

Dale's Comments to Council on November 22, 2023 Regarding the Consultant's Presentation of the Lake Drive Functionality Report

I was unable to access the RFP or WSP's proposal for this work, so I cannot know for sure what the scope of work was. However, P. 6-1 of the WSP report says that the problem statement was given as, "to develop and evaluate active transportation design alternatives, alternate lane arrangements, and traffic calming/safety controls that can be implemented for all road users along the corridor".

However, the study did not look in any significant way at traffic calming and safety controls, such as speed humps, additional stop signs, etc. This, despite the fact that many of the survey responses suggested such options. Further, WSP is recommending that another Traffic Calming Study be conducted to look at these sorts of options at a cost of \$50,000, even though this appeared to be part of the scope of work for this project.

WSP is also recommending another \$45,000 be spent on a traffic study, to look at traffic speed and volumes in the summer, and pedestrian and cyclist usage. It seems to me that this data should have been what informed the recommendations made by WSP, not data to be collected after they presented their report and made recommendations.

The WSP report page 8-12 says that "additional consultation with the emergency services..." should be conducted "...for the purposes of identifying and ensuring that emergency vehicles could be accommodated on Lake Drive and Hedge Road...". They then suggest that the issue should be addressed in the design stage (another \$69,700). I feel that how emergency vehicles are able to respond should have been a critical issue before the recommendation to one-way traffic was made.

I have concerns about pedestrians and cyclists using the same lane, as cyclists can reach fairly high speeds. I did a bit of research and found that someone just out for a bike ride would likely be travelling at 19 kph. However, club riders, like we often get on Lake Drive, can reach speeds of 30 to 38 kph. There was no discussion of how the interaction between cyclists and pedestrians would be handled, nor discussion of speed limits for cyclists.

The report seemed to rely on the tables on pages 7-31 to 7-33 identify the options to recommend. However, they provided no justification for how they determined their impact assessment (i.e., from best impact to worst impact). For example, what were the exact "planning criteria" used as they seemed to have been pre-determined to make the one-lane multi-use path the only alternative that would meet the planning criteria. The Active Transportation Network criteria also resulted in only the one-lane multi-use path being deemed appropriate, which makes me wonder if the criteria for planning and active transportation are the same, resulting in extra weight being put on that criteria. While Table 7-4 on pages 7-26 to 7-29 did explain the general rationale, there was no explanation for why each alternative was evaluated the way it was.

I would particularly like to know how WSP evaluated the Natural and Cultural Environmental Impact of the various options. For example, why would the painting of sharrows have a better impact on the environment than the do-nothing option. Or why does a one-lane multi-use path have the best impact on the environment? Without more background information as to how the specific assessments were made, I can't help but feeling that the recommendation for a one-way multi-use path was pre-determined. I also went through all the survey comments, and slightly more people did not want Lake Drive to become one-way than those that wanted one-way.

The implementation plan recommends that the first phase include Segments 1 and 2 of Section 3 – Segment 1 is Lake Drive between South Drive and Ravenswood Avenue, which is recommended to be one-way going eastbound with a multi-use path. Segment 2 is Lake Drive from Ravenswood to Hedge Road. Two-way traffic with sharrows is recommended for this segment. When westbound traffic on Lake Drive gets to Ravenswood and the road is restricted to one way in the opposite direction, WSP has suggested that traffic go north on Ravenswood to Nasello, then east on Nasello to Dalton Road. Both Ravenswood and Nasello are narrow, residential streets and directing more volume of traffic onto these streets would not be appropriate. The WSP report suggests that "the Town of Georgina confirm and/or revise this transition point as needed based on preliminary and/or detailed design, or through further studies, such as a traffic study, to inform and support a data-based decision." However, this is exactly the work that I expect should have been done as part of this study.

Hedge Road.

An advisory Lane was recommended for Hedge Road. This type of arrangement is typically used on roads that are relatively straight with good sight lines. That description does not fit Hedge Road. Section 4.4 of the WSP dealt with sightlines, and in fact stated, "there are considerable sightline concerns due to vegetation and structures that have been placed by residents along Lake Drive and Hedge Road over many years", however, they did not include any photos of the issues on Hedge Road in this chapter. They did include some sightline issue photos in Appendix B, but they didn't even include the worst areas where there are blind curves.

On Page 7-38, the WSP report states, "Advisory lanes are not anticipated to change the current use of the road". Yet a budget of \$39,000 is estimated as the cost to install the advisory lanes. Plus likely a good part of the estimated \$30,000 educational program would have to deal with how an advisory lane is used, as it is uncommon and likely no one has ever used one before.

When the time comes, I would like to make a motion that we DO NOT receive the WSP report, and that it be sent back for the deficiencies as I have outlined to be addressed.