

Area Municipal Responses to Revised Regional Cycling Network

Area Municipality	Municipal Staff Comment	Response
Ajax	The first objective for the re-examination of the Regional Cycling Plan should be to establish the vision and goals for the plan.	The proposed plan contains a vision, goals and policies.
	Building on the MMM report, Town staff would like to see the Region's objectives for a revised network include a complete and integrated network that serves the entire Region, both in its urban and rural communities.	The simplified regional network provides connections between local municipal cycling networks, the Regional trail system, serving each of local municipalities.
	The revised plan does not fully achieve our desire for cross-regional connectivity because of the limitation placed on north-south routes within the Region. The Environmental Assessments for Rossland Road and Westney are examples of projects that should be incorporated within the Regional Cycling Plan.	The provision of the simplified regional network does not preclude the local municipalities from designating and developing further cycling facilities. The simplified network is intended to provide the backbone for connecting more intricately planned local networks.
	The emphasis of multi-use paths on urban cross-sections in the revised Plan is a concern to Town staff since without a cost sharing strategy, it places the responsibility of implementing the Regional network on Regional spines solely on Area Municipalities.	The Region is prepared to share the responsibility for costs associated with the Regional Cycling spines on urban cross-sections. For multi-use trails the Region would provide the platform for the trail, and the local municipality would be responsible for the pavement structure (e.g. asphalt, granular) and maintaining the trail.
	There is merit in providing a range of cycling facilities on Regional spines in order to preserve the efficiency for the utilitarian cyclist. A Regional network consisting multi-use paths, bike lanes, paved shoulders and signed routes should be provided for.	The provision of multi-use trails on the Regional Spine network is preferred for higher order roads (i.e. Type A and B) and an urban cross section, provided that such trails are deemed feasible and appropriate. Through further design studies, cycling lanes or other alternatives may be considered.
	The Region should consider adopting a municipal partnership program that requires area municipalities to submit proposals to the Region to partially fund Regional cycling initiatives that support the Regional network or remove barriers to the network.	The Region is prepared to share the responsibility for cycling facility costs associated with the Regional Cycling spines on urban cross-sections, and to share the cost 50/50 with the respective Area Municipality on rural cross-sections for the pavement structure.
	It is our understanding that bicycle facilities on Kingston Road will be examined as part of the Highway 2 BRT study.	Agree.
	While it is important that we begin to frame a short term strategic network it must be developed in a manner that implements the long term strategy.	Agree.
	The revised plan should include an implementation strategy, performance measures and a reporting mechanism.	The timing and implementation of cycling facilities identified in the Regional Cycling Plan, will be considered through an annual Regional report and the Region's Development Charge Studies.
Brock	A logical extension of the cycling network in the future would be Simcoe Street north to Cannington and Lakeridge Road north from Uxbridge to Beaverton. A cycling route could be identified east from Lakeridge along Regional Road 10 to Sunderland.	Extensions north along Simcoe Street and Lakeridge Road will be considered in the future, and are shown schematically on the network map with arrows. Future consideration for Regional Road 10 will be examined through the 5 year review of the Plan.

Area Municipal Responses to Revised Regional Cycling Network

	If it is the intention to promote a Regional cycling network along Regional roads, the cost should be absorbed by the Region when road improvements are contemplated.	The Region is prepared to share the responsibility for cycling facility costs associated with the Regional Cycling spines on urban cross-sections, and to share the cost 50/50 with the respective Area Municipality on rural cross-sections for the pavement structure.
Clarington	The potential Highway 2 cycling route should be extended to Newcastle Village.	The development of a Regional Cycling Spine on Highway 2, including the extent of the route, will be considered through the Region's Highway 2 Bus Rapid Transit Study.
	With regard to the potential of cost sharing, staff believe that the work along Highway 2 in Clarington should be funded by the Region.	The Region is prepared to share the responsibility for cycling facility costs associated with the Regional Cycling spines on urban cross-sections, and to share the cost 50/50 with the respective Area Municipality on rural cross-sections for the pavement structure.
Oshawa	The newly proposed simplified network version of the Regional Cycling Network seems overly simplified. The simplified network does not reflect a commitment by the Region to establish an integrated and accessible Region-wide network of on and off road cycling facilities that would encourage Durham residents to cycle more often for both utilitarian and recreational purposes.	The provision of the simplified regional network does not preclude the local municipalities from designating and developing further cycling facilities. The simplified network is intended to provide the backbone for connecting more intricately planned local networks.
	City staff recommend the inclusion of the following additional routes: Simcoe Street from Taunton to Gibb Street; Park Road from Gibb Street to Bloor Street; Bloor Street from Park Road to the Oshawa GO/VIA station; Conlin Road; Adelaide Avenue/Manning Road; and alternatives to cycling through downtown Oshawa.	The provision of the simplified regional network does not preclude the local municipalities from designating and developing further cycling facilities. The simplified network is intended to provide the backbone for connecting more intricately planned local networks.
	City staff recommend that the Region re-consider their approach to providing only off road cycling facilities on one side of the road right-of-way in the urban areas. On-road facilities should not be precluded and should be part of the Regional Cycling Plan. Multi-use boulevard trails should be used either on an interim basis or as supplementary to an on-road system.	The provision of multi-use trails on the Regional Spine network is preferred for higher order roads (i.e. Type A and B) and an urban cross section, provided that such trails are deemed feasible and appropriate. Through further design studies, cycling lanes or other alternatives may be considered.
	City staff continue to support the draft Regional Cycling Plan recommendations that:	
	cycling facilities on Regional Roads be completely funded and maintained (including winter maintenance) by the Region.	The Region is prepared to share the responsibility for cycling facility costs associated with the Regional Cycling spines on urban cross-sections, and to share the cost 50/50 with the respective Area Municipality on rural cross-sections for the pavement structure.
	where no sidewalks exist and the Region intends to provide a multi-use boulevard trail in place of a sidewalk, the area municipality would be responsible for a contribution toward the multi-use boulevard trail equal to the cost of the sidewalk it would have otherwise provided.	The Region is prepared to share the responsibility for costs associated with the Regional Cycling spines on urban cross-sections. For multi-use trails the Region would provide the platform for the trail, and the local municipality would be responsible for the pavement structure (e.g. asphalt, granular) and maintaining the trail.
	the Region needs to amend, if required, its Development Charges By-law to include cycling infrastructure improvements so as to help fund key connections in the Regional Cycling Plan .	Some cycling infrastructure was included in 2008 Regional Development Charge Background Study.

Area Municipal Responses to Revised Regional Cycling Network

	the Region consider developing a Municipal Cycling Infrastructure Partnership Policy for annual funding contributions in order to smoothly implement the components of the Regional Cycling Plan that are on roads under the jurisdiction of area municipalities.	The Region is prepared to share the responsibility for cycling facility costs associated with the Regional Cycling spines on urban cross-sections, and to share the cost 50/50 with the respective Area Municipality on rural cross-sections for the pavement structure.
Pickering	City Staff have reviewed the proposed cycling spines, particularly within the jurisdiction of the City of Pickering, and is generally satisfied.	
	City Staff note that the Region of Durham must be principally and completely responsible for implementing the proposed cycling spines on Regional Roads in the City of Pickering.	The Region is prepared to share the responsibility for cycling facility costs associated with the Regional Cycling spines on urban cross-sections, and to share the cost 50/50 with the respective Area Municipality on rural cross-sections for the pavement structure.
	City Staff recognizes that the Region of Durham would be responsible for the coordination of background information, road geometry and other necessary elements connected with the proposed facilities.	Agree.
Whitby	The Town agrees with the two proposed facilities (Taunton Road and Victoria Street), however Town staff feel that the revised network is overly simplified and they recommend the following additional spines: a central Durham north-south cycling facility; a Winchester Road area cycling facility; an Adelaide-Manning-Rossland cycling facility; provisions for cycling facilities over the planned grade separations at Hopkins Street and at Annes/Gordon Street or Henry Street; and, a Conlin Road cycling facility.	The provision of the simplified regional network does not preclude the local municipalities from designating and developing further cycling facilities. The simplified network is intended to provide the backbone for connecting more intricate local networks.
	Town Staff recommend that the responsibility for cycling facilities along Taunton and Victoria, as well as those proposed by staff above, be the responsibility of the Region.	The Region is prepared to share the responsibility for cycling facility costs associated with the Regional Cycling spines on urban cross-sections, and to share the cost 50/50 with the respective Area Municipality on rural cross-sections for the pavement structure.
	Town Staff also note that for those facilities where off road pathways rank superior and preferred to paved shoulders and/or cycling lanes, and where sidewalks are currently identified within the Town's Development Charge Study, or where funds have been collected through development applications for the purpose of future sidewalk construction - these funds will be utilized accordingly to assist with the capital implementation financing of the cycling facilities.	
	The appropriateness of whether the facility is on-road or off-road needs to be verified in more detail and should be conducted in a pure analysis context exclusive of who is financially responsible.	The provision of multi-use trails on the Regional Spine network is preferred for higher order roads (i.e. Type A and B) and an urban cross section, provided that such trails are deemed feasible and appropriate. Through further design studies, cycling lanes or other alternatives may be considered.
	Town Staff recommend that strategic guiding principles be incorporated into the Regional Official Plan or TMP.	Agree.

Area Municipal Responses to Revised Regional Cycling Network

	<p>Town Staff do not concur with Region's approach that only off road facilities are being considered in urban areas. Depending on the daily volumes and characteristics of the roadway, on-road facilities can be created in a safe and effective fashion. As such, it is recommended that on-road facilities continue to be incorporated into the Cycling Plan to allow for maximum flexibility at the detailed design stage.</p>	<p>The provision of multi use trails on the Regional Spine network is preferred for roads with an urban cross section, provided that such trails are deemed feasible and appropriate. Through further design studies, cycling lanes or other alternatives may be considered.</p>
	<p>Cycling Plan should address issues such as prioritization, phasing, transitional routes, signage and safety matters.</p>	<p>The Regional Cycling Plan addresses matters related to education and outreach, safety, signage and implementation. Prioritization and phasing will be considered on an annual basis by the Region.</p>