

June 09 TAC Comments (on TMP Draft) and Responses

25-Jul-22

Item #	SOURCE	TMP SECTION	ORIGINAL COMMENT (JUNE 17/18)	FINAL RESPONSE/ACTION
1-1	TAC June 17	1.1 Overview	...and to inform and support the Town's recent declaration of a Climate Emergency	Section 1.1, par 1 revised as suggested in Jul 05 Final Draft
1-2	TAC June 17	1.1 Overview	anticipated growth	Section 1.1, par 1 revised as suggested in Jul 05 Final Draft
1-3	TAC June 17	1.1 Overview	anticipated growth	Section 1.1, par 1 revised as suggested in Jul 05 Final Draft
1-4	TAC June 17	1.1 Overview	...will need to be coordinated with other neighboring municipal transportation studies....	Section 1.1, par 1 revised as suggested in Jul 05 Final Draft
1-5	TAC June 17	1.1 Overview	should we also note our attempt to engage neighboring municipal partners in this study work?	This content is reflected in Section 1.1, par 3: <i>"The project team has worked closely with adjacent municipalities including the Municipality of Meaford, Town of Wasaga Beach, Clearview Township, Municipality of Grey Highlands, and Town of Collingwood and Grey and Simcoe Counties throughout this</i>
1-6	TAC June 17	1.2 Purpose of the Planor are connected to.	Section 1.2, revised as suggested in Jul 05 Final Draft
1-7	TAC June 17	1.2 Purpose of the Plan	"that also has at least two major urban centers as well as significant rural agricultural areas	Section 1.2, revised as suggested in Jul 05 Final Draft
1-8	TAC June 17	1.2 Purpose of the Plan	... we can not forget our significant agriculture sector --- supporting the tourism sector and also providing a necessary diversity for the local economy	Section 1.2, rephrased in Jul 05 Final Draft
1-9	TAC June 17	1.2 Purpose of the Plan	we are adjacent to another significant Tourism and agriculture region of the Province contained in another Upper Tier level of government	Reference to adjacent counties revised in Section 1.1.
1-10	TAC June 17	1.3.1 Grey County Transportation Master Plan (TMP)	(outstanding since 2015). This comment needs to be in our report.	Section 1.3.1 revised to read "...which was not adopted by Grey County Council in 2015..."
1-11	TAC June 17	1.3.3 Grey County Corporate Strategic Plan	The County plan failed to recognize the integration needed with neighboring plans! this needs to be mentioned in our report - a failure that we are trying to address in this report. Can we also mention that this plan has attempted to deal with the rather haphazard and uncoordinated transportation studies completed by the many new developments in the community. Also need to mention that this plan needs to be in sync with other major planning documents including the Town's OP as well as other documents like the Village Master Plan. I feel we need to mention these historical documents to show that they are not sitting on the self collecting dust.	Added new Section 1.3.2
1-12	TAC June 17	1.5 Engagement Dates	The last two dates seem difficult to achieve, we need to take the time and do the work to get it as close to right as possible.	No revisions. The goal is still to meet those September and October dates.
2-1	TAC June 17	2.2 Reginal	Meaford just completed a TMP that has significant gaps with an inside the borders lens and no plan to address new school access and egress of 1000 persons daily.	Resolved by adding section 2.2.9
2-2	TAC June 17	2.2.1 Grey County Cycling and Trails Master Plan (2020)	This was a pre-covid document and so much has changed since then, it wasn't completely finished or accepted or adopted because of the onset of COVID> A recommended working group is being formed this month. When this document was created there was resistance to looking through a regional lens.	Follow up with Shawn June 30. Confirmed that is was adopted (text added).
2-3	TAC June 17	2.2.7 Grey County Transportation Master Plan (2014)		Section 2.2.7 revised. <i>"The Master Plan was developed in 2014 but was not adopted by County Council (2015)."</i>
3-1	TAC June 17	3.1 Population and Land Use	Need a bit more detail on this interconnectivity.	Section 3.1: additional major road connections listed
3-2	TAC June 17	3.1 Population and Land Use	??? not sure where this is? 6th Street?	Reference removed.

3-3	TAC June 17	3.1 Population and Land Use	GR 40 is in Grey Highlands when it leaves the Blue Mountains	Acknowledged. Content unaffected.
3-4	TAC June 17	3.1.1 Age Profile	We cant base this report on the 2016 data when the 2021 data is now released and we are already referring to the 2021 data in most policy documents and staff reports.	Demographic data was available and content revised.
3-5	TAC June 17	3.1.1 Age Profile	except that this data is outdated and has been significantly impacted by COVID with no reversal of that impact seen of late. Look at water usage trends of late for a possible indication of how this trend remains	Population data was available and content revised.
3-6	TAC June 17	3.1.1 Age Profile	again, this data is outdated and not reflective of the COVID impact. WE are seeing more young families showing up. anecdotal example - school bus drop off the other day at Windfall. over 25 kids exited the bus in a development that was thought to be primarily second home residences.	Demographic data was available and content revised.
3-7	TAC June 17	3.1.1 Age Profile	The scale on the lefthand side of the chart is missing.	Chart (Figure 3-1) revised.
3-8	TAC June 17	3.1.2 Dwelling Type	Again the data is outdated. Nevertheless, we would have a higher seasonal residence percentage but this is heavily skewed to the Craiglith area and possibly LB area. not our rural areas or possibly Thornbury.	Transportation specific 2021 Census data not available until October. All other available data was incorporated.
3-9	TAC June 17	3.1.3 Land Use	2nd fastest growing municipality in Canada	Content not revised. Require source to add.
3-10	TAC June 17	3.1.3 Land Use	Again we can not forget our significant ag sector	Referenced added Section 3.1.2, par 2.
3-11	TAC June 17	3.1.3 Land Use	Castle Glen and LB needs special discussion as they are massive developments that will need supporting active and vehicular transportation infrastructure that may not be well considered in this report.	Review was undertaken for Lora Bay, Blue Mountain Village, and Senior Care Centre (Castle Glen and Camperdown are not approved). The total units are summarized in Section 6.1.2 Future Development. None of these are major generators of traffic that will impact the findings of the TMP, but a well-scoped TIA for the Blue Mountains expansion is recommended.
3-12	TAC June 17	Figure 3 5: TBM Community Structure Plan	These identified areas in particular CG are massive developments that are essentially already approved and will need supporting transportation infrastructure that is not well contemplated by this report. Also similar for the last phase of the development at the end of the pond at the Village some 700+ rooms! We also have the Campus of Care that we have mentioned previously. There will be many hundreds of folks here.	New Figure 6-1 showing growth areas added.
3-13	TAC June 17	3.1.4 Employment Table 3.1: TBM Employment Occupation Split	at previously noted, a large percentage of the population is retired - not showing up on the employment charts but a significant percentage of the population. so, while employment data is helpful these numbers are totally washed out by the high level of retirees in the area. Many retirees. The members for Natural Resources' agriculture and related production are low. Likely because it is from 2016	No content revisions. 2021 Census data on employment is not currently available Census definition of category: - Natural resources, agriculture and related production occupations These occupations include supervisors and equipment operators in the natural resource-based sectors of mining, oil and gas production, forestry and logging, agriculture, horticulture and fishing. Most occupations in this category are industry specific and do not occur outside of the primary resources industries. Occupations within this category generally require completion of college or vocational education programs. Some of these occupations, however, are characterized by on-the-job training and progression through experience. Given this definition, we would assume that migrant workers are not included in these counts.
3-14	TAC June 17	Table 3.1: TBM Employment Occupation Split	Are our migrant workers included here? If not they need to be noted somewhere. They cycle and van pool to services such as groceries, library wifi, etc.	See response, Comment 3-13.
3-15	TAC June 17	3.2 Current Mode Share	see 2016 data reference above.	the mobility-related census data is only going to be available to the public in October 2022
3-16	TAC June 17	3.2 Current Mode Share	This comparison is rather meaningless as the Ontario data is distorted and dominated by the inclusion of large urban cities (Toronto and Ottawa) that have rather large public transit systems and a much higher residential density. The better comparison would be to other similar rural cities.	Comparisons to similar municipalities in Ontario (Niagara On the Lake, Township of Tiny) made.
3-17	TAC June 17	Figure 3 7: Mode Share in TBM, 2016	how do we compare to other Ontario rural communities	See comment 3-16.
3-18	TAC June 17	3.3 Road Network	Note in document that the connecting link definition is set by the Province and not the Town	Connecting link definition added in Section 3.3.1.

3-19	TAC June 17	3.3 Road Network	Note in document that a number of the County roads in TBM are routed through the denser populated parts of the Town (Thornbury and Village area)	Note added under County Roads bullet, Section 3.3.1.
3-20	TAC June 17	3.3 Road Network	Need to define unclassified as roads in TBM that do not fall within the classifications noted above. - we have many! May need to say why they are not classified	There are no details on 'unclassified' road class. Presumably these are mostly TBM rural local roads.
3-21	TAC June 17	3.3 Road Network	do not lump together break apart. lumping together is misleading	See comment 3-20
3-22	TAC June 17	Figure 3 8: Existing Road Classification in TBM	can we please stop showing a map with roads that appear to dead end at the town boarder! They do not, they connect to something. pls show that connection.	No change. Generally, all county roads, collector roads and local rural roads show the crossing of the study boundary.
3-23	TAC June 17	Figure 3 8: Existing Road Classification in TBM	I have commented previously that the truck route to the apple storage/processing is at least a minor collector and to that point when Hwy 26 was closed for accident investigation, ALL traffic was diverted here. Hollow Road in Meaford should be noted.	No revisions. Base road class information from TBM is accurate.
3-24	TAC June 17	Figure 3 8: Existing Road Classification in TBM	SR33 is at least a minor collector road	No revisions. Base road class information from TBM is accurate.
3-25	TAC June 17	Figure 3.9: Existing Right-of Way Widths in TBM	This figure number should be Figure 3.9, not Figure 3.8	Figure number updated to 3-9.
3-26	TAC June 17	3.3.2 Highway 26	Since this is a "current status" section, should we not comment on how the traffic predictions created in 2015 have panned out? I expect that they may be significantly off now. WE also have some volume data we have been collecting over the past few months. The idea here is to make sure that we note that the 2015 solutions are needed much sooner. also we need to note the significant increase in residential development along the highway particularly in Craileith area, the speed reduction imposed on sections of the highway during COVID and adjusted recently with MTO approval, and the local craileith residents opposition to any widening.	The MTO report suggests that a bypass is needed between 2020 and 2030. The current modelling confirms this and the recommendation being put forward is that a bypass is needed by 2030, but is deperdent on rate of traffic growth (which could be offset by mode shift) and the time of year and time of day being analyzed. The peak summer and winter hour (on Saturdays) is a worst case scenario and not the most appropriate for making decisions on timing of major capital projects.
3-27	TAC June 17	3.3.2 Highway 26	can we note here the option proposed by the Town of late re the road swap and bypass solution for Thornbury. I wonder if it's worth noting this consideration somehow, though Stantec had indicated that upgrading the 10th line corridor is not necessary from a capacity perspective - sure it might relieve Mash/Bruce from some traffic but I would suggest it's service it's intended use.	A new figure is being developed for Section 3.3 that shows this potential bypass right-of-way through a land swap.
3-28	TAC June 17	3.4 Transit Network	missing here is any discussion or description of the public transit system that delivers visitors to the resort area from Barrie and the GTA. Prior to COVID, there were tons of buses heading to the resort from GTA collection points (subways terminals) and these essentially dies during COVID. They diverted a large amount of traffic off 26 etc. we need to discuss this and get some historical volumes.	New content has been added to discuss this service. Section 3.4, 3rd par, page 36.
3-29	TAC June 17	3.4 Transit Network	overstatement.	No revisions.
3-30	TAC June 17	3.4 Transit Network	pls discuss if these links are actually connected.	New content has been added to discuss this service. Section 3.4, 1st par, page 36.
3-31	TAC June 17	3.4 Transit Network	is this a reference to STA's?? needs clarification. as a general statement it is incorrect. IF STA's, is the reference, then get the proper definition and data.	See comment 3-29.
3-32	TAC June 17	3.4 Transit Network	im not aware that this has ever occurred! Where does this info come from?	This sentence has been removed
3-33	TAC June 17	3.4 Transit Network	example would be in the Village area where transit stops are not frequent (note where they are pls) and a more frequent drop off would involve the use of County roads that are not conducive The map that follows is rather instructive on that, but the actual stops are not well noted. Pls fix that.	A sentence was added in Section 3.4, 4th par, page 36. "It is important to evaluate the increased number of stops against the number of destinations in proximity to the stop."
3-34	TAC June 17	3.4 Transit Network	missing the semi private transit network offered by the Village. We have already advised on this and i expect to have a proper reporting of this in this report as it exists and now provides some relief that would otherwise need to be filled by full public transit!	This has been addressed in Section 8.2 and Figure 8.2
3-35	TAC June 17	3.4.1 Ridership	...when the resort was closed from January to Y and again from X to V in 2021	Acknowledged. Content unaffected.
3-36	TAC June 17	3.4.1 Ridership	comment on capacity factor>	Unable to track down 2021 ridership. Unsure of source.
3-38	TAC June 17	3.4.2 Transit Peer Review	is there any ability to compare to Inisville project using Uber? This would be very helpful.	No data available.

3-42	TAC June 17	3.5.1 Existing Network		This has been fixed
3-43	TAC June 17	3.5.1 Existing Network	Again this map needs to show routes outside of the TBM.	We do not see any missing routes. No revisions made.
3-44	TAC June 17	3.5.1 Existing Network	could we not find other incompatible uses that are more relevant to us?	This comment was addressed by adding snowshoers and cross-country skiers as examples to this section
3-45	TAC June 17	3.5.1 Existing Network	One incompatible use we hear about is the "Highly Confident" cyclists and the dog walking pedestrians on the Georgian Trail. There are others. Snowshoe and classic X-country. ATVs and mountain Biking. Etc.	this comment was addressed. See the response for the previous comment
3-46	TAC June 17	Table 3 7: Active Transportation User Breakdown	We have many runners on the road.	This comment was addressed by adding running as a mode in this table
3-47	TAC June 17	Table 3 7: Active Transportation User Breakdown	Many folks are walking in town and in the country on the side of roads on the paved shoulders.	This comment was addressed by adding paved shoulders as an existing facility type in this table
3-49	TAC June 17	Table 3 8: Other Network User Breakdown	Many in agricultural community use ATVs or SBS in daily work.	This comment was addressed by adding agricultural activity for ATVs as a type of travel in general in this table
3-51	TAC June 17	3.5.2 Mode and Facility Analysis	Facility design and implementation is further complicated by the different levels of road ownership and lack of local control. We can only request MTO and Grey County address issues and are often ignored.	Related TMP action added.
3-52	TAC June 17	3.5.2 Mode and Facility Analysis	in a selected but limited area of.....	Revised by adding this recommended text
3-53	TAC June 17	3.5.2 Mode and Facility Analysis	in the summer and walking skiing or snowshoeing in the winter. The Town began to maintain the trail in the winter of 2020 and continues to do so now.	Revised by adding this recommended text
3-54	TAC June 17	3.5.3 Seasonal Variation	We need to comment on the significant investment that the TBM has made to ongoing data collection. This data so far should be recorded here and used to either confirm or modify the StreetLight data.	This comment was addressed by a sentence in 1st par of this section.
3-55	TAC June 17	3.5.2 Mode and Facility Analysis	I find this statement confusing- is there a word missing?	This comment was addressed by rewording this sentence.
3-56	TAC June 17	3.5.3 Seasonal Variation	How does Streetlight accommodate all the cell dead zones in our area? Once someone arrives a their accommodation Friday evening and then takes a drive on Saturday are they then a local trip?	Question/answer. No content revisions.
3-59	TAC June 17	Table 3 9: Daily Trip Distribution - Winter Saturday 2019	Are some of these Collingwood accommodated tourists and others passing through Collingwood from farther south?	Acknowledged. Content unaffected.
3-63	TAC June 17	3.6.2 2019 Peak Hour Results	i think we should not say ski hill but resort area. This needs to be checked throughout the document	Acknowledged. Content unaffected.
3-64	TAC June 17	Figure 3 38: All Collision Events in TBM	We have a new fatal cyclist/motorcycle collision at the GR113/10th line/Hwy26 in April 2022.	This comment was addressed by adding a sentence in this section for this Figure on this new collision.
3-65	TAC June 17	3.7.2 Conclusions	To influence Grey County Roads is also challenging.	This comment was addressed by adding this text in this section.
4-1	TAC June 17	4.1 Online Survey 1	What's the difference between permanent resident and primary residence?	The bullet point related to primary residence was removed.
4-2	TAC June 17	4.1 Online Survey 1	we should comment that the survey participation may not fully reflect the views of the community. we have a hard time reaching many perm residents as well as non perm residents. This information is a year old which is a lifetime in current Covid, Post Covid and e-bike times	New sections, including 4.3 to 4.7 and 4.9, were added in the text to reflect the details of the survey participation
4-3	TAC June 17	4.2 Public Information Centre 1	we need to be upfront that these PIC were sparsely attended	See the previous comment
5-1	TAC June 17	5.1 Using The TMP	can we also suggest that, with the new TBM data collection technology, that the assumptions in the Plan be continually updated and verified?	Acknowledged. Content unaffected.
5-2	TAC June 17	5.2 Emerging Trends	Not to discourage vehicular traffic associated with economic development surely! What are the alternative available to the agricultural sector? Yes Need to clarify "in favour of" when appropriate to help ease congestion to allow necessary alternative to be more efficient	Revised by rephrasing this sentence

5-3	TAC June 17	5.2.1 Smart Cities and Open Data	Can we have a discussion re how TBM will collect, manage and asses the data it can and will collect from the new data collection technology? Should this data be the core data that is used for all future land development applications? Things change fast. Grey County has 6 cycle counters sitting on the shelf somewhere they are not using. Didn't purchase with solar chargers so high maintenance to manage battery recharging. Could be used to verity Strava data.	Revised by adding this recommended text
5-4	TAC June 17	5.2.2 Mobility as a Service (MaaS)	can we have more on how this could be done in TBM i like the idea, especially since we are getting in to live data collection	Revised by adding a new sentence at the end of this paragraph.
5-5	TAC June 17	5.2.3 Complete Streets	we need more public education on this. We need to temper the idealistic options with the common sense and currently polar opposite views on what a street should look like. One example is the proposed park/parkettes in the Thornbury West reconstruction project. Some hate it and others love it. How do we decide what to build?	Revised by adding a new sentence at the end of this paragraph.
5-7	TAC June 17	5.3.2 Objectives	Business and...	Revised by adding this recommended text
5-8	TAC June 17	5.3.2 Objectives	And facilitates business and economic activity.	Revised by adding this recommended text
5-10	TAC June 17	Table 5 1: TMP Objectives and Supporting Strategies	add Town planning and policies will support the inclusion of ride sharing services and companies as well as private mass transit options such as at the Resort now we need to educate the public in simple terms on what we are doing and what we are trying to achieve	Revised by adding a new bullet point in this table
5-11	TAC June 17	Table 5 1: TMP Objectives and Supporting Strategies	Where possible or practical,	Revised by adding this recommended text in the table
5-12	TAC June 17	Table 5 1: TMP Objectives and Supporting Strategies	add e-bike charging	Revised by adding this recommended text in the table
6-2	TAC June 17	6.1.3 Forecast Growth Rate	problem is that development seems to come in in rather large chunks. also, post COVID and recent massive increases in gas prices may put more tourist volume in our area as consumers limit longer distance vacation travel.	No revisions. 3% reflects a best estimate growth including planned developments.
6-3	TAC June 17	6.4 Scenario 2 : Achieve Mode Share Target	I've switched the figure references because that's the only way the percentages cited make sense; however, the figures are now in the wrong order of presentation.	No revisions. This reorder has been conducted.
8-1	TAC June 17	8.1.1 Road Classification Guidelines (Current)	What is in Section 3.3?	Revised by rephrasing this sentence
8-3	TAC June 17	Table 8 1: Road Classification Guidelines for TBM	in our area, we have county roads that goes thru some dense urban like areas where speed is 60 K for safety reasons. Classification variance or a sub category for that one and possibly others???? Agree - GRs 2 & 40 are high speed and GR 13 out the valley should be more of a slower scenic route plus we have GR roads in urban areas such as Thornbury, Clarksburg, BM Village, Ravenna, etc	Table 8.1 revised to reflect urban/rural speed ranges for Highway and other classifications.
8-6	TAC June 17	8.1.3 Speed Analysis & Recommendations	We asked for a comprehensive speed limit review, so aside from recommending speed limits by road classifications, what about any other specific areas that should have speed limits changed? I can think of some in the rural areas that came up in consultation. Aside from a few specific cases I can point out, I think the approach by road class covers most needs, but I have concerns that Council is going to expect something that is more comprehensive- like a list of specific road segments to be lowered, and not	No related revisions. The TMP is recommended speed limit ranges and context for specific road classifications. Isolated variations from this would require a more in-depth review of those specific locations, design standards, etc.
8-8	TAC June 17	Table 8 2: Speed Data Summary	What is the difference between average and 85th percentile?	Revised by adding this recommended text
8-10	TAC June 17	Table 8 2: Speed Data Summary	We have posted, average and 85th but how do we capture the extreme speeders that will kill someone if they hit them. The residents all experience and remember the extreme few that scream through their street.	Revised by adding text in the first paragraph of this section
8-14	TAC June 17	Table 8 3: Recommended Posted Speed Limits	would this only apply to town local rural roads that are also part of identified bike network? Posting 70 will require signage be introduced since currently the 80 default is not signed in most places. Will Stantec include new signage costs in future budget needs?	Revised to 70km/h
8-16	TAC June 17	8.1.4 Highway 26 Recommendations	widening - no way at this point!	Acknowledged. Early section on Hwy 26 describes the MTO options. Mixed views on widening.
8-18	TAC June 17	8.1.4 Highway 26 Recommendations	no we can not recommend the widening of 26 as that will only then further complicate the unmovable restriction at the bridge. The option is mode sharing and bypass.	See comment 8-16
8-20	TAC June 17	8.1.4 Highway 26 Recommendations	My route to the GTA includes GR 2 (down to 10 and 410) because I find it more efficient. Could we consider increasing the speed to 90 on this county road as in many south western Ontario county roads to encourage others to use this route and reduce the volume pressure on Hwy26? We have the alternatives of the 10th Line and GR13 for north south traffic with potentially slower speed limits. Gr 40 east and west should remain at 80 as we have alternative east west routes of GR119 and SR 33 / Frogs Hollow. This speaks to the suggestion of subclassifications mentioned earlier by R	No revisions. Speed changes on GR2 outside of TBM jurisdiction. Would not recommend higher posted speed - likely not designed for it and, identified as AT route.
8-21	TAC June 17	8.1.4 Highway 26 Recommendations	Can we recommend a timeframe for MTO to do this? Can we also have some language as to why this is a regionally significant need since long-term infrastructure planning at a local and regional level can be challenging with major uncertainties – and that the growth rate of TBM and neighbouring municipalities also potentially affected by provincial highway planning.	Revised by adding this recommended text

8-23	TAC June 17	8.2 Transit	Add consideration for opportunities to host regional transfer between GTR and Simcoe Linx? Staff have asked/expressed interest to Simcoe County for having their Linx service be extended to the Blue Mountain Village area to reduce transfer needs.	Revised by adding this recommended text
8-25	TAC June 17	8.2 Transit	All good but how do we deal with peak volumes of people coming for recreational purposes from out of town? None of these suggestions deal with this.	Revised by adding this recommended text
8-26	TAC June 17	8.2 Transit	I hope we can expand on what was provided in PIC 2 and offer some more commentary around our recommendations. I think we would benefit from a visual showing improved linkage between BMV and Thornbury, and maybe even a rough 'on demand' service area around the Village/Craileith area.	Addressed in Figure 8-2.
8-28	TAC June 17	8.3.1 Network approach	I think this a great way to organize the network Looking forward to seeing a higher rez image.	Acknowledged. Content unaffected.
8-29	TAC June 17	Figure 8 3 Active Transportation Network by Category	Most of the AT networks do not end at the border!	No revisions. We don't see any dead-ending of proposed AT routes.
8-30	TAC June 17	Figure 8 3 Active Transportation Network by Category	definition or expected users of Core, General, & Recreational	Definitions added.
8-32	TAC June 17	8.3.1 Network approach	I think this is not correct?	Rumble strips left in as we require some measures/tools to separate riders/drivers and this would increase safety from vehicles.
8-33	TAC June 17	8.3.1 Network approach	I don't see this trail helping to assist with 26 congestion.	Any active transportation infrastructure indirectly relieves congestion by 'stealing' more trips from car (to bike).
8-34	TAC June 17	8.3.1 Network approach	NO RUMBLE STRIPS I hope the message that rumble strips are considered by the cycling community as not appropriate has been heard. They are not appropriate in our area - cause flats, dangerous and uncomfortable to cross by cyclists and	See comment 8-32
8-35	TAC June 17	8.3.1 Network approach	The Georgian Trail is appropriate for some cyclists but not the road warriors or maybe the faster e-bikes because of the number of intersections, the speed limitations, and the interactions with other users such as dog walkers. They will still try to use Hwy 26. Multi-use pathways have severe limitations for use especially when pedestrians are one of the main high volume group.	No revisions. Data shows many more cyclists than other users every month. 4m paved surface would create a safe, enjoyable corridor for both.
8-66	TAC June 17	8.7 Goods Movement	Would be good to note the ag element here (locally it's a lot of apples)	Revised by adding the recommended text
8-68	TAC June 17	8.8.1 Existing Bridge & Culvert (>3m) Inventory	I have asked our manager of Road and Drainage if he has any in mind for potential decommissioning. Might be useful to have criteria with recs? – very low volume, does not isolate any properties, and minimal impact to residents?	Decommissioning recommendations added.
8-70	TAC June 17	8.9 Emerging Technology	Would intersection technology at our Thornbury main intersection help optimize traffic flow?	Revised by adding a paragraph on Smart Connected Signals
9-1	TAC June 17	9.1.6 Participation	Spike is due to email reminder sent out to all stakeholders on the 27th.	No revisions required.
12-2	TAC June 17	12.1 Projects	Have a list that I can provide of projects that have been made obvious to Stantec and others that may have been noted in passing. I have some edits to make to the list, then I can share.	Revised by adding the list