

Respondent	Date/Method	Comment	Response / Action
Resident	Email – October 3, 2022	<p>I'm a resident of Thornbury who has been following the TMP. Unfortunately, I was unable to attend the PIC on Thursday because of the conflict with the all candidates meeting (I'm sure you've heard this already.) It's good to live in a community with so many opportunities for public engagement that you have to pick and choose!</p> <p>In any case I have reviewed the presentation and Draft TMP and would like to submit the attached comment. You'll see I'm focusing on a particular issue -- traffic on Hwy 26 -- but please note that, overall, you and your colleagues have done some excellent and long-overdue work that is greatly appreciated.</p> <p>Please acknowledge receipt of this submission.</p> <p>Content of attached letter:</p> <p>I would like to thank staff and consultants for the extensive work required to develop the Draft TMP.</p> <p>There are many elements of the TMP that I support. Most important are the measures that will improve active transportation, pedestrian safety, and traffic calming. Along with many of my neighbours, I believe that controlling vehicular traffic and building the infrastructure required to make our streets safe and accessible for all modes of transport and all abilities is critically important – for our quality of life, for the environment, and for creating attractive commercial streets that support our local businesses.</p> <p>My main concern with the TMP relates to Highway 26. As a long-time resident I have seen traffic build steadily and often alarmingly along this corridor. Anecdotally, there are more stories each year about long waits to cross the Highway, residents in Thornbury neighbourhoods north of the Highway being “trapped”, near-death experiences by pedestrians, and the noise, stench, health hazards and carbon emissions of idling vehicles. We all know that the situation is serious and likely to get worse.</p> <p>This is confirmed by the TMP, which states that “peak periods of traffic demand (summer and winter weekends) are beginning to approach the 2-lane highway capacity particularly at congestion points such as Thornbury Bridge and at Grey Road 21. As residential and visitor growth continues at 3% annually, congestion will continue to increase even with the</p>	<p>Email (October 4, 2022):</p> <p>Thank you for your email and comments. We do our best to avoid conflicting situations for PICs but it appears that the dates and times of both events were arranged around the same time as well, so neither group could have reasonably known. Thank you for making time to still consider the TMP study. Staff are committed to continuing to work with the Ministry of Transportation to improve the transportation network as indicated in this study.</p>

Respondent	Date/Method	Comment	Response / Action
		<p>mitigating effects of transit and active transportation infrastructure investment.”</p> <p>Given the constant residential and visitor growth, it is obvious that we are very close to levels of congestion that seriously impair the ability of our small Town to function. Unfortunately, this is not an exaggeration – it has happened in many other small tourist Towns in Ontario and elsewhere.</p> <p>In this context it is disappointing, although not surprising, that the TMP has very little to offer. Active transportation, inter-modal shifts and transit have little relevance to Highway 26 traffic flows. Workers and tourists moving east-west through our region will be in their cars, trucks and RVs, at least for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>There are predictable references in the TMP to engagement and consultation with MTO about a potential bypass around Thornbury/Clarksburg, but this has been talked about for years. I am not holding my breath. And Highway widening could make things much worse – major disruptions for property owners, more traffic, and increased safety hazards so that vehicles can go fast for a few minutes before waiting in a long, slow line to cross the Thornbury bridge.</p> <p>The bottom line is we don’t have a solution to this problem.</p> <p>My request is that steps are taken to make sure that the Planning Department understands this reality. Staff reports and recommendations presented during the current Official Plan Review (OPR) have demonstrated clearly that Town Planners are strong advocates of doubling our current building height limit to 6 storeys and increasing maximum densities to 100 units per hectare along Highway 26 as it passes through Thornbury. This of course is the “choke point” where traffic congestion is most acute and pedestrian safety is most at risk.</p> <p>The Planning Department recommended approval of an Official Plan Amendment with these height and density changes, prior to a review of transportation, including traffic impacts, which is scheduled for Phase 2 of the OPR. Questions from the public about the capacity of our infrastructure to handle this form and location of development have been ignored or dismissed with no data or specific solutions.</p> <p>My hope is that staff in various departments will work together, considering all of the knowledge gained through the TMP, the OPR and other important planning initiatives, and develop realistic growth plans</p>	

Respondent	Date/Method	Comment	Response / Action
		<p>that will be sustainable given the increasingly well-documented financial, environmental, structural and jurisdictional constraints in our small Town.</p> <p>Thanks very much for the opportunity to comment.</p>	
Agency	Email – September 30, 2022	<p>I enjoyed the presentation and the huge amount of work that preceded it. I’m excited to see what next steps look like.</p> <p>Thanks for your speedy reply about accessibility. There are so many aspects of the legislation to ensure compliance that it’s challenging to be sure they are all being met. The good news is there are positive moves being made (and I might reach to say even universally) toward a culture of inclusion and accessibility awareness.</p> <p>I’ll respond below with the references to the applicable legislation. Please feel free to share this with others.</p> <p>As an afterthought, matching up the topic area with the legislation looked pretty messy. I put it in a chart, but really, it doesn’t look much better there. Hopefully this is helpful.</p>	<p>Email (September 30, 2022):</p> <p>It was nice to see you at our Transportation Master Plan PIC 3, and thanks again for your questions and willingness to connect with us.</p> <p>Admittedly we could have been better prepared to respond to your comments regarding accessibility. The scope of this plan does not get into detailed design for our proposed road network improvements. To Shawn Carey’s comment, detailed design is where specific accessibility requirements would come to the forefront, and where Town and County accessibility committees are essential.</p> <p>Below are a few key sections where our Draft TMP discusses accessibility. We welcome your feedback on how the draft Plan can be improved in this regard.</p> <p>Pg 107. TMP Objectives, under Objective 4 supporting strategies:</p> <p><i>Accessibility of the transportation network will be assured regardless of age or ability.</i></p> <p>Pg 52. for our active transportation facility design:</p> <p><i>When planning for active transportation in the Town, the following principles are paramount:</i></p> <p><i>...<b>Accessibility:</b> Under the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, which aims to make the province fully accessible by 2025, each active mode requires specific adaptation to address the mobility needs of all population members. Providing a seamless universally accessible journey supports the mobility of a mother pushing a stroller as much as a senior or other mobility challenged individual using a mobility device.</i></p> <p>Pg. 134 transit objectives</p> <p><i>...to provide options for members of the community with accessibility needs</i></p>

Respondent	Date/Method	Comment	Response / Action
Resident	Email – September 5, 2022	<p>After attending the public information meeting at the town and the discussions there and further discussions I have had with many people over the last number of weeks, I wish to add some further thoughts. Hopefully I am not too late.</p> <p>Considering the substantial opposition by residents of TBM and TBM Councils’ opposition to the proposal to widen Highway 26 to a 4-5 lane highway, I submit that a strong statement against the widening should be included in the report. The report did touch on the widening and it being within the jurisdiction of the province and not the Town. However, I firmly believe that it is extremely important for the future of transportation in the TBM that the widening be stopped and alternate routes be developed. The continued consultation of the Town with the surrounding municipalities, counties and the Province to develop a regional master plan should be strongly endorsed.</p> <p>This is a very comprehensive and well-presented master plan. However, the problem of the widening and alternate route creation is a dark rain cloud hanging over the whole issue of transportation in and around The Town. Hopefully statements confirming the continued opposition to the widening and encouraging the development of a regional plan can be included in the report. I submit that the report would be incomplete without this.</p>	<p>Email (September 29, 2022):</p> <p>Please note that the scope of this TMP does not include assessing and identifying a preferred alternative for Highway 26 capacity needs and the Town ultimately does not have the jurisdiction over provincial roads. However, your comments and opposition regarding widening Highway 26 have been noted by the project team.</p> <p>Highway 26 is a Provincial corridor servicing a much broader area than just the Town of the Blue Mountains, and studies of Highway 26 are conducted by the Ministry of Transportation (MTO). As part of this TMP study, the Town is consulting with various levels of government, including Grey County and the MTO. The draft Transportation Master Plan (currently available for public review at the following link: <a href="https://www.thebluemountains.ca/planning-building-construction/current-projects/strategic-projects-initiatives/transportation">https://www.thebluemountains.ca/planning-building-construction/current-projects/strategic-projects-initiatives/transportation</a>) provides recommendations regarding Highway 26.</p> <p>The traffic modelling results presented in the draft TMP Report demonstrate that peak periods of traffic demand (summer and winter weekends) are beginning to approach the 2-lane highway capacity particularly at congestion points such as Thornbury Bridge and at Grey Road 21. As residential and visitor growth continues at 3% annually, congestion will continue to increase even with the mitigating effects of transit and active transportation infrastructure investment. Knowing this, the TMP makes recommendations for MTO to initiate future studies at the regional level for Highway 26 capacity needs.</p>
Resident	Email – September 27, 2022	<p>Thank you for drawing attention to Highway 26 and #21. I realize that MTO needs to be involved but of all the roads I drive in the town this is the most hazardous and in need of attention. If a committee were to be struck for the most immediate issues with MTO I would be happy to participate.</p>	<p>Email (September 27, 2022):</p> <p>Thank you for your time considering the Draft Transportation Master Plan (TMP).</p> <p>This email is to acknowledge receipt of your comments regarding the intersection of Highway 26 and Grey Road 21/Simcoe County Road 34.</p> <p>I am not aware of any potential committees with that mandate at this time, but as the Draft TMP indicates, there is an interest in continuing to coordinate and collaborate with the Ministry of Transportation and Grey County for transportation needs.</p>
Resident	September 22, 2022	<p>I did not receive the notification of Public Information Centre #3, directly, from the TMP Team or the Town. Has my e-mail address been removed from the circulation list? Please advise.</p> <p>In advance of the Public Information Centre in September, I wish to register the following comments:</p>	<p>Email (October 5, 2022):</p> <p>Thank you very much for your email and your interest in the Town of The Blue Mountains Transportation Master Plan (TMP) Ms. Richmond.</p>

Respondent	Date/Method	Comment	Response / Action
		<p>Since 2015, I have remained keenly interested in the development of transportation infrastructure in the Town of the Blue Mountains. A well-structured Transportation Plan will provide a sound foundation for orderly development in the Town, especially in the narrow band of land between the top of the Niagara Escarpment and Georgian Bay, our two UNESCO designated Biospheres. Large swaths of this area have been identified as "flood plain" in the Drainage Master Plan.</p> <p>Floodplain areas include highly functioning, Provincially significant Wetlands, Woodlands, Watercourses and other natural heritage landscapes and ecosystems. Provincial principles and guidelines emphasize the importance of watershed-based planning to preserve, enhance, and grow the value of our investments in our Lands, now, and into the future.</p> <p>When traditional subdivisions are built using today's "clear-cutting" methods, a great amount of watershed function on the developed lands is lost. The cross-sections of standard road constructions being suggested in the TMP for the Town, especially in flood-prone areas designated for Development, do not appear to provide the space required for replacing these lost natural watershed functions. Foreseeable flooding of our roads and properties, public and private, has occurred seasonally, for many years throughout the town, and intermittently when large rain events occur in flood-prone areas. I have not found any consideration for the construction of enlarged ditches, raised roadways, or naturalized public lands adjacent to transportation systems to compensate for lost natural watershed functions and ecosystems as a result of overly aggressive development before infrastructure is in place, or adequately planned.</p> <p>Has this matter been considered? If so, how is watershed-based planning reflected in the TMP?</p> <p>Please advise.</p> <p>Please confirm receipt of this message and assure me I shall be included in any further notifications about the TMP as it progresses to its acceptance by the Town.</p>	<p>Please note that your contact information is on the project mailing list although you may have received a Public Information Centre 3 notice through the Town's website subscriber list.</p> <p>With respect to your comments on watershed considerations and planning as part of this TMP, generally TMPs are completed at a broad level of assessment and more detailed investigations and studies at the project-specific level would be completed separately following the master plan and would have to fulfil the Municipal Class EA requirements.</p> <p>This study is being undertaken in accordance with Approach #1 of the Master Planning Process, as outlined in Appendix 4 of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (MCEA) document (October 2000, as amended in 2007, 2011 and 2015). As such, the TMP will generally address Phases 1 and 2 of the MCEA process. The TMP is intended to provide a framework for transportation infrastructure improvement planning over the long term. Detailed investigations such as drainage, stormwater management, sourcewater protection, and watershed management studies will be carried out as part of subsequent Municipal Class EAs for individual projects, as required.</p> <p>Please don't hesitate to contact me should you have any further questions or comments.</p>
Chippewas of Rama First Nation	Email-September 19, 2022	Miigwech for providing the Chippewas of Rama First Nation with information about this project. At this time, we have only general comments on the draft plan. We would like to encourage, to the greatest extent possible, reliance on the incorporation of active transport and mass transport as means to alleviate significant increases in traffic.	<p>Email (September 19, 2022):</p> <p>Thank you very much for your input.</p>

Respondent	Date/Method	Comment	Response / Action
		<p>With regards to active transport, this may not alleviate concerns with individuals making their way into the Town of The Blue Mountains, it does align with the image and culture of the area and will likely see significant uptake with locals and those visiting the area for recreational purposes. Further, this can assist in alleviating some vehicular traffic associated with local travel.</p> <p>Mass transportation can be of assistance to both locals and those visiting the area. Many individuals arrive in the Town from areas where mass transportation are not available or where mass transportation cannot reach the Town of The Blue Mountains. This results in the use of individual vehicles to not only transport individuals to the area, but then also a reliance on those vehicles in the area once they arrive. The ability to leave their vehicles at home can support the use of active and mass transportation upon arrival.</p> <p>While the Chippewas of Rama First Nation recognizes the potential need for upgraded and expanded transportation infrastructure for vehicles, it is our opinion that other options may serve the Town in more substantial ways as a first priority.</p> <p>Moving forward, we look forward to reviewing plans for the Town and receiving information about how you choose to move forward with your TMP.</p>	
Resident	Email - September 30, 2022	<p>Could not participate due to tech constraints. Did a preliminary review of what I found on line.</p> <p>Can't see where study is addressing needs of Agriculture and business and construction for heavy truck traffic for bring in of goods and supplies and sending out products. Also did not see address of special needs of Ag community. Looks like new Duncan bridges will now cause long detours of farm equipment to avoid them as it does not look like design had regard for normal modern machine.</p> <p>Did not see anything to embed the right of farm equipment travelling from farm to farm and to storage, nb in the face of movement to ban farm traffic on some roads.</p> <p>I saw over emphasis on non motorized travel modes. Pretty hard to get a finished steer to market on a bicycle.</p> <p>I think it is unfortunate and sends a poor message to the rural communities that the Ag advisory was stood down and could not</p>	<p>Email (October 11, 2022):</p> <p>Thank you for your email. This study is being conducted at a broad level of assessment for many travel modes on our transportation system. We are following Approach #1 of the Master Planning Process, as outlined in Appendix 4 of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (MCEA) document (October 2000, as amended in 2007, 2011 and 2015). As such, the TMP will generally address Phases 1 and 2 of the MCEA process. The TMP is intended to provide a framework for transportation infrastructure improvement planning over the long term. We are aware that not all aspects of transportation are looked at, for instance how roads are designed in detail, or where we need to fill pot holes, or where new road signs could go.</p> <p>I attended the Ag Advisory Committee in May 2021 and March 2022 to provide information on the purpose of the study, and public consultation opportunities. The TMP study was also a standing agenda item for the monthly Ag Advisory Committee meetings until that Committee was stood down following its last meeting on May 12, 2022. We had a member of the Ag Advisory Committee also sit on the Transportation Advisory Committee which had its last meeting on August 2, 2022 as permitted by Council.</p>

Respondent	Date/Method	Comment	Response / Action
		participate and that participate was through the very sketchy wireless Internet common in the rural communities	<p>Regarding the bridge replacements in the Duncan area: These bridge replacements have gone through their own Environmental Assessment process. The attached email on this project may be informative for you.</p> <p>I have gone through the draft Plan and summarized some key areas where agriculture/goods movement has been considered.</p> <p><b>Section 8.1.4 Highway 26 Recommendations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Identifies bottleneck issue in Thornbury (bottleneck for all road users)</li><li>• Identifies future alternate route study area for Thornbury/Clarksburg (benefit to through-traffic and efficient goods movement)</li><li>• Identifies a road swap concept between 10<sup>th</sup> line north of Grey Road 13 and Bruce St, Mash St, and Alfred St/Grey Road 113</li><li>• Identifies broader capacity challenges with Highway 26 and who the stakeholders are for finding solutions</li></ul> <p><b>Section 8.3 Active Transportation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Use of physical barriers between vehicles and cyclists in a rural context is identified as a potential conflict with agricultural equipment, and design alternative are proposed</li><li>• Active transportation routes are only proposed for roads that can have a speed limit of 70km/h or less. Grey Road 2 has been considered for active transportation, but a proposed reduction of the speed limit was not a desirable option based on feedback from some of the Transportation Advisory Committee members as it relates to efficient goods movement. Grey Road 2, or portions of it, are still being considered for active transportation but to be balanced with prioritizing goods movement.</li></ul> <p><b>Section 8.7 (Page 161) Goods Movement:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Recognizes the value of goods movement and how transportation networks function in relation to goods movement</li><li>• Indicates that most goods movement takes place on County or MTO (highway 26) roads</li><li>• Identifies needs of agricultural equipment and basic road operation principles to facilitate equipment movement</li><li>• Identifies several strategies to improve goods movement, with Highway 26 corridor management and alternate route considerations being a focus</li><li>• Identifies need to consider agriculture/ goods movement through future road improvements</li></ul> <p><b>Other:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Action 12-3 Develop and implement a Public Education program to support the objectives of the Town and this TMP (e.g. Share the Road, directed at <i>all</i> road users).</li></ul>

Respondent	Date/Method	Comment	Response / Action
Huron Wendat Nation	Email – October 5, 2022	Thank you for your email. We would like to inform you that the buffer zones on the construction sites should be at least as wide as the buffers required for an archeological site so it can be compliant with archeological standards. Please keep us updated about any new addition and construction in regard of the transportation in the Town of the Blue Mountains.	<p>Email (October 6, 2022):</p> <p>Thank you for reaching out to our project team.</p> <p>Please note that this Transportation Master Plan is being undertaken in accordance with Approach #1 of the Master Planning Process, as outlined in Appendix 4 of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (MCEA) document (October 2000, as amended in 2007, 2011 and 2015). As such, the TMP will generally address Phases 1 and 2 of the MCEA process. The TMP is intended to provide a framework for transportation infrastructure improvement planning over the long term. Detailed design and construction components and investigations such as archaeological, heritage and natural environment studies will be carried out during later study stages (i.e. detail design) and as part of subsequent Municipal Class EAs for individual projects, if applicable.</p> <p>You will be notified of future projects and study stages when they are initiated.</p> <p>Please don't hesitate to contact me should you have any further questions or comments.</p>