

OFF ROAD VEHICLE TASK FORCE RESIDENT CORRESPONDENCE

Submitted prior to 12noon on Monday May 17th

From: Stephen Black

Sent: Friday, May 14, 2021 7:58 PM

To: ORVTaskForce <orvtaskforce@kawarthalakes.ca>

Subject: ORV Recommendations

Please note that I did not receive this Off Road Vehicle Task Force presents recommendation and announces second public meeting email from **jumpkawarthainlakes** until this afternoon and thus I have been unable to meet the apparent deadline of 12pm on May 14! However, I trust that my comments and concerns will still be received and addressed/considered by the ORV Task Force!

In response to the request contained in the ORV report of 14 May 2021 as reported through Kawartha Lakes Jump In, I wish to table the following comments and concerns regarding the proposed ORV routes through Bobcaygeon:

1- I know of no current ORV trails leading into or out of Bobcaygeon, and I understand that any out-of-town ORV would have to access Bobcaygeon via Hwy. 38, County Road 24 or County Road 7 or County Road 49. I question how are out-of- town ORVs expected to reach Bobcaygeon, when it is clear from the manufacturers specifications that ORVs are not designed for highway use?

2- Supposing that the Council does go against the wishes of most of the residents in Bobcaygeon, and approves the use of ORVs on streets within the town, I suggest that for safety reasons if no other, that they not be allowed on any town streets without sidewalks. This especially should apply to Port 32 which has no sidewalks (other than that from Hwy 36 to Edge Water condominiums) where residents walk their dogs, and walk daily summer and especially winter, on the streets.

3- Perhaps I have missed it, but I have seen no reference to either a traffic or a parking study to support this ORV initiative. We are all aware that there are currently both traffic and parking concerns/limitations within Bobcaygeon, without the introduction of ORVs. Have such studies been carried out specifically with respect to ORVs for Bobcaygeon?

4- The presence of ORVs and their associated noise, dust and exhaust fumes will only degrade the current exemplary reputation of Bobcaygeon, as a quiet, peaceful place to visit, shop and enjoy.

5- In their response to request for comments from the Task Force, I understand that the OPP, City of Kawartha Lakes Detachment suggested that an objective of the ORV Task Force should be to encourage ORV operators towards permitted trails and away from using roadways for general transportation. How does a blanket permit to ORVers to travel on almost every street on Bobcaygeon meet this objective?

6- There are very few walking trails in Bobcaygeon (the newly opened Kawartha Settlers' Village forest and meadow walking trail being one, if not the only). The presence of ORVs on such walking trails must be prohibited!

7- Any and all regulations/by-laws, etc. resulting from the recommendations of the ORV Task Force must restrict ORV use to linkage between trail routes specifically developed for ORV usage. I do not believe any such linkages exist within the Village of Bobcaygeon.

All I can ask is for the ORV Task Force to re-consider the present and future devastating impact of the current Task Force's recommendation to 'permit the operation of ORVs on all roads (trails are not even mentioned - I guess because there are none) within the Village of Bobcaygeon, save and except for Bolton Street between Canal Street to King Street! WHAT ARE THE TASK FORCE MEMBERS THINKING? Consider the residents of Bobcaygeon in addition to the wishes of the ORVers!

Respectfully submitted to the ORV Task Force - dated May 14 2021

Stephen A Black

From: Kens gmail

Sent: Monday, May 17, 2021 9:59 AM

To: ORVTaskForce <orvtaskforce@kawarthalakes.ca>

Subject: Re: New Response Completed for Request to Make Deputation-Presentation to Council

That's unfortunate, okay I will try to summarize below. Please make sure it is read by the mayor and councillors then archived....

I moved to (back) Lindsay 1 1/2 year ago. My wife grew up here and we got married here in 1980 and left to pursue our careers and raise a family. We currently live on [REDACTED] near city hall.

I wanted to talk about how unsafe ATV terrain tires are on pavement and how the roadways for connecting trail systems need to be selected based on engineering principles specifically to deal with this serious issue.

I current own a 2005 Yamaha Kodiak 450 and a 2015 Yamaha Viking SxS. I've been Atv'ng for going on 17 years so I am very familiar with the sport (they are at my cottage in Nipissing). I retired 5 years ago from Telus and I retired VP of Engineering so I know a thing or two about lab trials, field trials and 'Pilots'.

ATV tires are not designed for paved surfaces. There are many speciality tires for ORVs/ ATVs including street tires if you drive a lot on packed or paved surfaces. ATV terrain (which the vast majority of ATVs have) tires are low pressure tires with limited tire contact specifically designed for off road. They are extremely dangerous on paved surfaces. They are very hard to turn with a high centre of gravity, unstable at speed and very hard to maneuver. This is why all manufactures warn you to stay off paved surfaces.

My Yamaha manual stated paved surfaces as a hazard and to be avoided if at all possible and ROHVA who represents the manufacturers Yamaha, Polaris, Can-Am, Kawasaki as well as other manufacturers and suppliers states that ORVs are not designed, manufactured or intended for public roads. Driving an ATV on paved surfaces is similar to trying to skate across an ice rink on roller blades. This instability leads to accidents

The US product and safety commission states that **a greatly disproportionate number of ATV fatalities occur on paved roads. In 2014 alone more than half the deaths were on road.** The average ATV drives less than 1% of the time on paved surfaces, this translates to **for every kilometre an ATV is driven on a paved surface they are 100 times more likely to die or suffer serious injury than on a kilometre of non paved surface.**

Knowing these facts I was going to ask the council to revisit the methodology used to connect the two trail heads. Using basic engineering principles with the objective to design a route that has the same or fewer accidents per kilometre as the standard ATV trail. This involves modelling the unsafe characteristics of an ATV on paved surfaces and using that data to design the safest possible route and additional controls required to meet that objective (25 years Engineering experience here). It's unreasonable to require ATVs to put on road approved tires since they are mostly on driving on ATV trails.

Once designed you start with a trial to test your controls and measure key data such as KPIs (accident rate for example) and adjust the models accordingly. This will likely involve a straight route with very few turns on less busy streets with controls such as speed, time of day and distancing in place. Once you meet your objectives you move on to a larger pilot now that you know your data can be measured correctly and remedies quickly applied. In other words the key objectives end up designing the arteries to connect the trail heads through sound methodology.

What I see in the current proposed pilot (pilot in name only) are many streets named as both tributary and artery that seemed to be solely planned on convenience not sound engineering principles. This is a serious issue and many injuries and deaths can be avoided if designed correctly. The ATV manufactures have protected themselves with there warnings about the serious safety concerns of driving on paved surfaces. By not designing the routes around these safety issues the city has opened itself up for the inevitable lawsuits that it will be in inundated with by encouraging ORV traffic on paved surfaces and the moral issue of knowingly not addressing these issues with proven principles leading to disproportionate amount death and injury...

Regards

Ken Kerrigan

END OF CORRESPONDENCE