



NOTE TO FILE

Date: May 12, 2022
Project: Galloway Lands, Fernie
Subject: Notes in Response to City of Fernie and RCR Comments

Project #: 02-21-0081

To: File
From: Glen Pardoe, P.Eng.

This memo summarizes responses to comments raised by the City of Fernie and RCR regarding the above noted development application.

FERNIE COMMENTS

"...we do not agree with Bunt's initial assumption about a resort community":

- We counted Boomerang twice on a weekend during the ski season to acquire a local trip gen rate. We have data from each of a Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday and also Family Day Monday. The January Saturday represented the highest volumes.
- Observed trip gen rates were lower than the standard industry rate for "recreational homes" so we used the industry rate in the TIA to be conservative. Those rates include all manner of traffic related to homes including owners, visitors, trades etc.

"...roadway will provide an additional opportunity for parking and disruption....insufficient to accommodate a demand exceeding the visitor vehicle demand....":

- The issue here for Fernie seems to be related to parking and not traffic, and specifically parking unrelated to the proposed development.
- The proposed development is providing an additional road that may or may not get used by ski hill visitors to park. That may be the case, but if so, it is displacing parking from elsewhere on the FSH road system and not necessarily accommodating new traffic beyond what is already there under existing conditions. To suggest otherwise is conjecture.
- This current parking situation is not being caused by the proposed development, but resolution of the existing underlying issue involves increased enforcement of current parking violations, or better management of allowed parking locations. That is beyond the control of the developer of this application.

"...by providing further roadways as parking opportunities there will be significant additional traffic that will carry additional demand on the HWY 3 intersection":

- There is no data to support this supposition by Fernie. If there are additional parking opportunities created on the new roadway, it is just as or perhaps more likely that parking

will be displaced from other locations in the area. It will not necessarily attract additional ski hill visits. With the passage of time and expansion of the resort, there will be increased visits, but that is a function of resort growth that needs to be accommodated by the resort's own parking and not through the use of new roadways.

- If this of concern, the roadways could be signed "no parking" or provided with limited parking periods (ie. 2 hour etc.). However, this would require enforcement and we acknowledge that this is difficult to facilitate and is the responsibility of the BC MoTI. The point, however, is that this is not something that the developer has any control over.

Regarding the tighter geometry on Highline and our statement that people likely do not drive at 60 kph, the City noted the following: *"This biased analysis suggests that road users will be driving at lower speeds which is likely not a characteristic of many visitors."*

- We found it difficult to physically drive this turn near the intersection of Boomerang/Highline at a speed much more than 30-40 kph, and since we were personally on-site counting and observing during our data collection exercise, our visual observations indicated that most vehicles appeared to be moving quite slowly.
- Fernie has not provided evidence to support their statement that a lower speed at this location would be uncharacteristic.
- We stand by our statement and recommendation for signing the roadway at 30 kph.
- Although not specifically noted in the report, we feel that opportunities are available to improve the operation. Of the Boomerang/Highline intersection and to eliminate parking opportunities at the apex of the turn which would also improve the situation.

"...data does not reflect the significant impact of COVID on the traffic accessing the ski hill skewing the results during 2019 and 2020. We find this important fact surprisingly absent from the report":

- We did not collect data, nor did we conduct any analysis based on anything related to 2019 or 2020. Our data was collected in 2021 and 2022, and as well, checks of MoTI permanent count stations near the intersection on Hwy 3 showed volumes in 2018 and 2021 to be essentially identical.
- There was no COVID bias in our report.

RCR COMMENTS

"...TIA seems to only contemplate owners and does not acknowledge guests, visitors, staff and trades who will use the roads....RCR recommends that a higher volume be considered..."

- See response to the first bullet in the Fernie response above.

"...TIA implies....adequate for current and propo\sewd traffic.... RCR contests this conclusion....highlight the junction of Highline Drive and Bopomerang Way.....blind corner"

- We recommended posting 30 kph speed limits to deal with sight lines.
- Opportunities exist to re-shape the intersection and improve signage and sight lines if needed.

"RCR agrees that ...Hwy 3/FSH Road is currently adequate. However, RCR remains concerned that the TIA does not sufficiently recognize the traffic associated with the development, and adequacy to 2040 is unlikely":

- The approved scope for the TIA required that we increase Hwy 3 traffic but did not require that we increase RCR traffic as there were no active development applications related to RCR and the intent of this TIA was to test the impact of the proposed site.
- If growth occurs in RCR traffic prior to 2040 then that growth will accelerate the need for improvements at Hwy 3. That growth would need to be assessed through a separate TIA that would have to be completed by RCR to support their application.
- The volume of traffic associated with Galloway is too small to have any meaningful impact on the intersection by itself. Increases of 15-30 vehicles in a peak hour is minor and daily fluctuations on the highway will exceed that amount.

Thanks

GP