

City of Toronto Complete Streets Guidelines

Meeting Summary: Stakeholder Advisory Group Meeting #4

Metro Hall, Room 303

Tuesday, September 20, 2016

5:00 – 8:00 pm

1. Meeting Overview

On Tuesday, September 20, 2016, 13 members of the Complete Streets Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) participated in the fourth and final SAG meeting. Participants represented organizations with a range of interests and expertise related to Toronto's streets, including pedestrian advocacy, cycling advocacy, transit advocacy, professional associations, and others. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss updates to the Guidelines and next steps. The SAG also learned about implementation and the remaining tasks and timelines toward City Council's consideration of the Guidelines.

The meeting included a series of short presentations on Draft Guidelines content, each of which was followed by a plenary discussion during which time SAG members shared their feedback.

This Meeting Summary covers the main areas of discussion during the meeting. It is organized into the following sections and sub-sections:

1. Meeting Overview
2. Key Messages
3. Detailed Feedback
 - 3.1 Feedback about the Draft Guidelines overall
 - 3.2 Feedback about Draft Chapter 1: Introduction
 - 3.3 Feedback about Draft Chapter 2: Street Types
 - 3.4 Feedback about Draft Chapter 3: Steps to Street Design and Decision Making
 - 3.5 Feedback about Draft Chapter 4: Street Design for Pedestrians
 - 3.6 Feedback about Draft Chapter 5: Street Design for Cycling
 - 3.7 Feedback about Draft Chapter 6: Street Design for Transit
 - 3.8 Feedback about Draft Chapter 7: Street Design for Green Infrastructure
 - 3.9 Feedback about Draft Chapter 8: Street Design for Roadways
 - 3.10 Feedback about Draft Chapter 9: Street Design for Intersections
 - 3.11 Feedback about Draft Appendices
 - 3.12 Feedback about Key Messages and Public Reception
4. Next Steps

Please note the detailed meeting agenda attached as Appendix A and the list of participants as Appendix B. Comments submitted by SAG members before and after the meeting are included in Appendix C.

Claire Nelischer of the City of Toronto's Transportation Services, Public Realm Section wrote this Meeting Summary and shared it with participants for review before finalizing it.

2. Key Messages

The following are the key points that emerged during the discussion. Readers should review these messages in concert with the more detailed feedback that follows.

The Guidelines are strong. Many SAG members expressed support for the Guidelines, calling it an "excellent" and "useful" document.

Stakeholder feedback has been well integrated. Many participants appreciated how previous stakeholder feedback had been considered and incorporated into the latest version of the Guidelines.

The length and level of detail is appropriate. Participants commented that the Guidelines remain comprehensive without being overly detailed or lengthy.

Pedestrians should be more clearly identified as the most vulnerable road users. Some SAG members felt strongly that the vulnerability of pedestrians should be further emphasized throughout the Guidelines and that the Guidelines should refrain from grouping pedestrians with cyclists to reflect key differences in speed and vulnerability.

More clarity is needed on separation between cyclists and pedestrians. Several participants emphasized the Guidelines should include more specific references to the range of separation elements that respond to local speed and volume contexts.

The importance of flexibility should be further emphasized. Some participants felt that the need to consider flexibility in street design should be further emphasized. The Guidelines should make clear that streets should be designed to adapt to a range of different needs and uses that may change over a day, week, or season.

An Executive Summary would be valuable. Many SAG members agreed that a brief, visually engaging Executive Summary, written in accessible language, would help the public to understand the Guidelines' content and application and build excitement around the project.

3. Draft Detailed Feedback

3.1 Overall Feedback about the Guidelines

SAG members reviewed and gave feedback on the Guidelines overall. They shared **general** feedback and changes:

General feedback and questions about the Guidelines:

- **Many SAG members expressed support for the Guidelines overall.** SAG members felt the Guidelines were well written, comprehensive, and addressed diverse and challenging issues well.
- **Stakeholder feedback has been well considered and incorporated.** Many SAG members felt their feedback from previous SAG meetings and related communications had been well integrated and that the Guidelines now reflect their input.
- **Emphasize the need for flexibility in street design.** SAG members identified flexibility as a core consideration for street design and felt it should be further emphasized in the Guidelines. The ability of streets to change to meet different needs – including temporary activations, marches and protests, and civic gatherings – should be included in the text.
- **How are grade-separated roads reflected in the Guidelines?** Some SAG members requested clarification on how the Guidelines address overpasses and underpasses and related safety considerations. *Janet Lo, City of Toronto, Transportation Services Staff replied that City Staff and the Ontario Traffic Council are developing policies for these areas, so policies and best practices are changing. The Guidelines will attempt to capture this, or will be updated when policies are confirmed.*
- **Demonstrate how data supports decision-making.** SAG members thought the research, data, and best practices used to arrive at conclusions should be made more apparent throughout the report. *Janet Lo replied that the "More Information" sections in chapters 4-9 include other resources and best practices, and will soon include hyperlinks. Adam Popper, City of Toronto, Transportation Services Staff, added that the report states that it is the responsibility of each project to collect and monitor its own "before and after" data.*
- **Emphasize the need for separation between pedestrians and cyclists.** A number of SAG members thought the report should further emphasize the need for appropriate separation between pedestrians and cyclists to reflect the vulnerability of pedestrians, especially seniors and those with low or no vision, to all higher-momentum road users.
- **Captions and alt text are needed for all images.** *Adam Popper replied that the final Guidelines will include alt text for all images and the project team is in the process of adding image captions.*

3.2 Feedback about Chapter 1: Introduction

SAG members reviewed and gave feedback on Chapter 1: Introduction. They shared **suggested** changes:

Suggested additions and changes for Chapter 1: Introduction:

- **Clearly show that operations and maintenance impact all steps of the Street Design process.** Adjust the Structure of the Guide graphic to clearly show that operations and maintenance considerations are included in all steps of street design and decision making.

3.3 Feedback about Chapter 2: Street Types

SAG members reviewed and gave feedback on Chapter 2: Street Types. They shared **general** feedback and **suggested** changes:

General feedback about Chapter 2: Street Types:

- **The Street Types chapter addresses many challenging issues well.** Participants felt this section successfully addressed many diverse priorities and challenges.
- **The graphics and renderings are well done.** Participants appreciated that the graphics are visually appealing and informative.

Suggested additions and changes for Chapter 2: Street Types:

- **Include heritage overlays that account for more than just buildings.** Encourage street design teams to consider the social and cultural heritage of a place in addition to its built heritage. *Janet Lo added that Heritage Conservation Districts are included as an example of an overlay.*

3.4 Feedback about Chapter 3: Steps to Street Design and Decision Making

SAG members did not share any feedback specific to Chapter 3: Steps to Street Design and Decision Making.

3.5 Feedback about Chapter 4: Street Design for Pedestrians

SAG members reviewed and gave feedback on Chapter 4: Street Design for Pedestrians. They shared **general** feedback and **suggested** changes:

General feedback about Chapter 4: Street Design for Pedestrians:

- **The section is well done.** While some specific changes were recommended, many SAG members expressed support for this section overall.
- **Emphasize the importance of separation between pedestrians and cyclists.** Pedestrians are particularly vulnerable and travel at very different speeds than

cyclists. The need for separation between these modes should be further emphasized throughout the report, and especially in Chapter 4.

Suggested additions and changes for Chapter 4: Street Design for Pedestrians:

- **Design elements used to separate pedestrians and cyclists should be context-sensitive.** Emphasize that design elements to separate these modes should respond to local speeds and volumes and protect pedestrians as they are vulnerable even to cyclists. Clearly state that Tactile Walking Surface Indicators are not always sufficient, and mention that other means of separating these modes are available and can be beneficial.
- **Indicate what is *not* part of the pedestrian clearway.** SAG members applauded the City for including a section on is *not* part of the pedestrians clearly. They asked to add elements should not be included in calculations of the pedestrian clearway and often encroach into this space, like door opening areas, marketing areas and tree pits.
- **Pedestrian clearways should be direct, continuous, and uninterrupted.** A pedestrian clearway should not force pedestrians to change course within a block. Include that the pedestrian clearway should be, at minimum, a block long.
- **Consider the needs of children and animals.** In general, the guidelines focus on adult users. Street design should consider the particular needs and sightlines of children and animals, such as street furniture sized for kids.

3.6 Feedback about Chapter 5: Street Design for Cycling

SAG members reviewed and gave feedback on Chapter 5: Street Design for Cycling. They shared **general** feedback and **suggested** changes:

General feedback about Chapter 5: Street Design for Cycling:

- **The Context-Sensitive Cycling Facilities section is strong.** SAG members appreciated the detail provided on assessing the speed and volume of traffic.
- **Consider the various speeds of cyclists.** There is little mention of speed as a characteristic of cyclists in the report, but various cycling speeds and their impacts on safety and passing are important to consider in cycling facility design.
- **It's good to see speed and traffic highlighted as key factors influencing the design of cycling facilities.** The wording clearly emphasizes the need to consider contextual factors when separating these uses. Similar phrasing could be used in the Street Design for Pedestrians section.

Suggested additions and changes for Chapter 5: Street Design for Cycling:

- **Add more detail on mixing zones.** There is reference made to the need to avoid mixing zones, but more detail on considerations for mixing zones would be beneficial.

- **Include information on the need to accommodate cyclists and pedestrians during construction.**

3.7 Feedback about Chapter 6: Street Design for Transit

SAG members reviewed and gave feedback on Chapter 6: Street Design for Transit. They shared **general** feedback and **suggested** changes:

General feedback about Chapter 6: Street Design for Transit:

- **The Street Design for Transit section is strong and relevant to pedestrians.** SAG members appreciated that this section focuses on transit users as pedestrians and felt that this is a valuable message.
- **There is more potential for placemaking at transit stops.** The placemaking for transit stops section could be more ambitious by adding references to benches, planting, etc. and opening up the possibility for these elements to be included in transit stop design.

Suggested additions and changes for Chapter 6: Street Design for Transit:

- **Street design should respond to intensification strategies.** The Guidelines should acknowledge current transit-oriented intensification strategies and their impact on street design. Add a reference to street design around mobility hubs.

3.8 Feedback about Chapter 7: Street Design for Green Infrastructure

SAG members reviewed and gave feedback on Chapter 7: Street Design for Green Infrastructure. They shared **general** feedback:

General feedback about Chapter 7: Street Design for Green Infrastructure:

- **The Street Design for Green Infrastructure section is strong.** A SAG member felt this section was well written and current, and appreciated the emphasis on green infrastructure as serving multiple positive functions at once.

3.9 Feedback about Chapter 8: Street Design for Roadways

SAG members reviewed and gave feedback on Chapter 8: Street Design for Roadways. They shared **general** feedback and **suggested** changes:

General feedback about Chapter 8: Street Design for Roadways:

- **The Street Design for Roadways section is strong.** SAG members felt this section was comprehensive and useful.
- **It is critical to ensure dedicated safe space for pedestrians.** A number of participants stressed the importance of providing continuous, safe, separated space for pedestrians, with a particular focus on the most vulnerable pedestrians, including seniors and people with disabilities.

- **Make clear and consistent distinctions between pedestrians and cyclists.** Acknowledge that pedestrians are the most vulnerable road users and do not group cyclists in with pedestrians. Make explicit that pedestrians are vulnerable to interactions with cyclists as well as with motor vehicles, so appropriate measures should be taken to mitigate this risk.

Specific questions and comments about Chapter 8: Street Design for Roadways:

- **How are other uses – like people on rollerblades, e-bikes, and scooters – accommodated in roadways?** These road users are not mentioned in the Guidelines. Is there a need to create space for them in roadways? *Adam Popper responded that this is a regulation issue more so than a design issue, and falls outside the scope of the Guidelines.*
- **Include reference to turning lanes.** Turning lanes can be important elements of right-sizing and creating complete streets. Add a point about the benefits and issues associated with turning lanes.
- **Add more detail to the traffic calming section.** This section has little detail compared to other sections. Add information to demonstrate different traffic calming measures. Consider using the phrase "speed management" in place of "traffic calming".
- **Include a reference to the Safer City Guidelines.** CPTED principles are already mentioned but a note about the Safer City Guidelines should also be included.
- **Review curb lane widths.** 4.3m seems too wide as a target width for curb lanes, (without dedicated cycling facilities) and may encourage higher motor-vehicle speeds. Add more details on this figure or include a note about acceptable variance. *Janet Lo responded that this dimension is by request of the Cycling unit to allow for safe passing of cyclists in the curb lane, and that staff will take this comment back to the staff involved with the City's Lane Width Guidelines.*

3.10 Feedback about Chapter 9: Street Design for Intersections

SAG members reviewed and gave feedback on Chapter 9: Street Design for Intersections. They shared **general** feedback and **suggested** changes:

General feedback about Chapter 9: Street Design for Intersections:

- **Section 9: Street Design for Intersections is strong.** Many SAG members expressed support for the content included in Chapter 9.
- **It's good to see left-turn provisions for cyclists.** Dedicated left-turn facilities for cyclists help ensure the safety of all road users, including pedestrians. This is positive element of the Street Design for Intersections chapter and its graphics.

Specific questions and comments about Chapter 9: Street Design for Intersections:

- **Include a subsection on interchange ramp terminals and channelized routes.** The Guidelines don't currently address these types of intersections.
- **Encourage the use of audible pedestrian signals at all crosswalks.**
- **Prioritize the consideration of pedestrians when making decisions on mid-block crossings.** The current wording suggests that the benefits of moving traffic more efficiently could outweigh the safety of pedestrians provided by mid-block crossing. Adjust this phrasing to position pedestrian needs and vehicle movement needs more evenly.

3.11 Feedback about Appendices

SAG members reviewed and gave feedback on the Appendices. They shared **suggested** changes:

Specific questions and comments about Appendices:

- **Include a Road User Risk Assessment in the evaluation checklist.** Street design teams need to understand how proposed designs will impact road users differently and transfer risk between users. Include a Road User Risk Assessment in the decision-making process.
- **Include heritage considerations in the decision-making checklist.** Encourage street design teams to think about how placemaking strategies could tell the story of a street's past, present, and future.

3.12 Feedback about Key Messages and Public Reception

SAG members learned about the next steps for the Guidelines, including its consideration by the Public Works and Infrastructure Committee and City Council. They shared **general** feedback:

General feedback about Key Messages and Public Reception:

- **Create an Executive Summary.** The report is long and many members of the public will not read the whole report. Create a brief Executive Summary, with graphics and summary points from each chapter, to give readers a sense of what is in the report and how to interpret it. *Janet Lo and Adam Popper responded that an Executive Summary would be very useful and will be considered.*
- **Emphasize the flexibility of the Guidelines and their use.** In the Executive Summary and other communications, emphasize that the Guidelines are flexible and adaptable to local conditions. The Guidelines are context-sensitive, balance local priorities, and respond to the needs of local communities and Councillors.
- **Demonstrate that the Guidelines are a comprehensive and Toronto-specific document.** While other cities introduced complete streets guidelines long ago,

these Guidelines are more comprehensive and are based on and respond to the Toronto context.

- **Complete Streets are something you have to experience to fully understand.** Many people are not aware of what complete streets are and will not initially understand the concept. It may take time and implementation for the public to fully realize and appreciate complete streets.
- **What if the Guidelines aren't implemented consistently, or if complete street projects aren't used as they were intended?** Need to be prepared for inconsistencies in implementation or use, and be prepared to adapt.
- **The public and decision-makers may be critical of the Guidelines.** Some people may interpret the Guidelines as an attempt to control the design and use streets. Others from communities whose interests are represented in the Guidelines may still feel the need to find faults in the document. Be prepared for some criticism.
- **Be prepared for questions about budgeting and implementation.** Council and the public will want to know how the Guidelines will impact capital projects and budgets.

4. Next Steps

City Staff thanked participants for their feedback and committed to sharing a Draft Workshop Summary in the coming weeks. Adam Popper reminded participants that their written comments and suggested changes must be received by Friday, September 23 to be considered for the final Guidelines. Janet Lo reviewed the timeline to Council consideration of the Guidelines, including the dates at which the Guidelines and Council Report will be made public on the Public Works and Infrastructure Committee meeting agenda (November 7, 2016), and the meeting dates for PWIC and Council consideration (November 21, 2016 and December 13-15, 2016, respectively). Adam invited SAG members to share blog or social media posts about the Guidelines (#TOCompleteStreets), and reminded the group that they are welcome to depute at the PWIC and Council meetings. Adam and Janet thanked SAG members for their participation and commitment throughout the process.

Appendix A. Meeting Agenda

City of Toronto Complete Streets Guidelines September 2016 Stakeholder Advisory Group Meeting

Metro Hall, Room 303 — 55 John Street

Tuesday, September 20, 2016— 5:00 – 8:00 pm

Proposed Agenda

Purpose: To present and discuss updates to the Guidelines, gather final feedback from participants, and discuss final steps to completion and Council consideration.

5:00 Guidelines Presentation – including discussion of key component chapters

Questions of Clarification

Feedback: What's missing, needs clarification or strengthening?

6:30 Break

6:45 Implementation – including discussion of issues

7:30 Next Steps and Concluding Discussions

How do you think the Complete Streets Guidelines will be received by...

- 1. your constituents/groups?*
- 2. the general public?*
- 3. City Council?*

What would you say are the key messages of this document?

8:00 Adjourn

Appendix B. List of Invitees and Participants

Below is the list of the organizations that were invited to apply for SAG membership. The organizations that participated in the fourth SAG meeting are noted in **bold**.

8-80 Cities	Centre for Independent Living in Toronto	Metropolitan Action Committee on Violence Against Women and Children (METRAC)	Senior's Strategy Leader
Active and Safe Routes to School	Toronto CILT	Municipal Engineers Association of Ontario	Share the Road Coalition
Alliance for Equality for Blind Canadians (AEBC)	City of Mississauga	Municipal Urban Designers Roundtable (MUDR)	Spacing
Architecture for Humanity	Transportation Works Department	Neptis Foundation	Steve Munro
Autoshare	Civic Action	North American Native Plant Society	The Laneway Project
Beanfield	Clean Air Partnership	Ontario Association of Landscape Architects (OALA)	Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
Bell Canada	CNIB	Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO)	Toronto Association of BIAs
BionX International Corporation	Code Red TO	Ontario Motor Coach Association	Toronto Atmospheric Fund
Building, Industry, and Land Development (BILD)	Council for Canadian Urbanism	Ontario Professional Planners Institute (OPPI)	Toronto Centre for Active Transportation
Canada Post	Creating Healthy and Sustainable Environments	Ontario Public Works Association (OPWA)	Toronto Community Foundation
Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment	Cycle Toronto	Ontario Traffic Council	Toronto Electric Riders Association
Canadian Automobile Association	Cycling Think and Do Tank	Ontario Trucking Association	Toronto Environmental Alliance
Canadian National Institute for the Blind	David Suzuki Foundation	Park People	Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
Council of Canadians for the Blind	Ecojustice	People Plan Toronto	Toronto Skateboarding Committee
Canadian Courier and Logistics Association	Enbridge Gas Distribution	Pollution Probe	Toronto Women's City Alliance
Association	Environmental Defence Canada	Public Space Workshop	Toronto Society of Architects
Canadian Environmental Law Association	Enwave	Registered Nurses Association of Ontario	Transportation Options
Canadian Institute of Transportation Engineers	Evergreen	Residential and Civil Construction Alliance of Ontario	TTC Riders
Canadian Urban Transit Association (CUTA)	Green Communities Canada	Ryerson University	University of Toronto
Cancer Care Ontario	Harbord Village Residents Association		Urban Land Institute
CARP	Heritage Toronto		Urban+Digital
	Heart and Stroke		Walk Toronto
	iTaxiWorkers		Waterfront Regeneration Trust
	Jane's Walk		Wellesley Institute
	LEAF		
	Metrolinx - GO Transit		
	Metrolinx - Smart Commute		

Appendix C: Comments submitted by SAG members

Written comments submitted by email by SAG members before and after the September 20, 2016 meeting are included in the pages that follow. Written comments were received from the following SAG members:

1. Kara Garcia, David Suzuki Foundation
2. Gord Brown, Harbord Village Residents Association
3. Cameron Richardson, Toronto Region Conservation Authority
4. Dylan Reid, Walk Toronto

1. Comments submitted by Kara Garcia, David Suzuki Foundation

Subject: Re: Toronto Complete Streets Guidelines - Stakeholder Advisory Group
Meeting: September 20th
September 20, 2016

Hi Adam,

I have a comment, and I'm not sure if this suits your guide, but perhaps you can direct it to the right place.

In general, the guidelines seem to focus on adult users, so I thought children and animals should get special attention. I suggest that street design guidelines keep in mind line of eyesight for different users, with an effort to include stimulating, appropriate and interactive features for all. For example:

- Child sized street furniture
- Bushes at dog level

The King-Spadina ward is going through a dramatic transformation, with more children, elders, and dogs.

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to the SAG meeting.

Best,
Kara

2. Comments submitted by Gord Brown, Harbord Village Residents Association

Subject: Feedback re: SAG Meeting #4
September 22, 2016

Hello Adam:

Thanks again for arranging this meeting, and for the advance sharing of the information. Hopefully, you also found it helpful to get a more informed "heads-up" on what SAG members might be thinking.

Thanks also to your team for the truly excellent product that is emerging. It's clear that feedback has been received, and incorporated to the extent you could -- politically and strategically.

I want to acknowledge and express my appreciation for the attempts to address my concerns, specifically:

- several references in the document to the clear priority on pedestrian safety, as the most vulnerable road users.
- a clear statement that "mixing areas" are to be avoided.

That being said, I'll be pleased to recommend that both HVRA and the Disability Issues Committee support the Guidelines, if the following key concerns can be addressed:

1. Section 8.3, Design for Vulnerable Users

To highlight and expand on the high vulnerability of pedestrians mentioned here and elsewhere in the document, I suggest adding wording to descriptively highlight the vulnerability of pedestrians to ALL higher momentum road users, including cyclists -- for example, a second paragraph that reads:

"As indicated in Section 4.0, pedestrians are the priority in street design -- and their mobility and safety should be prioritized in roadway design. The reality of mobility, balance, impaired vision and cognitive issues mean that not only are pedestrians more vulnerable to motor vehicle collisions, but also to actual or feared interactions with other road users (for example, cyclists) that may cause loss of balance, and a harmful or fatal fall. Appropriate and effective separation of pedestrians from higher momentum road users is therefore a key factor in the safety of Complete Streets."

In addition, I suggest it is important to graphically depict this high vulnerability of pedestrians by modifying Figure 8.4 (as suggested in previous correspondence), to present cyclists and pedestrians separately. Specifically, I suggest that you please:

- Modify text to read: "*The force between two colliding objects is a factor of their respective momentum -- mass (weight) multiplied by velocity (speed in a straight line). Momentum differential between street users results in more severe injuries to the lighter or slower of the two colliding bodies.* [NB: this wording was previously provided in response to request by Swarhum Assoc after the previous SAG meeting, where this recommendation was presented by Walk Toronto].
- Modify graphic to separate cyclists and pedestrians (ie. four categories that reflect the four road users used throughout the Guidelines), and provide three pieces of data for each road users: mass, average velocity (or range of velocities) for each road user, and momentum (shown as High, High-Medium, Medium, and Low)
- Modify graphic title to read: Momentum of Various Road Users

2. Section 3.1, Steps for Street Design and Decision Making; and Appendix A2 Checklists

As highlighted by the Disability Issues Committee, and in my previous comments, I believe there is high safety value in specifying the requirement for a *Road User Risk Assessment* as part of the process of Assembling, Evaluating and Refining Complete Streets Design Options. This was done on a trial basis for the Bloor Street Bike Lanes Study, and even as a first attempt, it demonstrated the value of a simple, tabular presentation of relative road user risk impact in supporting a recommended alternative.

To do this would require simple modifications to:

- Section 3.1, Step 4, Evaluate, with wording such as: *To objectively assess the road user risk impact of each alternative, a Road User Risk Assessment Template will be completed that outlines potential road user interactions, and whether the risk to specific road users has increased, decreased or is unaffected. Where there is the potential for increased road risk to a specific road user (eg. bike lanes moved to sidewalk level), provide details of: the nature of the risk; potential mitigating actions; cost of mitigating actions; and, proposed follow-up plan to ensure effectiveness of proposed risk mitigation.*
- Appendix A2, on Page 166, second checklist, to also capture this step.

3. Section 4.4 Additional Accessibility and Universal Design Features

Reflecting my comments at the SAG meeting, I suggest that this section would benefit from the addition of two items:

- *safe, direct access to curbside transit, vehicle transfer and crosswalks.* {As a minimum, this would encourage careful design of crossings for sidewalk level cycle tracks}
- and, an item that parallels the intro to Section 5.0: *For many people, walking close to fast cyclists on sidewalk level cycle tracks and in mixing areas is uncomfortable and potentially threatening. Effective physical separation between pedestrians and cyclists pedestrians in such situations can reduce potential conflict and enhance real and perceived safety.*

Tactile Walking Surface Indicators & Delineators: the second bullet assumes (as do other references in the Draft Guidelines) that tactile delineators are all that is required to separate pedestrian and sidewalk-level cycle tracks. Reference to a "to-be-developed guideline" for sidewalk level cycle tracks would eliminate this bias, and allow concerns of the Disability Issues Committee to be more fully addressed in a manner that reflects a direct correlation between the speed and volume of cyclist traffic, and the requirement for greater physical separation.

4. Section 5.1 Cycling Design Principles, 3. Prioritize the Most Vulnerable Users:

I suggest a minor re-write that would parallel the need for greater cyclist/motorist separation as volume and speed of motor vehicle traffic increases. A suggested rewrite of the third sentence is: *Protect pedestrians from cyclists by providing cycling facilities that are appropriately separated from sidewalks, using design treatments that effectively address the volume and speed of adjacent cycling traffic. Separation treatments range from full curb or physical barrier separation, to visual contrast and tactile indicators. (See separate guidelines for details).*

I appreciate your consideration of these final, major comments -- and would be glad to address any questions.

Sincerely,

Gord Brown

3. Comments submitted by Cameron Richardson, Toronto Region Conservation Authority

Subject: Green Streets Guidelines SAG Feedback
September 23, 2016

Hello,

Thank you for inviting me to attend the SAG meeting on Tuesday, September 20th. It was a very productive meeting and very well organized for the volume of content that needed to be reviewed,

I don't have any specific feedback for the guidelines as many of the other SAG members covered of similar concerns. I will just highlight a few that stuck out to me:

- The photos throughout the document are great but I agree with other members that some may have to be changed to relate more to the section they are found in. Added captions will aid in this as well.
- It seemed to me that a lot of issues that other SAG members raised had to do with wayfinding and signage on streets. You do mention the Toronto 360 Wayfinding strategy throughout the document but perhaps making this more apparent and visible will help to reduce some of these concerns in the future.
- The guidelines are quite long so some sort of summary document that highlights key guidelines and objectives would be useful. This could be in the form of a web-based version of the document (with hyperlinks to more in depth information) or in the form of some sort of community engagement handout. Using simple language that is accessible to the majority of residents would be helpful.

Those are the only comments I have. Again, I just want to reiterate that the document is excellent!

Thanks again,
Cameron

Cameron Richardson, M.Sc. Project Manager, Don & Highland Watersheds
Watershed Strategies Division | Toronto and Region Conservation

4. Comments submitted by Dylan Reid, Walk Toronto

Subject: Re: Complete Streets Guidelines Stakeholder Advisory Group DRAFT Summary
September 26, 2016

Hi Adam,

This looks great.

A few thoughts.

My thoughts reading the key messages (section 2):

- Re. flexibility - one the aspects I hoped to emphasize more in terms of flexibility is different uses within a limited time frame - day, week, season - that can go back and forth (not just a progression over time). Can that be in the key message?

- Executive summary - make sure it conveys, not just the substance, but also the presence of useful illustrations, charts and photographs (e.g. could be a collage around the margins or something). That helps create a sense of dynamism and excitement, and could draw people into reading.

Once I kept reading, I see you actually address these in the body of summary. Maybe you can integrate these points into the key messages, though? Or else, you could make the key messages even more concise so they're just quick points without detail.

Other than that, looks good!

Dylan