

Stakeholder	Comments	Response
Transport 2000 Ontario and SHIFT Ontario (Sept. 30/09)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hwy 404 Ext'n north of Green Lane is not justified by traffic demands – urge removal from TMPU. 2. Some parameters used in transportation modelling force the results towards requiring more capacity for autos than might be needed – recommend using assumptions as per Metrolinx's model. 3. Justification for additional freeways (BBP, GTA-W and 427 Ext'n to GTA-W) is not evident in the report – provide additional analysis and justification. 4. Cycling network should have more physically-separated lanes and should remove physical barriers. 5. Mid-block collector roads crossing 400-series highways are important components of the road network. 6. HOV/Transit lanes on Regional roads will require enforcement. 7. Benefit to participating in the Sustainable Travel Choices study for Markham. 8. Agreement with Universal Transit Signal Priority to improve current situation. 9. Create a set of “model road design” guidelines with agencies/stakeholders to promote safe travel corridors for pedestrians, cyclists, fish, wildlife, and farm vehicles. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is needed to handle inter-regional, recreational and goods movements that originates from the Highway 404 corridor. In addition, the approved Provincial environmental assessment and controlled-access highway designation for this corridor requires that we protect for it. 2. Parameters used in the modelling work are reasonable and were reviewed prior to their use. Even if a different set of parameters were used that led to a higher auto occupancy rate, the reduction in forecast traffic volumes would not be large enough to change the road network recommendations. 3. Reviewed model outputs with the stakeholder. 4. The York Region Pedestrian and Cycling Master Plan recommends a network consisting of mostly on-street bike lanes on Regional roads. Adding a physical barrier either increases the capital cost of construction or the maintenance of the bike lane or both. Research from around the world have shown that the most dangerous places for cyclists are at intersections where the path of the cyclist crosses a road. That is where the focus of our attention will be initially. 5. Agreed. The recommendations and policies of the TMP and ROP reflect this. 6. Agreed. The York Region Police will be engaged to ensure that resources are applied to enforcement of these lanes. 7. Noted.

Transportation Master Plan Update – Comments Received on Draft Final Report
 October 21, 2009

		<p>8. Thank you.</p> <p>9. Good suggestion. Will forward this to Transportation Services for their consideration.</p>
<p>Malone Givens Parsons Ltd on behalf of Armadale Properties Ltd and Toronto Airways Ltd (Sept. 30/09)</p>	<p>10. Feel that the Region’s Master Plan Updates may not have allowed for the level of re-development expected for the Buttonville Airport lands.</p> <p>11. Request a meeting to resolve the scale of development differences.</p>	<p>10. The level of re-development for the Buttonville Airport lands is determined through York Region’s growth management initiative as part of the Regional OP review. Future development applications for the lands must be coordinated with available transportation and servicing capacity.</p> <p>11. A meeting is being coordinated through York Region’s Long Range and Strategic Planning Branch.</p>
<p>Ministry of the Environment (Sept. 30/09)</p>	<p>12. Generally supportive of the Region’s approach to put transit and alternative modes of travel as a priority.</p> <p>13. Provide more detail to support road widenings for HOV lanes and provide clarification on phasing and compatibility with compact, community based development.</p> <p>14. List road projects currently being undertaken by the Region.</p> <p>15. Provide more detail on the need and rationale for individual projects to address Phase 1 and 2 requirements of the Class EA process.</p> <p>16. Need greater discussion on road improvement impacts to sensitive environmental receptors (e.g., ANSI, ESA, wetlands, etc.) and a map displaying natural features affected by proposed road/transit routes.</p> <p>17. Include the Lake Simcoe Protection Act in the</p>	<p>12. Thank you.</p> <p>13. Road widenings for Transit/HOV lanes will only be recommended through an environmental assessment study and only after other less intrusive measures such as queue-jump lanes and transit signal priority have been considered. These potential improvements are needed to support improvements in transit service which would otherwise be caught in traffic congestion and is needed to support compact, community-based development.</p> <p>14. Reference to be made to the 10-year road capital plan presented in Section 2.2.2.</p> <p>15. Additional discussion and analysis has been added to Section 6.</p> <p>16. Map showing natural heritage features have been added with some discussion in Section 2.3.</p> <p>17. Lake Simcoe Protection Act introduced in Section</p>

Transportation Master Plan Update – Comments Received on Draft Final Report
 October 21, 2009

	<p>list of supportive Provincial policies and plans.</p> <p>18. Consider adding a discussion on the use of directional lighting on roadways to minimize light pollution effects.</p> <p>19. Beneficial to include a table listing TMP projects and their potential EA Schedules.</p> <p>20. New corridors should not be shown on the transit plan unless they include transit infrastructure.</p> <p>21. Concerns with Teston Road connection between Keele St. and Dufferin St. – recommend statement that this area will be studied as an Individual EA.</p>	<p>3.2.7.</p> <p>18. Noted. Text added.</p> <p>19. See response to #15.</p> <p>20. New corridors shown in the transit network plans are either rapid transit or transit priority corridors. Both represent different degrees of infrastructure to improve transit priority.</p> <p>21. Agreed. New text added to confirm previous commitment to conduct IEA study if Teston Road connection is being considered.</p>
<p>Concerned Citizens of King Township Inc. (Sept. 28/09)</p>	<p>22. Concern with amount of road work still planned for King Township and absence of full disclosure about future corridors.</p> <p>23. Recommend moving Bolton GO Rail timing ahead.</p> <p>24. Pleased with the public transit planning and creation of several pedestrian zones in King.</p> <p>25. Provide clarification and information on the relocation of the Hwy 400/Lloydtown Aurora Rd interchange and intentions for any new east/west corridor and East-West mid-York Study Area options.</p> <p>26. Clear benefit or need is absent for the Bathurst Street North expansion - consider impacts on environment and high costs.</p> <p>27. Encourage the Region to find a solution to the East-West mid-York corridor off the Moraine and south of King Road.</p> <p>28. Consider environmental impacts when King Road west improvements are identified.</p>	<p>22. Not all of the growth in travel demand can be met with transit and other alternative modes of travel. Even with the aggressive approach applied in the TMP Update to maximise transit and alternative modes, some level of road improvements is still needed to address future growth.</p> <p>23. GO Transit is currently conducting a feasibility study on providing GO service on the Bolton line. Staff is working closely with GO to expedite the feasibility study and the follow-on environmental assessment study to help prioritise service on this line.</p> <p>24. Thank you.</p> <p>25. The potential relocation of the Lloydtown-Aurora Rd interchange is being considered as part of the widening of Hwy 400 from King Rd to Hwy 9. The mid-York E-W Corridor study is a separate exercise that will be conducted in several stages beginning with a needs assessment.</p> <p>26. A comprehensive Schedule C Class Environmental</p>

Transportation Master Plan Update – Comments Received on Draft Final Report
 October 21, 2009

	<p>29. Explain why Keele Street north of King Road is recommended for improvements now given the EA recently done for the Keele/15th Sideroad intersection.</p> <p>30. Regret not seeing toll roads carried forward as a recommendation.</p> <p>31. Termination of Hwy 427 extension should be considered at another provincial highway instead of at Major Mackenzie to reduce traffic on regional roads.</p> <p>32. Encourage the Region to protect the environment (e.g., Oak Ridges Moraine) and reduce traffic through King Township.</p>	<p>Assessment study is being conducted for this segment of Bathurst Street. This comment will be forwarded to that study.</p> <p>27. The mid-York E-W corridor study will first examine the need for improvements. Once that has been established, alternative transportation corridors will be developed in a later stage in consultation with various stakeholders.</p> <p>28. An environmental assessment study will be conducted as part of the project where all impacts will be assessed.</p> <p>29. Improvement may not be the entire length of Keele Street. Recommended to serve the King City East secondary plan and confirmed in the TMP Update.</p> <p>30. York Region does not have the power to toll roads and cannot make such recommendations at this time.</p> <p>31. Agreed. The TMP Update recommends a further extension of Hwy 427 beyond Major Mackenzie Drive.</p> <p>32. The TMP Update will reduce the reliance on cars by aggressively recommending improvements to transit and alternative modes. Additional policies in the TMP Update will further enhance the process that York Region follows in planning and designing transportation improvements.</p>
<p>Metrolinx and GO Transit (Sept. 30/09)</p>	<p>33. Provide more information on why auto use is forecast to increase at about the same rate as population growth and how the non-infrastructure actions and policies proposed were incorporated into the modelling.</p>	<p>33. 2006 to 2031 population increase is 62%. VKT is projected to increase by 57%. This is a positive outcome reflecting the proposed policy recommendations which were incorporated through the procedure used to conduct the</p>

	<p>34. Provide more detail on transit/road network assumptions outside of York Region as well as GO Transit rail service levels assumed.</p> <p>35. Supports major elements of the Plan including rapid transit corridors, transit connections, queue jump lanes, and Regional policies on 6 lane widenings of arterial roads for HOV/transit and bike lanes.</p> <p>36. Provide greater detail on pedestrian/cycling facilities on regional roads, access to GO stations, and stronger reference to Ped/Cycling Master Plan.</p> <p>37. Continue to work and be further involved with YRT/Viva to maximize access to GO facilities, improve scheduling, implement technologies, and provide transit priority measures.</p> <p>38. Reserve the right to comment further on grade-separated crossings identified in the Plan at later stages and request clarification on actions needed in the process including property protection measures.</p> <p>39. Some specific comments on textual and mapping edits including clarifications on Hubs and GO Rail Line facilities.</p> <p>40. Rapid transit corridors not identified in <i>The Big Move</i> should be shown distinctly different on the network maps.</p> <p>41. Remove road network elements not recommended in <i>The Big Move</i> 25-year plan, the Growth Plan, or MTO’s 5-year capital plan such as the Bradford Bypass, Hwy 427 Ext. to the GTA West Corridor and northerly, and Hwy 404</p>	<p>forecasting/modelling of transit and road improvements, favouring transit.</p> <p>34. Assumptions consistent with Metrolinx RTP recommendations for GO services. Assumptions for adjacent municipalities were provided by those agencies and includes the Move Ontario 2020 plan.</p> <p>35. Thank you.</p> <p>36. Details contained in the York Region Pedestrian and Cycling Master Plan.</p> <p>37. Thank you.</p> <p>38. Noted. Property protection will be conducted through the planning and approval process in conjunction with GO Transit.</p> <p>39. Edits made to text and maps where appropriate.</p> <p>40. <i>The Big Move</i> is not a static document and is subject to review as is the TMP. Differences between <i>The Big Move</i> and the TMP are subject to interpretation and discussion.</p> <p>41. The Bradford Bypass and Hwy 404 extension north of Ravenshoe Rd are both protected by the Provincial Controlled-Access Highway designations. The GTA West Corridor and Highway 427 are in the Provincial Growth Plan and are currently under study by the Province. Add text to Master Plan that reflects Provincial position.</p> <p>42. Agreed. Policies on parking standards in centres and corridors changed to reflect this.</p> <p>43. Once approved, draft ROP policy 5.4.6 takes precedence.</p> <p>44. The goods movement industry is governed more so by Provincial and Federal legislations. Staff</p>
--	---	---

Transportation Master Plan Update – Comments Received on Draft Final Report
 October 21, 2009

	<p>north of Ravenshoe.</p> <p>42. Consider a review of min., max. and shared parking requirements near transit and max. parking standards for commercial uses in Centre & Corridors (C&C) in addition to residential uses.</p> <p>43. The bold directions of Principle 1 in the TMP should be consistent with Policy 7.15 of <i>The Big Move</i> (directing municipalities to prepare master plans for each anchor and gateway hub) and the draft ROP Policy 5.4.6 (requiring local municipalities to prepare secondary plans for C&C).</p> <p>44. Include actions/policies and best practices in Principle 5 bold directions to encourage environmentally sustainable goods movement.</p> <p>45. Referred to current applicable guidelines including Transit Supportive Land Use Planning, its update, and the Rail and Development Handbook.</p> <p>46. Provide clarification on definition of sustainability and explain how carbon footprint minimized with VKT forecast increases.</p> <p>47. Include “major institutional developments” in the list of uses requiring TDM plans or strategies as per <i>The Big Move</i>.</p> <p>48. Delete any statement regarding conformity with Metrolinx as consistency will be assessed based on a provincial policy statement currently being developed.</p>	<p>awaits the opportunity to provide input to Metrolinx’s Goods Movement Study.</p> <p>45. Noted.</p> <p>46. See response #33. A higher VKT forecast would be the result if a traditional approach was used in developing the network recommendations. This master plan favours transit and active transportation modes over the private automobile, and thus will improve the balance in providing equitable, affordable and accessible quality transportation services to all users in York Region.</p> <p>47. Agreed. Changes made to appropriate policies.</p> <p>48. Will add sentence to indicate that consistency will be determined by the Province and Metrolinx in discussion with York Region.</p>
<p>Toronto and Region Conservation</p>	<p>49. Overall, supportive of most recommendations of the Master Plans.</p>	<p>49. Thank you.</p> <p>50. Addition of text indicating sensitivity of natural</p>

Transportation Master Plan Update – Comments Received on Draft Final Report
 October 21, 2009

<p>Authority (Sept. 29/09)</p>	<p>50. Share Rouge Park Alliance’s concern with any proposed widening of 14th Avenue within the Bob Hunter Memorial Park and impacts on natural features.</p> <p>51. Concern with the Teston Road connection from Keele to Dufferin and impacts on natural environment and surroundings.</p> <p>52. Provide statements of the Region’s commitment to protecting the environment during all project phases, and performance monitoring of design consultants and contractors at the site level.</p> <p>53. Through the EA process, study the feasibility of the Langstaff Road – missing link transportation study area which is located within a Regional storm flood plain.</p> <p>54. Issue Paper on Protecting the Natural Environment was not provided to TRCA for comment.</p> <p>55. Consider including discussion on opportunities for Low Impact Development (LID) techniques for stormwater management and opportunities for “green infrastructure”.</p>	<p>area, working in coordination with Rouge Park, and need for further study and justification if improvements are needed. Improvements could include signalization, turning lanes, accommodation of bike lanes, etc.</p> <p>51. See response #21.</p> <p>52. York Region is bound by the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act and the approved Class Environmental Assessment process for municipal infrastructure. Current practice and additional policy recommendations in the TMP Update and draft ROP will enhance the processes that York Region will use to plan, design, construct and maintain Regional transportation infrastructure.</p> <p>53. Agreed that a feasibility and an EA study will be needed.</p> <p>54. This is a miscommunication. The Issue Paper was re-titled “Assessing the Impacts of Natural Heritage and Environmental Features”. A draft was provided to the study Technical Advisory Committee for comments in July 2008.</p> <p>55. Forwarded to draft ROP team for consideration.</p>
<p>Rouge Park (Aug. 7/09)</p>	<p>56. Avoid road intensification within Rouge Park.</p> <p>57. Concern with the designation of 14th Avenue as an arterial road through Rouge Park and improvements to increase capacity affecting areas such as the Bob Hunter Memorial Park. Efforts should be made to slow and reduce traffic flow on this road.</p> <p>58. Support for transit along 14th Avenue and improvements to facilitate transit.</p>	<p>56. The process used to develop the road network favours transit. The only road improvement recommended is 14th Avenue.</p> <p>57. See response #50.</p> <p>58. The level of transit service to be provided will be determined through YRT’s 5-year and annual service plans.</p> <p>59. Rouge Park Alliance will be consulted as appropriate in any future plans to improve Steeles</p>

Transportation Master Plan Update – Comments Received on Draft Final Report
 October 21, 2009

	<p>59. Support planned road improvements for transit along Steeles Avenue provided Rouge Park is consulted on the designs which should incorporate strong natural heritage protection.</p> <p>60. Consult with Rouge Park when planning for the new GO stations and gateway hubs in the area.</p> <p>61. Add Rouge Park to the TAC membership list.</p> <p>62. Request arrangement for a deputation at the Regional Transportation Committee.</p>	<p>Avenue.</p> <p>60. Noted.</p> <p>61. Done.</p> <p>62. Request already made to the Regional Clerk's office.</p>
<p>Ministry of Transportation (Sept. 3/09)</p>	<p>63. York Region and/or individual municipalities will be responsible for any additional costs that exceed the Provincial baseline and Metrolinx-approved project cost eligibility criteria and scope.</p> <p>64. The Province cannot provide assurance of funding for transit projects not designated in Metrolinx's 25 year plan including the Major Mackenzie and Dufferin-Bathurst corridors.</p> <p>65. Any new interchanges and/or alignments of highways such as the GTA West Corridor are subject to the EA studies.</p> <p>66. The Bradford Bypass and Hwy 404 extension north of Ravenshoe have not been identified as a priority of the Provincial government at this time and any implications this may have on the investment plans.</p> <p>67. Clarify the policy commitment regarding the Region's cap on road widenings to a maximum of 6 or 7 lanes including transit lanes.</p>	<p>63. Noted.</p> <p>64. Noted.</p> <p>65. The TMP Update presents these elements as conceptual and not their ultimate design or locations.</p> <p>66. Noted.</p> <p>67. This is a recommendation of the TMP Update for future projects. Current projects that already have an approved EA is not subject to this proposed policy.</p>
<p>Town of Vaughan (Sept. 25/09)</p>	<p>68. Show the GTA East West Economic Corridor north of Kirby Road from west of Concession 10</p>	<p>68. Change made to the network maps.</p> <p>69. The timing for this study will be discussed with the</p>

Transportation Master Plan Update – Comments Received on Draft Final Report
 October 21, 2009

	<p>to Highway 400 in Vaughan.</p> <p>69. Commence the study of the Langstaff missing link over the CN Rail Yards immediately.</p> <p>70. Examine mid-York East-West corridor in a broader study area to include missing links such as Teston Road, Kirby Road, and Langstaff Road, while considering implications of the GTA West Corridor and linkages between Urban Growth Centres.</p> <p>71. Note that Vaughan Council adopted OPA 603 in 2003 which deleted the Highway 400 overpass in Block 32 from OPA 600.</p> <p>72. The Regional Master Plan Update documents will be used as the framework for the City’s local master plan updates with further consideration as part of the City’s Growth Management Strategy process.</p>	<p>City of Vaughan and may require the approval of Regional Council.</p> <p>70. The extent of the mid-York E-W Corridor study area will be subject to discussion with affected local municipalities.</p> <p>71. Noted. No change necessary.</p> <p>72. Noted.</p>
<p>Town of East Gwillimbury (Sept. 29/09)</p>	<p>73. Confirm the timing and limits of 4 lanes on 2nd Concession north of Doane Road.</p> <p>74. Clarify the intent of the transit priority route/network along Leslie Street.</p> <p>75. Make note of Town Council’s position regarding the Bradford Bypass (i.e., support need prior to 2031, but wish to have the location/alignment revisited).</p>	<p>73. An EA is being conducted for potential improvements to 2nd Concession where the timing and limits of the improvements will be determined.</p> <p>74. The intent of a transit priority designation in the TMP Update is to acknowledge the need to improve transit service along the corridor. Improvements such as queue-jump lanes, transit signal priority or transit/HOV lanes will be considered.</p> <p>75. Noted.</p>
<p>Global Environmental Action Group</p>	<p>76. Refer to and incorporate the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan in the TMP Update.</p> <p>77. Issues with identifying the Bradford Bypass, its</p>	<p>76. See response #17.</p> <p>77. A Provincial environmental assessment for the Bradford Bypass was approved in 2002.</p>

Transportation Master Plan Update – Comments Received on Draft Final Report
 October 21, 2009

(Sept. 30/09)	impact on the local cultural and economic sectors, and the lack of a cost-benefit analysis.	
Greater Toronto Airports Authority (Sept. 22/09)	78. All reference to the “GTAA Pickering Airport” should be revised to “potential Pickering Airport” since the decisions will be made by Transport Canada.	78. Change made to all references.
Malone Given Parson Ltd on behalf of North Markham Landowners Group (Sept. 8/09)	79. Commence the Class EA for the extension of Donald Cousens Parkway (DCP), between Major Mackenzie Drive and 19 th Avenue as soon as possible. 80. Supportive of roads designated for widening in north Markham for the purposes of HOV lanes. 81. Identified several other jogged intersections that should be eliminated or improved. 82. Recognize the importance of the rapid transit corridor recommended along Major Mackenzie as well as transit priority measures in north Markham.	79. Timing for this study will be subject to discussion with the Town of Markham and its inclusion in York Region’s 10-year road capital plan. 80. Noted. 81. Only major jogs are identified in the TMP Update. Minor jogs will be eliminated as part of intersection improvements to be programmed according to available budget. 82. Noted.
David Donnelly on behalf of Huron- Wendat First Nation (July 21/09)	83. Request funding from York Region for consultation and review of study documents.	83. Response letter sent acknowledging First Nation consultation needs and the Region’s position on not funding consultation to any stakeholder.
Town of Markham (From Draft Oct 27/09 presentation)	84. Clarification on intensification/white belt development assumptions used for Markham in the TMP. 85. TMP needs to be updated based on Markham’s Growth Management Strategy. 86. Region needs to discuss a consultation strategy with Markham Council prior to initiating any EA	84. Approved population and employment forecasts provided as part of York Region’s growth management initiative to update the Official Plan includes some growth in the whitebelt. 85. Regional staff will work with Markham staff to identify areas that need to be updated once Markham’s Growth Management Strategy has

Transportation Master Plan Update – Comments Received on Draft Final Report
 October 21, 2009

	<p>study.</p> <p>87. Provide linkages between growth and transit initiatives in performance monitoring.</p> <p>88. Provide more details on local transit service/feeder system which are required to minimize driving trips to transit hubs.</p> <p>89. Identified working towards fare integration in 2-5 years, but not specific initiatives mentioned.</p> <p>90. Consider other potential rapid transit routes such as a north/south corridor on Warden or Kennedy between Hwy 7 and Major Mackenzie and potential linkages between Sheppard subway and Markham Centre.</p> <p>91. Coordination needed to review ped/cycling and parking plans pertaining to jurisdiction, funding and implementation.</p> <p>92. Region's 10-Year Construction Plan needs to be updated in consultation with Markham (Don Cousens Pkwy – Major Mackenzie to Hwy 48).</p> <p>93. Strategy/consultation plan for sensitive road projects/studies need to be vetted by Markham Council before proceeding.</p>	<p>been completed.</p> <p>86. Agreed.</p> <p>87. Performance monitoring and transit infrastructure triggers will be necessary in developments proposed in the Centres and Corridors.</p> <p>88. Details on improvements to local transit service will be provided as part of the YRT's 5-Year Service Plan updates.</p> <p>89. Fare integration will evolve through initiatives such as the Presto Card.</p> <p>90. Future EA studies of the north-south transit priority corridors of Warden and Kennedy will determine the need for extensions of the rapid transit network.</p> <p>91. Both Markham and York Region's Plans are consistent; there is no overlap in the network. Staff are working together on the programs.</p> <p>92. Agreed. Standard part of York Region protocol.</p> <p>93. Agreed. Standard part of York Region protocol.</p>
<p>Town of Markham (Preliminary staff comments from Brian Lee) Sept. 25/09</p>	<p>94. Extending the GO Rail services into Durham well beyond the urban boundary will encourage urban sprawl.</p> <p>95. Show East Markham Mobility Hub (Highway 7/Don Cousens Parkway/Havelock Line/Hwy 407 area) as a study area.</p> <p>96. What is "Study of Sustainable Travel Choices in Markham"?</p> <p>97. Show jog elimination at 19th Ave/Woodbine. What is the difference between improvement for</p>	<p>94. GO Rail services recommended are consistent with GO and Metrolinx Plans. It provides a more sustainable mode of transportation to accommodate growth.</p> <p>95. Planning for this hub will have to include a comprehensive transportation study as required in the draft ROP.</p> <p>96. Study of Transit/HOV lane projects.</p> <p>97. See #81. Improvement for capacity is for car capacity while improvement to 6 lanes is for</p>

	<p>capacity and improvement to 6 lanes?</p> <p>98. John Street at Hwy 404 interchange study should include looking at partial interchange at 14th Avenue in Markham.</p> <p>99. "Limiting widening to max 6 or 7 lanes including transit lanes" - Highway 7 will be more than 7 lanes.</p> <p>100. Concern about restricting heavy vehicles during certain time of the day will have negative impact to businesses and implies giving priority to commuting traffic (Priority should be transit, commercial trips including trucks, carpools, Single Occupancy Vehicles).</p> <p>101. Hwy 48 between Major Mackenzie Drive and 16th Avenue has been down loaded from MTO to the Town - change for all figures/maps.</p> <p>102. Some major streets with rapid transit show only sidewalk on one side, e.g. Major Mackenzie Drive, which is contrary to OP policy.</p> <p>103. Commuter parking lots should not be close to nodes and corridors. Carpool lots should be at the peripheral of the urban boundary, e.g Woodbine/Hwy 7, Bayview/John St are not appropriate.</p> <p>104. Inconsistencies between the target transit modal splits shown in the Master Plan presentation and ROP.</p> <p>105. Consider Major Mackenzie Drive RT to use Highway 48 (Town's intensification corridor) and across Bur Oak Ave (connects with Mount Joy GO Station) to 9th Line instead of on Don Cousens Parkway.</p>	<p>transit/HOV priority.</p> <p>98. Noted. 14th Avenue will be included in the study.</p> <p>99. Noted. Previously approved EA projects are grandfathered.</p> <p>100. This policy is proposed for the longer term, so details will be subject to further study and discussions in coordination with local municipalities.</p> <p>101. Noted. Maps corrected</p> <p>102. Figure 2.8 (Long-Term Pedestrian System) and Figure 2.9 (Long-Term Cycling Network) form part of the integrated Ped/Cycling Master Plan. Some streets such as Major Mackenzie (MM) Drive show sidewalks on one side because the other side is proposed for a multi-use trail. It should be noted MM is the northern boundary of urban development in Markham; sidewalks are part of the local municipal responsibility.</p> <p>103. Commuter parking lots are needed to attract and concentrate suburban traffic to access higher order transit. Existing parking lots such as the ones referred to will continue to be operated. Figure 2.10 shows existing YRT and GO Transit park and ride lots.</p> <p>104. ROP target modal splits are for specific areas of York Region while the presentation numbers refers to the entire York Region.</p> <p>105. Specific alignment of the rapid transit corridor will be determined at the EA study stage.</p> <p>106. No, the intent is to highlight the significance of them and to protect them for implementation.</p> <p>107. See response #97.</p>
--	--	---

Transportation Master Plan Update – Comments Received on Draft Final Report
 October 21, 2009

	<p>106. Is it the intention of the mid-block collector roads crossing Highway 404 to become Regional streets?</p> <p>107. Clarify what are "Arterial Road Improvements for Capacity".</p> <p>108. Markham Council does not support Hwy 404 crossing north of Major Mackenzie Drive.</p> <p>109. Transit modal split appears to be lower than the 33% cited in 2002 TMP (see Pg 58).</p> <p>110. Improvement for capacity for 19th Avenue is more urgent than Hwy 404 flyover south of 19th Avenue.</p> <p>111. 19th Avenue interchange will be required earlier than 2031.</p> <p>112. Add a policy to work with local municipalities to develop alternative Regional street design parameters (lane width, intersection spacing, daylight triangle dimension, boulevard width, etc.) to encourage walkability and urban context in nodes and along corridors.</p>	<p>108. The Hwy 404 crossing was identified and approved as part of the Cathedral Secondary Plan.</p> <p>109. The 2002 TMP target of 33% was for trips originating from urban areas of York Region and destined to the City of Toronto during the a.m. peak period. Modal splits presented in this Master Plan Update are for trip interchanges of different areas of York Region. The recommendations of the Master Plan Update results in modal splits that are consistent with the 2002 TMP target.</p> <p>110. Both are recommended to be implemented between 2011 and 2021. No additional information available to suggest need to advance one over the other.</p> <p>111. The 19th Avenue interchange will be re-phased to the 2021 horizon year to be consistent with the improvements along 19th Avenue immediately east and west of Hwy 404.</p> <p>112. Agreed. New policy to be added.</p>
<p>Town of Newmarket (October 6, 2009)</p>	<p>113. The 2031 population forecast for Newmarket does not match with the Town's Official Plan projection.</p> <p>114. Rephrase policy initiative to "require local municipalities to establish the minimum densities needed..." rather than "achieve" the minimum densities needed.</p> <p>115. Show the new east-west collector road north of Green Lane as per East Gwillimbury's Official Plan.</p> <p>116. The Town is supportive of the strategy to advocate for improvements to the Provincial</p>	<p>113. The difference is relatively small and does not result in a change to the recommendations of the Master Plan. Regional staff will work with Newmarket staff to address this as part of the Region or Town's Official Plan review.</p> <p>114. Agreed. The word "establish" will be used.</p> <p>115. Noted. However, only the section between Leslie and Woodbine is shown since it could be partially funded by the Region.</p> <p>116. Noted.</p> <p>117. Noted.</p> <p>118. Noted. York Region is supportive of the efforts</p>

Transportation Master Plan Update – Comments Received on Draft Final Report
 October 21, 2009

	<p>highways, particularly for 6-lanes on Hwy 404 and full movements at the Mulock interchange.</p> <p>117. Parking restrictions or parking plans must be implemented through the local municipality whether through a formal Town Parking Authority or local Council committee.</p> <p>118. York Region has indicated their support of TMA's, events and project however do not mention any financial support.</p>	<p>of its local TMAs and will continue to provide financial support and/or in kind support as needed.</p>
<p>Town of Georgina (Local Council report commenting on ROP and Master Plans – Oct. 2009)</p>	<p>119. Issue with Cycling Master Plan which does not show a route on Warden and Woodbine Ave.</p> <p>120. New Regional road surface treatment discourages cycling.</p> <p>121. Identify potential rural transit connection from Pepperlaw to Keswick along Ravenshoe Rd.</p> <p>122. Hwy 404 extension to Glenwoods Ave should be advanced to promote Keswick Business Park.</p>	<p>119. Staff will revisit this issue at the next update to the Pedestrian and Cycling Master Plan.</p> <p>120. Comment relayed to Road Operations staff.</p> <p>121. Agreed and changes made to transit map.</p> <p>122. Will continue to lobby Province to advance this segment. Performance trigger in place requiring Province to provide direct connection from Ravenshoe Rd to Hwy 404 at Woodbine Ave. That connection together with the widening of Woodbine Ave will provide short to mid-term capacity needs in the area.</p>