

MINUTES
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON
CHAMPLAIN ROOM

6 MAY 1998

9:00 A.M.

PRESENT

Chair: D. Holmes

Members: M. Bellemare, W. Byrne, R. Cantin, B. Chiarelli, L. Davis, C. Doucet,
H. Kreling, J. Legendre, M. McGoldrick-Larsen, M. Meilleur

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That the Transportation Committee confirm the Minutes of the meeting of 15 April 1998.

CARRIED

1. 1998 TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE BUDGET
 - Co-ordinator, Transportation Committee report dated 6 Apr 98
 - 1998 Draft Capital Estimates and 10-Year Capital Forecast - Existing Program Requirements previously distributed on 11 Feb 98
 - 1998 Draft Operating Estimates Transportation Committee - Existing Program Requirements previously distributed on 11 Feb 98

The Committee received the following public delegations:

Eli Tannis, Ottawa-Hawthorne Business Park informed the committee that the expansion of Hawthorne Road and Conroy Road is vital to the park, which is the largest business park in the Region and is surrounded by residential development. He explained that the four-lane expansion will improve an already dangerous situation when motorists exit the

Note: 1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.
2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 13 May 1998 in Transportation Committee Report 7.

park at either end. He explained that the impact of peak-hour traffic is felt by the businesses within the park and stressed the need for them to provide adequate roads to ensure the employees of those businesses and area residents have a safe road on which to travel. He urged committee to support these capital projects.

Sonia Myles, resident of Lowertown spoke to the issue of pedestrian safety, particularly at the corner of St. Patrick and King Edward Avenue. She illustrated her concerns through a video which focused on the extent of the traffic and the difficulties which pedestrians and cyclists face at this intersection. She pointed out the deliberate illegal movements by motorists and the hazard this poses to those in the intersection. Ms. Myles was concerned about the lack of response given by motorists to pedestrians attempting to cross the road, especially when they have the right-of-way - motorists kept turning without giving the people an opportunity to walk out. She believed it was only a matter of time before someone is injured at this intersection. Ms. Myles stated that the signage at the crossing is inadequate and stressed the fact that drivers do not see the sign because they are looking left for oncoming vehicles rather than to the right for pedestrians. In order to improve this very unsafe intersection, she suggested the following steps be considered:

1. square the corners of the intersection and erect signage to prohibit motorists from making a right-turn on the red signal;
2. paint zebra stripes at the pedestrian crossing so it is more visible to motorists and would discourage them from stopping their vehicles in the crosswalk area;
3. the use of automatic walk lights which could be activated when the pedestrian arrives at the intersection.

Councillor Cantin was of the opinion that no matter what signs are erected, motorists will continue to make illegal turns. He raised a concern about businesses who use costumed individuals to advertise on medians and pedestrian islands; he saw these as a hazard because they can distract motorists driving by. Staff agreed this can be a problem and indicated their willingness to investigate if so directed by the committee. The councillor further questioned whether putting signage on the left hand side to encourage motorists to watch for pedestrians was an option that staff had investigated. The Commissioner confirmed this, noting that a potential solution has been found but which would depend on the Safety Improvement Program. Ms. Myles interjected that in discussions she had with staff, one solution was to erect signage that would prevent motorists from making a right turn around the island, although this has not been done yet. The Director of Mobility Services, Doug Brousseau agreed the situation at this intersection is deplorable and indicated it is a location that the Safety Improvement Program (SIP) recommends be reviewed. Councillor Cantin made reference to a separate signal used to control traffic using the right-turning channelization lanes and suggested this could be implemented at this intersection. The Director indicated this is one of the solutions being proposed through the SIP, but went on to state that the demand for right turns cannot be ignored

and staff will continue to investigate options of separating right-turning motorists from pedestrians.

Councillor Legendre questioned whether the Region had the ability to create a force of traffic enforcers for Regional roads, similar to municipal traffic enforcement officers. He believed these positions could be created on a revenue basis without requiring additional monies. The Commissioner advised that enforcement is successful only when motorists realize they will be caught if they break the law and it is a combination of education, enforcement and engineering that is required to control illegal movements. He further noted that any resolution from Council in this regard would require a request to the Province seeking the enabling legislation for such a proposal.

Moved by J. Legendre

That staff prepare a report regarding a request to the province for special legislation giving the RMOC the ability to create a unit of non-police traffic enforcers for Regional roads.

CARRIED

With respect to the concerns raised by Ms. Myles, Councillor Meilleur advised that the problems at St. Patrick and King Edward occur on a regular basis and agreed strongly that something should be done to improve the situation. She suggested a committee be struck made up of community representatives and staff with a view to addressing this very dangerous intersection. D. Brousseau advised that staff do have a report coming forward on the SIP but if so directed by committee, they would solicit input from the community first. The committee agreed with this suggestion.

Councillor Holmes brought to the committee's attention a letter from the Regional Chair which outlined that a work order has been issued to erect signage which would prohibit right-turns at the island at this intersection; Regional Police have been notified and charges can now be laid. In addition, pavement markings will be put in place to ensure motorists do not make illegal turns.

Councillor Davis believed staff should take a more proactive approach to bringing these situations to the committee's attention and not wait until a councillor raises the issue. The Commissioner confirmed that staff do act proactively to bring forward issues of concern and a result has been a reduction in accidents over the years. He also acknowledged that the Department does receive input from the public on a lot of areas. The councillor was concerned that staff were only measuring it in terms of accidents and not including those "near misses" which she believed needed to be captured. D. Brousseau indicated that while staff have not examined where people "might" be hurt, they do address those intersections that have problems. Councillor Cantin remarked that staff resources are limited and believed it is part of a councillor's role to bring issues of concern to the attention of staff.

Mayor Merle Nicholds, City of Kanata made reference to a resolution adopted by the City on 5 May 1998, requesting the acceleration of the West Transitway Extension to their town centre. The municipality sees the extension as an important part of its growth, as well as the growth in Nepean. The Mayor emphasized that the City is working to achieve the Region's objective of growth and confirmed that development has been based on meeting the transit objectives of the Region. She referred to the future development of a hotel and a 24-screen theatre in Kanata, the latter anticipated to attract people to and from the area all the time and not just in the evenings. Consequently, she expressed some concern about the gridlock on the Queensway that would occur as a result of these developments. With the expansion in the municipality, she believed more roads would have to be constructed to handle the increased traffic that will accompany such growth and although she acknowledged funding restraints, she urged committee members to uphold the priorities set out in the Regional Official Plan (ROP) and the Transportation Master Plan (TMP). In closing, she stated that the City of Kanata relies on the Region's plan to have efficient movement of people and in view of the fact the municipality has exceeded its growth objectives by five years, there is an even greater need for balancing growth and development with the corresponding infrastructure.

Councillor Munter spoke briefly to the committee with regards to his recent request to staff for a report to indicate how the Region will continue to meet its existing TMP goals in terms of public transit service to the west and the southwestern communities. With respect to the west transitway extension, the Commissioner advised that staff have done an analysis with OC Transpo on the west transitway and it was recommended that Phase 1A proceed, with Phase 1B being constructed in 2006. He indicated that the southwest transitway is the second priority and would not be constructed until between 2002-2006. Councillor Munter stated that even if the west extension is not constructed until 2006 or beyond, the development of transit intensive land uses such as the large theatre described by Mayor Nicholds, will attract a lot of bus users and that changes the assumptions that those dates came from. In light of this, he supposed the west extension should proceed before the southwest or perhaps some investments need to be made looking at this.

Following a staff presentation on the Capital portion of the Transportation budget, questions arose on the impact the highway transfers have on the budget. The Commissioner confirmed these projects will not add to the tax rate in 1998, although it may have an impact in subsequent years.

Councillor Cantin made reference to audible pedestrian signals and the small amount being allocated to this program. He suggested the program be increased from \$20,000 to \$50,000 because the current standard needs to be implemented. The Commissioner advised that it would be best to rearrange the existing amount for this year and make the necessary adjustments the following year. The councillor proposed the following Motion:

That the budget for Audible Pedestrian Signals be increased to \$50,000 for 1998 and that the budget for 2003-2007 be reduced by \$30,000; the \$30,000 increase be funded from the proposed urban forest restoration program which will now read \$970,000.

Geoffrey Sharpe stated that the Region is in a situation where it is confronted by an enormous capital expense (West Transitway Extension) and he preferred that this project be deferred indefinitely. He believed that if the committee accepts the construction of the Bayshore Transit Station it is essentially saying that the entire project will be completed. He further stated that if there is any change in this process it would involve going to the Ontario Municipal Board and the Official Plan would have to be changed. Mr. Sharpe believed the pilot rail project and the West Transitway extension were connected and opined that it was not reasonable to divide the West Transitway into phases and move the available dollars into the pilot rail project. He believed that if the private sector was willing to fund a light rail pilot project, there would be no opposition; however if there is a surplus from deferral of Phase 1B, then it should be applied to the transitway because it has already cost taxpayers millions of dollars.

The Committee Chair indicated that the Regional Chair and Councillor Byrne had brought forward several Motions for the committee's consideration as follows

1. *That Phase 1B of the West Transitway Extension be deferred to the year 2003.*
2. *That the amount of \$500,000 for studies and consultants be added to the Pilot Rail Project in 1998, with the capital allocation to be obtained from the savings identified in the deferral of Phase 1B of the West Transitway Extension.*
3. *That the authority of \$19.5M (from Project 942-30626 - West Transitway Extension) be allocated for Transit uses to be determined, including the possible use for light rail.*

The Director of Engineering, Jim Miller advised that the West Transitway Extension Phase 1 (Acres to Pinecrest) is a high priority item for transit because of the rapid growth of high tech employment in the west end of the Region. He emphasized it is important to provide a strong transit link because of the growth of jobs in Kanata.. He indicated that the benefit of dividing the project and deferring Phase 1B allows the Region to defer an expenditure of \$20M.

Helen Gault from OC Transpo concurred with the comment that the West Transitway is a very high priority for them and that the section from Pinecrest to Acres Road will provide greater benefits to the transit service. The transit station at Bayshore Shopping Centre is a major transfer point, served by two of the largest routes. The current situation is not acceptable to area residents because buses park for long periods at a time along

Woodridge Crescent, adjacent to the shopping centre parking lot. She believed that a transit station at this location would improve the bus service, provide amenities for transit users and provide better access to the shopping centre. For comparison purposes, Ms. Gault indicated that approximately one third of the people shopping at St. Laurent arrive by bus, but only 10% of patrons at Bayshore come in this fashion and improvements must be made to increase ridership to this retail centre. She pointed out that the station will connect the transitway to Acres Road which in turn will connect to the Queensway westbound. In summary, the extension will provide faster service for Route #97 heading to Kanata with better transfers for employees to and from the high tech areas and will improve the local service routings from Bayshore. It is estimated to shave approximately 3 minutes from the usual travel time in each direction.

Questions arose about the costs associated with delaying Phase 1B for one year and the Project Manager, Mike Richards advised it would be approximately \$5.6M, which includes paying for the balance of the Bell Canada relocations, completion of payments for the hydro relocations and shutting down engineering services. He confirmed there would be costs associated with stopping and then starting the process again but those costs were not known.

Councillor Bellemare inquired what the result would be if the Region were to shut down the whole project now and what portion of the \$5.6M can be recouped if Council decided to restart the project in the future vs what the liabilities the Region would incur as a result of halting the process. Although staff advised that such costs were difficult to quantify, the councillor asked that those numbers be provided to committee members.

The councillor further questioned whether it was possible to go forward with Phase 1A and delay 1B forever. H. Gault indicated there are benefits OC Transpo will gain from building the station at Bayshore and the link to Acres Road that are completely independent of anything else that is done. The Commissioner added that if it is constructed by 2006, which would be approximately five years following the completion of Phase 1A, it is not unreasonable and there would then be a period of time when the value of the money that is deferred, overcomes the extra cost; to start and stop for just one year would be too expensive.

Following a short break, the Committee resumed their discussions. The Regional Chair announced that during the break he received word that the province will be giving the Region unconditional funding in the amount of \$25M. Although this was good news, he cautioned that Council still faces serious challenges to deal with the base budget over the next few years.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen questioned what percentage of the Regional Development Charge (RDC) is put towards public transit under the current By-law. The Finance Commissioner, Jack LeBelle, advised that staff would provide committee members with a copy of the Regional Development Charge By-law which illustrates how much is for each of the areas i.e. transit, water, sewer, et cetera.

With respect to the design of the transit station at Bayshore, the Committee Chair inquired whether there was a working committee comprised of members of the community, Bayshore Shopping Centre representatives and interested councillors to work on that design. H. Gault advised that the design has already been prepared and will be presented to the Regional Transit Advisory Committee next month and the Late Night Users Committee which is run by OC Transpo. She indicated it is not a set design, and some changes could be made. Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen agreed the public should be involved from the conceptual stage and not just to respond to a design after the fact. She questioned whether OC Transpo had a policy that stated that and H. Gault indicated they did not. The councillor believed this should be something the Transit Services Committee could consider and the following Motion was proposed:

Moved by M. McGoldrick-Larsen

That OC Transpo and Transportation Planning staff prepare a policy on public consultation to involve the community and members of RMOC Council from the conceptual stage of the development of transit stations to be brought forward to the Transit Services or Transportation Committee for consideration.

CARRIED
(H. Kreling dissented)

Councillor Davis agreed with the above, stating the public must be heard and in particular seniors who are a big user of public transit.

Councillor Byrne highlighted the comments made in her report to the committee dated 5 May 1998. She reiterated comments made previously with regards to the benefit of a transit station at Bayshore Shopping Centre and the relief this will bring to residents living on Woodridge Crescent. She went on to state that the proposed connection from Bayshore to Acres Road will improve bus service to Kanata. By deferring Phase 1B for a few years it allows the Region to address current financial restraints, but still leaving the option open for completion at a later date. She acknowledged receipt of a variety of comments made by members of the public, both in favour and opposed to the extension. She urged committee to recommend that Council proceed with Phase 1A and although there is a need for Phase 1B, it is not as urgently required as the first portion.

Councillor Meilleur believed there is a need for public transit in a north/south direction and given the Region's limited budget, stated there is a need to improving transit there. In this regard, she supported the exploration of light rail in the Region because the existing transit service may not be addressing the needs of the community. She recognized the comments made by Mayor Nicholds and her concern about congestion on the Queensway and the councillor firmly believed the Region can provide the service to that municipality, but at less cost than what is before committee today. She indicated that safety was her main priority and agreed a transit station at Bayshore would certainly improve the present situation of people having to cross a parking lot to reach a bus. She noted the Region

should do more to encourage residents to use public transit because it is better for the environment and helps reduce congestion. She felt the Motion would not go contrary to using public transit because with the money saved from deferring Phase 1B, the Region will be able to provide better service to another area of the community.

Councillor Cantin stated that regardless of who funds it, the Region will have to make a decision whether or not there is a need to protect its mass transit capabilities. He stated the need to keep the existing ridership or work to increase it and in this regard, frequency, reliability, affordability and convenience is what is important to transit users. He did not favour any changes to the Official Plan at this point in time and he believed that to generate the dollars the Region needs for all other programs it is responsible for, there is a need for economic development and that means having good transit. With respect to the popularity of light rail, documentation shows that some cities across North America are moving away from rail systems and working more to implement/improve the bus system and the councillor believed the Region could benefit from that information. He preferred to know where the pilot rail project is going to go before approving anything with regards to that particular mode of transportation. He concluded by stating the Region has spent the time and money to build a decent transit system and to establish ridership and the way to continue this is to follow all the work that has been done in the Official Plan.

The Regional Chair suggested the committee not rule by what decisions have been made in the past and that they be prepared to make different decisions when appropriate. In response to the comment above about light rail, he referred to a Council Motion of 28 January 1998, which directed staff to “investigate a north-south route for light rail...” He indicated the three Motions he and Councillor Byrne have put forward suggest a very moderate approach and is a reasonable compromise.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen stated the committee should look at the need and growth in Kanata and look at what the Region put in its Official Plan and the Transportation Master Plan. She recognized that the Region must address the public transit needs in the west and perhaps the option of deferring 1B for one year, but certainly not until 2003. With specific reference to Motion 3, she did not feel comfortable including funds in the light rail project in the long term until a decision has been made with respect to the direction in which Council wishes to proceed.

Councillor Munter acknowledged that Council has supported light rail and should continue to do so. Although staff have been directed to examine a north/south rail link, it would not deal with the development currently taking place in Kanata's town centre. This area is part of the Official Plan and the Region has been leaning on the municipality to ensure its development is put on future transit routes. Therefore, he was of the opinion that Council should meet the goals of the Official Plan to ensure there is adequate transit service to that area. While that may not mean a full-fledged separated transitway for several years, Council should at least examine other ways of providing service such as bus-only lanes or a public transit “hub” in its town centre. In closing, he remarked that light

rail should not come at the expense of ensuring the Region meet its transit objectives set out in the Official Plan with respect to the extension to the Kanata Town Centre.

Councillor Byrne recognized the needs for the future development in this area and believed Motion 1 would address some councillor's concerns. She further stated that Motion 3 would put the authority to enhance public transit which could be in the form of park and ride lots, additional buses, a transit station in Kanata, or light rail if the pilot project is successful. In response to questions posed by Councillor Legendre, the Finance Commissioner advised that the effect of Motion 3 is that the authority would remain in that project until Council decides to do something else with it; essentially, it identifies that authority for transit purposes and for the possibility of light rail. He confirmed that it is authority associated with the West Transitway, but if the Motion is approved, it can be provided for transit elsewhere.

Councillor Bellemare raised some questions about the Region's anticipated shortfall in funding and the Finance Commissioner advised that the Corporation has a shortfall in its annual budget requirement of \$69M and the report tabled at the last council meeting addressed a number of base adjustments that could reduce that amount by approximately \$35M. Therefore, there is approximately \$35M left in base budget shortfall for this year and subsequent years. He advised that the newest funding from the province (\$25M) would be part of that one-time solution. In view of these statements, the councillor was not convinced the Region should proceed with Phase 1A of the West Transitway Extension, noting that information must be brought forward on what the true costs are to put the entire project on hold and what are the liabilities vs what is actually a good investment. He acknowledged past decisions to proceed with the West Transitway Extension, but Council must now decide whether this should be continued as quickly as it seems to be going at a time when Council has to make some difficult decisions on whether or not to increase taxes, or decrease the Region's contributions to the reserve fund. He proposed an amendment to Motion 1 to read as follows:

That the Transportation Capital budget be amended to defer Phase 1A and 1B of the West Transitway Extension to 2003.

The councillor had serious misgivings about linking this to the light rail project, especially given the present economic situation the Region is faced with. He did not know what kind of financial situation the Region may be in next year and he felt Council should determine whether or not it really wants to proceed with such a project.

Councillor Kreling believed the West Transitway Extension is an appropriate project the Region should proceed with for all of the positive reasons put forward today and previously. He did not interpret Motion 3 to be one that will lock the Region into a light rail project, but rather, is a restating of a commitment that already exists in the budget. He expanded on that thought by stating inter-modal opportunities were a premise in the TMP and he could not take a look at one without looking at the other. In summary, the councillor believed the Motions were reasonable and reflect the reality of today vs the

reality many years ago when the West Transitway expansion was first approved. He urged committee members not to accept Councillor Bellemare's amendment but to support the Motion as submitted.

Moved by M. Bellemare

That Phase 1A and 1B of the West Transitway Extension be deferred to the year 2003.

LOST

YEAS: M. Bellemare....1

NAYS: W. Byrne, R. Cantin, B. Chiarelli, L. Davis, C. Doucet, D. Holmes,
H. Kreling, J. Legendre, M. McGoldrick-Larsen, M. Meilleur10

Moved by W. Byrne

That Phase 1B of the West Transitway Extension (Project 942-30626) be deferred to the year 2003 (pg. 192).

CARRIED

YEAS: W. Byrne, B. Chiarelli, L. Davis, C. Doucet, D. Holmes, H. Kreling,
J. Legendre, M. Meilleur....8

NAYS: M. Bellemare, R. Cantin, M. McGoldrick-Larsen....3

Moved by W. Byrne

That the amount of \$500,000 for studies and consultants be added to the Pilot Rail Project (Project 942-13417) in 1998, with the capital allocation to be obtained from the savings identified in the deferral of Phase 1B of the West Transitway Extension (pg. 178).

CARRIED

(M. Bellemare dissented)

Moved by W. Byrne

That the authority of \$19.5M (from Project 942-30626 - West Transitway Extension) be allocated for Transit uses to be determined, including the possible use for light rail.

CARRIED

(M. Bellemare, R. Cantin and
M. McGoldrick-Larsen
dissented)

The committee then considered the additional pages distributed by staff as follows:

Airport Parkway Ramps(pg. 140)

The Manager of Finance and Operations Support in the Environment and Transportation Department indicated that when staff first made a submission to the Canada Ontario Infrastructure Works Program (COIW) they outlined various projects and associated subsidies that would be allocated to those. Subsequently, staff were requested to assess each of the projects and determine whether the budget targets were met with respect to budgeted subsidy. Staff were asked to utilize the full funding provided to the Region from the senior levels of government and one such initiative was the Airport Parkway ramps, especially those at Hunt Club and staff relooked at the application for that project without increasing the scope and going beyond the initial application how those ramps could be financed through that project. Staff were successful in convincing the Board that reviews the applications, that this was permissible and then with some very good tender prices within the Hunt Club project, staff were able to use some of the savings to make up the Region's 1/3 contribution to COIW. Therefore, staff were able to turn back \$1.2M in terms of the existing subsidy that is on the books for the ramps. With a budget of \$2.2M and \$1.2 being returned, \$1M will remain in that particular project to undertake the one ramp at Walkley Road.

The Commissioner summarized this explanation by indicating staff went to the Board that review the COIW applications and interjected the Airport Parkway ramps, which happened to be on Hunt Club Road. They expanded the description of that project to include those ramps and therefore access COIW funds that otherwise would have been returned to the federal and provincial government.

In response to a concern voiced by Councillor Doucet, the Commissioner clarified that the financing has nothing to do with whether or not the Region constructs the ramps at Walkley; it is simply a fortunate acquisition of funds to be used by Council and is not an approval to do or not to do the ramps and Council will determine what the funds are to be used for. In response to a question about the Walkley ramp and waiting for the Ministry to make comments on the ramps at Hunt Club, J. Miller indicated the monitoring program is currently underway and there is no intention to do any construction before that is complete. Following the opening of the ramps at Hunt Club, there will be another monitoring program to assess the impacts, followed by a report to Committee and Council. It was also confirmed that should Council decide not to proceed with the Walkley Ramps, this money can be used for other purposes.

That Transportation Committee recommend Council approve the revised pages for Project 912-30736, Airport Parkway Ramps.

CARRIED

Ottawa-Carleton Forest Restoration Program(new)

The Commissioner advised that this new program contains a large budget which is necessary to compensate for the set back experienced by the ice storm in January. Staff will also be looking separately for additional funding assistance.

Councillor Legendre was concerned that the fact staff found money to implement this program may undercut the Region's request for assistance from the province. The Finance Commissioner clarified that this money has not been "found", but that the program would be debt financed for the time being and as part of staff's presentation to the province would speak to it around those terms.

There was general support for this program, and the benefits of trees and the initiatives taken by the community during the ice storm were cited. Councillor Meilleur indicated that the City of Vanier has a program whereby people pay money for the ongoing maintenance of trees. She suggested other municipalities could be encouraged to adopt a similar program and that the committee may want to revisit this issue if there are funds coming from the province.

That Transportation Committee recommend Council approve the Ottawa-Carleton Forest Restoration Program.

CARRIED

Transportation Demand Management(pgs. 61 and 175)

Staff explained that these new pages reflect a combination of the TDM programs within the Transportation Department and the Planning and Development Approvals Department.

It was clarified there is no increase in authority across the project, but that staff have reflected the actual expenditure and fine-tuned it in terms of having prepared this sheet after the end of the year.

That Transportation Committee recommend Council approve the new pages for Transportation Demand Management, reflecting a combination of the Transportation and Planning and Development Approvals Departments (Projects 912-33413 and 912-33430).

CARRIED

Provincial Highway Transfer(new)

The Environment and Transportation Commissioner provided a brief introduction to these new pages which reflect changes in a variety of programs as a result of provincial highway transfers. He advised that staff would continue to lobby the upper level of government because this is inadequate funding.

That Transportation Committee recommend Council approve the new pages associated with provincial highway transfers.

CARRIED

Councillor Doucet proposed the following Motions:

1. *That the Transportation Capital Budget be amended to defer those capital projects that expand road capacity until the year 2000.*
2. *That traffic calming initiatives be implemented or be part of any capital rehabilitation.*
3. *That a new page be inserted into the capital budget titled Urban Traffic Rehabilitation - Traffic Calming Implementation and that \$1M be allocated in 1998 and subsequent years with the capital allocation to be obtained from the savings identified in the deferral of capital expansion projects; and,*

That staff prepare a report describing how a Branch for Traffic Calming and Pedestrian Issues will be created within the Transportation and Environment Department. This branch would address planning issues and implementation related to the environmental capacity of regional roads, regional traffic calming, liaison with the area municipalities and school boards that reflects common needs; and,

That staff prepare a long-term financing package that realistically reflects the regional needs for traffic calming studies, implementation and the development of criteria for future capital projects.

The Councillor stated that pedestrian issues are the number one priority in the Official Plan and yet there is virtually no funding in the budget for them. He explained that traffic calming is part of existing infrastructure and is in no way an expansion. He indicated his intention to reword Motion 1 to reflect deferral for only one year. He agreed to leave the funding in place because he recognized there was not a lot of money in capital projects and he recognized also that it wouldn't mean a great saving if it was deferred until 2000. He understood the reasons for upgrading the two roads (Conroy and Hawthorne) but he felt this was the only area where significant savings can be made if they can be put off for a year. He believed there was a need to send a small but visible signal to the people of Ottawa-Carleton and to Queen's Park that Council must make some very difficult decisions brought on by provincial downloading.

The Regional Chair stated the Region must be consistent and practical. While he believed that Motion 1 is a very significant expansion of an existing policy and program and could

therefore not support it, he indicated his willingness to endorse a Motion to find a funding source to put towards traffic calming for 1998/99.

When questioned what the impact would be of deferring the capital projects referred to in Motion 1 (Conroy and Hawthorne), the Environment and Transportation Commissioner advised that Hawthorne Road has failed and the Region would have to spend the same amount of money in any case just to maintain it. With respect to Conroy Road, he advised it might be possible to delay the rehabilitation a couple more years, but then the Region would be faced with large maintenance expenses.

At this point in the discussion, the Committee Chair read out a Motion put forward by Councillor Davis:

That \$1M be added to Traffic Calming Measures (Project 912-30740) with the funds to be identified by staff for the Council budget meeting on 13 May 1998.

With respect to traffic calming initiatives, Councillor Byrne stated that if Council is going to give serious consideration to the Official Plan then these are the issues that need to be focused on. While Councillor Doucet makes reference to mixing transportation demand management with traffic calming, she believed efforts should be made to address existing problems in the road system and expanding that system will only exacerbate them. She suggested the Region deal with these issues using traffic calming measures because it addresses the objectives set out in the ROP and may serve to encourage motorists to move to friendlier modes of travel. She supported putting \$1M into traffic calming because she believe it would be the only way to deal with the existing problem.

Councillor Meilleur expressed her disappointment that major roads in her ward have been put off yet again because there are no rehabilitation dollars available. She recognized the fact that the Region inherited several bridges from the federal government which required major rehabilitation, but a consequence of seeing to those first is there are no funds left over to repair roads, including a small portion of Laurier Avenue, which is one of the oldest streets in the Region. She was also frustrated that development occurs when the infrastructure cannot support such expansion and now two of those roads (Conroy and Hawthorne) are in desperate need of rehabilitation. The councillor agreed traffic calming was a necessity. She believed the Region should simply maintain what it already has instead of putting money towards expansion thus increasing the Region's financial liability.

With respect to Motion 1, Councillor Legendre noted that a case has been made for both the reconstruction of Conroy and Hawthorne Roads and questioned whether Conroy Road could be done this year. Staff advised the project would take two years to complete once construction begins. In light of the necessity to upgrade Hawthorne Road, the councillor proposed that Hawthorne Road be exempted from Motion 1 put forward by Councillor Doucet.

Councillor Cantin emphasized the importance of upgrading Conroy Road for one very important reason being that when there is an emergency and the fire station exit is blocked because of congestion, motorists cannot move out of the way because there are ditches on each side of the road. He reminded members that approval of both projects will not affect the tax rate this year and therefore did not begrudge dollars being used to improve safety. With respect to the Motions pertaining to traffic calming, he stated the committee should not go further until the Region has had more experience with such initiatives

Councillor Kreling did not disagree with the concept of traffic calming on Regional roads but wrestled with Councillor Doucet's Motion 2 because it becomes an affordability factor and there is a need to grasp where the Region is heading with respect to these initiatives and how those are to be implemented. He agreed that traffic calming initiatives are something the Region needs to review, but felt this should more appropriately be considered as part of a policy discussion context before proceeding further.

Councillor Davis noted there has been an attitudinal change towards traffic calming and while she wanted to move funds to this program, she did not want to simply move them into the departments budget and used under the Commissioner's authority. She preferred that staff bring forward all traffic calming initiatives to committee for consideration.

Moved by J. Legendre

That Hawthorne Road be exempted from Motion 1 to defer Capital Projects which expand road capacity.

CARRIED

Moved by C. Doucet

That the Transportation Capital Budget be amended to defer those capital projects that expand road capacity until 1999 with the exception of Hawthorne Road.

LOST

YEAS: W. Byrne, L. Davis, C. Doucet, D. Holmes, J. Legendre....5

NAYS: M. Bellemare, R. Cantin, B. Chiarelli, H. Kreling,
M. McGoldrick-Larsen, M. Meilleur....6

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen made reference to a study carried out by the City of Nepean which recommended the municipality examine road construction projects to ensure they provide the necessary opportunities for traffic calming, whether that be through the use of curbing the road, planting trees, et cetera. Since this is part of all road reconstruction in the municipality, she suggested that when the Region is considering capital road construction that a similar process be implemented as an automatic

occurrence and not to wait for the community or the local councillor to come forward with a request.

Several committee members suggested minor amendments to Motion 2 with respect to how traffic calming initiatives would be implemented e.g. “when requested”, “when required”, “be addressed” and “subject to the budget envelope provided in the budget process”. Some amendments were withdrawn in favour of others.

Some felt there was a need for a policy to come forward on this and the option of deferring Councillor Doucet’s Motions was discussed. Staff confirmed that the Region is already doing traffic calming initiatives on capital rehabilitation projects; however, if it was the will of committee to address the Motions that would be reasonable and would allow the committee an opportunity to decide on the merits of each case.

Following a brief discussion, Councillor Doucet withdrew his Motion 2 for discussion in a policy context. He agreed to bring it forward to committee at a later date for further consideration. Subsequent to this, the councillor also withdrew Motion 3.

In consideration of Councillor Davis’ Motion, the committee wanted assurance the information would be brought forward prior to the Council meeting and the Motion was amended to read as follows:

Moved by L. Davis

That \$1M be added to Traffic Calming Measures (Project 912-30740) with the funds to be identified by staff a few days before the Council budget meeting on 13 May 1998 (pg. 142).

CARRIED

(M. Bellemare, R. Cantin, H. Kreling,
and M. McGoldrick-Larsen dissented)

Councillor Cantin reworded his original Motion with respect to Audible Signals which was raised previously in the meeting to read as follows:

Moved by R. Cantin

That the budget for Project 912-37143 Audible Pedestrian Signals be increased to \$50,000 for the years 1998 to 2001 (pg. 158).

CARRIED

Moved by D. Holmes

That \$200,000 be deleted from Project 912-33814 - Renovations/Replacement of Maintenance Buildings (pg. 153) and added to Project 912-33417 - Cycling Facilities Improvement Program (pg. 167).

CARRIED
(M. Bellemare and
H. Kreling dissented)

In consideration of the Capital Budget, as amended, in bulk, Councillor Meilleur noted that a portion of Laurier Avenue has been slated for reconstruction for many years and yet will not be reconstructed until 2001 because it is closely related to the Laurier Avenue bridge rehabilitation and as stated earlier, funds for rehabilitation are being focused on bridges with little or none going towards roads. The councillor indicated her displeasure with this and expressed her concern that the community will have to be disturbed for many more years before Laurier is rehabilitated. Staff responded to these comments by confirming that Laurier Avenue is a “works-in- progress” and it is the phasing issue that the councillor appears to be concerned about.

That the Transportation Committee recommend Council approve the 1998 Draft Capital budget estimates for the Transportation Committee as tabled by Council on 11 February 1998, including the transportation portion of the Planning and Development Approvals Departmental Capital Budget, as amended by the Budget Review Board report dated 31 March 1998 and including the new and revised pages.

The Committee also confirmed the Sign Maintenance portion of the Operating Budget for Mobility Services, as amended by the Budget Review Board (Advertising and Promotion pg. 13 of the Budget Review Board report of 31 Mar 98). *This section had originally been deferred on 15 April 1998 as it pertained to the Special Events budget discussed at Item 2 of the agenda.*

CARRIED* as amended

- * With Councillors Bellemare and Cantin dissenting on Project 942-13417 - Pilot Rail Project and Councillor Bellemare also dissenting on Project 942-30626 - West Transitway Acres Road to Pinecrest Road.

Moved by H. Kreling

That the vote now be put for Items 2 and 3 of the remaining agenda items.

CARRIED

2. SPECIAL EVENTS ON REGIONAL ROADS - BUDGET

- Co-ordinator, Transportation Committee report dated 6 Apr 98

Moved by R. Cantin

That the Transportation Committee recommend Council approve the establishment of a Departmental "Special Events Budget" to cover some costs associated with signage changes, alterations to traffic control signal displays or timing phases, newspaper ads and logo signs (the required amount for 1998 is estimated at \$84,000 which includes almost \$19,000, approved as part of the 1997 Environment and Transportation Department Operating Budget, for Winterlude and United Way).

CARRIED

3. SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION - RECOMMENDATIONS

- Co-ordinator, Transportation Committee report dated 6 Apr 98

With respect to Recommendation 1, the Commissioner advised that if it is approved by the committee and Council, staff would report back with a plan on how to implement it. Discussion took place around Recommendations 2 and 3 with respect to the creation of two new positions. The Commissioner indicated that if these are approved, staff would bring forward a program for implementation for the committee's consideration. He confirmed that there will be the resources to carry out a program for both positions.

That Transportation Committee recommend Council approve that the Environment and Transportation Department:

1. **Develop an education program from a transportation perspective that is designed for the media, including community newspapers, that explains the need to reduce greenhouse gases, and the relationship between greenhouse gases and climate changes;**

CARRIED

(H. Kreling dissented)

Moved by M. McGoldrick-Larsen

That the following be referred to staff with a report back to the committee:

That Transportation Committee recommend Council approve that the Environment and Transportation Department:

2. **Create a full time position to deal exclusively with Transportation Demand Management;**

3. Create a full time position to deal exclusively with pedestrian and cycling matters.

CARRIED
(H. Kreling dissented)

4. TRAFFIC CALMING - BUDGET PRIORITIES

- Director, Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services report dated 6 Apr 98

The Director advised that staff have a report scheduled to come forward at the next meeting which addresses the implementation and ranking policy for traffic calming initiatives. The committee agreed this item could be withheld until that time.

For discussion.

DEFERRED TO 20 MAY 98

5. AIRPORT PARKWAY EXTENDED TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY (APETIS)

- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner report dated 21 Apr 98

Brendan Reid of the Project and Infrastructure Planning Branch provided a brief overview of the report, highlighting the comments brought forward by the Steering Committee. He indicated that the request to expand the study to look at the option of not twinning the Airport Parkway would be a major undertaking because both the Transportation Master Plan and the Official Plan include strategies dealing with growth at and around the Airport. However, since it is work that will eventually have to be done as part of Council's direction of 28 January 1998, staff are recommending a change in the scope of the APETIS study.

Another matter considered by the Steering Committee was the focus of its membership and the classification of attendees at meetings as "official" and "non-official" members. If committee approves the recommendation to amend the terms of reference, staff would recommend the expansion of the Steering Committee to include representatives from additional communities. He confirmed that staff Recommendation 2 deals with the monitoring of the implementation of the Hunt Club ramps, prior to and after ramps have been in operation and a report will be brought back in one year on the results of that monitoring.

Marjorie Fulton, Ottawalk and a member of the Steering Committee was particularly concerned about the recommended change in the terms of reference and the proposal to expand the committee's membership. She was worried about the effect it will have on distorting the purpose of the study as was originally sought by the residents of downtown. Ms. Fulton indicated that the purpose of APETIS is to examine the traffic implications of changes to the Airport Parkway on bordering communities and examine ramifications downstream. She indicated that the Steering Committee will be focusing on specific

proposals and immediate actions such as construction of the ramps et cetera, and it needs an opportunity to learn about the impacts and plan how to integrate those, without having changes made at this time.

John Kane stated that the issue of twinning or not twinning the Airport Parkway and related implications were already included in the study for the Transportation Demands to and from the Southeast Sector, which was carried out several years ago. Mr. Kane reminded members that Council had requested an initial impact study and then requested a more thorough review be completed by November 1997, although even at this late date, there are requests to change the terms of reference to expand the scope and to expand the membership of the committee. He suggested the Region could use the data taken from APETIS in the report on the Airport Parkway twinning deletion, because it is related, however, this is a different issue and the two should be kept separate. Mr. Kane believed it was important to remember that regardless of the outcome of this study, the ramps at Hunt Club and the Walkley will still be completed and therefore the APETIS not be delayed any longer and ensure it is complete before its intent is totally lost.

David Jeanes, Transport 2000 shared the concerns expressed by the previous delegation that this study has been delayed well beyond the original intent of Council as decided last summer. He noted the reason for the delay of this study is mentioned in the report, but admitted that the Steering Committee had never seen that explanation before. He emphasized the importance of this study and the fact the Steering Committee did not object to having representatives of the Airport Authority participating in discussions, especially since the impact on the Airport was one of the more important factors that had not been examined closely in the original environmental assessment. In addition, representation from Carleton University is understandable because that community is affected by these changes. He indicated that the terms of reference of the study really focused on a number of issues that were of importance to the five identified communities, but these same concerns do not seem to apply to six of the community associations proposed to be added. He maintained that the study should proceed with the original terms of reference.

Cam Robertson, City Centre Coalition indicated the Coalition represents nine communities, five of which are within the study area. He reiterated many of the concerns previously expressed and supported most if not all of the comments and suggestions brought forward. Mr. Robertson emphasized that representation from additional communities is not needed for the purpose of studying the impact on the central areas; such an expansion would take away from those areas Council originally decided should be studied. Mr. Robertson read a letter from David Gladstone of the Centretown Citizens' Community Association. Essentially, Mr. Gladstone's comments echo those already made today. A copy of his letter is held on file.

Following the delegations' presentations, some committee members appeared confused at the comments coming from some of the Steering Committee members today and what was recorded in the committee's minutes of 10 February 1998 in which the Steering

Committee had recommended that the study incorporate the impact of the late 1997 changes to Bronson Avenue on near-term traffic affects and in the long-term analysis, examine the impact of not twinning the Parkway. Mr. Robertson clarified that at the last meeting of the Steering Committee in April, staff advised that if the Steering Committee wanted to include an examination of not twinning the Airport Parkway, other communities needed to be involved. He went on to state that the recommendations to change the terms of reference to include studing several roads in the southeast sector was a staff recommendation. The Commissioner of Planning and Development Approvals indicated that on 10 February 1998, the Steering Committee requested staff to look at the effect of not twinning the Parkway, which is the reason the report is before committee today because it is clearly a change in the terms of reference.

Based on the comments presented by the delegations, Councillor Legendre questioned whether they did in fact wish to reconsider their original recommendation and not change the terms of reference. Ms. Fulton advised that she had never heard the Steering Committee propose to change the terms of refernece, although there was some discussion about would happen when the Parkway was twinned as compared with what it would be like if it was not expanded. She believed there was a misunderstanding or misinterpretation about the discussion. Mr. Jeanes interjected that once Steering Committee members found out what this would mean, they would probably not require that the impact of not twinning the Airport Parkway be included because the importance is getting the study done so communities can understand the impact for the impact is actually upon them.

Mr. Reid confirmed that the APETIS will be completed well before the ramps are completed and in operation. He indicated that the Steering Committee was advised at its last meeting of staff's intention with regard to the direction given by the Steering Committee in February and that it was staff's interpretation of their direction that it would require a change in the terms of reference and as such, would require approval of the Transportation Committee and Council. He recollected that when this information was brought forward, the Chair of the Steering Committee proposed a Motion to delete the issue of the impact of not twinning the Parkway, but he did not get a seconder and therefore no vote was taken. Consequently, staff took that as direction that the original direction of the Steering Committee in February should be pursued and proceeded to bring the report forward to the Transportation Committee.

Councillor Doucet stated that the delegations have explained the misunderstanding that took place at one of the Steering Committee meetings. He sympathized with the community's anger at the length of time this process has taken, but agreed they had every right to feel as they do and did not blame them for objecting to these last minute changes to the terms of reference. He supported the request of the delegations to not change the terms of reference.

Councillor Kreling noted there was some confusion how this item came to be before committee today and noted there were very different viewpoints being made by staff and the delegations. He indicated he would submit an amendment to the report.

The Committee Chair provided some background information on how this study first came about. She hoped the committee would approve the original terms of reference, allowing the study to finally take place.

Councillor Doucet suggested that some Steering Committee members may not be overly familiar with the procedures at meetings, which could explain the confusion that has come about. He did note however, that one issue which was raised and is one of the more serious concerns of residents north of Rideau Canal, is the issue of pedestrian crossings, particularly at Carleton University which has over 20,000 students, a large number of which cross Bronson at various points. It was interesting to note that the discussion at the Steering Committee meeting that he had attended focused on this issue, but noted the APETIS does not address this aspect.

Councillor Holmes made note of a letter from the Airport Authority dated 6 May 1998 in which it is stated that while they prefer not to widen the scope of work of this study, the Airport Authority does support the Region's position. Given their original preference, she believed they would prefer the terms of reference were not widened.

Councillor Kreling proposed:

That the Study Area and Study Direction be amended to include the "South Urban Community"; and

That the Long Term Study Horizon be amended at subsection (c) to include the words "and that this scenario consider the impact on the Ottawa International Airport."

Councillor Doucet proposed an amendment to staff Recommendation 1 to read as follows:

Moved by C. Doucet

That the Transportation Committee recommend Council approve:

- 1. That the original Terms of Reference be retained which do not include the removal of the twinning of the Airport Parkway.**

CARRIED
(H. Kreling dissented)

Brendan Reid requested clarification of the membership of the Steering Committee and noted the recommended addition of a variety of groups, with the deletion of those

communities which would normally have been included if the terms of reference had been amended today.

Councillor Kreling withdrew his amendment.

Moved by R. Cantin

That representatives from the following organizations be added to the membership of the Steering Committee:

City Centre Coalition

Ottawa East Community Association

Carleton University Administration, Carleton University Student Organization

National Capital Commission

City of Ottawa

CARRIED

2. **The proposed traffic monitoring program pertaining to the implementation of the ramps to/from the Airport Parkway at Hunt Club Road which are currently under construction, attached at Annex 'B'.**

CARRIED as amended

INFORMATION PREVIOUSLY DISTRIBUTED

1. **OVERNIGHT TRUCK BAN ON KING EDWARD AVENUE**
- Director of Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services report dated 23 Mar 98
2. **1998 RESURFACING PROGRAM**
- Director, Infrastructure & Maintenance report dated 16 Apr 98

POLICY SESSION

The committee scheduled a policy session for 17 June 1998 at 1:30 p.m.

NEXT MEETING - START TIME

In light of the new Transit Services Committee meeting schedule, the Committee discussed the option of holding its next meeting (20 May) at 1:30 p.m. It was noted the committee could not officially consider to change the starting time for the second meeting each month, until Council has confirmed the meeting schedule for the OC Transpo Commission and the Transit Services Committee.

It was agreed that the meeting scheduled for Wednesday, 20 May 1998 would commence at 1:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

CO-ORDINATOR

CHAIR