SUBJECT: Downtown Transportation Master Plan Five Year Review (PW08083) - (City Wide)

RECOMMENDATION:

(a) That the five year review of the 2001 Downtown Transportation Master Plan (DTMP) be endorsed and the General Manager of the Public Works Department be authorized and directed to file the five year review, as per the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (October 2007), on the public record with the Municipal Clerk for a thirty day public review;

(b) That upon the completion of the thirty day public review, the General Manager of the Public Works Department be authorized and directed to program and include the recommended projects, (as shown in Appendix A), in the five year review of the Downtown Transportation Master Plan in the capital budget for future years; and,

(c) That with respect to the Gore Park Pedestrianization Plaza Initiative, the concept of Closing the South Leg of Gore Park, to begin as a pilot project, be endorsed, and,

   (i) All HSR buses will be redirected to the North side of Gore Park and the proposed Multi-Modal Transit Terminal, consistent with the final recommendations for the Multi-Modal Transit Terminal, to allow for a focus on pedestrians; and

   (ii) That the General Manager of Public Works be authorized and directed to undertake a functional design study, which will include a consultation and communications strategy, at an approximate cost of $100,000, subject to approval through the 2009 budget process.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The purpose of this five-year review is to re-evaluate projects outstanding from the 2001 Downtown Transportation Master Plan (DTMP). A study area map and table, illustrating the preferred alternatives, are available in Appendix A.

Through this review, the 2001 objectives were found to be still valid, except:

- There is now a greater desire for pedestrian improvements (Gore Park);
- The potential for rapid transit is more immediate, impacting James Street, Main Street and King Street; and,
- There is less need for policy intervention on parking - due to market forces taking over.

Although some of the projects recommended from the 2001 DTMP have been implemented, a number of projects are still outstanding.

- Two-way road conversions on: King/York/Wilson; Bay Street (optional); Park/McNab; Hughson/Hess; King William; Rebecca and Hunter Street;
- Pedestrian improvements to designated streets as budget/needs justification permits;
- Cycling Network Improvements: Hunter Street/Canada Street Bike Lanes; Caroline Street Contra-flow lane; Ferguson Street Bike Lanes; York Street Bike Lanes;
- Other Recommendations: New Transit Terminal at MacNab; Employee Trip Reduction Program; Long Term Parking Rate Increase

To determine if there have been any changes that would trigger a more detailed review to the 2001 DTMP recommendations, the follow approach was undertaken:

- Data used in the original study was compared with current data and assessed any impacts on the validity of the 2001 recommendations;
- Assumptions revisited for recommended schedule B projects that are yet to be implemented to ensure they are still valid in the current context;
- A more detailed review of the 2001 recommendations is suggested if current conditions warrant it; and
- Allow planned Schedule B projects beyond 2006 to proceed.
The following projects are recommended for design and implementation as soon as budget allows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two-way conversions:</th>
<th>Pedestrian improvements:</th>
<th>Cycling improvements:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• York Boulevard/Wilson Street</td>
<td>• Jackson Street</td>
<td>• Ferguson Avenue bicycle lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Park/MacNab</td>
<td>• Queen Street</td>
<td>• York Boulevard bicycle lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hughson/Hess</td>
<td>• Catharine Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• King William</td>
<td>• Mary Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rebecca</td>
<td>• George Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following projects are not recommended at this time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two-way conversions:</th>
<th>Pedestrian improvements:</th>
<th>Cycling improvements:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• King Street</td>
<td>• Main Street</td>
<td>• Hunter Street bicycle lanes. The ability to provide bike lanes on Hunter Street is directly related to the current transit terminal Class EA study, which is nearing completion. This should be reviewed in more detail once the design for the transit terminal is finalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bay Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BACKGROUND:**

The City of Hamilton completed its Transportation Master Plan (DTMP) for the Downtown Area in 2001. The study was undertaken as part of a set of initiatives, referred to as **Putting People First: Downtown Land Use and Transportation**. “Putting People First” was an integrated land use and transportation planning exercise that examined the downtown as an overall system as opposed to a number of separate components.

Prior to October 2007, Municipal Class Environmental Assessment rules required a review of those projects not implemented every 5 years to determine need for detailed reviews and/or updates. Changes that may trigger need for detailed review of outstanding projects include:

- Major changes to original assumptions
- Major changes to components of the Master Plan
- Significant new environmental effects
- Major changes in proposed timing of projects within the Master Plan

In order to review the Master Plan and determine if there have been any changes that would trigger a more detailed review, the following approach was undertaken:

- Compare data used in the original study with current data and assess any impacts on the validity of the 2001 recommendations;
- Revisit assumptions and recommendations for schedule B projects that are yet to be implemented to ensure they are still valid in the current context;
- Suggest a more detailed review of the 2001 recommendations if current conditions warrant it; and
- Allow planned Schedule B projects beyond 2006 to proceed and enable projects to proceed with Phases 3 to 5 of the EA process.

The 2001 DTMP provided a number of recommendations addressing all aspects of the transportation system including road networks, bicycle networks, pedestrian facilities,
transit and parking. The following recommendations from the 2001 DTMP have been implemented:

- Conversion of James Street and John Street to two-way operations, initially consisting of the north sections in Fall 2002, followed by the remaining southern sections in Fall 2005. More analysis on observations from the James/John conversion experience are documented in Appendix B;
- Streetscaping improvements on Bay Street, Ferguson Avenue, Hughson Street and King William Street;
- Development of a King William Street Streetscaping Master Plan; and
- The initiation of an Environmental Assessment for the proposed Downtown Transit Terminal (location TBD)

A number of recommendations from the 2001 DTMP Plan have yet to be implemented. Below is a table of the projects recommended as per the 2001 DTMP, and the progress of the said projects thus far.

**Exhibit 1.1: Table of projects recommended in the 2001 DTMP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Improvement</th>
<th>Target Implementation</th>
<th>Actual Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Road Network Changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James/John Two-way Conversion (Phase 1)</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James/John Two-way Conversion (Full)</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King/York/Wilson Two-way Conversion (Partially to be completed with Farmer’s Market/Library Improvements)</td>
<td>Beyond 2006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Street Two-way Conversion (optional)</td>
<td>Beyond 2006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Street Network Changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park/McNab Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughson/Hess Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King William Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Street Conversion</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to designated streets as (Development of a King William Street Streetscape Master Plan, Streetscaping improvements on Bay Street, Ferguson Avenue, Hughson Street, and King William Street)</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cycling Network Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Street/Canada St Bike Lanes</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Street Contra-flow lane</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson Street Bike Lanes</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Street Bike Lanes</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Recommendations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Transit Terminal at MacNab (Starting an Environmental Assessment for the proposed Downtown Transit Terminal, for which the preferred location is to be selected in 2008)</td>
<td>Beyond 2006</td>
<td>EA on-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Trip Reduction Program</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Parking Rate Increase</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One of the cornerstone elements of the 2001 DTMP was the recommendation to convert several major and minor streets from one-way to two-way operation. The DTMP clearly stated that in order for the remaining two-way conversions to occur, there would need to be a measurable mode shift to non-automobile alternatives prior to implementation. The other approach would be diversion of existing traffic volumes after conversion occurs. Accordingly, this review examines trends in traffic volumes and transit ridership through the downtown to provide an assessment of whether or not any mode shift has occurred since 2001. A thorough review of the implemented projects is available in Appendix B. A review of the impacts of the James/John two-way conversion has also been carried out to provide insights into the impacts and public perceptions related to the two-way conversions (see Appendix B: Review of Implemented Projects). A number of these recommendations are outstanding and were reconsidered in this five-year review, with regard to new City policies and directions.

To guide the review of outstanding projects, with specific regard to two-way street conversions, a review of the impacts of the completed two-way conversions on James Street and John Street was carried out. In general, the two-way conversions were intended to slow traffic, provide increased accessibility to properties, but had the potential to increase collision exposure and increase congestion and travel times. The DTMP 5 year review attempted to quantify as much as possible the actual impacts arising from the implementation of two-way traffic on James Street and John Street (see Appendix B: A Review of Implemented Projects). Additionally, business located along James Street and John Street were interviewed to get feedback on downtown transportation issues, and also to obtain reactions to the two-conversion of these streets. The purpose of conducting these interviews was to obtain a snapshot of perspectives on changes to the transportation network that have been implemented since 2001.

Key changes since 2001 that would impact on the implementation of outstanding projects from 2001, as identified in the DTMP 5 year review, are:

- Greater emphasis on environment, including air quality and climate change;
- Downtown Hamilton is now designated as an Urban Growth Centre by the Province of Ontario;
- Funding opportunities for rapid transit have arisen;
- Increased aspirations for pedestrian improvements (e.g. Pedestrian Charter);
- Commitment to improve street façade (e.g. Farmers Market/Library, Art Gallery);
- Major developments are now taking place;
- No significant change in traffic volumes in the study area;
- Increase in parking occupancy throughout study area; and
- Increased transit ridership evident from HSR data.

Findings
The 2001 objectives were found to be still valid, except that issues around excess parking have lessened as parking supply has remained largely unchanged and occupancy has increased. The 2001 recommended solution is therefore considered still valid, except:

- There is now a greater desire for pedestrian improvements
- Potential for rapid transit is more immediate, impacting James Street, Main Street and King Street
- Less need for policy intervention on parking - due to market forces taking over
As a result of the five-year review of the Master Plan, there are outstanding projects (from the 2001 DTMP) that are recommended for implementation (see Appendix A). Given these new findings, two new projects that also recommended are:

- Caroline Street two-way conversion
- Gore Park pedestrianization – proceed with planning/preparation and next steps

As a result of the five-year review of the 2001 Master Plan, the following outstanding projects are recommended for design and implementation, as soon as the budget allows:

**Two-way conversions:**

- **York Boulevard/Wilson Street two-way conversion:** The 2001 Master Plan identified York Boulevard as a priority for two-way traffic and bike lanes.

Key issues that must be considered in the proposed conversion of York Boulevard from one-way to two-way traffic include:

- A commitment has been made by the City for pedestrian improvements around the Farmers Market and Library;
- A Streetscape Master Plan (urban design study) for York Boulevard between Bay Street and James Street is currently under way; current eastbound traffic volumes on one-way York Boulevard in the vicinity of James Street exceed the capacity of a two-way street, and traffic diversion will need to occur.
- If vehicle capacity on York Boulevard is reduced, other techniques for improving the pedestrian environment on Main Street that do not reduce vehicle capacity on Main street may be required; and
- Impacts of two-way traffic on transit speeds and integration with future Rapid Transit need to be considered; and
- More recently a need for wider sidewalks, parking and amenity space has been identified to support the Market Precinct. A key challenge is how to allocate available road space to accommodate these competing needs while maintaining reasonable vehicular access.

The rationale/benefits for converting York Boulevard/Wilson Street to two-way traffic is as follows:

- will reduce traffic speeds on York Boulevard/Wilson Street through the study area;
- will reduce circuitous travel to and from properties in the downtown; and
- provides for greater flexibility for changing King Street (i.e. future studies – Rapid Transit).

While the conversion would provide benefits, there are issues with the implementation of two-way traffic on York Boulevard/Wilson Street that will need to be considered:

- Two-way conversion will require removal of parking on either side;
- Two-way conversion reduces traffic speeds, but long queues may form in peak hours unless diversion occurs;
- Lane widths in some locations will be close to the lowest acceptable lane widths;
- Two-way conversion of York Boulevard to Wilson Street reduces capacity for eastbound traffic and requires diversion to alternate routes/modes (possibly Main Street, Barton Street);
- A reduction in travel speeds may increase emergency response times (based on our understanding but EMS has not provided any comment); and
Two-way conversion will introduce opposing movements and affect access to properties such as the York Parkade.

Some of the above diversion could take place with drivers switching to alternative routes or by using alternate modes such as transit or cycling, or by changing the time of the trip to avoid peak hour conditions. Furthermore, analysis using an updated EMME/2 transportation model indicates a large number of trips on York Boulevard are long distance trips with origins and destinations outside the downtown. A significant proportion of traffic on York Boulevard appears to have origins on Highway 403, and destinations on Burlington Street. Based on the above analysis, a significant portion of York Boulevard traffic could use alternative routes, take transit (HSR or GO Transit) or cycle.

As per the analysis, the following recommendation is made for York Boulevard/Wilson Street:
• Convert to two-way traffic as recommended in the 2001 Master Plan between Bay Street and Wellington Street; and
• Proceed with preliminary design to determine how best to accommodate both bicycle lanes and parking; see Appendix A.

• **Park/MacNab two-way conversion:** Conversion of MacNab Street from one-way to two-way operation from York Boulevard would provide additional access to the Farmers Market from the north. The two-way connection could also allow an extension of the Farmers Market Precinct north of York Boulevard. While the DTMP study area extends only as far north as Barton Street, the North End Traffic Management Study recommends two-way conversion on the northern section of MacNab Street between the railway corridor and the waterfront. No issues have been identified with the conversion of Park Street to two-way operations.

• **Hughson two-way conversion:** Changes in baseline conditions have not impacted the need and justification to convert Hughson Street north of Wilson Street to two-way operation.

• **Hess two-way conversion:** The conversion of the southern portion of Hess Street in the Durand neighbourhood took place in 2004 and has been well received in the neighbourhood. Conversion of the remaining section north of York Street would provide a connection between Cannon Street and York Boulevard, and also to King Street and Main Street. Changes in baseline conditions have not impacted the need and justification to convert Hess Street to two-way operation.

• **King William two-way conversion:** Conversion of King William Street was recommended in 2001 between John Street and Mary Street. Changes in baseline conditions have not impacted the need and justification to convert King William Street to two-way operation. This five-year review further endorses this recommendation.

• **Rebecca two-way conversion:** Conversion of Rebecca Street was recommended between John Street and Wellington Street. Changes in baseline conditions have not impacted the need and justification to convert Rebecca Street to two-way operation. This five-year review further endorses this recommendation.

**Pedestrian improvements:** the baseline review has concluded that the majority of pedestrian improvements can be implemented as originally planned in the 2001 DTMP,
and do not require further detailed investigation. The scope of pedestrian improvements will be determined at the functional design stage, once the DTMP has been approved. The following projects are recommended for pedestrian improvements:

- **Jackson Street**
- **Queen Street**
- **Catharine Street**
- **Mary Street**
- **George Street**

Cycling improvements: The 2001 Plan recognized the need for improved east-west bike connections. The following cycling network improvements are considered for further review:

- **Ferguson Avenue bicycle lanes**: the location where the Ferguson Avenue bicycle/pedestrian route crosses Main Street is recommended for traffic signal control in order to provide a safer crossing at what is currently an uncontrolled crossing point across four lanes of arterial traffic.

- **York Boulevard bicycle lanes**: On York Boulevard east of Bay Street, provision of dedicated bike lanes and two-way traffic will impact the ability to accommodate vehicular traffic and parking. On-street parking is considered essential by the BIAs and residents.

Accordingly, dedicated bicycle lanes are recommended on York Boulevard from Queen Street at the western edge of the study area to Bay Street. East of Bay Street, shared lanes are proposed.

York Blvd between Bay Street & James Street is currently undergoing a Streetscape Master Plan for the two-way conversion. The Hamilton Transportation Master Plan recommends bike lanes or possibly shared lanes (if space constraints) for the full length of York from Dundurn Street through to James Street, and continuing on Wilson St through to Sherman. Different options for the cross-sections are being considered - mindful of the various demands - including pedestrian areas, transit, on-street parking, cycling facilities, and travel lane requirements.

Projects not recommended for implementation at this time

- **King Street two-way conversion** (to be implemented pending outcome of Rapid Transit and Gore Park studies)

In 2007, King Street was identified as a potential rapid transit route. Ultimately, the location and type of rapid transit system selected may dictate the future configuration for King Street. Also, an investigation of alternatives to improve pedestrian conditions on King Street at Gore Park has been initiated.

The rationale for the above recommendation for King Street is as follows:

- Further Environmental Assessment studies are required to confirm preferred routing and design concepts for Rapid Transit and related terminal facilities;
- A significant change from previous assumptions has occurred due to future rapid transit on King Street or Main Street and the concept of a Gore Park pedestrian plaza; and
- Proceeding with two-way conversion before transit and Gore Park issues are resolved is premature.
While the two-way conversion of King Street is expected to provide benefits, there are issues with the implementation of two-way traffic on King Street that will need to be considered, in addition to those listed under “rationale”:

- Narrow lane widths in some locations will be close to the lowest acceptable lane widths;
- Implementing two-way traffic on King Street may reduce speeds of future rapid transit or limit options for providing Rapid Transit;
- A reduction in travel speeds may increase emergency response times; and
- Two-way conversion will introduce opposing movements and affect access to properties.

**Bay Street Two-Way Conversion**: As in 2001, the two-way conversion of Bay Street was recommended as an optional project. This recommendation for Bay Street in the study area remains optional. This project should only be considered if monitoring after two-way conversion of York Boulevard indicates benefits would result from the conversion of Bay Street.

**Main Street Pedestrian Improvements**: (Implement pending outcome of Rapid Transit and Gore Park studies). Any streetscape improvements carried out on Main Street prior to the decision on east-west rapid transit should not reduce lane capacity in a manner that would preclude rapid transit on Main Street. Rapid transit planning should include opportunities to improve pedestrian environment on Main Street.

Projects not included in original Master Plan recommended to be implemented:

- **Caroline Street two-way conversion**: The 2001 Master Plan recommended providing a contraflow bicycle lane on Caroline Street from York Boulevard to Herkimer Street. Subsequently, Caroline Street south of Main Street has been converted to two-way traffic, which does not allow the provision of adding bike lanes in that section without removal of parking. However, the two-way conversion has provided a lower speed environment and allows northbound movement by bicycles and other vehicles. As part of the two-way conversions, bike lanes could be installed on Caroline Street between York Boulevard and Main Street, but the lanes would not connect to other routes. Converting Caroline Street to two-way operations between Main Street and York Street would help to reduce speeds, and improve access to residences, businesses and parking on Caroline Street. This alternative would create similar conditions to those on Caroline Street south of Main Street, and is recommended for implementation.

- **Gore Park Pedestrianization Plaza**: proceed with planning/preparation and next steps as described below.

In October, 2007, Mayor Fred Eisenberger made a presentation to the Public Works Committee that called for an investigation of pedestrianizing the Gore by closing it off to through traffic and creating a public plaza. The Gore area generally refers to the Gore Park area on King Street between James Street and John Street, extending east to Catharine Street, although Mayor Eisenberger referred to an area from James Street potentially extending as far east as Wellington Street as well. Mayor Eisenberger noted that the idea was becoming more desirable given that the HSR buses are likely to be moved from Gore Park, the City increased the focus on promoting more sustainable forms of transportation, and the development of a rapid transit system through the downtown is being planned. Mayor Eisenberger’s presentation suggested several options to achieve the objective of pedestrianizing the Gore:
• Closing off one or both legs of King Street through Gore Park
• Continuing to allow public transit and delivery vehicles to pass through
• Seasonal or time of day closures

The Public Works Committee forwarded the pedestrianization proposal to staff for further review and evaluation in conjunction with the review of the DTMP.

Presently, Gore Park sits beside four lanes of fast moving, heavy, and noisy vehicle traffic which bisect the park from retail uses along the north side of King Street. A fence running the length of the park’s northern edge further reinforces this division. The northern leg of King also handles most of the area’s bus and pedestrian traffic. Not surprisingly, it is also home to the busier retail shops. There is considerably less pedestrian traffic on King Street’s south leg. The south leg also sees significantly more shade not only because it is north facing, but also due to a taller built form. Most pedestrians in this area are idly waiting for buses. This southern leg also handles very little vehicle traffic, thus it does not pose a significant barrier for pedestrians. Appendix C presents the constraints and opportunities facing the pedestrianization of Gore Park.

**Closure Options**

There is a wide range of potential closure options for the re-design of King Street including temporary closures, partial closures in the area of Gore Park only, or more extensive permanent closures, including closing King Street between James Street and Wellington Street. One of the key tasks of this study was to investigate the traffic impacts of potential closures. To do this, three basic scenarios were developed and tested to reflect the range of potential options. Some of these scenarios, or a combination of a few, could be considered regardless of the design option pursued. Each of these closure scenarios could involve:

- Introducing Rapid Transit on King Street;
- Accommodating delivery vehicles;
- Temporary closures only (e.g. on weekends);
- Provisions for bicycles; and
- Shared space design.

**Design Options (for further consideration once the closure option is selected)**

Based on the analysis of case studies from other communities, alike to Hamilton, the following design options may be considered:

- Motorized vehicles are not permitted but delivery vehicles can access the space during restricted hours. A bus corridor passes through the northern edge but all idle time is spent off the site.
- Gore Park’s existing trees are kept, but more are added to expand the park’s boundaries.
- The central area is dedicated to passive activity with kiosks, movable seating, cafes, and space for event programming. This new space for activities both preserves and frames the existing iconic monuments and fountain.
- The existing sidewalks adjacent to retail are removed and use the same new paving as the rest of the space. These, now wider, linear corridors still support most east/west movement.

**Options for Investigation of Transportation Impacts for Gore Park**
The following options were investigated using EMME/2 software to predict network-wide effects of road closures, and using Synchro software to review the impacts on specific intersections in terms of delays and queuing.

**Scenario 1**
- Close King Street (north and south leg) to vehicular traffic between James Street and Wellington Street;
- All other primary mobility streets remain as is; and
- All north-south streets remain open to traffic except Hughson Street.

**Scenario 2**
- Close both sides of King Street (north and south leg) to vehicular traffic between James Street and John Street
- All other primary mobility streets remain as is; and
- James Street and John Street remain open to north-south traffic.

**Scenario 3**
- Close King Street to vehicular traffic between James Street and Wellington Street;
- York Boulevard/Wilson Street and King Street (James to Queen) converted to two-way traffic; and
- All north-south streets remain open to traffic.

**Scenario 4**
A fourth scenario involving the closure of the south leg of King Street was found to have minimal traffic impacts.

**Evaluation of Closures of King Street (all scenarios)**
**Impact of King Street Closure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Pedestrian and Cycling Environment | • Reduced traffic noise and visual presence of cars  
• Closure would likely be complemented with investments in street furniture, landscaping and other pedestrian and cycling amenities | • At times the closed street may have few pedestrians and feel vacant  
• Under full pedestrian option, cyclists may be delayed |
| Business Environment       | • Street closure may be stimulus for investment in Downtown  
• Pedestrian traffic will increase | • Businesses that depend on automobile traffic and parking may be affected  
• May take time to build pedestrian levels necessary to support business |
| Pedestrian and Vehicle Safety | • Reduced pedestrian-vehicle conflicts in closed sections | • Adjacent streets may become busier  
• Diversions from King Street may result in more “turning” traffic movements and may increase potential for collisions |
| Transit Level of Service   | • Rapid transit could be a key feature of King Street  
• Reduced level of private vehicle service will make transit more attractive | • Transit running times may be affected at transition points  
• North-south transit times may increase as a result of east-west traffic congestion. Diverted traffic turning on James Street to get back to King Street may result in queuing on James Street which would impact Transit. |
| Traffic Level of Service   | • Could serve to shift longer distance vehicle trips to transit, with widespread improvements in level of service | • Delays on parallel streets and turning movements/volumes at transition points will result in a reduced intersection level of service. |

Suggested options for pedestrianization of Gore Park:
1) Close south leg
2) Pilot test varying degrees of temporary street closures to explore public opinions under these conditions, the traffic impacts of the closure, and generate public interest.
3) Establish a consultation webpage for announcing project updates and upcoming events as well as facilitating a creative exchange of ideas amongst interested parties.
4) Identify and refine viable functional design options for Gore Park, followed by a series of design charrettes to further build public interest to refine the alternatives and selection of the final design options.

Next steps for pedestrianization of Gore Park:
- Articulate a clear vision for Gore Park that will provide a framework for strong leadership creative communication that is free to challenge existing conventions while reflecting local culture and values.
- Finalize the rapid transit feasibility studies to move forward in coordinating Gore Park redesign initiatives.
- Finalize the transit terminal options, by undertaking a functional design study to begin the process of rationalizing bus traffic around Gore Park and open the...
possibility for a Gore Park pedestrianization project to link with this new transit hub.

**ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION:**

1) The alternative to the Downtown Transportation Master Plan Five year review recommendation (1(a) and (b) proposed on Page 1 of this report) is: **Not file the five year review of the Downtown Transportation Master Plan (2001)**

   The outcome of this Do nothing Alternative would result in the City being unable to implement any of the outstanding projects from the 2001 Downtown Transportation Master Plan. It is therefore suggested that recommendations a) and b), as indicated on Pg 1 of this report, be endorsed.

2) The alternatives to the Gore Park Pedestrianization Plaza recommendation (1(c) proposed on Page 1 of this report) are:

   There are three alternatives to consider for the Gore Park Pedestrianization initiative:
   (a) That another scenario be selected, as described in this report on Pg 11;
   (b) That no action be taken to further the study on the Gore Park Pedestrianization Plaza;
   (c) That the south leg of Gore Park be closed permanently, rather on a pilot project basis.

   The south leg closure of Gore Park will assist Hamilton in the opportunity to assert local culture by way of a civic square. It will also capitalize on the focus on active transportation (pedestrian traffic), which is a major consideration put forth in the City Transportation Plan. Further, feedback from the Downtown BIA suggests that there is support for a south leg closure of Gore Park, on a pilot project basis. It is therefore suggested that recommendation c), as indicated on Pg 1 of this report be endorsed.

**FINANCIAL/STAFFING/LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:**

**Financial** - The City’s ten year capital plan for Downtown Hamilton was reviewed to determine funding and implementation timeframe and any changes that may be required to accommodate the recommendations of this five year review of the DTMP (2001) (please see the list of recommended projects in Appendix A). The bulk of primary and secondary street conversions were included in the Capital Plan for the year 2016. In order to achieve the objectives of the Master Plan, it is recommended that projects be brought forward wherever possible, especially the lower cost initiatives. The recommended projects will be referred to the Downtown West Harbourfront Coordination Committee’s capital budget sub-committee for review and update of the 10-year capital budget for downtown. In this way, projects will be brought forward for programming and implementation as per recommendation (b) on Page 1 of this report.

   Improvements to York Boulevard, are underway and being coordinated with the improvements to the Framer’s Market and Library. Improvements to York Boulevard were approved as part of the capital budget and are being funded from account number 4030703700. Funding (approximately $100,000) for the next phase of the Gore Park study, is subject to approval through the 2009 budget process. Assuming this is fine, no more money is needed for York.

   **Staffing** - There are no staffing implications.
Legal - Municipal undertakings such as road improvements, water and wastewater projects are subject to Ontario’s Environmental Assessment Act. The Act allows for the approval of Class Environmental Assessments and the municipality has the option of following the planning process set out in the Municipal Engineers Association Class Environmental Assessment (October 2000, as amended in 2007). As per these changes, a review of all outstanding projects is required every five years for those Master Plans that were started endorsed prior to September 2007.

POLICIES AFFECTING PROPOSAL:

There are several studies impacting the outstanding projects as identified in the DTMP (2001). The Growth Related Infrastructure and Development Strategy (GRIDS) study identifies the Downtown as a major node, consistent with the Provincial Growth Plan, and with this a requirement for intensification. The GRIDS study also provides the overall land use framework, including population and employment forecasts. This will have impacts on the Downtown transportation network performance and needs.

The Downtown Secondary Plan presents the community’s vision for the future of the Downtown, which guides public and private decision-making. Further, the Plan indicates what the City’s priorities will be for publicly funded initiatives in the Downtown.

The City-wide Transportation Master Plan identifies the need for an east-west and a north-south Higher Order Transit corridor through the Downtown. Stage 2 and Stage 3 of the City-wide Transportation Master Plan completed in May 2007 provided an overall policy and infrastructure framework for the transportation system, including rapid transit, over the next 20-30 years. The primary corridors for rapid transit that would impact the downtown were identified as follows:

- A lower east-west corridor on King Street/Main Street/Queenston Road
- A Central north-south corridor on James Street and Upper James via Mohawk College

Rapid Transit alignments through the Downtown were not being planned at the time the DTMP was prepared, and so were not considered in the original DTMP. Specific alignments will be determined through the Environmental Assessment process and through consultation with the Transit Division, the public and other stakeholders. Outstanding projects in the DTMP must therefore be considered in light of the new policy direction for Rapid Transit in Hamilton.

The Public Works Strategic Plan is upheld through the DTMP because it positions Hamilton as a leader in greening and stewardship for the downtown core. Further, the projects set out reflect realistic and effective levels of service.

Additionally, there are several studies and documents, related to the downtown, that have a bearing on the recommendations of the 2001 DTMP including:

- The Corporate Strategic Plan – Focus areas: Growing our community, Healthy Community (7.7) and Environmental Stewardship (6.1).
- The Rapid Transit Feasibility Study
- The Hamilton Downtown Mobility Street Master Plan prepared in 2003;
- Setting Sail (The West Harbour Secondary Plan);
- The Environmental Assessment of Downtown Transit Terminal Options;
• Recommendations and implemented projects from Neighbourhood Traffic Management Studies in Durand, Corktown, and the North End;
• The upcoming Strathcona Neighbourhood Secondary Plan and,
• The Market Precinct Plan.

All of the above studies have been considered in the baseline review and the detailed review of outstanding projects and next steps for the DTMP 5 year review.

RELEVANT CONSULTATION:

Public Consultation
In accordance with the Class EA planning and design process, a public information centre (PIC) was held on October 3, 2007 to present the findings of the five year review and to receive feedback on the conclusions and recommendations. Additional issues such as the potential pedestrianization of Gore Park were raised just prior to the October 2007 PIC, and could not be addressed adequately at that PIC. Approximately 50 people attended the first PIC. Comments received from PIC #1 are presented in Appendix D. A second PIC was held on March 18, 2008 to present the technically preferred recommendations and the alternative closure options for Gore Park. Over 100 people attended. Comments received from PIC #2 are summarized in Appendix E.

To provide a forum for those in the public who were unable to attend the PICs, or meet with City staff during work hours, a 5yr review DTMP website was established. Content on the website included the PIC Boards presented at each PIC and a summary of comments received from the public.

Stakeholder Consultation
On Wednesday, July 18th and Friday, July 20th, 2007 selected businesses along James Street and John Street were interviewed to get feedback on downtown transportation issues and, in particular, reactions to the two-way conversion of these streets. The purpose of these interviews was to obtain a snapshot of perspectives on changes to the transportation system that have been implemented since 2001, as well as general thoughts on transportation issues. Overall, 26 business, selected at random, were surveyed in person. This exercise found that opinions regarding the effect of the two-way conversions and the direction of further two-way conversion was evenly split between those in favour and those opposing. As noted in the review of the past projects, in the period immediately following the conversions, there was motorist confusion, resulting accidents. In particular, the intersection of James Street and St Joseph’s Drive experienced a number of accidents before signage and signals were improved. Appendix B observes these differences and provides some rationale for the mixed business opinion on two-way street conversion. The overall results also indicate that businesses do not view the two-way conversion to have been successful in improving conditions for pedestrians. Almost 60% of surveyed businesses report that pedestrian conditions (e.g., pleasantness of walking environment, pedestrian safety, etc.) have not improved since the two-way conversion.

Additionally, a questionnaire was emailed to the James Street District, King West BIA, Downtown BIA, James North Business Association, and the International Village BIA on August 15, 2007. Questioned related to prioritization of objectives and potential changes, impact of two-way conversions, and general opinion on required changes. Unfortunately, only limited responses were received to the survey.
City Staff also met with the Downtown BIA Board of Directions in late March 2008 to solicit feedback on their impressions of the DTMP. At the request of the Downtown BIA, staff met with the BIA and their constituents in May 2008 to further discuss the five year review of the DTMP.

**City Departments**

Additionally, the following City of Hamilton departments were contacted for this project:

- Planning and Economic Development (Community Planning, Heritage and Development Planning)
- Public Works (Transit, Traffic Engineering & Operations, Capital Planning and Implementation)
- Hamilton Emergency Services
- Cultural Services (representative for the Farmer’s Market)
- Hamilton Public Library

**Agency Consultation**

Several agencies were contacted for this project. A complete list is indicated in the file report. The following Agencies acknowledged receipt of project information from the City:

- Natural Resources Canada
- Go Transit
- Indian and Northern Affairs Canada
- CN Rail
- Hydro One
- Transport Canada

Staff also met with interested Ward Councillors and the representatives from the Mayor’s Office, to gain insight into the current issues, as well as gain feedback on outstanding projects, as indicated in the 2001 DTMP.

**CITY STRATEGIC COMMITMENT:**

By evaluating the “**Triple Bottom Line**”, (community, environment, economic implications) we can make choices that create value across all three bottom lines, moving us closer to our vision for a sustainable community, and Provincial interests.

**Community Well-Being is enhanced.**  ☑ Yes  ☐ No
The public are involved in the definition and development of local solutions.

**Environmental Well-Being is enhanced.**  ☑ Yes  ☐ No
A sustainable transportation network provides many options for people and goods movement; vehicle-dependency is reduced.
Activities transportation, including pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles were considered for an efficient and effective transportation network

**Economic Well-Being is enhanced.**  ☑ Yes  ☐ No
Changes to the transportation network in the Downtown core, may encourage further investment. Further, existing businesses could capitalize on the improvements recommended should people find it easier to travel into the downtown, using a variety of different travel methods – walking, cycling, driving.

**Does the option you are recommending create value across all three bottom lines?**  ☑ Yes  ☐ No

**Do the options you are recommending make Hamilton a City of choice for high performance public servants?**  ☐ Yes  ☑ No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Improvement</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Estimated Start Year of Implementation</th>
<th>EA Schedule</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Road Network Changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York/Wilson Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>In conjunction with Farmers' Market Precinct Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>Pending Rapid Transit Feasibility Study Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Street Two-way Conversion (optional)</td>
<td>Not recommended</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Street Network Changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park/MacNab Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughson Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hess Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King William Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Two-way Conversion</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Street Conversion</td>
<td>Not recommended</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Two-way conversion costs no longer required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Street Two-way Conversion (Main to King)*</td>
<td>New Project</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>New project not included in Capital Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>Can implement</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>A+/B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Boulevard Streetscaping</td>
<td>Can implement**</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>A+/B</td>
<td>Streetscaping projects &gt;$2.2 million fall under Schedule B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Street</td>
<td>Can implement</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>A+/B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Street</td>
<td>Can implement</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>A+/B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catharine Street</td>
<td>Can implement</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>A+/B</td>
<td>(if not part of another project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Street</td>
<td>Can implement</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>A+/B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Street</td>
<td>Can implement</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>A+/B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cycling Network Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter St Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Street Contra-flow lane*</td>
<td>Not recommended</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Boulevard Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>A+/B</td>
<td>Could be A+ if no road widening required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Recommendations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Terminals at MacNab and Hunter</td>
<td>Pending EA approval***</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Trip Reduction Program</td>
<td>Can implement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Parking Rate Increase</td>
<td>Can implement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gore Park Pedestrianization</td>
<td>Proceed to further study/pilot projects</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>Streetscaping projects &gt;$2.2 million fall under Schedule</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**  
* Caroline Street subsequently converted to two-way, contraflow lane no longer required/feasible  
** Subject to and in conjunction with Farmers Market Precinct Project  
*** As part of separate study
Review of Implemented Projects

To guide the review of outstanding projects, a review of the impacts of the completed two-way conversions on James Street and John Street was carried out. In general, the two-way conversions were intended to slow traffic, provide increased accessibility to properties, but had the potential to increase collision exposure and increase congestion and travel times. The following review attempts to quantify as much as possible the actual impacts arising from the implementation of two-way traffic on James Street and John Street.

Traffic Volumes
- while traffic volumes have decreased in the peak direction on James Street and John Street, the volume decrease appears to have transferred from James Street to John Street for southbound traffic, and from John Street to James Street for northbound traffic. That is, the pre-conversion volumes appear to have been maintained within the James/John corridor.
- steady traffic volumes on Queen Street, but a decrease in southbound traffic volume on Wellington Street, and a minor increase in northbound traffic volume on Victoria Street following the two-way conversion of James and John Streets
- two-way conversion of James Street and John Street has not shifted traffic volumes to adjacent streets, nor does it appear to have increased or decreased traffic volumes in the Downtown significantly

Collisions
A review of the City's collision data was carried out to determine if any traffic safety impacts arising from previous two-way conversions could be observed. The review focused on James Street and John Street, splitting the review into two sections to review the impacts of the Phase 1 and Phase 2 conversions.

The Phase 1 conversion of James Street and John Street was completed in October 2002, and a review of collision data for a period of three years before and three years after was possible. Since the Phase 2 conversion was completed in November 2005, comparison of a three year period before and after the Phase 2 conversion was not possible. At the time that the analysis was carried out for this report, only one full year of collision data was available following the Phase 2 conversion, but the data has been included for illustrative purposes.

Data from 2004 and later was adjusted upwards to account for decrease in collision reporting that was documented in the City of Hamilton Collision Report of 2005-2006. The City's Collision Report states:

As a result of the introduction of self-reporting, there has been a significant decrease in total number of collisions reported by Police officers, and the statistics in this report reflect this. This is to be expected, as the onus for reporting minor collisions was shifted from the police officers to the general public. However, a parallel decrease in injury collisions was also noted in our statistics. This change was unexpected as all injury collisions are still categorized as requiring police reports. There are no obvious background factors which we can identify as causing a year-to-year reduction in injury collisions. We must, therefore, conclude that the change to reporting centres is also responsible for the statistical change in injury collisions.

PHASE 1 CONVERSION OF JAMES AND JOHN STREETS

Analysis of reported collisions on the northern sections of James Street (north of Main Street) and John Street (north of King Street) was carried out. Data for the conversion year (October 2002-October 2003) was excluded from the comparison to ensure that short-term impacts from drivers becoming familiar with the new two-way configuration did not skew the comparison of before and after conditions.

- an apparent increase in the number of 90 degree angle intersection collisions, but either shows no significant increase or a decrease in all other collision types. Based on the above data, it
appears that the conversion of James Street North to two-way traffic operation did not result in any significant increases in reported collisions.

As for James Street above, the frequency of different collision types on John Street North was reviewed before and after the Phase 1 two-way conversion. Exhibit 1-1 below shows the results of the comparison for John Street.

Exhibit 1.1 Collisions on John Street North before and after two-way conversion

As is the case for James Street, the above comparison on John Street indicates either no significant increase or a decrease in most collision types, although an increase in the frequency of pedestrian-vehicle collisions appears to have occurred.

While not shown in the charts above, the collision record indicates increase in collisions during the year of conversion. The year of conversion was removed from the above chart as it is considered to represent a time of transition in which people may have been adjusting to different traffic patterns.

PHASE 2 CONVERSION OF JAMES AND JOHN STREETS

For the two-way conversion of the south sections of James and John Streets in November 2005, only one complete year of data immediately following the conversion was available. Since three years of collision data before and after the conversion is not available for the Phase 2 conversion, before and after comparison of collision data for the Phase 2 conversion cannot be done in the same way as for the Phase 1 conversion. As noted above, the collision record for James Street and John Street North indicated an increase in collisions for the year immediately following the two-way conversion, which did not represent the collision frequency for the following years. This is the same for Phase 2 conversion.

- In particular, on James Street, there were 10 left turn collisions in 3 months at the intersection of James Street and St Joseph’s Drive. Intersection improvements at the intersection of James Street and St Joseph’s Drive were made to change signal timing and phasing, and this change appears to have addressed the collision issue since no left turn collisions were reported from February 2006 to June 2007.
- The collision data for John Street south indicates a decrease for most types of collision, with the exception of left turn collisions with oncoming traffic, and right turn collisions. However,
since collision data is not available for a three year period after the Phase 2 conversion, it is premature to draw conclusions on the impact of the Phase 2 conversion on the rate of collisions on James Street and John Street.

SUMMARY OF COLLISIONS ON JAMES AND JOHN STREETS

Data indicates an overall reduction in collisions following the Phase 1 two-way conversion (excluding the conversion year Oct 2002-03). The annual rate of collisions on James Street and John Street is shown in Exhibit 1-2 below. For the Phase 2 conversion, a comparison of collision records before and after the Phase 2 conversion is not informative due to the lack of data following the conversion. However, the exhibit below includes the Phase 1 and Phase 2 conversions for illustrative purposes.

Exhibit 1.2 Total collisions per year before and after Phase 1 and 2 conversions

With the exception of the Phase 2 conversion of James Street South (where three years of collision data following the conversion is not available, and results may not be representative of long-term trends), reported collisions have either stayed the same or decreased following the two-way conversion.

Travel Times

Part of the rationale for introducing two-way traffic on Hamilton’s downtown streets was to reduce traffic speeds and improve conditions for pedestrians. It was therefore anticipated that travel times would increase on the roads converted to two-way traffic. To measure the change in travel time due to two-way conversion, travel time surveys were carried out on James Street and John Street before the Phase 1 conversion, and after the Phase 1 and Phase 2 conversions. The travel times are for travel in the direction of travel on James Street and John Street prior to the two-way conversion, i.e. southbound on James Street and northbound on John Street.

Exhibit 1.3 Travel time on James Street and John Street North before and after Phase 1 and 2 conversions
The travel times above shown as 2002 represent peak hour travel times before the Phase 1 conversion in 2002, and are for travel on James Street between Burlington Street and King Street. The travel times shown as 2003 and 2007 represent peak hour travel times after the Phase 1 and Phase 2 conversions respectively. As can be seen in Exhibit 4-9 above, the southbound travel time on James Street North in the p.m. peak hour has increased by approximately one minute.

Exhibit 1-4: Travel time on James Street and John Street South before and after Phase 1 and 2 conversions

The travel times above shown as 2004 represent peak hour travel times before the Phase 2 conversion in 2002, and are for travel on James Street and John Street between King Street and St Joseph’s Drive. The travel times shown as 2007 represent peak hour travel times after the Phase 2 conversion. As can be seen in Exhibit 4-10 above, the southbound travel time on James Street South in the p.m. peak hour has increased by approximately one minute following the Phase 2 conversion. The northbound travel time on northbound John Street from St Joseph’s Drive to King Street has also increased by approximately one minute following the Phase 2 conversion.

The above data indicates that increased travel time has resulted from the two-way conversion of James Street and John Street.
### Summary of the constraints and opportunities in pedestrianizing Gore Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Although Gore Park has suffered in recent years, the area is still holds significant potential to meet the needs of a more pedestrian-friendly environment. Amplifying and expanding the park’s assets beyond its current boundaries may be the preferred option.</td>
<td>Gore Park is an important symbolic location to the City. It cannot be completely re-written and, in particular, the pre-existing mature trees, monuments, and memorials will have to be incorporated into the new design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With careful programming and design Gore Park itself could provide an important intermediary link between the opposite retail strips.</td>
<td>The area is quite wide and unlikely to function as a typical pedestrian street, but rather more like a public square or piazza.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the lack of development pressures, the area's beautiful architecture remains and offers tremendous potential for revitalizing the core as a historic centre, provided the buildings can be reused. Such a re-marketing of the city centre and possibly an important tourist destination.</td>
<td>Many buildings adjacent to the site (and some inside the site itself) are currently unoccupied. At night, there are few activities in the area and without many retail stores on adjacent streets, lighting is poor and the streets relatively devoid of people, making it feel somewhat unsafe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond transit, Jackson Square and the Eaton Centre generate significant pedestrian activity and could serve as important anchors for Gore Park provided they are well connected to it. As well, there is tremendous potential for infill development and historic preservation.</td>
<td>The park is not well anchored, with very few grand or symbolic pedestrian-friendly land uses on either end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The area is full of bus stops and with the potential for a new transit hub and rapid transit corridor nearby, transit can continue to play a major role in generating pedestrian activity in the park, particularly after dark.</td>
<td>The location of the new transit hub can have a dramatic impact on the feasibility of pedestrianizing Gore Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dense pre-existing office uses guarantee busy daytime pedestrian activity and parking lots provide excellent opportunities for development of other land uses, particularly residential, should property and rental values rise.</td>
<td>There are considerable densities immediately adjacent to the park, but most are only daytime uses and beyond these taller buildings there are many cheap surface parking lots, which will make it difficult to encourage alternative modes of transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lack of recreational space downtown can be seen as further justification for the importance of expanding Gore Park to provide much needed downtown space for recreational activities which would hopefully encourage further such public investments.</td>
<td>There are very few downtown parks and recreational spaces for Gore Park to connect with.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comments/ Questions

1. **Do you agree with the overall recommendations of the 2001 Downtown Transportation Master Plan, which involves rebalancing transportation capacity to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists? Please explain.**

   Many of the information boards are blatantly contradictory. For instance, how can anyone talk about pedestrian/cyclist safety in the same breath as making Main and King streets into “drag strips”. All the safety issues recommended in “Putting People First” are being ignored in favour of vehicular traffic.

   Not enough mention of curtailing auto capacity especially East/West on Main and King in conjunction with safer cycling alternatives and improved transit infrastructure. Overall glad to see.

   HSR should extend all mountain bus routes east/west out to Ancaster/stop at far end of Ancaster – not at Mohawk Rd./Upper Paradises/ stops at Meadowlands/Downtown Ancaster etc.

   I am generally happy with the direction and implementation of the 2001 plan, and certainly feel that major gains have been made. The steps to return to two-way streets, along with various traffic calming measures in the core, have had a huge impact on several key commercial areas, and there can be no question that James Streets North and South in particular have reaped the benefits of these changes.

   Yes, I agree that the transportation network should be rebalanced to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists. The current (1950s) network was designed with only the interests of motorists in mind, and has made the streets uncomfortable (and sometimes dangerous) for other street users. The emphasis on high speed through traffic has also been a factor in the decline of downtown as a commercial centre.

   Yes, great idea to add 2 way bicycle lanes reduce traffic lanes and maintain parking in most design plans. Great for King and York to become 2 way at Locke and Bay.

   Yes, on King and on Main I find that people speed and persons with mobility issues have difficulty in crossing due to the short green lights and also that drivers think they are on the Molson Indies Racetrack!

   I agree with the 2-way conversion of James and John. It makes it safer for pedestrians.

   Yes, focus should remain on “People Capacity” of downtown with many *options*.

   Yes, as long as there are ways to negotiate the downtown area by car, there has to be more emphasis on pedestrian and cycling conditions, along with expanded transit service.

   I agree with the overall recommendations of the 2001 plan. There continues to be a great need to make the area safer and more attractive for pedestrians and cyclists. This is not just for appearance but as an essential element to encourage more physical activity and reduce the environmental impact of so many vehicles. In other words, to benefit the health and welfare of our citizens.

   Yes- but let’s get at it! We must make downtown welcoming and comfortable for pedestrians and cyclists. The majority of vehicles are just going through
### Comments/ Questions

2. What projects from the 2001 Plan would you like to be implemented as soon as possible?

- develop policies and enforcement practices for pedestrian safety.
- eliminate the many surface parking lots and build parkades at strategic points to reduce congestion in the downtown core.
- offer incentives to eliminate brownfield sites and build housing for people with a variety of disabilities on limited income (current incentives are not for these vulnerable people)

- Potential consideration for King Street
- Potential cycling network improvements, however with east/west dedicated bike lanes on Main and King

East/West busses should stop and wait for next North/South busses at intersecting streets. North/South busses such as Upper Ottawa, Upper James/Mohawk College bus etc reduce wait time at end of route.

Overall I am disappointed at the very slow pace of implementation of the 2001 plan. Apparently, only three projects have actually been implemented. In order of priority, I would propose:

1. two way conversion of as many downtown streets as possible
2. implementation of all proposed bike lanes
3. relocation of the buses from Gore park and pedestrianizing the south side King St. in Gore park.

Hunter – reduced lane, added bike lane and maintain parking
Hess- become 2 way but extend 2 way to King St. and it would tie in with King as 2 way.
King – become 2 way

Hunter street (option A)
York conversion, King conversion, King William conversion, Caroline conversion (Option C), MacNab conversion

The 2-way streets and bus stops placed so that people can find their way back downtown without walking such a distance.

2 Way- one lane bike route.

Cannon should be made 2 way
MacNab should stay 1 way

More conversion of one-way to two, MacNab Street N and Hunter
Move Bayfront HSR off MacNab N on to James

The elements of the 2001 plan that I would like to see have a priority are the completion of all two way conversions of streets, a reduction in the number and width of lanes on King and Main Streets so as to create separate bicycle lanes and give more separation between pedestrians and motor vehicles and the removal of all through traffic of heavy trucks.

2 Way streets; move buses away from Gore Park. King William could be done right away, it’s already part and part
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments/ Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Are there any projects from the 2001 Plan that should be reconsidered, based on your knowledge of what has taken place/changed in the Downtown in the last 5 years?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The downtown has been studies to death, and the money spent could have probably completed the “Urban Braille” on King Street from James to Bay. The liability for injuries to people with mobility and/or vision limitations could be horrendous, and inexcusable in terms of delay and cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential considerations for Caroline could be left out, Main and King are the priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busses should go “Out of Service” at HSR bus garage near mount hope airport – not at Gore Park – Very irritating to see an empty bus go past you in the winter when the outside temperature is 10°F outside and you want a bus ride up the mountain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given the success of the two-way conversion of James N, I would urge the City to investigate two-way conversion of more streets in addition to those considered in the 2001 plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining Cannon westbound as a throughway. Better to remove a lane for cyclists and add larger walkway with flowers etc. May discourage transport traffic using Cannon currently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclist lane should also be 2-way cycling direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale back the Downtown transit terminal if rapid transit developed to Mohawk College (with 5 min headways) as majority of mountain transfers could happen there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Way conversions not necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Caroline could be 2 wayed because it is out of the Downtown core.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Street should be 2 way with parking alternative A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter street conversion (not necessarily 2-way conversion) with single, two-way cycle lane. I don’t believe street space on Hunter should be devoted to a transit terminal. I don’t believe two-way vehicle flow is essential on Hunter if cyclists can be accommodated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My observations over the past 5 years is that the changes so far have been positive but we still are apparently dominated by the view that the car (or truck) is King and must have final priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The major deficiency of the 2001 Plan, in my vies, was the decision to leave out Cannon Street as a target for major change. My hope and expectation is that with gains elsewhere over the past several years the spotlight may now be shown upon this street, which (along with the already-targeted York and Wilson Streets) poses a major obstacle to commercial and residential redevelopment of a massive portion of our downtown core.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move faster, we need to provide the environment that will foster the rejuvenation of downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are there any new transportation projects not identified in the 2001 plan that you think should be considered to improve conditions for pedestrians, cyclists, transit, goods movement, or auto drivers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the presentations should reference to the Vision 2020 progress team recommendations to have traffic go around the “enterprise zone” instead of through it. Money was wasted redoing the bicycle lanes of the mid-90’s. No effort has been put into establishing a pedestrian crossing protocol as in other communities. Obviously the timing of crossing signals should be adapted to people who use a variety of assistive devices, rather than inconvenience to drivers. HSR drivers should automatically lower ramps for people with mobility problems, instead of having to be asked.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Comments/ Questions**

Busses travelling south from downtown to mountain routes split half and half on John South as well as James South. Interested in hearing about BRT and possibly light rail. More importantly, feel that safer cycling alternatives are needed, specifically dedicated lanes marked with possible barriers and or posts.

The downtown plan must consider light rail (modern streetcars) as part of the future transportation network. Although they have high initial capital costs, modern streetcar systems have much lower operating costs and much higher capacities than bus rapid transit. Streetcars are also the best way of drastically increasing transit use (Hamilton’s official plan calls for doubling per capita transit use).

Finally, in cities such as Portland and Huston streetcar lines have been shown to attract many times their capital costs in new investment.

The fact that the province has proposed $300 million in funding for rapid transit (light rail) in Hamilton means the City needs to be prepared with a plan in place for implementing streetcar lines. Neighbouring municipalities such as Kitchener-Waterloo and Mississauga are already forging ahead.

| Hess St – Why not extend 2 way from Barton to King St. W |
| Hess St. School – York/ Cannon/ Queen/ Hess still not designed for pedestrian/ student safety. Very big mess and concern for parents, teachers and students. Please look at improving time to install flashing 40km/h signs for schools on main arteries. Would help in high traffic areas. |
| Queen → James N | area covering |
| King → Barton |

Contra flow rapid transit on Main St. (i.e. make a decision to have 2- way transit on Main Street and remove King street from RT options)

Make NB HSR service north of downtown to James St. so HSR 2-Way on one street (move it off of MacNab and Barton Streets)

Build incline railway.

Build covered bridge over Valley Rd.

The HSR bus goes North on MacNab between Cannon and Barton. No one gets on/off the Bayfront bus on MacNab. The bus should run north along James.

Barton between Wellington and James needs attention. It is an unsafe area for pedestrians to walk along.

Dedicated bike lanes on busy streets – not really needed on Caroline (small street with slow cars) but needed on Cannon

More reduction of traffic lanes on King and Main and removal of heavy truck through traffic in the city core would go a long way to make the core much more attractive, healthy and liveable.

Giving priority to public transit (such as advance green lights for buses as is done successfully in many other jurisdictions) can be managed and need not be costly. Slowing the speed of traffic would also reduce pollution, increase safety and discourage the idea that the one way streets that we have are useful speedways.
The portion of Cannon Street East which approaches James Street North is essentially a four-lane highway with a disproportionate amount of heavy truck traffic. My concern is not with respect to the presence of trucks per se, but the fact that trucks are able to travel at high speed and along stretches containing recessed catch basins and other surface irregularities, creating a noisy, rumbling, uncomfortable environment. It is most inhospitable for pedestrians, and the prospects for storefront or residential development along Cannon itself are very poor. The effect extends beyond the street itself: Cannon has become a boundary which separates (psychologically as well as physically) the neighbourhoods and commercial districts to its north and south.

I am concerned that greater attention has not been paid to Cannon Street in the contexts of the Master Plan process, as it strikes me (as a layperson) that some relatively inexpensive and uncontroversial measures could be taken immediately to improve matters. Nothing as dramatic as a two-way conversion is necessary, though this would seem like an obvious ultimate goal. Given the relatively low volume of traffic on Cannon (i.e. on a per lane basis), even during peak times, I would suggest that study would confirm that one or two lanes could be converted to street parking or otherwise limited to through traffic (e.g. using bumpouts). Further, there would seem to be little downside (to be confirmed by study) to adjusting intersection signals to disrupt the high-speed flow of traffic. Such changes could be effected, I would think, in an incremental fashion which would minimize disruption.

Dealing with the pathology of Cannon Street cannot, in my view, be left behind, perhaps with the mindset that downtown traffic patterns will have to be reevaluated after other changes are made to Hamilton’s transportation system. I thus urge you to consider adding Cannon Street (within the Master Plan boundaries) to the roads under consideration for fundamental change.

- Pedestrian mall on at least the south arm of King
- Let’s de-synchronize some of the Main St. lights
- As soon as the red hill expressway is finished, remove through trucks from downtown
5. Misc.

HSR Evaluation:
1. Employees/ Drivers – Excellent
2. Safety and Maintenance – Excellent
3. Fare Price ($2.10) – Excellent
4. Travel Time – Medium
   a) Cars are tough competition
   b) Reduce/ minimize transfer times between bus routes and other transportation services
   c) Transportation staff should ride busses to work not use family cars to see how to “fine tune” the system ie. What is helpful to customer

Case 1: Streetcar with train tracks embedded in the street
Bad – streetcar tracks must avoid parked cars
Bad – Streetcar has to stay on tracks embedded in street therefore blocking a lane
-King street has only 4 lanes, 2 lanes blocked so cars have difficult time getting around them if one way traffic exists on King street (trolley cars gotten rid of in 1960s in Hamilton.

Case 2: Trolley Cars using poles connecting to overhead wires
Bad – Trolley car can only go on routes with overhead wires
Bad – If an electrical pole snaps or is disconnected the trolley must stop in the middle of the street and the driver must get out and reconnect it.
Bad – Overhead wires not attractive / problems with icing / winter storms (gotten rid of in the 60’s)

Case 3: Existing 2007 Diesel Busses
Best – Flexible/ can be used on any route in the city

Integrated TH an B/ Go Station
All busses (Go and HSR), All Trains (GO/ VIA), All cars (family cars, taxies)
Good – All located in one station to allow quick transfers by commuting passengers.
Commuter going from house to work to house only have to walk up or down a few stairs to transfer quickly from cars to busses to trains
– Women with baby carriages / Handicap with wheelchair/ People with heavy suitcases don’t have to travel long distances ie. Three or four blocks to get between bus train and car transportation services / extra travel time/ extra taxi costs if trains at TH and B Hunter St and Bus station at Rebecca St – Bad
Good – TH&B / Go – 95% of HSR busses go past TH&B now Sept/07
- Close to downtown / 50 apartment buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CNR LIUNA c1980</th>
<th>TH&amp;B Hunter Go Station 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1000 Passengers</td>
<td>2000 Passengers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trains</td>
<td>200 Passengers</td>
<td>1000 Passengers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I wasn’t able to make it to the open house tonight regarding the TMP review for Downtown, but would like to know what I missed and have an opportunity to comment. Will there be something posted on the web site? How can I find out more?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments/ Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I’ve recently read through the presentation on your website and would like to add some feedback:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Yes, I support two-way conversions of King, Wilson/York and Caroline. 2-way on Bay would also make sense since it is so wide and not very busy. It would also allow people to head down to Main St. Instead of traveling past the market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-I would like to see light rail, both ways on Main Street. I did an unscientific evaluation of Main St. and was quite confident that light rail could travel both ways on the north side of Main in it’s own dedicated lanes (stations would be median-style). 2 eastbound car lanes would remain, with on-street parking on the south curb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Trucks must be removed from downtown. Our ring highway system is now complete and there is no need for industrial district trucks to be using York or Main.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Yes, I like the Hunter St. option for bike lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Yes, I support the pedestrianization of the south leg of Gore. However, I would like to see two-way transit on a two-way King St. Many people and shoppers in this area are there because of transit. Transit signals would allow buses to ‘jump’ into the single lane when traveling eastbound on King at Catharine and the same then traveling westbound at James.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it is important to remember that the ultimate goal is less cars and more cyclists, pedestrians and transit users. Light rail offers us this opportunity. There shouldn’t be so much concern on this website with trying to maintain current ‘peak hour’ traffic flow. Peak hour traffic flow should be bottled up and slow for those who choose to drive. LRT from Mac to Eastgate and BRT from the north end to the central mountain would take a LOT of single occupancy cars off the road. It has in other cities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.hamiltonlightrail.com">www.hamiltonlightrail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I just read the Transportation Master Plan Environmental Assessment (from the October 3, 2007 PIC), and would like to share my comments and suggestions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Light Rail</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>----------</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The most glaring omission from the plan was any mention of a new modern light rail line for Hamilton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the Higher Order Transit Concept was released, it simply assumed without any analysis that the two new rapid transit lines would be Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). This is a far inferior option for several reasons:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Light rail has higher capital costs, but the province has offered to pay the capital costs of new rapid transit lines, and has indicated in campaign literature that these would be light rail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Light rail has lower operating costs, per passenger, than buses/BRT -between 25 and 75 percent less. As liquid fuel prices continue to increase, the cost benefit of light rail will only improve further.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Light rail attracts many more <em>new riders</em> than buses - people who ride transit by choice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
because it is a fast, convenient and attractive mode.

4. Light rail has very, very strong ROI for development along the Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) corridor (approximately 400 m to either side of the line). New investment along the Pearl District line in Portland OR generated well over $2 billion in new investment.

5. Light rail is quiet, produces no emissions at the tailpipe, and the electricity to run it can be produced in a wide variety of ways, including wind (Calgary's light rail line runs entirely on wind power).

For more details and sources, please see, 'An Economic Case for Light Rail':
http://hamiltonlightrail.com/article/an_economic_case_for_light_rail/

At a stroke, a light rail line could eliminate many of the problems facing downtown: a perceived "need" to maintain very high vehicular traffic flow via one-way streets, abundant surface parking, and a $25,000 per unit premium on downtown condos to meet mandatory parking requirements, while attracting badly needed new investment.

Two-Way Street Conversions
--------------------------

I understand the Department of Public Works believes Main Street cannot be considered for two-way conversion due to the high volume of cars it carries. This is a mistake, in my opinion. As long as Main Street remains one-way, the downtown will remain splintered by an 'urban expressway', and no amount of pedestrian-friendly improvements can overcome the inherent repellent effect of all that high-speed traffic.

If all the streets downtown are simply converted to straightforward two-way traffic, traffic will simply find its own way along a multiplicity of paths of least resistance to a variety of micro-destinations. 40,000 cars drive on Main Street today *because they can*, not because they must.

Jane Jacobs has repeatedly documented what happens when lane capacity is reduced: some of the traffic simply disappears, as people find different means to accomplish their goals based on the choices available. Just as demand is somewhat induced when lane capacity increases, demand is ameliorated when lane capacity shrinks.

Again, a new light rail line on Main Street will help considerably in this regard, as a single modern streetcar can carry up to 170 people, taking 170 cars off the road.

James/John Lessons Learned
--------------------------

I hinted above that two-way conversion should be straightforward rather than convoluted. I think the most important lesson learned from the two-step conversions of James and John is that the north side has been more successful, mainly because the streets were *conceptually changed* in the two-way conversion.
**Comments/ Questions**

On the south legs, by contrast, the conversion was undertaken in a heavily engineered manner that sought to preserve the essence of the one-way traffic flows that had obtained previously. The streets don't know whether they want to be one-way or two-way, so the conversions are less successful. Further, the cumbersome design is non-intuitive for drivers, which may explain the localized increase accidents on James South.

**Conceptual Shift Required**

What the downtown needs is not more tuning around the margins (as happened on Bay Street, with landscaping improvements that did nothing to address the fundamental lack of appeal for pedestrians) but a conceptual shift in its thinking of the role of streets in a city centre.

Quite simply, it is not the job of downtown streets to act as conduits for people to race across the city. Turning Main Street into an expressway has killed street life, and it will never become a pedestrian-friendly place as long as the underlying assumption about its role as a traffic conduit remains unchallenged.

Please begin to look seriously at light rail, reconsider your opposition to two-way conversion on Main, and stop making trade-offs between what city streets need to thrive and what benefits commuters 'just passing through'.

I believe that all the streets in the downtown core should be two way. Of course it will slow down traffic but would you rather have people living and enjoying downtown or just driving through. That I believe is the most important thing we can do for downtown right now but we should also include light rail possibilities. These would be great for the city as it would increase the already high ridership of the HSR and also give allow the Hamilton street RAIL's name to make sense once again.

There are many possibilities but I believe that the most important would be two way street conversion. Let’s encourage pedestrians and public transit. Great work so far.
Public Works
Capital Planning & Implementation Division
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Downtown Transportation Master Plan 5 year review
Study Process


- The 2000 Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process requires a review of Master Plans every 5 years to determine need for detailed reviews and/or updates.

- Through the Review, projects that have not been implemented since 2001 are reassessed to determine their feasibility in the current downtown context.
Findings from this Review

Through this review, the 2001 objectives were found to be still valid, except:

- There is now a greater desire for pedestrian improvements (Gore Park);
- The potential for rapid transit is more immediate, impacting James Street, Main Street and King Street.

2 Major projects completed from 2001

- James Street & John Street North - Two-way conversion (Phase 1)
- James Street and John Street - South Two-way conversion (Phase 2)
Projects yet to be implemented

- King/York/Wilson two-way conversion
- Park/MacNab, Hughson, Hess and other two way conversions
- Hunter Street, York Boulevard
- Various pedestrian improvements

New projects, not part of the 2001 DTM Plan
- Caroline two way conversion
- Gore Park Pedestrian Plaza

York Blvd/Wilson St two-way conversion

- The 2001 Master Plan identified York Boulevard as a priority for two-way traffic and bike lanes.
  - will reduce traffic speeds on York Boulevard/Wilson Street through the study area;
  - will reduce circuitous travel to and from properties in the downtown; and
  - provides for greater flexibility for changing King Street (i.e. future studies – Rapid Transit).
Recommended two-way conversions

- Park/MacNab two-way conversion
- Hughson two-way conversion
- Hess two-way conversion
- King William two-way conversion
- Caroline two-way conversion

Recommended pedestrian improvements

- Jackson Street
- Queen Street
- Catharine Street
- Mary Street
- George Street
Cycling improvements

- Ferguson Avenue bicycle lanes
- York Blvd Bike lanes

Projects not recommended for implementation at this time

- King Street two-way conversion
- Bay Street Two-Way Conversion
Projects not included in the original Master Plan recommended to be implemented

- Caroline Street two-way conversion
- Gore Park Pedestrianization (Closure Option)
  - Gore Park possible Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Impact of King Street Closure (1)</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and Cycling</td>
<td>• Reduced conflict with vehicles</td>
<td>• Improved quality of life and presence of parks</td>
<td>• Access to the closest street may be less convenient and less efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>• Noise levels may be reduced</td>
<td>• Increased pedestrian and cyclist safety</td>
<td>• Pedestrian traffic may increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Environment</td>
<td>• Sales revenue may be reduced</td>
<td>• Pedestrian traffic may increase</td>
<td>• Businesses that depend on accessible traffic may be affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and Vehicle Safety</td>
<td>• Reduced pedestrian conflicts in</td>
<td>• Access to the closest street may be less convenient and less efficient</td>
<td>• All businesses may be impacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>transit sections</td>
<td>• Pedestrian traffic may increase</td>
<td>• Pedestrian traffic may increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Level of Service</td>
<td>• Reduced travel times on King</td>
<td>• Improved pedestrian and cyclist safety</td>
<td>• Increased travel times may be expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>• Travel times for transit may be reduced</td>
<td>• Pedestrian traffic may increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Level of Service</td>
<td>• Delays on King Street</td>
<td>• Improved pedestrian and cyclist safety</td>
<td>• Increased travel times may be expected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) For this evaluation, a King Street closure is assumed to be any closure that would restrict vehicle capacity on King Street in favor of pedestrians. The impacts of scenarios and disadvantages would depend on the length, time period, and operational rules for the closure.
Recommendation for Gore Park Pedestrian Plaza

• Suggested options for pedestrianization of Gore Park:
  – Close south leg
  – Pilot test varying degrees of temporary street closures
  – Establish a consultation webpage
  – Identify and refine viable functional design options for Gore Park, followed by a series of design charrettes to further build public interest to refine the alternatives and selection of the final design options

Consultation

• Two Public Information Centers held:
  • October 3, 2007 (Information exchange)
  • March 18, 2008 (Recommendations presented)

• Interviews with businesses along James Street and John Street (July 18 and 20, 2007)

• Questionnaire emailed to BIAs (August 15, 2007)

• Two meetings with the Downtown BIA
Thank you

• Questions? Comments?