bouquets left on a grave.
- Do not take rubbings of any monuments or markers without getting written permission from the Hamilton Municipal Cemeteries to do so. Many stones are fragile and should not be touched.

This document is intended for educational purpose. Failing to follow the guide could be a violation of the Cemeteries By-law.