



Staff Report

Operations

Report To: Committee of the Whole Meeting
Meeting Date: November 2, 2021
Report Number: CSOPS.21.084
Title: Transportation Master Plan Stage 1 Report
Prepared by: Adam Fraser, Transportation Master Plan Project Coordinator

A. Recommendations

THAT Council receive Staff Report CSOPS.21.084, entitled "Transportation Master Plan Stage 1 Report" for their information;

AND THAT Council endorse staff to proceed to Stage 2 of the Transportation Master Plan study.

B. Overview

This Staff Report provides Council with a high-level summary of the data and information gathered through background research and consultation activities conducted in Stage 1 of the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) study. Further details can be found in the Stage 1 Report included as Attachment 1.

C. Background

Following the Request For Proposal (RFP) process, the Town of The Blue Mountains (The Town) retained Stantec Inc. as the engineering consultants in early 2021 to bring the TMP project through Approach #1 of the Master Planning Process as outlined in Appendix 4 of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) manual, which covers Phase 1 and 2 of the Class EA process.

Generally, Phase 1 of the Class EA process is to gather broad information to identify existing conditions, challenges and opportunities. Phase 2 of the Class EA process builds on information gathered in Phase 1 to develop alternative solutions to the transportation network and then through further analysis and public consultation, determine preferred solutions.

This project has been arranged to provide progress reports in three stages that coincide with the three planned Public Information Centres (PIC). This report follows the completion of PIC 1 and the intention to conclude Phase 1 of the Class EA process. The next two PIC events and two reporting stages are within Phase 2 of the Class EA process which will take place between the date of this report and the anticipated completion of this project in Summer 2022.

In May 2021, the Notice of Study Commencement was initiated and distributed as well as invitations to form technical and stakeholder advisory groups.

In mid-June 2021, the Town launched a public survey for the TMP. The survey was built into two parts:

- 1) A standard form survey designed to collect information on how people use the transportation network, identify priorities concerning transportation, and obtain input on an overall vision of a future multi-modal transportation network; and,
- 2) A map-based pin tool for participants to virtually pinpoint specific locations to provide input on transportation issues they see and/or have experienced in the community. This tool was useful in learning more about issues tied to specific locations opposed to higher level strategic concepts.

Report [CSOPS.21.051](#) Transportation Master Plan Public Information Centre 1 presented material for the TMP's PIC 1. Following Council approval, PIC 1 was initiated on July 29 in a virtual user-driven format on the TMP project website and concluded August 27. As required by the Class EA process, all comments received throughout the project become part of the public record, excluding personal information.

D. Analysis

The PIC 1 that took place from July 29 to August 27 was conducted virtually with a user-driven interactive platform. Feedback on the virtual format of PIC 1 was very positive, with expressions of interest to have other Town PIC events held in a similar format going forward. PIC 1 virtual attendance reached a total of 99. Attendance was below expectations but higher than what likely would have occurred under a non-pandemic, in-person PIC.

It is anticipated that PIC 2, which is also planned to be virtual, will attract more attention due to the nature of the content. PIC 2 is intended to propose alternative solutions to challenges and opportunities identified within Stage 1.

In addition to the Stage 1 Report in Attachment 1, the following documents have been prepared and posted on the TMP project's public-facing website for further detailed information:

- First TMP Survey, Summary Memo – 251 total participants
- First TMP Survey: complete results generated from the Town's Your View – The Blue Mountains (Bang The Table) platform.
- PIC 1, Summary Memo
- Agency comment-response matrix
- Public comment- response matrix

<https://yourview.thebluemountains.ca/transportation-master-plan>

The key takeaways, as a result of the work conducted in this stage of the project to understand existing conditions, challenges and opportunities are summarized below:

What we have heard – from TMP Survey, PIC comments other communications:

- Strengths:
 - Access to nature and recreation;
 - General ease of ‘getting around’; and,
 - The Georgian Trail for recreation/transportation.
- Top three community transportation issues:
 - Increasing traffic volume/seasonal congestion.
 - travel time, driving experience;
 - community feel – noise, heightened stress level; and
 - real & perceived safety concerns of drivers and vulnerable road users.
 - lack of road safety.
 - absent infrastructure;
 - road design concerns; and,
 - perceptions of safety impacting travel/recreation choices.
 - desire for improved active transportation infrastructure.
- Preferences for making travel safer and more convenient:
 - Improved safety through greater separation (infrastructure) or delineation of space between road users including paved shoulders for cyclists;
 - Improved pedestrian and cyclist crossings;
 - Improved education on sharing the road between cyclists and motorists; and,
 - Intersection improvements (improved signal timing, turning lanes, adding traffic lights or roundabouts at more intersections).
- Speeding/traffic calming
 - Concerns/Perceptions of excessive speeding;
 - Desire to reduce vehicle speeds – generally, and in specific locations;
 - Desire to reduce posted speed limit as a means of mitigating speeding occurrences; and,
 - Desire to implement other traffic-calming measures where appropriate.
- Concerns with Highway 26
 - Increased traffic volume, congestion, road safety concerns;
 - Desire for clarity on the Ministry of Transportation’s long-term plan for Highway 26;
 - Pedestrian and cyclist safety concerns crossing Highway 26 (Georgian Trail crossing, areas in Thornbury and other active crossing locations); and,
 - Desire for an alternate route around Thornbury for through-traffic.

What the data is telling us - from Streetlight Traffic data, TMP Survey, PIC comments, geographic information, and other communications:

- Internal vehicle trip activity (vehicle trips that have both origin and destination within the Town) is the primary contributor to our traffic, opposed to pass-through activity with origins or destinations outside of the Town. Both locals and visitors contribute to the internal trip activity;
- There is a big gap between existing travel mode share (proportion of trips taken by different travel modes like walk, bike, bus and car) and preferred mode share stated in the survey especially regarding private vehicles mode share. The private vehicle mode share is also considerably higher than its average in Ontario that shows the available potential for improvement;
- The road infrastructure that supports the bulk of vehicular traffic within the Town is owned and operated by the County or Province. This TMP is an opportunity to share information with the County and MTO to support future studies and opportunities for improvement and to continue fostering collaborative relationships with our municipal partners and stakeholders. The Town should have an active role in the review process considering the direct impact on the Town's transportation system;
- Highway 26 is a critical traffic artery for the Town;
- Seasonal fluctuations in traffic place relatively short but significant demands on the road network, creating greater challenges in balancing the needs of all road users. The results showed that the peak season traffic is approximately 2.4 times higher than regular peak traffic;
- The Georgian Trail is a core community asset for active transportation;
- Based on the volume of short-distance vehicular trips and stated preference by survey responses in the TMP survey, there is great potential for enhanced public transit service and active transportation infrastructure to mitigate impacts of localized traffic, particularly in the Blue Mountain Village area; and,
- Collision events are generally concentrated in areas of greatest volume of traffic and mix of road users, in Thornbury, the Blue Mountain Village area, along Highway 26 and Grey Road 19. The main reason reported for collisions is collisions with wild or domestic animals, followed by speed related collisions, many of which are speeding relative to road conditions. This data confirms that potential improvements on high volume corridors can reduce the frequency of accidents.

Information Needs, Data Gaps

- Data on the occurrence of speeding is limited, but not required at the strategic level;
- Regionally, there are inconsistencies with the level and type of data collected; and,
- Gathering, assessing, and drawing meaning from data and information is an ongoing effort.

E. Strategic Priorities

1. Communications and Engagement

We will enhance communications and engagement between Town Staff, Town residents and stakeholders.

3. Community

We will protect and enhance the community feel and the character of the Town, while ensuring the responsible use of resources and restoration of nature.

4. Quality of Life

We will foster a high quality of life for full-time and part-time residents of all ages and stages, while welcoming visitors.

F. Environmental Impacts

The TMP is intended to provide policy recommendations and a framework for transportation infrastructure improvement planning over the long term. While no detailed environmental investigations, including archaeological assessments, are being undertaken as part of the TMP, more detailed studies with potential environmental impacts may be initiated under the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act in the future to complete the planning for some of the recommended infrastructure improvements identified in the final TMP.

G. Financial Impacts

An implementation strategy is included as part of the TMP scope of work which is expected to provide priority timeframes and the estimated funding needs associated with TMP recommendations. Achieving the Phase 1 and 2 of the Class EA process will streamline future projects to implement the TMP and inform future Town plans and studies such as the annual capital budget and Development Charges Background Study.

H. In Consultation With

Shawn Carey, Director of Operations

I. Public Engagement

The topic of this Staff Report has been the subject of a Public Meeting and/or a Public Information Centre which took place from July 29 to August 27, 2021. Those who have engaged with the study through various consultation and communication efforts and desired to receive further project notices have been provided notice of this Staff Report. Past public engagement and future public engagement events are anticipated to occur in accordance with the following schedule:

- May 14, 2021 - Notice of Study Commencement;
- May 14, 2021 - Notice of Request to Consult to First Nations and Metis Communities;
- May 14, 2021 - Technical Advisory Group invitations distributed;
- May 14, 2021 - Stakeholder Advisory Group invitations distributed;
- May 20, 2021 - Notice of Study Commencement published in Blue Mountains Review and Collingwood Connection;
- June 23, 2021 - Launch of public survey;
- June 29, 2021 Committee of the Whole - Initial staff report CSOPS.21.051 Transportation Master Plan Public Information Centre 1 with recommendation to proceed to public consultation;
- July 7, 2021 - Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting 1;
- July 12, 2021 - Council - Recommendations from June 29, 2021 Committee of the Whole considered by Council;
- July 15, 2021 - Technical Advisory Committee meeting 1;
- July 16, 2021 - End of first public survey;
- July 16, 2021 - Notice of PIC to Stakeholders, First Nations and Metis Communities;
- July 16, 2021 - Website update for Notice of PIC 1;
- July 22, 2021 - Notice of PIC 1 published in Blue Mountains Review and Collingwood Connection (1);
- July 29, 2021 - Notice of PIC 1 published in Blue Mountains Review and Collingwood Connection (2);
- July 29, 2021 - Virtual PIC 1 launch;
- August 27, 2021 - Virtual PIC 1 closes;
- November 2, 2021 – Committee of the Whole TMP Stage 1 Report CSOPS.21.084
- January 2022 - Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting 2;
- January 2022 - Technical Advisory Committee meeting 2;
- January 2022 – Notice of Public Information Centre 2 to Stakeholders, First Nations and Metis Communities;
- January 2022 - Notice of PIC 1 published in Blue Mountains Review and Collingwood Connection x2;
- January 18, 2022, - Committee of the Whole Report - Transportation Master Plan Public Information Centre 2 with recommendation to proceed to public consultation;
- January 31 2022, - Council – Recommendations from January 18, 2022 Committee of the Whole considered by Council; and,
- February 2022 - Virtual PIC 2 launch.

Any comments regarding this report should be submitted to Adam Fraser, Transportation Master Plan Project Coordinator tmp@thebluemountains.ca.

J. Attached

1. Attachment 1: Transportation Master Plan Stage 1: Background Review

2. Attachment 2: Presentation Material

Additional material is available on the TMP project website:

<https://yourview.thebluemountains.ca/transportation-master-plan>

Respectfully submitted,

Adam Fraser
Transportation Master Plan Project Coordinator

Shawn Carey
Director of Operations

For more information, please contact:
Adam Fraser, Transportation Master Plan Project Coordinator
tmp@thebluemountains.ca
705-351-2630

Report Approval Details

Document Title:	CSOPS.21.084 Transportation Master Plan Stage 1 Report.docx
Attachments:	- Attachment 1 Transportation Master Plan Stage 1 Background Review.pdf - Attachment 2 - Presentation Material.pdf
Final Approval Date:	Oct 22, 2021

This report and all of its attachments were approved and signed as outlined below:

Shawn Carey - Oct 22, 2021 - 10:56 AM




Transportation Master Plan
Stage 1 Memo – Background
Review

Prepared for:



Sign-off Sheet

This document entitled Town of the Blue Mountains TMP: Stage 1 Draft Report was prepared by Stantec Consulting Services Inc. ("Stantec") for the account of The Town of the Blue Mountains (TBM) (the "Client"). Any reliance on this document by any third party is strictly prohibited. The material in it reflects Stantec's professional judgment in light of the scope, schedule and other limitations stated in the document and in the contract between Stantec and the Client. The opinions in the document are based on conditions and information existing at the time the document was published and do not take into account any subsequent changes. In preparing the document, Stantec did not verify information supplied to it by others. Any use which a third party makes of this document is the responsibility of such third party. Such third party agrees that Stantec shall not be responsible for costs or damages of any kind, if any, suffered by it or any other third party as a result of decisions made or actions taken based on this document.

Prepared by 
(signature)

John Heseltine, LPP MCIP

Table of Contents

1.0	Introduction.....	1
2.0	Building an Interconnected Network	2
2.1	Purpose of the Plan	2
2.2	The Environmental Assessment Process	3
2.3	Engagement Dates	5
3.0	Policy Context.....	6
3.1	Provincial	6
3.2	Regional	9
3.3	Municipal	12
4.0	Existing Conditions	16
4.1	Population and Land Use	16
4.2	Current Mode Share	26
4.3	Road Network.....	26
4.4	Transit Network	31
4.5	Active Transportation Network.....	45
4.6	Travel Characteristics	50
4.7	Collision Analysis.....	72
5.0	What We've Heard	74
5.1	Online Survey 1	74
5.2	Public Information Centre 1	85
6.0	Guiding Themes and Objectives	87
6.1	Using the TMP	87
6.2	Emerging Trends	88
6.3	Vision and Objectives	94

List of Figures

Figure 1-1: Transportation Master Plan Study Stages	2
Figure 4-1: TBM Population Pyramid, 2016	17
Figure 4-2: Permanent Residents in TBM and Grey County, 2006-2016	18
Figure 4-3: Occupied Private Dwellings by Type, 2016	19
Figure 4-4: Existing Land Use in TBM	20
Figure 4-5: TBM Community Structure Plan	22
Figure 4-6: TBM Employment Occupation Split, 2016	25
Figure 4-7: Mode Share in TBM, 2016	26
Figure 4-8: Existing Road Classification in TBM	29
Figure 4-9: Existing Right-of-Way Widths in TBM	30
Figure 4-10: Preferred Alternatives for Highway 26, 2015	31
Figure 4-11: Existing Route 3 & 4 of Grey County Transit Line	33
Figure 4-12: Existing Walking Distances to Transit Stops	34
Figure 4-13: Collingwood Transit Blue Mountain Link Annual Ridership Change, 2014-2020	36
Figure 4-14: Collingwood Transit Blue Mountain Link Monthly Ridership, 2014- 2020	37
Figure 4-15: Existing Grey County Transit Route 4 Ridership, 2020/2021	38
Figure 4-16: Grey Transit Route 4 Stop-Level Ridership	39
Figure 4-17: Annual Ridership by Peer Agency, 2015-2019	42
Figure 4-18: Passengers per Service Hour by Peer Agency	43
Figure 4-19: Peer Comparison of Service Hours and Passengers (per Capita)	44
Figure 4-20: Active Transportation Network	46
Figure 4-21: Active Transportation Network by Primary Function	47
Figure 4-22: Seasonal Trip Frequency by Day of the Week (2019)	52
Figure 4-23: Average Hourly Trip Distribution (Winter Saturday, 2019)	52
Figure 4-24: Average Hourly Trip Distribution (Summer Saturday, 2019)	53
Figure 4-25: Average Hourly Trip Distribution (Fall Weekday, 2019)	53
Figure 4-26: Origins and Destinations of Trips to and from the Blue Mountains in 2019	56
Figure 4-27: The Blue Mountains Internal Zones Trip Production in 2019 Winter Saturdays	62
Figure 4-28: The Blue Mountains Internal Zones Trip Attraction in 2019 Winter Saturdays	63
Figure 4-29: The Blue Mountains Internal Zones Trip Production in 2019 Summer Saturdays	64
Figure 4-30: The Blue Mountains Internal Zones Trip Attraction in 2019 Summer Saturdays	65
Figure 4-31: The Blue Mountains Internal Zones Trip Production in 2019 Fall Weekdays	66
Figure 4-32: The Blue Mountains Internal Zones Trip Attraction in 2019 Fall Weekdays	67

Figure 4-33: The Blue Mountains Gates Local and Pass-Through Average Daily Traffic, 2019	69
Figure 4-34: All Collision Events in TBM	72
Figure 4-35: Speed Related Collision Events in TBM	73
Figure 4-36: Pedestrian and Cyclist Collision Events in TBM.....	74
Figure 5-1: Online Survey Question # 7 Results	76
Figure 5-2: Online Survey Question # 9 Results	77
Figure 5-3: Online Survey Question # 12 Results	78
Figure 5-4: Online Survey Question # 13 Results	79
Figure 5-5: Online Survey Question # 17 Results	80
Figure 5-6: Online Survey Question # 18 Results	81
Figure 5-7: Online Survey Question # 21 Results	83
Figure 5-8: Online Mapping Survey Results.....	85
Figure 6-1: Multi-Modal Transportation Open Data	88
Figure 6-2: Uber Integration into the Transit App	90
Figure 6-3: Complete Streets Road Space Equity.....	91
Figure 6-4: Traffic Fatalities in Sweden, 2000-2015.....	92
Figure 6-5: User Interface of Belleville’s On-Demand Transit Mobile App.....	93

List of Tables

Table 4-1: TBM Employment Occupation Split.....	24
Table 4-2: TBM Road Classification Lengths	28
Table 4-3: Annual Ridership on Collingwood Transit Blue Mountain Link, 2014-2020.....	35
Table 4-4: Transit Peer Agencies	39
Table 4-5: Peer Agency Operational Data.....	41
Table 4-6: Active Transportation User Breakdown	48
Table 4-7: Other Network User Breakdown.....	48
Table 4-8: Daily Trip Distribution - Winter Saturday 2019	54
Table 4-9: Daily Trip Distribution – Summer Saturday 2019	55
Table 4-10: Daily Trip Distribution – Fall Average Weekday 2019	57
Table 4-11: Internal Daily Trip Distribution - Winter Saturday 2019	59
Table 4-12: Internal Daily Trip Distribution – Summer Saturday 2019.....	60
Table 4-13: Internal Daily Trip Distribution – Fall Weekday 2019.....	61
Table 4-14 The Blue Mountains Gates Local and Pass-Through Daily Traffic - 2019.....	68
Table 4-15: TBM Zones Historical Trip Generation – Winter Saturday 2017, 2019, and 2020	70
Table 4-16: TBM Zones Historical Trip Generation – Summer Saturday 2017, 2019, and 2020	70
Table 4-17: TBM Zones Historical Trip Generation – Fall Weekday 2017, 2019, and 2020	71
Table 4-18: Speed Related Collision Events in TBM by Weather Conditions.....	73

1.0 Introduction

The TBM Transportation Master Plan or TMP is a long-range strategic plan for the Town of the Blue Mountains. The TMP will identify transportation infrastructure requirements to address existing challenges and support growth, along with policies to guide transportation and land use decisions. TMPs are integrated with environmental planning and sustainability principles and provide the framework and “blueprint” for implementing coordinated improvements on a town-wide basis. The TMP will shape and define regional connections and support the movement of goods and services throughout the region. It will include a financial strategy will be developed to address the short, medium, and long-term transportation needs of the community.

Work for this study is divided into three stages that complement each other in an iterative process visualized in **Figure 1-1**:

- Stage 1: Status Assessment, Data Collection, Community Engagement
- Stage 2: Technical Analysis, Visioning & Draft Recommendations
- Stage 3: Comprehensive Transportation Master Plan & Implementation

Stage 1 will identify the existing and future deficiencies or opportunities, while Stage 2 will develop solutions to address these issues or opportunities by considering the existing environment in the context of established decision-making criteria. Stage 3 will take the preferred solution and develop the implementation and financial plans culminating in a comprehensive Transportation Master Plan.

Our approach will be collaborative through all three stages. This report has been prepared for review by Town staff, Council, and the public to confirm our complete and accurate understanding of the TBM transportation network and the challenges and opportunities it should address. This report presents Stage 1 findings that will lay the foundation for identifying future transportation constraints, needs, opportunities, and strategies for TBM in the subsequent stages of this study. It will provide the foundation for a TMP that will map short-term actions over the next ten years to initiate a process to develop a transportation network for the TMP Horizon Year of 2065.




Figure 1-1: Transportation Master Plan Study Stages

2.0 Building an Interconnected Network

2.1 Purpose of the Plan

Transportation networks are influenced and shaped by the communities they serve. Their role can vary widely depending on community expectations and needs. The Town of the Blue Mountains (TBM) is a popular four-season recreational and tourism destination in Ontario. Picturesque features of the town such as the Niagara Escarpment, Nipissing Ridge, and Nottawasaga Bay attract both residents and visitors. In the context of its natural beauty, TBM provides hiking, cycling, golfing, skiing, and much more to residents and visitors. Given its role as a recreational community and tourist destination, transportation provisions for TBM must address seasonal changes in population, fluctuating levels of visitation, as well as associated safety concerns. TBM is a lower-tier municipality within Grey County. The 2014 Grey County Transportation Master Plan (TMP), which has not been adopted by Grey County Council but is regarded as a guide to transportation issues in the region, sets out five objectives for the County's transportation system:

- **Goal #1:** Create a vision for all modes of transportation in Grey County, with a particular focus on encouraging active transportation options (cycling, walking/running).

- **Goal #2:** Identify transportation network constraints and opportunities, as well as required infrastructure improvements/expansions to ensure the continued safe and efficient movement of people and goods to the year 2036.
- **Goal #3:** Ensure that the TMP is fully aligned with the County's vision and goals identified in the County Corporate Strategic Plan and other County plans/strategies.
- **Goal #4:** Establish solutions reflective of the present economic climate and future conditions.
- **Goal #5:** Coordinate and establish partnerships with public and private agencies.

The first goal focuses on developing an integrated transportation system that promotes active transportation options, such as cycling, walking, and running. The County TMP also emphasized the need to define network limitations and opportunities to assure safe and efficient movement of people and goods to 2036 (Goal #2). All the objectives must be aligned with the County's vision and goals defined in the County Corporate Strategic Plan and other County plans/strategies (Goal #3).

The Vision of the 2017 to 2019 Corporate Strategic Plan developed after the County's TMP is "Grey County... an exceptional blend of healthy living and economic opportunity, where people feel genuinely at home and naturally inspired," which aligns with the TMPs endorsement of Active Transportation. The Strategic Plan also commits to improving rural transportation services and endorses TMP recommendations for connecting links and road transfers. Road. Potential road transfers include the transfer of County roads and bridges within Blue Mountains to the Town.

The Town of the Blue Mountains has commissioned Stantec to develop a Transportation Master Plan (TMP) to support and accommodate growth through 2041. In accordance with the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act, this study will conform to Stages 1 and 2 of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Process including the identification of existing and future problems (deficiencies) or opportunities and the development of solutions to address them.

2.2 The Environmental Assessment Process

This TMP is being conducted in accordance with the requirements of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process (MCEA 2000, as amended in 2007, 2011, and 2015) for Master Plans (Approach 1). The Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (MCEA) outlines a streamlined, proponent driven, comprehensive planning process under which municipal road, sewage, and water infrastructure undertakings are approved. The undertakings are considered approved provided the mandatory environmental planning process as set out in the Municipal Class EA document is completed.

- The MCEA document provides municipalities with a five-phase planning process approved under the EA Act to plan and undertake all municipal infrastructure projects in a manner that protects the environment. Key components of the MCEA planning process include:
- Consultation with potentially affected parties early and throughout the process
- Consideration of a reasonable range of alternative solutions
- Systematic evaluation of alternatives
- Clear and transparent documentation
- Traceable decision-making.

The Master Plan approach recognizes the benefits of using the EA process when comprehensive plans are undertaken for projects with relatively minor environmental effects. The outputs of this TMP include road and active transportation projects, as well as recommendations relating to public transit. The Municipal Class EA process addresses Phases 1 and 2 of the EA process including the identification of problems and opportunities, as well as identifying and evaluating alternative solutions to address the problem and establish the preferred solution. Approach 1 for Master Plans involves preparing a Master Plan document at the conclusion of the first two phases of the Municipal Class EA. The Master Plan is made available for public comment before proceeding to the Municipality for approval. Master Plans are typically done at a broad level of assessment. More detailed analysis or investigation is required at the project level to fulfill the requirements for specific Schedule B and C projects identified within the Master Plan. Schedule A+ and A projects, on the other hand, can be implemented on approval of the TMP. Examples of transportation projects under each schedule include:

- **Schedule A** projects are limited in scale, have minimal anticipated environmental impacts, and generally include normal or emergency operational activities. Projects may be implemented without following the planning process as outlined in the Municipal Class EA. Schedule A+ projects are similarly pre-approved but require proponents to notify potentially affected parties before implementation. Schedule A and A+ projects may include road rehabilitation works.
- **Schedule B** projects generally include improvements and minor expansions to existing facilities. They have the potential for some adverse environmental and social impacts. Proponents must undertake a screening process involving mandatory contact with potentially affected members of the public, Indigenous communities, and relevant review agencies to ensure stakeholders are aware of the project and their concerns are addressed. Schedule B projects require the completion of Phases 1 and 2 of the Municipal Class EA planning process, which is

documented in a Project File made available for review by the public, review agencies, and Indigenous communities for a minimum 30-day period.

- **Schedule C** projects have the potential for significant environmental impacts and must follow the full planning process specified in the Municipal Class EA document including Phases 1 through 4. These projects are documented in an Environmental Study Report (ESR) that is filed for review by the public, review agencies, and Indigenous communities for a minimum 30-day review period.

2.3 Engagement Dates

Stakeholder engagement is an important component of the EA process. Notifications and consultation with public, agencies, and other stakeholders are required at key phases of the process. Continuous consultation ensures stakeholder issues, ideas, and priorities will be incorporated in the plan in a meaningful way.

The following consultation opportunities and events are either completed, ongoing, or planned for the study:

- Notice of Commencement | May 14, 2021
- Online Engagement Survey #1 | June 23, 2021 to July 16, 2021
- Public Information Centre #1 (Online) | July 29 – August 27, 2021
- Technical Advisory Group Meetings | July 2021 and October 2021
- Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meetings | July 2021 and October 2021
- Study Update Presentation to Council | October 2021
- Public Information Centre #2 | November 2021
- Online Engagement Survey #2 | November 2021
- Public Information Centre # 3 | May 2022
- Final Draft TMP Report Presentation to Council | June 2022
- Final TMP Report to Council | June 2022
- Notice of Completion | July 2022

The TMP was initiated in May 2021 through a Notice of Study Commencement published on the Town's website, and in The Blue Mountains Review and Collingwood Connection newspapers. It was also sent directly to key community stakeholders by email. Invitations to participate in the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) and Stakeholder

Advisory Committee (SAC) were also sent out with the Notice of Commencement on May 14, 2021.

A dedicated TMP study webpage (<https://yourview.thebluemountains.ca/transportation-master-plan>) was developed to provide ongoing information concerning project events and outcomes. An email account (ttmp@thebluemountains.ca) has been established to facilitate email correspondence from members of the public interested in the TMP. The email account is linked to key study team members to provide instant access to incoming and outgoing messages and create a common forum. Throughout the entire study process stakeholders will be able to provide their email or contact information so that they may be directly informed of the study's progress and upcoming engagement sessions. A monthly newsletter providing TMP study updates will be posted to the dedicated study website.

Online surveys will be posted on the Town's existing engagement platform as an enhancement to the PICs. Each survey will include questions regarding demographics, general travel trends, visioning and preferences, to obtain input on multi-modal transportation network issues, successes and opportunities.

In addition to the consultation opportunities noted above, a series of meetings with Town's Transportation Committee is planned to discuss key issues and local concerns identified through our existing conditions analysis and to provide an opportunity to share information related to travel analyses and forecasting. A summary of all comments received, and the associated actions or responses will be included as an appendix to the draft and final TMP reports.

3.0 Policy Context

A wide range of municipal, regional, and provincial plans dealing with land use and environmental protection, as well as transportation frame or influence this TMP. It is important to align the TMP with provincial, regional, and municipal planning frameworks to complement and enhance their over-arching vision, values, and goals as they pertain to multi-modal transportation.

3.1 Provincial

The Province of Ontario has produced several guidance documents over the past decade that shape the land use context in which Grey County and TBM are to develop.

3.1.1 Towards a Greater Golden Horseshoe Transportation Plan: Discussion Paper (2021)

TBM is located close to but outside of the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH) area, which includes the Cities of Toronto and Hamilton, and lands bordering the western half of Lake Ontario south to Niagara Falls, north to Peterborough, and west to the border of Grey County. Traffic in the Town is significantly influenced by trips to and from the GGH.

The 2051 vision outlined in the Discussion Paper focuses on region-wide transit investments and promotion of active transportation for local trips.

In relation to Goal 7 dealing with Muskoka, Haliburton and Connections Beyond the GGH, the Discussion Paper specifically refers to the Town of the Blue Mountains with the context of the south Georgian Bay area:

MTO is committed to working with the communities in the south Georgian Bay area to identify needs and opportunities to improve the transportation network. This includes looking at ways for the transportation system to better support the needs of the tourism sector in urban and rural areas so that both tourists and tourism employees can move efficiently – both for short term recovery and in the long term.¹ (p. 28)

It further references the area in connection with Ontario government initiatives that are already underway:

The Southwestern Task Force has already been established and is discussing issues such as highway, airport, and transit improvements and opportunities that connect to the GGH, including along the Hwy 401 corridor as well as in the Blue Mountains and Owen Sound areas, among other topics.

and

Addressing traffic and safety concerns in the Georgian Bay area, including connections between the Greater Golden Horseshoe and southwestern Ontario, by working with municipalities to explore improvements along highways and county roads, such as the implementation of revised posted speed limits on Highway 26 in the Craighleith area, to better support tourism and local mobility MTO will continue to meet with municipalities to discuss capital projects and safety improvements along provincial highways within the region, provide input to regional transportation plans, and share available data.²

¹ Ontario, *Towards a Greater Golden Horseshoe Transportation Plan: Discussion Paper*, June 2021, p. 28.

² *Ibid.*, p. 29.

3.1.2 Provincial Policy Statement (2020)

The Provincial Policy Statement is intended to provide policy direction on matters of provincial interest related to land use planning and development. As a key part of Ontario's policy-led planning system, the Provincial Policy Statement defines the policy foundation for regulating the development and use of land. It also supports the provincial goal to improve the quality of life for all Ontarians. Policies related to the transportation system emphasized promoting active and public transportation modes. In addition, the plan asserts the need to plan public streets, spaces, and facilities to be safe, meet the needs of pedestrians, strengthen social interaction, and facilitate active transportation and community connectivity.

3.1.3 A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2019)

The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe was released by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing in 2006, as Ontario's growth strategy for the region to 2031. It is a "framework for implementing Ontario's vision for building stronger, prosperous communities by better managing growth in this region". Grey County and TBM are just outside the Greater Golden Horseshoe but are strongly influenced by its large population. The Growth Plan complements the Provincial Policy Statement and Places to Grow Act and has the objective to develop and optimize infrastructure while protecting and enhancing natural resources and heritage. It defines a framework of objectives and policies to achieve a balance between development, protection, and the enjoyment of this important landform feature and the resources it supports.

3.1.4 Niagara Escarpment Plan (2017)

The Niagara Escarpment Plan identifies where and how population and employment growth should occur across the Niagara Escarpment. The Niagara Escarpment extends 725 kilometres from Queenston on the Niagara River to the islands off Tobermory on the Bruce Peninsula, including the Regions of Niagara, Halton and Peel, Counties of Dufferin, Simcoe, Grey, and Bruce, and the City of Hamilton. The plan seeks to protect the natural environment of the Niagara Escarpment and surrounding lands by ensuring compatible development. Lands within the Blue Mountains TMP study area are designated as Recreation Areas, acknowledging TBM's role as a key tourist and recreational attraction. Under the Escarpment Plan, existing and new recreational developments should protect and maintain community character, hydrologic and natural heritage features, and the scenic resources of the Escarpment.

3.1.5 Greenbelt Plan (2017)

The Greenbelt Plan, released by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs under the Greenbelt Act in 2005, identifies where urbanization should not occur in the Greater Golden

Horseshoe region and complements the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. The Greenbelt Plan permanently protects agricultural land use, natural heritage, and water systems while encouraging eco-tourism and recreation in protected areas within a band of land encompassing the Greater Golden Horseshoe. The Greenbelt Plan details measures for environmental protection and restoration of natural and open space connections surrounding Lake Ontario.

3.1.6 #CycleON Strategy (2013)

#CycleON is Ontario's 20-year vision through the year 2033 to have cycling recognized as a respected and valued mode of transportation. The plan acknowledges cycling's potential to reduce traffic congestion and create province-wide benefits for personal and public health, the environment, and tourism. The guiding principles of this strategy are safety, partnership, Accessibility and Connectivity which culminate in five strategic directions including:

1. Design healthy, active and prosperous communities
2. Improve cycling infrastructure
3. Make highways and streets safer
4. Promote awareness and behavioural shifts
5. Increase cycling tourism opportunities.

3.2 Regional

TBM is a component of Grey County and operates within a framework developed by the upper tier government. Two key documents deal directly with transportation and active transportation and include specific directions for TBM. The Official Plan of Simcoe County, which TBM borders, and the official plans of abutting lower-tier municipalities in Grey County (Meaford and Grey Highlands) and Simcoe (Collingwood and Clearview), also have important implications for transportation development in TBM.

3.2.1 Grey County Cycling and Trails Master Plan (2020)

The Cycling and Trails Master Plan provides tools and resources to support ongoing efforts achieve the County's future vision for cycling and trails. The main objectives of the plan are as follows:

- Design and a continuous and connected network.
- Improve accessibility and inclusivity.
- Provide recreational, commuting, and touring opportunities within the County.
- Provide connections to areas of natural and cultural significance.

- Support the increased use of active modes of travel and recreation.
- Identify tools, policies and programs of cycling, trails all over the year.
- Identify potential partners and programs to support local economic development and tourism initiatives.
- Support the development of clear, consistent, and branded communications to enhance promotion, safety and increased use of cycling, trails and other active forms of travel and recreation.
- Provide the County with tools, strategies, and recommendations to guide future planning, design, implementation and operations of safe and comfortable infrastructure and meaningful programming.

The Plan proposes 63 kms of cycling routes and trails in TBM (29 kms on County roads). It identifies several short- and long-term investments valued at \$23,150 to create 22.6 kilometres of trails and cycling routes in TBM close to Blue Mountain Village and in the Thornbury area.

3.2.2 Recolour Grey: County Official Plan (2019)

Grey County's Official Plan is aligned with the Vision of County's Corporate Strategic Plan "to be the place where people feel genuinely at home and naturally inspired – enjoying an exceptional blend of active healthy living and economic opportunity". The plan presents five main themes: Cultivate Grey, Develop Grey, Natural Grey, Live Grey, and Move Grey. These themes set the foundation and policy direction for the Plan:

- Cultivate Grey takes into account the rural and agricultural areas outside towns, cities, and villages, which make up the bulk of the land in the County and are crucial to Grey County's residents, businesses, and visitors.
- Develop Grey emphasizes settlement areas where the majority of population growth, essential services, and businesses will be located.
- Natural Grey focuses on Grey County's scenic and naturally beautiful environment.
- Live Grey focuses on some of the profound areas that affect living standards and quality of life in Grey County.
- Move Grey calls for an integrated transportation system, incorporating different projects to connect settlement areas including Recreational Resort Areas, while prioritizing active transportation and public transit. Safety is an essential element in the plan and land use is to be managed to avoid compromising future transportation corridors.

3.2.3 Town of Collingwood Official Plan (2019)

Collingwood's Official Plan calls for re-direction of traffic from the Town to recreational and resort destinations, improvement of roads within the Town and connection the Town to the GTA, and establishment of a system of pathways and trails. Policy also encourages compact development to support public transit. The Plan specifically commits to cooperation with neighbouring municipalities such as TBM to foster an integrated transportation system.

3.2.4 Township of Clearview Official Plan (2019)

The leading transportation objective of Township of Clearview Official Plan is to "foster an integrated (hierarchical) transportation system, in cooperation with the Township's neighbouring municipalities." In addition to objectives concerning road standards, parking, and safe vehicle movement, the final transportation objective is to promote "pedestrian and cycling linkages."

3.2.5 County of Simcoe Official Plan (2016)

Simcoe County seeks to maintain and improve a multi-modal transportation network following the County's Transportation Master Plan "considering the needs of pedestrians and cyclists in road design." Policies also promote cooperative transit and "inter-regional connectivity."

3.2.6 Grey County Growth Management Strategy (2008) Update (2015)

The 2008 Growth Management Strategy forecasted population, household, and employment growth in the County to 2031. This report is employed as a guide for the five-year official plan of the Grey County and its municipalities. An update was prepared in 2015. The update projects populations in TBM of 8,320 in 2031 and 8,910 in 2041 up from 6,830 in 2006 and 7,025 counted by the most recent complete census in 2016. It anticipates 3,850 occupied dwelling units, 230 vacant units, and 4,300 seasonal residential units in the Town by 2036. The prediction that 54% of units will be unoccupied is by far the highest among areas forecasted in the County. The Update also notes that TBM had a resident employed labour force of 2,180 in 2011 of which 64% commuted to work outside of the Town. Census numbers from 2016 not referenced in the Growth Management Strategy Update indicate out commuting fell to 56% of TBM's employed labour force.

3.2.7 Grey County Transportation Master Plan (2014)

The Transportation Master Plan (TMP) is a strategic plan that manages policies and infrastructure initiatives in Grey County. The five main objectives of the plan are presented in Section 2.1, above. As noted previously, the Master Plan has not been adopted by County Council. Its objectives nevertheless align with current priorities to be

addressed by this TMP for Blue Mountains, most notably through its emphasis on active transportation and regional transportation solutions. It has been referred to by Stantec for content and is considered a guiding document for the current TMP process.

3.2.8 Municipality of Meaford Official Plan (2014)

The Meaford Official Plan sets out objectives for road network development and encourages the provision of active transportation facilities. The plan seeks to encourage a built environment that supports active transportation and to develop a regional active transportation network "to permit linkages between municipalities." The document, however, makes no reference to transit development.

3.2.9 Municipality of Grey Highlands Official Plan (2010)

The Official Plan for Grey Highlands is focused on issues of road categorization and access, and on development on roadways. The Plan does not refer to public transit or active transportation.

3.3 Municipal

TBM's own plans set directions with which the TMP should be aligned. The 2010 Comprehensive Strategic Transportation has set the current direction for transportation services in the Town. This TMP will review and re-shape the priorities of the ten-year old document. In addition to the documents listed consultants, Dunbar & Associates, are preparing a Leisure Activities Plan to assess community recreation interests and needs. A report is not yet available, but it can be expected to address active transportation from the recreation perspective.

3.3.1 Town of the Blue Mountains Economic Development Strategy, 2021-2025

The Economic Development Strategy addresses the broad objectives of the Town to assist and promote business including initiatives to recover from the COVID pandemic. The SWOT analysis conducted by the consultants identified "limited public transportation infrastructure" as a weakness of the community. The Strategy also notes initiatives of the Community Recovery Task Force to hire four additional By-law enforcement officers to manage parking issues and other concerns, and the implementation of paid parking to manage traffic at high-volume beachfront areas.

3.3.2 The Blue Mountains Future Story: Integrated Community Sustainability Plan (2020)

TBM has engaged consultants to prepare a new Integrated Community Sustainability Plan (ICSP) to replace the ICSP prepared in 2010 (see Subsection 3.3.6, below). The

consultants have completed the first phase of the project, which is reported in a “Current State Report.” The document summarizes a situational assessment conducted in 2020 and acknowledges the ongoing TMP process. It also reinforces transportation themes established in the 2010 ICSP including the promotion of active transportation and public transit.

The project has two additional phases. A Vision and Objectives Report is expected in October 2021. The final ICSP, to be titled The Blue Mountains Future Story is scheduled for completion in December.

3.3.3 Town of the Blue Mountains’ Corporate Strategic Plan (2020-2024)

TBM’s Corporate Strategic Plan contains five goals with sub objectives:

- **Goal #1:** Create Opportunities for Sustainability
- **Goal #2:** Engage Our Communities & Partners
- **Goal #3:** Support Healthy Lifestyles
- **Goal #4:** Promote a Culture of Organizational & Operational Excellence
- **Goal #5:** Ensure Our Infrastructure is Sustainable

The recommendations set forth in this TMP must align with the Strategic Plan’s goals and objectives to support a growing and evolving community. In particular, Goal #1 encourages the use of sustainable modes of transportation, Goal #2 requires that the community has their say throughout the process of this TMP and beyond into implementation, Goal #3 to support healthy lifestyles can be achieved through expanding the active transportation network to increase physical activity and recreation, Goal #4 relies on an efficient use of Town resources and assets, and Goal #5 ensures that infrastructure is available to support development.

3.3.4 Town of the Blue Mountains’ Official Plan (2016)

The TBM Official Plan sets out the Municipality's long-term vision for growth and development. The plan guides Council decisions on development applications, changes in land use, and community enhancements. The goals of the plan are intended to achieve a sustainable balance between the environment, society, culture, and the economy, and to promote development that meets the needs of the present while keeping in mind future generations and their needs. The Town has recently launched a Plan review process with which this TMP will be coordinated.

Related to transportation, the goals are as follows:

- Assure safe and efficient movement of people and goods within the Town's communities and from and to neighbouring municipalities.
- Create an integrated transportation system that takes into consideration different modes, including walking and cycling, public transit and automobiles.
- Encourage active transportation modes (walking and cycling) in addition to public transit as accessible and affordable forms of travel.
- Protect transportation corridors to make it easy for the development of a transportation system that takes into account the existing and future land uses.
- Assure safety while constructing new roadways
- Ensure the appropriate right-of-way widths and all proposed and existing roadways.
- Encourage efficient land use along transportation corridors to enhance the level of use of public transit.
- Set restrictions on private roads development.

With regards to active transportation, the plan proposed several goals that would encourage walking and cycling, which will reduce the use of vehicles. Below presents some of the goals for active transportation:

- Encourage a connected, safe, and well-designed active transportation network for cyclists and pedestrians.
- Promote the vision of safe and convenient cycling and walking routes, especially for new developments.
- Considering the Georgian Trail as a master active transportation corridor through the Town, which provides a connecting link between Collingwood and Meaford.
- Prioritize the maintenance of the Georgian Trail along the former CN rail line.
- Require sidewalks in settlement areas and where appropriate.
- Promote mixed-use and pedestrian-oriented neighbourhood design.
- Consider providing bicycle/ pedestrian paths whenever possible in the reconstruction of roads and bridges.

Finally, with regards to the transportation demand management goals, TBM emphasizes on the need to promote active transportation modes to manage the increase in travel demand.

3.3.5 The Town of the Blue Mountains Comprehensive Transportation Strategic Plan (2010)

The Comprehensive Transportation Strategic Plan addresses the short, medium and long-term transportation needs for all levels of road infrastructure in TBM. The main objectives of the plan are as follows:

- Define the effect of existing and future development on all major roads and on all local roads that intersect with major roads within the study area.
- Conduct a traffic operational review within the Craigeleith area (including the area at the base of Blue Mountains) to define and recommend the collector and arterial road network to support existing and proposed development.
- Develop a Highway Access Management Plan (HAMP) that will help to maintain and/or enhance the safety, mobility and Level of Service along the Highway 26 corridor within the Town's boundaries.
- Specify alternative transportation modes (e.g., transit and cycling), travel demand management tools (e.g., commuter parking and carpooling) and related strategies consistent with Provincial policies and initiatives to mitigate the effect of new development.
- Review road classification and propose recommendations while taking into account their classification.
- Develop time schedule and capital cost estimate for the recommended enhancements.

3.3.6 The Blue Mountains Sustainable Path 2010-2060 (2010)

The Sustainable Path was TBM's first ICSP. It presents a vision to establish TBM as "an international showcase for rural sustainability" by 2060. The plan is built on three foundational pillars – Environment and Ecological Integrity, Community Vibrancy, and Economic Prosperity – that support 18 core themes accompanied by 63 goals, and multiple strategies and actions. The document emphasizes collaboration with lower and upper tier municipalities in Grey and Simcoe counties. It also identifies a range of transportation-related initiatives that the current TMP will carry forward including encouragement of more compact communities, development of "alternative" transportation infrastructure (e.g., energy efficient vehicle as well as AT facilities), encouragement of transit, and diversion of Highway 26.

4.0 Existing Conditions

Stantec reviewed TBM's current land use, demography, and multi-modal transportation network operations to understand how the Town's transportation system operates. Appreciation of existing transportation provisions and constraints is critical before applying future population and employment growth to the network. For the transportation network review, the following section summarizes the road network hierarchy, travel trends, traffic volumes, commercial vehicle network, transit ridership, cycling facilities, and pedestrian facilities.

4.1 Population and Land Use

An effective multi-modal transportation network must be tailored for the local context. Understanding the correlation between tourist trips, the shifting local age profile, and the distribution of land uses is imperative to understanding current traffic movement, as well as the future needs of residents and businesses.

TBM is on the eastern edge of Grey County and is primarily connected to the region via Highway 26, County roads, multi-use trails, and options such as Grey Transit Route and Collingwood Transit. The road network connects the Town to neighbouring communities in Grey and Simcoe Counties such as Grey Highlands, Meaford, Collingwood, and Clearview Township.

4.1.1 Age Profile

Based on the 2016 Census, the town's population of 7,025 accounts for 7.5% of 93,830 Grey County residents. From 2011 to 2016, population in TBM grew by 1.7% annually or close to twice the average annual population growth rate within Ontario (0.91%).

Comparison of total private dwelling units in the town (6,477) to private dwelling units occupied by usual residents (3,271) indicates only 51% of the dwelling units are occupied by permanent residents.

TBM's 2016 population pyramid is inverted. The largest age group of TBM residents is the cohort from 60 to 64 years, amounting to 11% of the total population compared to 6% in this cohort in Ontario (**Figure 4-1**). In general, the town has an older population than the province, with a median age of 58 compared to the Ontario median of 41. The aging population is likely due to the influx of "Baby Boomers" born between 1946 and 1966 who are reaching retirement age and choosing the Town of the Blue Mountains as their permanent residence in retirement.




Figure 4-1: TBM Population Pyramid, 2016
Source: Census Profile (Statistics Canada, 2016)

4.1.2 Dwelling Type

Housing occupancy numbers from the Census illustrate the high level of vacation and seasonal/temporary housing the Town of the Blue Mountains. Over the past 10 years, roughly half of all dwelling units in the town house permanent residents, compared to

over 80% in Grey County (




Figure 4-2). Seasonal fluctuations in population create unique transportation needs, with a flexible transportation network required to accommodate changing population levels efficiently.




Figure 4-2: Permanent Residents in TBM and Grey County, 2006-2016
Source: Census Profile (Statistics Canada, 2016)




Figure 4-3 illustrates occupied private dwellings by type in Ontario, Grey County, and TBM according to the 2016 Census. Among the three geographies, the Town has the highest percentage of single-detached housing with 69% of all dwelling units compared to 65% for Grey County and 43% for Ontario.




Figure 4-3: Occupied Private Dwellings by Type, 2016

Source: Census Profile (Statistics Canada, 2016)

During the pandemic in 2020, local observation suggests some seasonal residents chose to stay in TBM and work remotely. Given the apparent acceptance of telecommuting by a much wider range of employers as a result of recent experience, more seasonal residents as well as new residents may choose live in the Town year-round. Data to establish the extent of the shift will not be available until 2021 Census of Canada data is released in 2022.

4.1.3 Land Use

TBM hosts a wide variety of urban, rural, recreational, and tourism amenities. The town is also situated on the shores of Georgian Bay within the Niagara Escarpment Plan Area, which contains unique ecological and geological features, and historic areas,

including the Bruce Trail, and designated Natural, Protection, Rural and Recreation Areas, as well as Parks and Open Space. The varied natural environment provides an abundance of recreational opportunities within less than two hours of the Greater Toronto Area. The Town is a four-seasons recreational and tourism destination with skiing, hiking, cycling, golf, and other recreational activities. Blue Mountain Village, the primary recreational area, draws large numbers of tourists annually and provides a mix of employment opportunities for local residents.

Based on the Town of The Blue Mountains Official Plan, lands within the town are primarily used for Agricultural, Recreational, Residential, Small Town Ontario Urban, Rural, and Open Space (**Figure 4-4**). The primary residential areas are within the communities of Thornbury and Clarksburg, and in the Blue Mountain Village area, as well as the residential shoreline communities of Craigleith, Camperdown, and Lora Bay. Thornbury and Clarksburg are the main urban employment areas and community living areas, which generally consist of residential development and complementary land uses.




Figure 4-4: Existing Land Use in TBM

The Official Plan includes the Community Structure Plan (CSP) (**Figure 4-5**), which illustrates the major structural elements of the Town including settlement areas, resort areas, and key corridors and connections. The CSP guides land use and infrastructure decisions that effect where people live, work, and play, as well as their travel choices

within the Town. The CSP is also supports the efficient use of infrastructure, minimizes the consumption of land, and supports the mixing of uses and activities in appropriate locations. The main elements of the CSP are as follows:

- **Thornbury/Clarksburg Settlement Area** – the main concentration of urban activities including commercial, residential, cultural, and government functions in a well-designed land use form. The settlement area will continue to function as a place of symbolic and physical interest for residents and visitors. A range of housing types is supported but all new development should respect the character of the community and established neighbourhoods while making efficient use of infrastructure.
- **Blue Mountain Village Resort Area** – the primary resort area that complements the existing recreational base through a range of residential, recreational, and commercial uses, and provides additional opportunities for year-round recreational opportunities and facilities.
- **Craigleith Village** – a smaller settlement area similar to the Thornbury/Clarksburg Settlement Area, serving Craigleith and surrounding area providing commercial, residential, and recreational functions.
- **Residential/Recreational Area** – the area designated in the County Official Plan extending along the Georgian Bay shoreline providing a resort-related residential and recreational function.
- **Future Secondary Plan Areas** – areas that are identified as requiring more detailed planning before undertaking development:
 - › Area in west part of Thornbury
 - › Area east of Thornbury, south of Highway 26
 - › Area south of Blue Mountain Village Area
 - › Area south of Swiss Meadows Subdivision
- **Special Study Areas** – areas where further review and analysis is required prior to development proceeding.
- **Highway 26 Spine and Georgian Trail** – Highway 26 serves as the Town's main transportation corridor for residents and tourists, linking Thornbury/Clarksburg to other communities along the Georgian Bay shoreline. The Spine is the corridor for the location of community facilities and services. The Georgian Trail is a regionally significant trail link along the Highway 26 corridor.
- **Key Corridors/Connections** – links other communities and areas of the Town to the Highway 26 Spine and nearby communities.

- **Community Gateways** – intended to achieve a sense of entrance/arrival to the Town and neighbourhoods through effective site, building and landscaping design.
- **Rural Countryside, Natural and Waterfront Areas** – consists of agricultural areas, specialty crop areas, hamlets, natural features/areas/systems, and waterfront areas for conservation, recreation, and tourism purposes.




Figure 4-5: TBM Community Structure Plan

Source: Town of the Blue Mountains Official Plan, 2016

4.1.4 Employment

According to the Town's employment distribution as summarized in **Table 4-1** and

TBM Employment Occupation Split




Figure 4-6, sales and service occupations (21%) account for the largest share of jobs. Many service businesses are focused on the tourist market and their employment numbers peak in the most active winter and summer months. A considerable percentage of the population is also employed in management occupations (20%); business, finance, and administration (14%); education, law, and social, community and government services (11%); and trades, transport, and equipment operators (11%).

Table 4-1: TBM Employment Occupation Split

Occupation	Employment	Share (%)
Sales and service	720	21%
Management	690	20%
Business; finance and administration	500	14%
Trades, transport and equipment operators and related	395	11%
Education; law and social; community and government services	390	11%
Art; culture; recreation and sport	250	7%
Health	240	7%
Natural resources; agriculture and related production	130	4%
Natural and applied sciences and related	115	3%
Manufacturing and utilities	60	2%
Total	3,490	100%

Source: Census Community Profile (Statistics Canada, 2016)

TBM Employment Occupation Split




Figure 4-6: TBM Employment Occupation Split, 2016
Source: Census Community Profile (Statistics Canada, 2016)

4.2 Current Mode Share

According to 2016 Census data collected from approximately 2,155 respondents in TBM, private vehicles are the dominant mode of transportation, with 91% of the respondents commuting as vehicle drivers or passengers (**Figure 4-7**). By contrast, 77.9% of Ontarians commuted in private vehicles in 2016, with 14.6% using transit. Walking, which is favoured by more than 7% of TBM residents, is however more popular in TBM than in Ontario as a whole, where it accounts for 5.3% of commuting trips. Bicycling on the other hand is the choice of 1.2% of Ontarians but just 0.4% in TBM. The data does not however include seasonal variation in commuting modes.




Figure 4-7: Mode Share in TBM, 2016

Source: Census Community Profile (Statistics Canada, 2016)

4.3 Road Network

A road classification system groups streets into different classes according to the type of service each class is intended to provide. The road hierarchy is a fundamental tool for urban development and road management. Grouping roads with similar functions can improve transportation planning, road infrastructure design, maintenance, traffic, and road operations, while reducing land use conflicts. New roads and re-constructed roads under the Town's jurisdiction shall be developed to comply with the classification,

function, and general design requirements for each road category. Building roads to the standards set for each class ensures travel will be efficient and safe for all modes.

The 2016 Town of the Blue Mountains' Official Plan recognizes the following roadway groupings:

- **Highway 26 and connecting links:** Highway 26 serves mainly inter-regional travel demands and connects urban areas or nodes in different municipalities. It carries high volumes of traffic and accommodates truck traffic, rapid transit services, and high occupancy vehicle lanes. The road is under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Transportation and access is restricted. The Highway 26 right of way width is up to 50 meters and transit-supportive land uses are encouraged along its right-of-way within urban areas. Specific Provincial regulations set out by the Ministry of Transportation Ontario (MTO) apply in the vicinity of the highway
- **County Roads:** Roads owned and maintained by Grey County serve mainly inter-regional and regional travel demands. They accommodate truck traffic, carry high volumes of traffic, and connect urban areas or nodes in different municipalities. County Roads have a right-of-way width up to 30 meters. For County Roads outside of settlement areas, on-street parking is not permitted, and access is restricted with access points consolidated where possible.
- **Major Collector Roads:** Major collectors connect neighbourhoods and provide access to adjacent land uses. They direct traffic to and distribute traffic from County Roads. Major Collector Roads have a right-of-way width up to 26 meters and 30 meters with on-street parking. On-street parking is generally permitted on these roads; however, access is restricted with access points consolidated where possible.
- **Minor Collector Roads:** Minor Collectors are similar to Major Collector Roads with two travel lanes and right-of-way width up to 26 meters. Access to Minor Collector Roads is partially controlled.
- **Local Roads:** Local Roads connect individual properties to collector and arterial roads. They are expected to carry low volumes of traffic. Right-of-way width is up to 20 meters and 23 meters for rural cross-sections. On-street parking in rural areas is generally restricted, while parking in urban areas may be allowed on both sides depending on pavement widths. Access control is not required.
- **Local Heritage Roads:** Historic routes/roads and cottage roads classed as Heritage Roads usually serve low volumes of local traffic. The designation recognizes roads where the historic method of construction, terrain, and local environment may be considered to be below modern geometric standards. Local Heritage Roads have a right-of-way width up to 20 meters with up to two travel lanes. They provide limited opportunity for road improvements and area specific construction standards shall be used for their construction.

- **Seasonal Roads:** The Town manages Seasonal Roads and provide access to adjacent lands. These roads will not be maintained during the winter season and have a right-of-way width up to 20 meters with up to two travel lanes. Like Heritage Roads, they provide limited opportunity for road improvements and area specific construction standards shall be used for their construction.
- **Private Roads:** Private Roads are historic laneways and shared driveways that may or may not be owned or assumed by the Town and include condominium roads established under the Condominium Act. Area specific construction standards are to be used for their construction. All condominium roads shall be designed and built wide enough to accommodate emergency vehicles with vehicle parking provided on one side of the road.

Table 4-2 provides a summary of the lengths of each road category within the boundaries of TBM. **Figure 4-8** illustrates the Town's current road classification and **Figure 4-9** shows existing right-of-way (ROW) widths, which indicates that the majority of Town roads currently have 20 metre rights-of-way.

Table 4-2: TBM Road Classification Lengths

Road Network Class	Length (km)
Provincial Highways (Highway 26)	19.5
County Roads	82.1
Minor Collector	7.1
Major Collector	6.2
Local and Unclassified	283
All Roads	397.8




Figure 4-8: Existing Road Classification in TBM




Figure 4-9: Existing Right-of-Way Widths in TBM

Public and private parking in the Town of the Blue Mountains is provided at on-street and off-street. On-street parking is provided through the town's road network. Parking on-street is not permitted overnight between 2:00 AM and 7:00 AM from November 1st until April 1. The Zoning-Bylaw regulates the on-street parking including limitations on no-parking areas and time limited parking. The private off-street parking lots play an important role in providing parking for the attractions in the area. The Town also provides public parking at municipally owned recreational, institutional, and other facilities. Stantec will further review and discuss the Town's parking supply in later stages of this study as part of developing a car parking strategy.

Highway 26 along the south shore of Georgian Bay is an important regional mobility corridor, providing a principal route for moving people and goods between communities in the Georgian Triangle and other parts of Ontario, including the Greater Toronto Area. Highway 26 also supports access to a variety of adjacent land uses and plays a critical role in local circulation for area residents, businesses, and tourists. Within the region, it handles substantial pass-through traffic along the shoreline corridor. In 2015, the Ministry of Transportation Ontario (MTO) conducted a transportation needs assessment to analyze existing and future transportation conditions, problems and opportunities; identify and evaluate a range of multi-modal solutions to address the problems and opportunities; and recommend a preferred alternative(s). The MTO Needs Assessment Report presented three options illustrated in **Figure 4-10**. The preferred alternative and its construction horizon have not been finalized.




Figure 4-10: Preferred Alternatives for Highway 26, 2015


Source: Needs Assessment Report by MTO (2015)

4.4 Transit Network

The built-up areas of TBM are partially served by Collingwood Public Transit (CollTrans) and Grey Transit Route (GTR). Collingwood Transit provides public transit services to the Craighleith area, including Blue Mountain Resort, on the Collingwood/Blue Mountain Link (**Figure 4-11**). The headway for this bus link is hourly, with a stop at Blue Mountain Village. In addition, GTR recently introduced public transit services from TBM to Owen Sound in September of 2020 that connects riders to other routes throughout Grey

County as illustrated in **Figure 4-11**. Trips run from Wednesday to Sunday during the AM and PM peak periods.

The transit service in TBM provides crucial connections to essential and frequently visited destinations in the Town such as the Blue Mountains Village, resorts, shopping, dining, and other leading destinations. TBM faces unique challenges to developing an improved transit system. Many residences in the densest areas of town are used as temporary lodging for tourists who most often arrive with their own vehicle. Furthermore, tourism creates peaks in travel demand such as in the summer and winter weekends, where conditions differ significantly from typical off-peak patterns in other communities. This can impact bus reliability and cause delays that inconvenience transit riders.



REGIONAL TRANSIT NETWORK

TOWN OF THE BLUE MOUNTAINS TMP

Grey Transit Route (GTR)

- Route 1
- Route 2
- Route 3
- Route 4
- Route 5
- Route 6

○ GTR Stop

Collingwood Public Transit (CollTrans)

- Collingwood/Blue Mountain Link
- Transit Route




Figure 4-11: Existing Route 3 & 4 of Grey County Transit Line




Figure 4-12: Existing Walking Distances to Transit Stops

Another factor impacting the success of transit is the pedestrian environment surrounding bus stops, as a comfortable and walkable neighbourhoods are important for attracting and maintaining riders. Five- and ten-minute walking distances are generally represented by 400 and 800 metre network distances, respectively. Highway interchanges, large block sizes, grade separations, circuitous streets, and a lack of sidewalks all reduce the distance that can be covered in 5 or 10 minutes from transit. Designing pedestrian-friendly walkable streets around mixed-use developments will improve the experience for pedestrians accessing transit and reduce the distances from transit to the final destination. The current 5-minute (400m) and 10-minute (800m) walking distances to transit stops, also called walksheds, are shown in **Figure 4-12**, above.

4.4.1 Ridership

Stantec reviewed historical ridership along the Collingwood Transit Blue Mountain Link dating back to 2014, as illustrated in **Table 4-3** and **Figure 4-14**. The data reveals a growing interest in transit in the town from 2014 to 2019. It also shows peak ridership during summer and winter months, which is consistent with traffic peaks during these periods when recreational activities in the community are at their highest levels (**Figure 4-14**). Ridership has been increasing since 2014, with a sharp increase in 2019 followed by a decline in 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Ridership will be monitored throughout 2021 to understand how well transit riders are returning to the system as stay-at-home restrictions lessen and businesses reopen.

Table 4-3: Annual Ridership on Collingwood Transit Blue Mountain Link, 2014-2020

Year	Annual Ridership
2014	24,683
2015	26,635
2016	28,455
2017	27,785
2018	34,507
2019	51,995
2020	30,348




Figure 4-13: Collingwood Transit Blue Mountain Link Annual Ridership Change, 2014-2020




Figure 4-14: Collingwood Transit Blue Mountain Link Monthly Ridership, 2014-2020

Stantec reviewed ridership between October 2020 and January 2021 on GTR Route 4 serving TBM (**Figure 4-15**). While the ridership numbers appear low, service on GTR Route 4 was introduced on September 23, 2020, in the midst of COVID-19 pandemic restrictions and has not operated during typical conditions as businesses and recreational destinations have been partially or fully closed during the time period. In addition to people working from home and generally reducing the number of trips they make due to the pandemic, potential riders may have felt unsafe traveling on public transit due to the potential spread of COVID-19 and difficulty social distancing onboard public transit vehicles. The route has, therefore, had lower-than-expected ridership that is anticipated to increase once people feel more comfortable sharing vehicles and the region reopens to pre-pandemic levels.

October had the highest level of ridership, with declining use into the winter. It should be noted that this new service was free for riders during the month of October to encourage transit use and allow riders to test out the service. The decline in ridership following this initial free period may be due to the increase in cost as well as harsher weather conditions and pandemic restrictions. Given the small sample and the influence of the pandemic on the period examined, our assessment will also take into consideration stakeholder feedback and demographic information.




Figure 4-15: Existing Grey County Transit Route 4 Ridership, 2020/2021

Looking one level deeper, the average ridership at each stop on Route 4 was analyzed between October 2020 and January 2021 (**Figure 4-16**). The analysis reveals that both end destinations for the route – Blue Mountain Village and Downtown Meaford – see the highest activity. As mentioned above, this analysis is based on a relatively small sample size during pandemic conditions and may not reflect the patterns of pre- or post-pandemic travel.

**Grey Transit Route 4- Stop-Level Ridership
(Oct 2020-Jan 2021 Average)**




Figure 4-16: Grey Transit Route 4 Stop-Level Ridership

4.4.2 Transit Peer Review

Nine peer transit agencies were selected for comparison to Collingwood Transit, which serves TBM (**Table 4-4**). The peer group consists of transit agencies in Ontario cities or towns serving 7,000 to 20,000 people to allow for a reasonable operational comparison. Tourist destinations such as Niagara-on-the-Lake and Wasaga Beach, with similar patterns of visitation and economic activity to TBM, were also included. Collingwood Transit has a more extensive service area with a larger population than just TBM, which we have considered in the peer review.

Table 4-4: Transit Peer Agencies

Agency/Municipality	Service Area Population	Service Area (km2)
Collingwood	19,000	27.1
Port Colborne	18,425	40.5
Midland	12,500	23.0
Port Hope	12,350	13.1
Wasaga Beach	11,560	18.4

Agency/Municipality	Service Area Population	Service Area (km2)
Niagara-on-the-Lake	12,041	22.2
Huntsville	11,000	12.0
Cobourg	10,741	13.0
/Elliot Lake	10,498	16.0
Kenora	7,000	16.0
Peer Average	11,791	19.4

Source: Ontario Public Transit Association Transit Fact Books, 2019

The peer group was analyzed based on available operational and financial data to determine how Collingwood Transit performs in comparison to similar agencies. All transit agency data was sourced from the 2019 Ontario Public Transit Association (OPTA) Fact Book, which is the most recent dataset dealing with all the peer communities. Data for GTR was not available as part of this dataset.

Table 4-5 compares operational data from the OPTA Fact Book for Collingwood Transit (including transit to TBM) with its selected peers. Collingwood Transit performs similarly to its peers in many areas. Its ridership is significantly higher but that reflects service throughout Collingwood rather than just TBM.

Considering the service hours per capita, Collingwood Transit offers higher levels of service than its peers, which supports a transit culture. Passengers per service hour are just below the peer average but indicate that ridership uptake in Collingwood and TBM is comparable to its peers. At the same time, ridership levels also suggest there may be opportunities to evolve the current transit system to improve linkages between trip generators (schools, tourist sites, offices, medical facilities, etc.) and better serve the communities.

Considering the service hours per capita, Collingwood Transit offers higher levels of service than its peers, supporting a transit culture. Passengers per service hour are just below the peer average but indicate that ridership uptake in Collingwood and TBM is comparable to its peers. At the same time, ridership levels also suggest there may be opportunities to evolve the current transit system to improve linkages between trip generators (schools, tourist sites, offices, medical facilities, etc.) and better serve the communities.

Table 4-5: Peer Agency Operational Data

Agency	Service Area Population	Service Area (km ²)	Number of Routes	Fleet Size	Ridership	Passengers per Capita	Service Hours per Capita	Passengers per Service Hour
Collingwood Transit	19,000	27.1	5	6	236,661	12.5	1.5	8.2
Port Colborne	18,425	40.5	2	1	29,734	1.6	0.4	4.5
Midland	12,500	23.0	2	1	27,405	2.2	0.4	6.0
Port Hope	12,350	13.1	2	4	66,612	5.4	0.3	17.3
Wasaga Beach	11,560	18.4	2	4	56,541	4.9	0.6	7.6
Niagara-on-the-Lake	12,041	22.2	2	5	91,166	7.6	0.9	8.5
Huntsville	11,000	12.0	2	7	25,398	2.3	0.5	4.4
Cobourg	10,741	13.0	2	5	98,795	9.2	0.8	11.4
Elliot Lake	10,498	16.0	4	3	104,020	9.9	0.6	16.8
Kenora	7,000	16.0	3	4	34,575	4.9	0.5	9.8
Peer Average	11,791	19.4	2	4	59,361	5.3	0.6	9.6

Source: Ontario Public Transit Association Transit Fact Books, 2019

**In the absence of 2019 data for Port Colborne, 2018 data was used*

Annual ridership is shown below for Collingwood Transit and its peers. Ridership has remained relatively consistent over the past five years, but **Figure 4-17** suggests there has been a slight increase over time. Collingwood Transit has had one of the greatest increases in overall ridership, growing from 214,995 passengers in 2015 to 236,661 in 2019 (10% change). Kenora and Huntsville have seen the greatest decrease in annual ridership. Others have generally experienced moderate increases.




Figure 4-17: Annual Ridership by Peer Agency, 2015-2019

Source: Ontario Public Transit Association Transit Fact Books, 2015- 2019

Passengers per service hour (also called passengers per revenue hour) is an industry standard used to assess the productivity of a transit system. It indicates the number of customers attracted to the transit system per hour of service, which reveals the effectiveness of the route to carry passengers. Historical service productivity (passengers per service hour) for Collingwood Transit was compared to the peers in **Figure 4-18** based on available OPTA data from 2015 to 2019. The chart indicates a downward trend in productivity for Collingwood Transit compared to a peer average that is increasing slightly over time. While Collingwood Transit has experienced an increase in ridership from 2015 to 2019, ridership has not increased at the same rate as the service hours provided, resulting in a decrease in ridership per hour of service.




Figure 4-18: Passengers per Service Hour by Peer Agency

Source: Ontario Public Transit Association Transit Fact Books, 2015-2019

Ridership per capita is a relative measure of system usage that allows us to compare agencies operating in areas with different population size. Service hours per capita is a good measure of transit availability or investment in transit by the agency or municipality. **Figure 4-19** compares 2019 passengers and service hours per capita for the selected peer agencies.

Clearly, investment in increased transit service is correlated to higher ridership per capita. Agencies with above-average service levels, such as Collingwood, Niagara-on-the-Lake, Cobourg, and Elliot Lake all have above-average ridership per capita. Passengers per capita on Collingwood Transit remains higher than the peer average and all other peers. **Figure 4-18** and **Figure 4-19**, together, suggest that Collingwood Transit is offering good levels of service, though there is room to modify routing and schedules using existing resources to improve the overall effectiveness of the service.




Figure 4-19: Peer Comparison of Service Hours and Passengers (per Capita)
 Source: Ontario Public Transit Association Transit Fact Books, 2019

4.5 Active Transportation Network

Unlike networks for transit, goods, and personal vehicle movement, active transportation networks typically balance user movement with recreational values. Like the other networks, active transportation facilities carry their users (i.e., walkers, cyclists, and other self-propelled travellers) safely and efficiently between desired origins and destinations. At the same time, they are expected to provide opportunities for fitness, relaxation, and enjoyment of the natural environment. As recreational amenities, they may join important origins and destinations in the process, but trips frequently follow inefficient routes in pursuit of recreational and entertainment experiences.

One of the defining characteristics of TBM and a leading economic driver is the balance of natural beauty with small communities and recreational opportunities. The Town's active transportation infrastructure serves the community at both levels. It provides a recreational facility as well as a practical means of connecting destinations for individuals relying on self-propelled transportation modes.

4.5.1 Mode and Facility Analysis

For the purposes of this TMP, active transportation encompasses the modes of travel listed in **Table 4-6**; however, the local and regional trail network is often shared by additional users as shown in **Table 4-7**. Each mode brings different considerations to design and accommodation of users categorized by the column headings in the table:

- the general purpose of a trip using that mode of travel as either recreation or transportation
- identification of existing facility types that mode will use based on the legal requirements and user behaviors
- considerations for users traveling by that mode, which are important when considering the environment in planning for them
- applicable principles of network design.

Some modes are less compatible with each other. Horses for example, often do not mix well with other modes on narrow trails and are generally excluded from shared trail systems as a result. Similarly, snowmobiles and pedestrians are rarely compatible as they have very different design considerations given differing expectations of trip distance and protection from weather.




Figure 4-20: Active Transportation Network




Table 4-6: Active Transportation User Breakdown

<i>Mode</i>	Type of travel in general	Existing facility types	Considerations for users	Additional Comments
<i>Walking</i>	Transportation / Recreation	Sidewalks, crosswalks and multi-use trails	Trip lengths tend to be short / within a local area, and are often linked with other modes (e.g., Transit, rideshare)	Trip lengths are short
<i>Hiking / Trail running</i>	Recreation	Trails	Users visit trails for the purpose of recreation (e.g., going for a walk, hike or run)	Trips will often originate with another mode to arrive at the trail
<i>Cycling / E-bikes</i>	Potential for both	Roads (with or without protection from other traffic) Engineered trails	Accommodates longer trip lengths, serving as transportation mode and fully recreational trips	Existing facilities on road are currently provided without any protection for users

Table 4-7: Other Network User Breakdown

<i>Mode</i>	Type of travel in general	Existing facility types	Considerations for users	Principles for network design
<i>Snowmobiles</i>	Generally, Recreation	On roads or designated trails only	Requires appropriate weather conditions.	Employs a mixture of designated trails and roads.
<i>ATVs</i>	Recreation	Off-road trails only (not permitted on TBM roadways)	ATVs must be transported to off-road trails and cannot be driven on roadways	Safety is a key element of trail design as ATVs may share off-road trails with other AT users

<i>Mode</i>	Type of travel in general	Existing facility types	Considerations for users	Principles for network design
<i>Horses</i>	Recreation	On designated trails only. Horses can use road shoulders.	Not frequently used for trip destination without destination planning, often used in context of group rides	Not generally compatible with other uses, especially motorized uses.
<i>Micromobility / Scooters</i>	Generally, transportation	Undefined – mixture of sidewalks, paved trails and roads	Shorter trip lengths in general, can be personally owned or rented	Emerging technology which has not yet deployed in TBM.

Facility design and accommodation are particularly important when planning active transportation networks, especially when accommodating the range of modes considered in this study. This is further complicated by the various design guidelines applied for active transportation facilities. When planning for active transportation in TBM, the following principles are paramount:

- **Safety:** It is critical that users are both meant to be safe and feel safe using active transportation facilities. Users need sufficient protection from passing traffic to use each mode. In areas of higher congestion, this may mean physical protection (e.g., dividing curbs) or separation (e.g., trails). In lower congestion areas, additional space may be sufficient (e.g., paved shoulder). This may inform design operating speed for other vehicles as well.
- **Directness:** Distance and time are exponentially more significant for self-propelled travel modes than for vehicle travel. For example, if a pedestrian must add two minutes to an 8-minute trip to access a crosswalk, their trip time increases by 25%. This may reduce affect the willingness of pedestrians and cyclists to cover the distance, causing them to cross wherever they are or may discourage their use of active transportation altogether.
- **Accessibility:** 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.

- **Comfort:** Active modes are not only more affected by variations in distance and time, they are also more sensitive to variations in routing. Topography is particularly important as it can influence the effort required from users and may limit access to individuals with mobility limitations. It is also often important, where facilities serve recreational and tourist functions in addition to transportation roles, to consider views and environmental factors that may enhance user experiences.

Active transportation facilities in TBM generally require improvement or modification to satisfy these principles. Sidewalks are concentrated in the Thornbury area and Blue Mountain Village, and many are too narrow to support universal accessibility. Cycling routes, where present, are provided without any protection or delineation on regional and local roads where they share roadways with high-speed vehicles and seasonal agricultural operations. Trails are generally not engineered, increasing some accessibility barriers. The highest quality trail in TBM is the heavily used the Georgian Trail, connecting TBM, the [Municipality of Meaford](#), and the [Town of Collingwood](#). The trail is crushed limestone and is best suited to recreational cyclists and pedestrians.

Addressing the infrastructure deficit will promote increased user safety, support sustainability objectives, and facilitate user choice. Given the wide range of needed improvements for active transportation, a program of upgrades should be developed and prioritized to maximize the benefits of capital investment.

4.6 Travel Characteristics

4.6.1 Seasonal Variation

Travel demand data was evaluated by leveraging anonymized mobile app data available from third-party provider StreetLight Data. StreetLight applies proprietary algorithms to estimate trips by expanding anonymized cell tower and mobile app data based on permanent traffic counters.

According to StreetLight, “for location-based services (all modes) a trip starts when a device begins moving from a location where it was once still. Similarly, a trip ends when a device does not move at least 5 meters in 5 minutes. Additionally, a trip will end if there is a significant gap in pings seen from the device, or if the device is seen pinging within a fixed location for an extended amount of time with minimal movement. A trip is also required to be at least 3 minutes and 500 meters in length.” The aggregated data can be used to study traffic vehicle volumes, travel patterns, and origins/destinations over time. Due to the impact of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic on 2020 traffic patterns, results from the 2019 have been used in this study to better understand the regular travel patterns.

Recognizing the variations in traffic patterns in TBM through its changing tourist seasons, Stantec reviewed 2019 trip information to assess the average daily traffic

volumes across the year. Each trip included in the assessment had either its origin or destination within the Blue Mountains study area. Weekday and weekend daily trips show how tourism and employment influence mobility between weekdays and weekends. The average weekday is an average of results for Tuesday to Thursday. It does not include Mondays or Fridays as both days are typically affected by weekend trips.

Figure 4-22 presents seasonal trip frequency by day of the week in 2019. It shows that the highest traffic occurred on winter Saturdays, followed by summer Saturdays. Average 2019 winter Saturday daily traffic (90,598 vehicle trips) was 33% higher than summer Saturday daily traffic (68,074 vehicle trips) and 141% higher than average fall weekday daily traffic (37,601 vehicle trips). The numbers reinforce TBM's position as one of the leading winter destinations in Ontario. Summer had the highest average daily weekday traffic, which was 33% higher than fall weekday traffic. **Figure 4-23**, **Figure 4-24**, and **Figure 4-25** present the average hourly trip distribution for average winter Saturday, fall weekday and summer Saturday in 2019, respectively.

The average winter Saturday hourly trip distribution indicates the peak traffic period occurred between 1:00 PM and 3:00 PM with the majority of the trips traveling within TBM's boundaries. The peak traffic period in the summer Saturday period occurred during afternoon hours with the highest number of trips at 2:00 PM. Unlike winter Saturday, the majority of trips during most summer Saturday hours were contributed to trips with origins or destinations outside TBM's limits.

Figure 4-24 shows the peak period of traffic on an average fall weekday fell between 2:00 PM and 4:00 PM, with a second peak during the morning at 8:00 AM. The results also show that majority of fall weekday trips have one origin or destination outside the limits of TBM. A comparison between winter Saturday highest peak hour volume (8,425 vehicles/hr) to fall weekday highest peak hour volume (3,318 vehicles/hr) shows a 154% growth during the winter Saturday peak hour. This seasonal variance is a unique challenge for TBM as winter Saturdays see a major increase in demand on local, regional, and provincial roadways. This is further affected by the different trip purposes that each season/period represents; with fall weekday trips typically focused on employment, and winter and summer weekend trips typically focused around recreational and commercial uses.

Tourism in TBM contributes to the observed increase in trips and how often trips are made during the weekends. The variance between weekday and weekend trip numbers is primarily evident in the incremental short-distance trips within Blue Mountain Village on weekends. Visitors often make several short-distance trips between various points of interest in the town. This is further discussed in the following section.




Figure 4-22: Seasonal Trip Frequency by Day of the Week (2019)




Figure 4-23: Average Hourly Trip Distribution (Winter Saturday, 2019)




Figure 4-24: Average Hourly Trip Distribution (Summer Saturday, 2019)




Figure 4-25: Average Hourly Trip Distribution (Fall Weekday, 2019)

4.6.2 Trip Distribution

Stantec used StreetLight Traffic data to analyze travel trends to and from TBM during 2019 average winter Saturday, the highest peak of travel period, as well as during 2019 2019 summer Saturday and fall average weekdays. The analysis showed the majority of trips were internal trips with both their origin (trip start point) and destination (trip end point) within the community. Collingwood was the main origin or destination for external trips. **Figure 4-26** illustrates TBM's trip distribution patterns for winter Saturday, summer Saturday and fall weekday in 2019. **Table 4-8** summarizes trip distribution during winter

Saturday 2019 and **Table 4-9** and **Table 4-10** provide similar information for 2019 summer Saturday and fall weekday.

During winter Saturday, 57% of the daily trips were internal to TBM with the remaining 43% of trips going and coming from areas beyond TBM's boundary (**Table 4-8**). Collingwood was the main origin or destination of the external trips with around 24% of trips start or end within the town. The other major trip origins or destinations were Meaford (3%), Clearview (3%), Toronto (2%), Wasaga Beach (2%), Grey Highlands (1%), and Barrie (1%).

During summer Saturday, 43% of the daily trips were internal to TBM with the remaining 57% of trips going and coming from areas beyond TBM's boundary (**Table 4-8**). Similar to winter Saturday, Collingwood was the main origin and destination of the external trips with around 29% of trips starting or ending within the town. The other major trip origins or destinations were Meaford (6%), Wasaga Beach (3%), Clearview (3%), Grey Highlands (2%), Toronto (2%), Brampton (1%) and Barrie (1%).

During fall average weekdays, the share of daily trips classified as internal was reduced to about 42% with the remaining 58% going and coming from areas beyond TBM's boundary (**Table 4-10**). Collingwood is again the main origin or destination of the external trips with 33% of trips starting or ending there. The other major trip origins or destinations were Meaford (8%), Clearview (3%), Wasaga Beach (2%), Barrie (2%), Grey Highlands (2%), Toronto (1%), and Owen Sound (1%).

Table 4-8: Daily Trip Distribution - Winter Saturday 2019

To/From	2019			
	from	to	Total	%
TBM (Internal)	51,583		51,583	57%
Collingwood	11,237	10,215	21,452	24%
Meaford	1,625	1,456	3,081	3%
Clearview	1,129	1,269	2,398	3%
Toronto	744	1,103	1,847	2%
Wasaga Beach	899	822	1,721	2%
Grey Highlands	561	510	1,071	1%
Barrie	445	609	1,054	1%
Other Areas	2,871	3,520	6,391	7%
Total			90,598	100%

Source: Streetlight Data's Insight Platform

Table 4-9: Daily Trip Distribution – Summer Saturday 2019

To/From	2019			
	from	to	Total	%
TBM (Internal)	29,525		29,525	43%
Collingwood	9,705	9,797	19,502	29%
Meaford	2,055	2,068	4,123	6%
Wasaga Beach	1,096	1,183	2,279	3%
Clearview	794	994	1,788	3%
Grey Highlands	751	615	1,366	2%
Toronto	460	647	1,107	2%
Brampton	487	534	1,021	1%
Barrie	381	522	903	1%
Other Areas	2,783	3,677	6460	9%
Total			68,074	100%

Source: Streetlight Data's Insight Platform




Figure 4-26: Origins and Destinations of Trips to and from the Blue Mountains in 2019

Table 4-10: Daily Trip Distribution – Fall Average Weekday 2019

To/From	2019			
	from	to	Total	%
TBM (Internal)	15,810		15,810	42%
Collingwood	6,170	6,105	12,275	33%
Meaford	1,450	1,573	3,023	8%
Clearview	506	529	1,035	3%
Wasaga Beach	468	457	926	2%
Barrie	320	344	664	2%
Grey Highlands	350	308	658	2%
Toronto	222	328	550	1%
Owen Sound	174	177	350	1%
Other Areas	1,086	1,224	2,310	6%
Total	37,601			100%

Source: Streetlight Data's Insight Platform

Table 4-11 summarizes an evaluation of daily trip distribution within TBM internal zones for 2019 winter average Saturdays. **Figure 4-27** and **Figure 4-28** show the trip production and attraction in each of the internal zones.

A review of the internal daily trip distribution during winter Saturday highlights the main travel trends within TBM as follows:

- Blue Mountain Village is the main origin and/or destination of trips during the winter Saturday peak with the highest number of trips traveling internally within its area (16% of all trips) followed by trips to external locations (11% of all trips) and then from external areas (11% of all trips).
- Craigleith Zone 1 is the second leading trip generator within TBM. Craigleith Zone 1 internal trips account for 5% of all trips and followed by trips from TBM external areas (5% of all trips) and then to TBM external areas (5%). The trips between Craigleith Zone 1 and Blue Mountain Village are also significant representing 4% of all trips.

- Thornbury & Clarksburg and Craigleith Zone 2 are the third and fourth highest trip generators for 2019 winter Saturday.

A review was also conducted of the internal daily trip distribution during Summer Saturday and result are presented in **Table 4-12**. The findings were as follows:

- Blue Mountain Village is the main origin and/or destination of trips during the summer Saturday peak with the highest number of trips traveling internally within its area (10% of all trips) followed by trips from external locations (14% of all trips) and then to external areas (13% of all trips).
- Thornbury is the second leading trip generator within TBM. Thornbury internal trips account for 7% of all trips, followed by trips from areas external to TBM (5% of all trips) and from TBM (5%).
- Craigleith Zone 1 is the third highest trip generator for 2019 summer Saturday.

Table 4-11: Internal Daily Trip Distribution - Winter Saturday 2019

Origin Zone	Name	Destination Zone													Total
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
1	Camperdown	1,082		382	6		7		210	157		11	317	543	2,715
2	Castle Glen		5	11				33		4				139	192
3	Craigleith 1	328	15	4,758	1,140	50	36	49	25	3,986	20		432	4,177	15,016
4	Craigleith 2	8	4	1,898	600		16	18	49	4,587			14	687	7,881
5	TBM West Area 1	9				28	30	9		8	11		126	160	381
6	Lora Bay	17		97	8	6	263	18		39			457	240	1,145
7	PRVP Park	34	25	9			31	1,371	16	76		38	22	860	2,482
8	TBM Center Zone	433	14	50	27			19	82	20	16		82	111	854
9	TBM Village	142	7	3,582	3,159	3	67	48	8	14,858	41		252	10,143	32,310
10	TBM West Area 2	7		12					13	44	130	44	149	233	632
11	TBM West Area 3	16						31	25	34	12	236	33	125	512
12	Thornbury & Clarksburg	213		242	34	138	605		98	204	201	15	3,131	2,093	6,974
13	External	657	121	4,221	674	87	234	1,065	259	9,628	264	106	2,188		19,504
Total		2,946	191	15,262	5,648	312	1,289	2,661	785	33,645	695	450	7,203	19,511	90,598

Table 4-12: Internal Daily Trip Distribution – Summer Saturday 2019

Origin Zone	Name	Destination Zone													Total
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
1	Camperdown	366		159		9	61		28	216	12		235	578	1,664
2	Castle Glen		8					22		7				138	175
3	Craigleith 1	194		1,262	112	18	4	9		2,342	44	38	280	2,460	6,763
4	Craigleith 2			143	448		3			1,361		24	57	849	2,885
5	TBM West Area 1			30		14	17		5		26	9	180	147	428
6	Lora Bay	38		42		17	929		4	57	18	9	533	576	2,223
7	PRVP Park		11	12				445		7	11	21	24	366	897
8	TBM Center Zone	5		18	10		5		124	19	14	68	8	164	435
9	TBM Village	296		2,355	1,238	5	42	23	46	6,573	50	19	285	9,185	20,117
10	TBM West Area 2	46		66	8	49	2		24	42	237	76	142	382	1,074
11	TBM West Area 3				18		28	6	21	40	39	368	117	515	1,152
12	Thornbury & Clarksburg	270		355	36	226	550	11	100	155	283	67	5,019	3,152	10,224
13	External	604	107	2,975	1,055	169	626	437	299	9,549	564	392	3,260		20,037
Total		1,819	126	7,417	2,925	507	2,267	953	651	20,368	1,298	1,091	10,140	18,512	68,074

Table 4-13: Internal Daily Trip Distribution – Fall Weekday 2019

Origin Zone	Name	Destination Zone													Total
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
1	Camperdown	209	-	148	2	32	-	9	17	36	-	-	219	566	1,237
2	Castle Glen	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	5	-	-	3	42	54
3	Craigleith 1	148	-	596	40	4	44	4	9	656	9	-	126	1,347	2,984
4	Craigleith 2	-	-	50	63	-	-	8	11	307	-	13	17	228	696
5	TBM West Area 1	10	-	22	-	72	19	4	13	24	25	-	223	167	580
6	Lora Bay	17	-	19	-	21	291	-	-	34	24	26	398	350	1,180
7	PRVP Park	4	11	8	-	-	-	173	6	8	5	-	9	318	543
8	TBM Center Zone	38	-	10	-	3	-	19	26	10	5	-	47	99	257
9	TBM Village	16	7	694	360	5	47	4	4	3,460	38	11	197	4,404	9,246
10	TBM West Area 2	27	-	20	-	34	19	-	30	4	134	35	185	256	745
11	TBM West Area 3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	16	14	52	41	143	275
12	Thornbury & Clarksburg	132	3	165	15	259	535	6	73	187	254	44	4,261	2,826	8,759
13	External	586	40	1,389	241	318	340	259	156	4,383	281	153	2,899		11,045
Total		1,187	61	3,122	721	753	1,295	485	355	9,130	790	332	8,625	10,746	37,601




Figure 4-27: The Blue Mountains Internal Zones Trip Production in 2019 Winter Saturdays




Figure 4-28: The Blue Mountains Internal Zones Trip Attraction in 2019 Winter Saturdays




Figure 4-29: The Blue Mountains Internal Zones Trip Production in 2019 Summer Saturdays




Figure 4-30: The Blue Mountains Internal Zones Trip Attraction in 2019 Summer Saturdays




Figure 4-31: The Blue Mountains Internal Zones Trip Production in 2019 Fall Weekdays




Figure 4-32: The Blue Mountains Internal Zones Trip Attraction in 2019 Fall Weekdays

Stantec reviewed pass-through traffic volumes at the following five selected gates at the borders of TBM:

- Highway 26 East: bi-directional gate east of Regional Road 21
- Highway 26 West: bi-directional gate west of 10th Line
- Mountain Road: bi-directional gate east of Regional Road 21

- Six Street: bi-directional gate east of Regional Road 21
- Gray Road 10: bi-directional gate east of 10th Line.

Table 4-14 summarizes the estimated TBM local and pass-through average daily traffic at the study gates for 2019 winter Saturday and fall weekdays. Key findings are:

- Highway 26 East gate has the highest daily total traffic and pass-through traffic in both study periods.
- Mountain Road has the lowest share of pass-through trips among the gates.
- While daily traffic volumes are lowest at Grey Road 10 gate, the highest share of pass-through trips were observed at this gate.

Table 4-14 The Blue Mountains Gates Local and Pass-Through Daily Traffic - 2019

Selected Gate	Winter Saturday			Summer Saturday			Fall Weekday		
	Local	Pass-Through	Total	Local	Pass-Through	Total	Local	Pass-Through	Total
Highway 26 (East)	19,218	6,024	25,242	17,417	9,180	26,597	12,824	6,200	19,024
Highway 26 (West)	3,731	3,575	7,306	4,886	4,563	9,449	3,991	3,570	7,561
Mountain Road	11,162	899	12,061	13,093	957	14,050	6,192	922	7,113
Sixth Street	11,891	1,780	13,671	13,717	2,934	16,651	6,376	2,258	8,634
Grey Road 10	880	854	1,734	1,224	1,093	2,317	945	838	1,783




Figure 4-33: The Blue Mountains Gates Local and Pass-Through Average Daily Traffic, 2019

4.6.3 Historical Growth

To review traffic growth in TBM, Stantec extracted trip generation data for 2017, 2019, and 2020 from StreetLight data for the internal zones. Trip generation includes both trips to and trips from each zone and covers internal and external trips. As noted, the outbreak of COVID-19 virus influenced travel behavior in 2020.

Table 4-15, **Table 4-16**, and **Table 4-17** present daily trip generation changes from 2017 to 2019 and then from 2019 to 2020 for winter Saturday, summer Saturday, and fall average weekend. **Table 4-15** shows that while total daily trips on winter Saturdays increased at an annual rate of 9%, they decreased by 22% due to the COVID-19 impacts from 2019 to 2020. On summer Saturdays, total daily trips were increased at an annual rate of 8% from 2017 to 2019. A 3% increase was also reported between 2019 to 2020. The average fall weekday daily trip generation results in **Table 4-17** show a slight reduction from 2017 to 2019 (-1% per annum) and then -15% from 2019 to 2020.

Table 4-15: TBM Zones Historical Trip Generation – Winter Saturday 2017, 2019, and 2020

Zone/Year	Winter Saturday Trip Generation			Annual Trip Variance %	
	2017	2019	2020	2017 - 2019	2019 -2020
Camperdown	4,064	5,643	6,182	18%	10%
Castle Glen	381	392	275	1%	-30%
Craigleith1	24,014	30,400	23,665	13%	-22%
Craigleith2	3,019	13,503	7,947	111%	-41%
TBM West Area 1	370	680	1,000	36%	47%
Lora Bay	1,921	2,434	2,239	13%	-8%
PRVP Park	2,426	5,176	3,184	46%	-38%
TBM Center Zone	677	1,650	1,207	56%	-27%
TBM Village	64,263	65,506	47,707	1%	-27%
TBM West Area 2	1,086	1,333	912	11%	-32%
TBM West Area 3	181	915	564	125%	-38%
Thornbury & Clarksburg	17,233	14,332	16,002	-9%	12%
Total	121,652	143,983	112,904	9%	-22%

Table 4-16: TBM Zones Historical Trip Generation – Summer Saturday 2017, 2019, and 2020

Zone/Year	Summer Saturday Trip Generation			Annual Trip Variance %	
	2017	2019	2020	2017 - 2019	2019 -2020
Camperdown	2,434	3,506	5,091	20%	45%
Castle Glen	107	295	461	66%	56%
Craigleith1	13,051	14,046	13,957	4%	-1%
Craigleith2	2,019	5,790	7,056	69%	22%
TBM West Area 1	485	946	1,103	40%	17%
Lora Bay	3,484	4,531	5,425	14%	20%
PRVP Park	138	1,775	2,624	259%	48%
TBM Center Zone	499	1,105	1,735	49%	57%
TBM Village	29,927	40,087	35,108	16%	-12%

Zone/Year	Summer Saturday Trip Generation			Annual Trip Variance %	
	2017	2019	2020	2017 - 2019	2019 -2020
TBM West Area 2	1,143	2,365	1,781	44%	-25%
TBM West Area 3	1,391	2,196	3,215	26%	46%
Thornbury & Clarksburg	28,204	20,782	22,713	-14%	9%
Total	84,899	99,443	102,289	8%	3%

Table 4-17: TBM Zones Historical Trip Generation – Fall Weekday 2017, 2019, and 2020

Zone/Year	Fall Average Weekday Trip Generation			Annual Trip Variance %	
	2017	2019	2020	2017 - 2019	2019 -2020
Camperdown	1,858	2,401	2,770	14%	15%
Castle Glen	319	113	430	-41%	281%
Craigleith1	9,584	6,001	5,541	-21%	-8%
Craigleith2	657	1,399	1,168	46%	-17%
TBM West Area 1	365	1,317	1,503	90%	14%
Lora Bay	1,525	2,440	2,094	26%	-14%
PRVP Park	1,120	989	1,147	-6%	16%
TBM Center Zone	798	591	761	-14%	29%
TBM Village	14,517	18,063	13,278	12%	-26%
TBM West Area 2	841	1,535	1,095	35%	-29%
TBM West Area 3	676	581	1,130	-7%	94%
Thornbury & Clarksburg	21,909	17,418	13,564	-11%	-22%
Total	56,186	54,866	46,500	-1%	-15%

4.7 Collision Analysis

Stantec reviewed collision reports from 2015 to 2020 to assess the frequency and type of collisions in TBM:

- Collisions with animals (17%), speed related collisions (15%), and failure to yield right of way (8%) were the most frequent types of collisions.
- Collisions increased consistently from 2015 to 2019 and dropped in 2020 when traffic declined during the COVID-19 pandemic.
- Five collisions resulted in fatal injuries (1%), 100 resulted in non-fatal injuries (13%), and the remaining 671 collisions resulted in property damage only (86%).
- Nine collisions involved pedestrians and 9 collisions involved bicycles.

Figure 4-34 illustrates collision events in TBM. The results show that the highest number of collisions were reported in the Blue Mountains Village Area and in Thornbury along Highway 26 (Arthur Street) at its intersection with Bruce Street South.




Figure 4-34: All Collision Events in TBM

Figure 4-35 illustrate collision events and speed related collision events in TBM and **Figure 4-36** presents pedestrian and cyclist collision events in TBM. **Figure 4-35** shows that Grey County Road 19, County Road 119, and Highway 26 have the highest

frequency of collisions related to speeding. **Figure 4-36** shows most pedestrian and cyclist collisions occurred at County Road 19 and Highway 26 in Thornbury and the Blue Mountain Village area.




Figure 4-35: Speed Related Collision Events in TBM

The speed related collision events were also explored by weather conditions at the time of the event. Out of a total of 113 speed related collision events, 103 (91%) were categorized as “speed – too fast for conditions” while only 10 (9%) were categorized as “speed – excessive.” This indicates that collisions as a result of excessive speeding are much less common than speeding faster than the conditions allow, such as in snow or rainy conditions. The breakdown of weather for the “speed – too fast for conditions” category is shown in **Table 4-18**.

Table 4-18: Speed Related Collision Events in TBM by Weather Conditions

Speeding Category	Weather Conditions	Count	Percent
Speed -- too fast for conditions	Snow	52	46.0%
	Clear	32	28.3%

Speeding Category	Weather Conditions	Count	Percent
	Drifting Snow	10	8.8%
	Freezing Rain	3	2.7%
	Rain	3	2.7%
	Strong Wind	2	1.8%
	Other	1	0.9%
Speed -- excessive		10	8.8%
Total		113	100.0%




Figure 4-36: Pedestrian and Cyclist Collision Events in TBM

5.0 What We've Heard

5.1 Online Survey 1

The online survey and online mapping survey were available prior to Online PIC 1 from June 23, 2021, to July 16, 2021. The survey was hosted on the Town's dedicated

webpage for this study (<https://yourview.thebluemountains.ca/transportation-master-plan>) through the Bang the Table survey application. The online mapping survey was hosted via an ArcGIS platform. The goal of these surveys was to collect information on how people use the transportation network, identify priorities concerning transportation, and obtain feedback on the overall vision for the future multi-modal transportation network.

The online mapping survey also offered survey participants an opportunity to identify areas of concern or opportunity within the Town's transportation network. As part of this mapping exercise, users were asked to select from a list of transportation topics and place points on a map of the Town related to specific locations and provide their feedback.

A total of 490 unique visits were made to at least one page of the online survey. A total of 233 online surveys were completed and 18 hard copies of the survey were received by the Town. A total of 115 unique map points were received as part of the online mapping survey.

The following themes were identified through the survey responses:

- In addition to the themes identified above, the following survey results were identified:
- 67% of survey participants noted that they are a permanent resident of the Town of The Blue Mountains
- 80% of participants noted that the Town of The Blue Mountains is their primary residence
- Over 70% of survey participants were 55 and older
- Most people travel to use services or to shop in the Town
- Driving a car is the most frequently used travel mode (82%) to get around Town and the most preferred travel mode (55%)
- Traffic volumes and congestion, road safety, and expanding walking and cycling infrastructure are the three top transportation issues
- Improvements identified that could make travel safer and/or more convenient include adding paved shoulders on roads to improve safety for cyclists, separating cyclists and pedestrians from motor vehicle traffic at more locations, improving pedestrian and cyclist crossings, improving traffic signal timing at intersections, and adding intersection improvements (e.g., turning lanes, turn arrows, traffic signals, traffic circles) at more intersections

- Desire to prioritize cycling and pedestrian facilities and improve education on sharing the road for cyclists and motorists
- More than 50% of participants noted that driving a car is their preferred travel mode and 20 % selected bicycle as their preferred travel mode (see **Figure 5-1**).

Overall, most survey participants noted that there are no barriers for them to use their ideal travel mode but 23% said inadequate transportation infrastructure is a barrier to them using their ideal travel mode (see **Figure 5-2**).




Figure 5-1: Online Survey Question # 7 Results




Figure 5-2: Online Survey Question # 9 Results

Safety and improvements to the existing transportation network were another focus of the online survey. A series of questions asked about safety, speed management and potential improvements for safety. Survey participants were asked to rank key transportation issues for the TMP.

Traffic volume and congestion, road safety, and expanding walking and cycling infrastructure were ranked as the three most important transportation issues, while expanding public transportation services, availability of parking for cars, and preparing for new technologies (autonomous vehicles) were ranked as the three least important transportation issues that the TMP should consider for the future of the Town (see **Figure 5-2Error! Reference source not found.**).




Figure 5-3: Online Survey Question # 12 Results

The majority of improvements identified by survey participants to make travel safer in the Town were focused on improvements to increase the safety of cyclists and pedestrians. The most popular suggested improvements were adding paved shoulders on roads to improve safety for cyclists, separating bicycles and pedestrians from motor vehicle traffic, adding intersection improvements, and improving pedestrian and cyclist crossing facilities at certain locations (see **Figure 5-3**).




Figure 5-4: Online Survey Question # 13 Results

The online survey also included questions on public transit and active transportation.

The majority of participants noted that they do not use public transit. Nearly a quarter of participants were not aware of the public transit services currently available in the Town. While nearly a quarter of participants noted that no improvements would get them to use public transit, the remainder said that better service, coverage, and routing; better access and connectivity to destinations; and more information concerning transit services would encourage them to use the service (see **Figure 5-5**).




Figure 5-5: Online Survey Question # 17 Results

The survey responses indicate a moderate level of bicycle or e-bike use as a travel mode with over half of survey participants using a bicycle or an e-bike at least once a

week and a third using a bicycle or e-bike more than once a week although one third rarely or never use a bicycle or e-bike (see **Figure 5-6**). The Georgian Trail, the Beaver River Trail, and Town roads such as Cameron Street, Grey Road 19, Grey Road 13, Grey Road 2, 10th Line were listed as popular cycling routes for various reasons including recreation, ease of access, safety, and connections to amenities.




Figure 5-6: Online Survey Question # 18 Results

The survey also included a question asking participants to rate how strongly they agreed or disagreed with a series of statements regarding transportation infrastructure in the Town (**Figure 5-7**). The statements included topics such as active transportation facilities, Off-Road Vehicles, Highway 26, parking facilities, and potential road improvements. More than 60% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that there are intersections on Highway 26 in the Town that need traffic lights or a roundabout. Most

participants strongly disagree with the Town allowing Off-Road Vehicles for recreation purposes on the Georgian Trail. 66% of participants strongly agreed or agree that there should be an alternate route built to support Highway 26 regional traffic around Thornbury, while less than half of participants were split between Neutral, Disagree and Strongly Disagree.

To better understand Town priorities for transportation infrastructure and policies, as well as to share considerations with other road authorities such as Grey County and the Ministry of Transportation, please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with




Figure 5-7: Online Survey Question # 21 Results

Overall, survey participants said they enjoy travelling in the Town because of the ease of driving, good calm traffic conditions during tourism off-season, proximity to amenities and shops, and access to the Georgian Trail.

The online mapping survey results are summarized below and in **Figure 5-8**. Based on the feedback received through the online mapping survey, it was generally noted that the majority of feedback was focused within the Thornbury area, with some points noted along Highway 26, as well as within the mid-portion of Blue Mountain Village. Specifically, the following themes were identified:

- A large number of road safety points within Thornbury adjacent to Highway 26, as well as along 4th Line and 6th Line and Side Road 21
- Speeding issues were also identified within Thornbury, and along Highway 26
- Concerns associated with the intersection operations in Thornbury and Blue Mountain Village
- New active transportation infrastructure needs within Thornbury as well as on Grey Road 40 and Beaver Valley Road.
- Traffic volume capacity issues in Thornbury, as well as along Highway 26, Mountain Road, and County Road 2.




Figure 5-8. Online Mapping Survey Results

5.2 Public Information Centre 1

The purpose of Online PIC 1 was to present and gather feedback on the TMP study process, the goals and objectives of the TMP, existing travel conditions and community characteristics, community input on transportation infrastructure in the Town, as well as next steps in the TMP process. Comment form links were imbedded in the Online PIC presentation where interested persons could submit their input and feedback on particular topics in the Online PIC content (i.e., input on challenges and opportunities identified for the TMP, preliminary evaluation criteria, draft vision statement) or general comments as well.

Interested persons were also encouraged to contact the study team directly, should they have any additional comments, concerns and/or wished to be added to the study mailing list.

As mentioned, the first PIC was held online, and consisted of a recorded presentation that was hosted on the study website (<https://yourview.thebluemountains.ca/transportation-master-plan>), beginning on July 29, 2021, and concluding on August 27, 2021. A recorded presentation, including the transcript and displays, was available for review, and members of the public were encouraged to complete the online comment forms, and contact the project team to ask questions and/or share any ideas with respect to the study. Comment forms were provided via a link to a Survey Monkey comment format. Online PIC 1 participants were encouraged to submit their comments online, either within the online comment forms, or by email and/or telephone before August 27, 2021.

5.2.1 ONLINE PIC 1 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

During the Online PIC 1 period (i.e., from July 29, 2021, to August 27, 2021), participants submitted comments via the online survey questions embedded within the recorded PIC presentation and/or via the email address provided on the Town's engagement website. In total, six people submitted comments via the SurveyMonkey embedded comments links within the PIC presentation. A total of thirteen email comments were submitted during the Online PIC period. The embedded comment links were intended to provide the public with the opportunity to provide feedback on preliminary Evaluation Criteria, TMP Objectives, the draft TMP Vision Statement, and any additional inputs they wished to provide.

Based on the comments submitted via email and via the imbedded comment links within the PIC presentation, the following themes were identified:

- Excessive speeding on Highway 26
- Requests to lower speed limit on Highway 26
- Highway 26 should be re-routed and should bypass Town of Blue Mountains
- Highway 26 should not be widened
- Speed reductions on specific roads such as Sunset Boulevard, Sleepyhollow Road, and Grey Road 19
- Roundabouts should be implemented at Highway 26 and County Road 21
- The waterfront should be protected
- Safety for pedestrians due to speeding vehicles
- Design for more pedestrian and cyclist friendly communities and multi-modal activities
- The environment and greenhouse emissions must be considered for the TMP

- Agricultural communities should be considered as part of TMP
- Pedestrian safety at Highway 26 and crossing roads like Elgin
- Paved shoulders on roads for cyclists.

6.0 Guiding Themes and Objectives

The preparation of a TMP is an opportunity to update transportation provisions and objectives for The Blue Mountains community. Our foregoing assessment of current transportation infrastructure and services will provide a foundation for determining future improvements. Directions will take into account the latest thinking to create a balanced multi-modal transportation system.

6.1 Using the TMP

The TMP is meant to be used by transportation stakeholders as both a reference and a guiding document for developing strategies and making investment decisions. It may also be used as a starting point for developing more detailed plans and analyses for transportation-related studies, projects, and initiatives. This is underpinned by the Town's transportation vision, goals, strategy, and initiatives to help TBM grow into the future. More specific examples illustrating how the TMP may be used include:

1. The public may have an interest in following the development of transportation initiatives in the town and in gaining a better understanding of how mobility choices will improve in the future. The TMP empowers the public to actively participate in the change and prepare for its benefits.
2. Elected Officials should use the TMP to assist in decision making. They can also use it to educate and engage their constituents about transportation-related changes that will impact their neighbourhoods and the community as a whole.
3. Town staff should use the TMP as a guide to make clear, balanced and fiscally prudent decisions on transportation initiatives, infrastructure investments, and program administration. In general, TMPs can be used as the basis for implementing the Town's Official Plan.
4. Town engineers, designers, and capital delivery programs staff should scope transportation capital programs and plans to implement the TMP.
5. Town transportation professionals, planners, and health practitioners will be able to use the transportation system performance targets to achieve modal-split aspirations and improve the reliability of travel by balancing the transportation network for all users, regardless of age, ability or income.

6. The TMP can put the Town into a “state-of-readiness” for partner-funded transportation initiatives (e.g., Federal, Provincial, Public-Private-Partnerships) as funding becomes available and partners are engaged.
7. Prospective investors in the Town may use it to make development decisions based on transportation initiatives that result in new available transportation connections.

6.2 Emerging Trends

Approaches to transportation and community development are constantly evolving. Transportation professionals have access to increased data and improving analytical tools. Emphasis is increasingly placed on comprehensive approaches that consider transit and active transportation alongside motor vehicle movement. The goal, now, is more often to discourage vehicle travel in favour of alternatives and, certainly, to ensure that other modes can co-exist comfortably and safely with motor vehicles. New data, improved data processing and communications, and new approaches are creating more varied, attractive, and environmentally friendly transportation networks.

6.2.1 Smart Cities and Open Data

The application of Big Data is a major trend in all forms of management and analysis. Smart Cities describes the leveraging of Big Data by municipalities across Canada and the world to enhance urban and regional planning. A Smart City is an urban area that uses different types of electronic data collection sensors to supply information to manage assets and resources efficiently. In terms of mobility, traditional methods of data collection use pneumatic tubes or manual counting for traffic recording. These mechanical methods are often costly to implement, prone to high maintenance costs, and difficult to leverage for alternative modes of transportation like transit, cycling, and walking. As illustrated in **Figure 6-1**, there are new ways to leverage information and communication technology to optimize the cost-effectiveness of data collection and the efficiency of town operations to promote a dialogue between town planners and the public and to better understand how people travel within the community.





Figure 6-1: Multi-Modal Transportation Open Data

The foundation of this trend is open data or databases that are available free or at low cost for use by governments, businesses, and private citizens. The expansion of open data, combined with advances in big data analytics, is freeing information that was once trapped inside the dusty pages of overlooked reports, enabling improved decision making, new product and service offerings, and greater accountability. This change comes at a time of heightened focus on data-driven knowledge and evidence-based decision making. Smart City technology and Open Data can help improve transportation-demand forecasting, prioritize transport infrastructure improvements, and synchronize the ways different modes of transportation inter-operate. For example, the Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) was able to avoid building their own mobile application to identify next-bus arrival times by making their real-time vehicle GPS data open through an application programming interface (API). This avoided the need to procure a developer and handle the continual maintenance of a mobile application. This same process has been leveraged in the City of Barrie for Barrie Transit where several mobile applications have been built using open data.

6.2.2 Mobility as a Service (MaaS)

Mobility as a Service (MaaS) is the integration of various forms of transportation services into a single mobility service accessible on demand. To meet a municipality's transportation demand, MaaS facilitates a diverse menu of transport options, be they public transport, ride-, car- or bike-sharing, taxi or private automobile, or a combination thereof. For residents this approach can offer added value through use of a single application or service to provide access to mobility with a single payment channel instead of multiple ticketing and payment operations. At its most basic level, MaaS helps residents meet their mobility needs and solve the inconvenient parts of individual journeys by providing easier access to the entire system of mobility services. The aim of MaaS is to provide an alternative to the use of the private car that may be as convenient, possibly cheaper, and more sustainable, while helping to reduce congestion and constraints in transport capacity.

MaaS is a relatively new concept and approach to transportation planning, with elements integrated in a piecemeal fashion in many jurisdictions across North America. The most abundant form of MaaS is via integrated ride-hailing mobility services such as Uber or Lyft and bikeshare services integrated into transit planning or maps applications



Source: <https://transitapp.com/region/toronto>

Figure 6-2: Uber Integration into the Transit App

such as The Transit App or Google Maps as represented in **Figure 6-2**. Several European and Asian cities have fundamentally changed the way people search for, consume, and pay for transportation, in much the same way as Netflix has changed video consumption. Since 2016, Helsinki residents have been able to use an app called Whim to plan and pay for all modes of public and private transportation within the city – be it by train, taxi, bus, carshare, or bikeshare. Anyone with the app can enter a destination, select his or her preferred mode of to get there – or, when no single mode can cover the door-to-door journey – a combination of modes.

While there are obvious stark differences between TBM and Helsinki, MaaS can be moulded to create a localized and tailored solution that works with the available transportation assets and is scaled to TBM's capacity and need.


6.2.3 Complete Streets

Streets are vital places within TBM. They are the common spaces where the town comes together, where children learn to ride bicycles, neighbours meet, and couples stroll. They are the proverbial front door to homes, businesses, parks, and institutions. They reflect the values of the town and, at their best, are a source of pride for residents and visitors alike. Understanding how our transportation network can equitably be shared between different road users such as auto drivers, transit riders, cyclists, or pedestrians is imperative to promoting a multi-modal transportation network that provides a range of attractive choices for mobility by integrating all modes into a seamless network.

Complete Streets is an approach whereby streets are designed to be safe for everyone who walks, cycles, takes transit, or drives, and regardless of age and ability. This ensures that transportation is planned and designed for all road users, not only motorists. There is no singular approach to Complete Streets; however, the concept recognizes that a delicate balance needs to be maintained among different road users and stakeholders. The local context determines this based on the needs and

opportunities that dictate the necessity for specific infrastructure in different parts of the multi-modal transportation network as illustrated in **Figure 6-3**. The link between Complete Streets and public health is well documented as it enhances human and environmental health by providing an environment that enables and encourages active transportation.

Although the figure clearly emphasizes complete streets as a response to the demands of intensely develop urban environments, the concept is equally valid in small communities and rural areas. Incorporating facilities for alternative modes is generally easier to implement in less intensively developed settings where space is more available and facility requirements are likely to be more modest. The Toronto Area Centre for Active Transportation Backgrounder for Rural Complete Streets³ points out that in 2011, “25% of pedestrian fatalities in Canada were on rural roads, although only 19% of the population lives in rural areas.” The Backgrounder further notes that 29% of Canadians are not licensed drivers and many rural areas have limited transit services. Finally, they note that these facilities add activity to rural streets and enliven local environments. We would add that they are important recreation facilities in smaller communities that cannot always afford the type of large-scale recreation complexes found in cities and suburban areas and support active tourism opportunities that support many rural economies.




Source: City of Toronto Complete Streets Guidelines (City of Toronto, 2017)

Figure 6-3: Complete Streets Road Space Equity

³ Toronto Area Centre for Active Transportation, *Backgrounder: Rural Complete Streets*, <https://www.completestreetsforcanada.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Rural-Complete-Streets-final.pdf>

6.2.4 Vision Zero

Vision Zero is a multi-national road traffic safety project that aims to achieve a transportation network with no fatalities or serious injuries involving road traffic. The approach started in Sweden and was approved by the Swedish Parliament in October 1997. A core principle of the vision is that ‘Life and health can never be exchanged for other benefits within society’ rather than the more conventional comparison between costs and benefits, where a monetary value is placed on life and health, and then that value is used to decide how much money to spend on a road network towards the benefit of decreasing how much risk. Since adopting the concept, Sweden has made tremendous progress in road safety reducing the number of traffic fatalities by over 50% between 2000 and 2014 (**Figure 6-4**).



Source: (Parachute Vision Zero Network, 2017)

Figure 6-4: Traffic Fatalities in Sweden, 2000-2015

Several municipalities across Canada are embracing the Vision Zero approach to road safety by implementing road safety plans and actions to reduce road-related fatalities and protect vulnerable road users. In 2015, Edmonton became the first major Canadian City to officially adopt Vision Zero. The City of Toronto soon followed suit in 2017. Vision Zero is now a recognized approach toward planning for road safety with other cities, including the City of Ottawa, considering its implementation.

6.2.5 Alternative Service Delivery


Alternative service delivery is a strategy deployed by many transit agencies and municipalities across North America. The approach enables transit riders to pre-book trips at a specific time, noting a pickup and drop-off destination, within a set service boundary. This service is often enabled through dynamic scheduling technology where trips can be grouped and optimized, allowing riders to use a mobile application to book, track, and pay for their trips. This type of service would integrate effectively within a MaaS platform where individuals can plan all components of their multi-modal trip via one resource, leveraging available technology for real-time updates. Several transit agencies across Canada have been deploying alternative delivery services to provide the right-size service in communities that are not adequately served by conventional

fixed-route services or to expand coverage areas of transit service. When establishing this service type in new areas it can be used to document travel patterns and build transit ridership to support the eventual introduction of fixed-route service.

Alternative service delivery encompasses a continuum of service types. Two commonly used methods include an on-demand service where riders in designated neighbourhoods are offered door-to-door or stop-to-stop trips as well as a home-to-hub type service where riders in designated service areas may book trips from their homes to a nearby transportation hub where they may connect to fixed-route service or access other transportation services.

Benefits of alternative service delivery include:

- Flexible routing or scheduling to meet customer demand
- Use of technology (mobile apps) to correlate supply and demand
- Optimized fleet deployment resulting from the comingling of different customer types
- Connections provided between several transportation services to complete trips.



Source: (City of Belleville, 2020)

Figure 6-5: User Interface of Belleville’s On-Demand Transit Mobile App

Many municipalities across Ontario have been deploying some form of alternative service delivery. One notable example is Belleville Transit, which launched a demand-response pilot in September 2018 where they replaced two fixed route late night services with a demand-response service. The agency used a mobility app on their existing 40-foot conventional buses to provide dynamic routing and scheduling as shown in **Figure 6-5**. This service was stop-to-stop as opposed to door-to-door, meaning users were transported to and from existing bus stops, rather to and from their homes. Trips were booked via phone, mobile app, or web booking. A significant increase in ridership was observed- with the number of monthly trips tripling over the

pilot period. The bus fleet grew from two to five buses with certain trips operating at full capacity. Average utilization rose to 30 people per vehicle in the evening (9 PM to 12 AM) compared to just three people per vehicle in the same period previously.

6.3 Vision and Objectives

TBM roadway, transit, and active transportation systems must reflect the community's vision to foster multi-modal transportation options that address a spectrum of needs across all ages, abilities, and trip purposes. Planning and analysis conducted through this TMP acknowledges the Town's role within its regional context and provides connections to both local and regional facilities. This must all be done by balancing the needs of varied users of the multi-modal transportation network and the Town's fiscal and environmental responsibilities of maximizing the network's efficiency to accommodate future growth while reducing dependence on private automobiles.

6.3.1 Draft Vision Statement

A draft vision statement for the TMP was developed and presented for feedback from the public. Through the next round of consultation, this vision statement will be vetted through the community and stakeholders and revised accordingly:

“As the Town of The Blue Mountains continues to grow, the TMP will provide a blueprint to enhance connections between neighbourhoods, jobs, services, local businesses, recreation and tourism opportunities, balancing all modes of transportation to become a more livable and healthy community.”

6.3.2 Objectives

A well-designed multi-modal transportation network can be a strong contributor to achieving the local goals articulated in various plans. Simplicity in design and functionality usually means establishing a simple and effective multi-modal transportation network that everyone can understand and use. Understanding why people may react to transportation options in different ways, based on their personal needs and circumstances, helps to create a multi-modal network that is intuitive and that reduces barriers to use - potentially offering new and sustainable ways to travel for many. The expectation of the network is captured and incorporated in its overall vision and the TMP articulates this vision by describing what that might look like in terms of service and infrastructure, and then outlines a plan to evolve toward that vision. The creation of a vision is necessary to inform other plans and create a sense of unity and cohesion amongst them.

Transportation plays an important role in the life of residents and visitors to TBM, not only as a means to move around, but as a tool that enhances the Town's quality of life. With this consideration, it's imperative that transportation plays a role in empowering the

community’s residents, visitors, and businesses by balancing a multi-modal approach to transportation that addresses all different types of needs and users. A strain on the transportation network has negative ripple effects in other areas of the community, and even beyond to neighbouring communities. Often, improving conditions for one user group may create unfavourable conditions for another. An example may be increasing traffic speed limits to improve the throughput of a roadway. It may improve traffic flow, but it may diminish the safety of other modes of transportation such as cycling and walking. It is important to acknowledge the interdependencies of the community’s environment and make recommendations that balance benefits between all users. The following are some general goals that are applicable to TBM in relation to the TMP:

- Identify the town’s future transportation needs and opportunities on the short and long-term horizons
- To provide connectivity between transportation modes to move people and goods sustainably, efficiently, and safely
- To establish a sustainably integrated multi-modal transportation system that reduces reliance on any single mode and promotes walking, cycling, and transit
- To define policies and long-term strategies that will protect corridors for all modes of transportation to address current and projected population and employment growth.

Taking into consideration the various components of this study, we have developed seven objectives that will guide the development of the TMP. These objectives will be tailored and adjusted in the course of the study through consultation and stakeholder engagement, and include:

The transportation system will be supported by settlement and land use patterns that encourage active transportation and transit	• Denser patterns of settlement will be encouraged to reduce trip distances and facilitate the use of active transportation and transit options • Mixed use development will be encouraged to facilitate denser development • Pedestrian and cycling links will be incorporated in new development and retrofitted where possible in existing developments to connect to the TBM and regional active transportation networks • Requirements for parking and other facilities to accommodate motorized vehicles will be eased where feasible to encourage the use of transportation alternatives • Facilities to support sustainable transportation options (e.g., bicycle racks and electric vehicle charging stations) will be encouraged
--	--

The transportation system will encourage active transportation and transit	• The active transportation network will serve a transportation function to help reduce automobile use through alternative options. • Active transportation infrastructure will complement and promote transit, tourism, and healthier communities year-round. • Transit will be a viable alternative for residents, leveraging multi-modal connections and emerging/creative service solutions to maximize its investment.
The transportation system will improve connectivity and travel choices	• One integrated multi-modal network will be provided instead of separate networks for each mode. • The multi-modal network will promote the idea of using different modes for different trips and needs, as well as using multiple modes within a single journey. • Residents and visitors will have many viable transportation options.
The transportation system will improve safety for all road users	• The multi-modal transportation system will be safe, comfortable, and reliable for all road users regardless of how residents choose to travel. • Accessibility of the transportation network will be assured regardless of age or ability.
The transportation system will support seasonal tourism fluctuations	• The transportation network will allow dynamic use of transportation infrastructure that can change with seasonal tourism levels. • The network will minimize under-utilized infrastructure during off-peak seasons and enhance network operations during peak seasons. • Active transportation and transit networks will work together year-round to serve residents and tourists, encouraging active transportation users to shift to transit during winter months.
The transportation system will reduce greenhouse gas emissions	• The multi-modal network will promote a shift away from single-occupancy vehicle use through efficient active transportation, transit, and other shared ride options.
The transportation system will support the movement of goods	• The heavy vehicle network will move goods sustainably, efficiently, and safely. • The goods movement network will support economic prosperity within the Town of the Blue Mountains.

The transportation network will improve regional transportation connections	• Improvements will be identified that will effectively manage growth throughout the region. • The transportation network will consider the needs of other municipalities in Grey County and facilitate regional connections.
--	--



Town of The Blue Mountains Transportation Master Plan

Committee of the Whole November 2, 2021



Master Planning Process

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 2015).

Phases 1 and 2 of the MCEA process will generally be addressed and will form the basis for the recommended Schedule B and C transportation infrastructure projects identified in the TMP Update report.

Phase 1:
Problem and Opportunity

Phase 2:
Alternative Solutions

- Information Gathering
- Identify Problems and Opportunities

- Identify and Evaluate Alternative Solutions
- Develop Implementation Strategy



**Transportation
Master Plan**





Transportation Master Plan Objectives

- **Improve connectivity and travel choices** by providing reliable, equitable and accessible options
- **Improve the safety of transportation systems for all users**
- Plan the transportation network to **support seasonal tourism fluxes and efficient development within the municipality**
- **Encourage active transportation and transit**
- **Plan transportation infrastructure that assists in reducing greenhouse gas emissions**
- Align with the transportation vision and goals of Grey County and **improve regional transportation and transit connectivity**
- Support the **movement of goods and services throughout the region**



Consultation Process

Phase 1: Problem and Opportunity

- Information Gathering
- Identify Problems and Opportunities

Phase 2: Alternative Solutions

- Identify and Evaluate Alternative Solutions
- Develop Implementation Strategy



**Transportation
Master Plan**

Ongoing Consultation

Notice of Study
Commencement (May 2021)

Online Survey
(June 23 – July 16, 2021)

Online Public Information Centre 1
(July 29- August 27, 2021)

Online Public Information Centre 2
(November 2021)

Online Public Information Centre 3
(April / May 2022)

Notice of Study Completion
(July 2022)

Consultation Process (cont'd)

Summary of Online PIC 1 Feedback and Online Survey:

- The online survey was available from June 23, 2021, to July 16, 2021.
- 490 unique visits were made to at least one page of the online survey.
- 233 online surveys were completed and 18 hard copies of the survey
- 115 unique map points were received as part of the online mapping survey.
- 99 unique visits to the project website were made during the PIC time period (July 29 - August 27, 2021).
- The most number of unique visits to the website in a day was 22 visits on August 18, 2021.
- 6 people submitted comments via the SurveyMonkey comments links within the PIC presentation.
- 15 email comments were submitted during the Online PIC period.





What we've heard so far:

Transportation Master Plan

Strengths of the Transportation Network

- Access to nature and recreation
- A general ease of 'getting around'
- Georgian Trail



Top Three Transportation Issues

- Increased traffic volume and seasonal congestion
- Road safety – lack of infrastructure, real and perceived issues from motorist and vulnerable road users
- Desire for improved active transportation infrastructure



Making Travel Safer and More Convenient



- Improved safety through greater separation (infrastructure) or delineation of space between road users, including paved shoulders.
- Improved pedestrian and cyclist crossings.
- Improved education on sharing the road between cyclists and motorists.
- Intersection improvements (signal timing, turning lanes, adding traffic lights or roundabouts at more intersections).



Speeding/Traffic Calming



- **Concerns of excessive speeding.**
- **Desire to reduce vehicle speeds – generally, and in specific locations.**
- **Desire to reduce posted speed limits as a means of reducing travel speeds.**



Highway 26 Concerns



- Increased traffic volume, congestion, road safety concerns.
- Desire for clarity on the Ministry of Transportation's long-term plan for Highway 26.
- Pedestrian and cyclist safety concerns crossing Highway 26
 - Georgian Trail
 - Other active crossing locations in built-up areas
- Desire for an alternate route around Thornbury for through-traffic.



What the data is telling us so far:

Transportation Master Plan

Traffic



- **Internal vehicle trip activity (vehicle trips that have both origin and destination within TBM) is the primary contributor to our traffic, opposed to pass-through activity with origins or destinations outside of the Town. Both locals and visitors contribute to the internal trip activity.**
- **There is a big gap between existing travel mode share and preferred mode share stated in the survey especially regarding private vehicles mode share.**
- **The bulk of traffic within The Blue Mountains is on arterial roads, most owned and operated by Grey County or MTO.**





Traffic continued...



- Highway 26 is a critical traffic artery for TBM.
- Seasonal fluctuations in traffic place relatively short but significant demands on the road network, creating greater challenges in balancing the needs of all road users.
- Peak season traffic is approximately 2.4 times higher than regular peak traffic.



Road Network




ROAD NETWORK

TOWN OF THE BLUE MOUNTAINS TMP

- Provincial Highways
- County Roads
- Major Collector Roads
- Minor Collector Roads
- - - Proposed Minor Collector Roads
- Local Roads
- Local Unassumed Roads
- Local Heritage Roads
- Private Roads


Existing Travel Trends: Traffic Distribution



Source: StreetLight, 2019




Existing Travel Trends: Seasonal Trips



Source: StreetLight, 2019

Existing Travel Trends: Local and Pass-Through




Source: StreetLight, 2019


Existing Travel Trends: Hourly Distribution



Average Hourly Trip Frequency (Winter Saturday, 2019)



Average Hourly Trip Distribution (Fall Weekday, 2019)





Existing Travel Trends: Historical Growth

Year	Winter Saturday Trip Generation			Annual Trip Variance %	
	2017	2019	2020	2017 - 2019	2019 -2020
Winter Saturday Trips	121,652	143,983	112,904	9%	-22%
Summer Saturday Trips	84,899	99,443	102,289	8%	3%
Fall Weekday Trips	56,186	54,866	46,500	-1%	-15%

Source: StreetLight, 2019




Active & Public Transportation



- The Georgian Trail is a core active transportation community asset.
- Our active transportation network is fragmented, and this is a barrier to increased travel by active modes.
- There is great potential for enhanced public transit service and active transportation infrastructure to mitigate impacts of localized traffic.
- Higher proportion of older adults/retirees can inform future health and accessibility aspects to transportation infrastructure and services.



Active Transportation Network



ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION NETWORK

TOWN OF THE BLUE MOUNTAINS TMP

- Sidewalk
- Off-Road Trail
- Paved Shoulder
- Partially Paved Shoulder
- Georgian Trail
- Bruce Trail




Collision Data



- Collisions are generally concentrated in areas of greatest volume of traffic, complexity of the road network and mix of road users – in the Thornbury, Blue Mountain Village area, along Highway 26 and Grey Road 19.
- Most common type of collisions are:
 - between a vehicle and a wild or domestic animal
 - speeding relative to road conditions – many weather related



Collision Data Review: All Collisions



COLLISION EVENTS

TOWN OF THE BLUE MOUNTAINS TMP

Number of Collision Events, 2015-2020



- ▲ Fatal Injury
- Non-Fatal Injury
- Property Damage Only

Information Needs, Data Gaps



- **Data on speeding occurrences is limited, but not required at the strategic level.**
- **Regionally, there are inconsistencies with the level and type of data collected.**
- **Gathering, assessing and drawing meaning from information is an ongoing effort – to set ourselves up for future success.**



Ah-ha's, Surprises (and not-surprises)



- **We, The Town – residents and businesses that attract visitors to spend time in TBM – are the primary generators of traffic.**
- **Traffic/congestion from seasonal fluctuations can be mitigated, but is built-in to TBM's circumstances.**
- **The desire to engage with the community by active modes of transportation is significant.**
- **Based on the survey data, parking is not considered a high priority for TBM relative to other transportation needs.**



Next Steps

Phase 1 Problem and Opportunity

- Information Gathering
- Identify Problems and Opportunities

Phase 2 Alternative Solutions

- Identify and Evaluate Alternative Solutions
- Develop Implementation Strategy



**Transportation
Master Plan**

Ongoing Consultation

Notice of Study
Commencement (May 2021)

Online Survey
(June 23 – July 16, 2021)

Online Public Information Centre 1
(July 29- August 27, 2021)

Online Public Information Centre 2
(Winter 2022)

Online Public Information Centre 3
(April / May 2022)

Notice of Study Completion
(July 2022)

Questions?