

Town Talks – Transportation

1) Development of a Highway 26 alternate route / Enhancements to 26

- **Coordinating road development and management with Prov, County and neighbouring municipalities**
- **What actions are being taken by TBM to address the need for an alternate east west route over the escarpment?**
- **Timeframe for moving forward on this initiative**

- **Status of upgrades to Highway 26**

- **Road Widening**
- **Passing Lane(s) / Roundabouts**

- **Speed Limits**

- **What steps is TBM undertaking to address speeding issues on roads throughout the Town?**
- **Frequent reports and requests for speed enforcement and speed limit modifications but limited if any action.**
- Frequent reports to the OPP are answered by saying the Town does not approve the necessary resources in their OPP contract. What is the solution?
- Cameras?
-
- **Georgian Trail Crossing Improvement**
- Pedestrian Crossings in Thornbury
- Coordination of Traffic Light at Bruce and Pedestrian Light at Bridge

Upgrades to Bruce St and Highway 26

- **Left hand Turn Lanes blocking through traffic in all directions – time to shift turning to other intersections and widen 26 to the west to accommodate with tie into street modernization as part of Thornbury West?**
- Development of a smart intersection with sensors to manage variable traffic and pedestrian flows.

Status of Improvements to and from intersection of Grey 21,19 and at Mountain Road, Osler Bluff Rd then proceeding on 19 to Existing Roundabout including access for TBM roads on East side of 119 as well as pedestrian and cyclist volumes on both east and west side of 19.

Status of Improvements to Grey 19 and interconnecting municipal roads from Traffic Circle to Intersection of 26

Status of Improvements from Grey 19 and Craigleith Rd connecting to Arrowhead Rd to Hy 26 to provide in totality an alternate to a large portion of Hy 26

Why did TBM not object to Grey County's reduction in Engineering Standards to their rebuild of Grey 119 resulting in speed reductions and the subsequent diversions of large amounts of traffic onto Town Roads which still have 80 km speed limits?

What can now and is being done to deal with the resulting problems on Grey County's rebuild of Grey 119

What can and is being done to prevent Grey County further degrading primary throughfares going through TBM.

What is the status of an alternate route / bypass around Thornbury as suggested by the Province approximately 10 years ago.

2) Tracking and ensuring sufficient road traffic capacity

- **Alignment with development – ie Lora Bay phases plus east Meaford dev**
- **Do we have reliable and locationally accurate traffic data? Do we have the information not just on volume but also from where the traffic originated and where it went to within TBM boundaries?**
- Recent Stakeholders briefing by Master Transportation Consultant used very “run of the mill” traffic data which they had not reviewed against similar data produced in the last year by Grey County – an example was Stava Cycling Data.

Does our consultant have the experience with real time traffic data systems using Artificial Intelligence Technology?

What is TBM's path to reliable and Continuous Traffic Data?

Does the Consultant contract have financial penalties for non performance and if not why not?

Thornbury West Road Redevelopment

- **This project is now 3 years plus in the planning phase and while not only roads are involved it has taken too long to begin. Recent issues with Beaver Street shows the level of community frustration.**
- **When will the Thornbury West Road Redevelopment actually begin?**

3) Management of our Trails system

- **What is the plan for the future of Trails for walking, cycling and hiking in TBM?**
- **What resources have been allocated to this plan?**

Recent Town Study showed that TBM itself has just 30 trails for a distance of 44.17 km almost all of which are in the Urban areas of the Town. This does not include the Georgian Trail, Bruce Trail or Conservational Authority Trails. However, noted as “unassumed”, there are large areas of Town owned property intended to be trails, many in fact used as trails which have not been maintained or identified as TBM Trails. Why do lands the Town gains ownership remain in some cases decades later with an Unassumed status? What is the plan to correct this and deliver to residents both old and new the trail systems shown in Town Approved Development Plans which TBM owns.

During this term of Council what has been done to increase the km’s of trails? What direction has Council given to move forward on this issue?

For years the current CAO was the Director whose portfolio included Trails – what went wrong? Where is the accountability for plans not achieved?

4) Parking facilities and policies

- **Effectiveness of parking controls – managing visitors to TBM**
- **Revenue and enforcement efforts – tracking ticketing? – tracking revenue against expense?**
- **Accommodating needs of local businesses and consumers**
- **Is the Town actively pursuing collection efforts and unlike past By law efforts participating in court proceedings to prosecute offenses?**

5) Road allowances

- **A recent Town Report showed over 25 unopened Road Allowances with water access and no issues with deeded access. Why have these areas not been opened up to public use?**
- Are there issues of Private Encroachment on to these public lands and what is the plan to end this?
- Why in the Town report was it proposed that some of these road allowances – in areas where there is no deeded issues of local residence use – is the Town indicating that they would restrict use to only local residences?
- **Why is the Town not eliminating the sale of unopened Road Allowances and instead using them as public spaces – adopt into the trail system and or for storm water management?**
- Preservation of road allowances them to help control development. Example the road allowances in the land proposed for the Wake Park which the Town would have to sell to facilitate the Wake Board Venue.
- **Grey County has repeatedly complained that TBM has not taken steps to insure sufficient width of road allowances are available to provide separated walkways, cycle paths and storm water management concurrent with road renewals. Why did TBM not put in place the necessary road allowances for the services they are responsible for? What is TBM doing about this moving forward?**

6) Safely accommodating cyclists

- **Increasingly large volumes of cyclists on roads is the reality and while vehicles and cyclists are legally required to share the road the volume of both in many areas has reached a point where it poses safety risks and compromises traffic flows. What is TBM's Plan to address this?**
- **Grey County advances paved shoulders and directing cyclists from County roads to Municipal Roads, but their initiatives are not funded and do not address the problem. What is TBM's plan to address the issues?**
- **Will TBM follow the lead of other jurisdictions and move to separate cyclist lanes or routes?**