

MINUTES
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON
CHAMPLAIN ROOM

7 JUNE 2000

1:30 P.M.

PRESENT

Chair: D. Holmes

Members: W. Byrne, C. Doucet, H. Kreling, J. Legendre, M. Meilleur,
M. McGoldrick-Larsen

REGRETS M. Bellemare, R. Cantin, L. Davis

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That the Transportation Committee confirm the Minutes of the meeting of 17 May 2000.

CARRIED

Note: 1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.
2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 14 and 28 June 2000 in Transportation Committee Reports 63 and 64, respectively.

PUBLIC HEARINGS - ROADWAY MODIFICATIONS

1. COVENTRY ROAD AT ST. LAURENT BOULEVARD -
ST. LAURENT SHOPPING CENTRE EXPANSION

- Director Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services report dated 19 May 00

Having held a public hearing, that the Transportation Committee recommend Council approve the construction of the modifications to Coventry Road and St. Laurent Boulevard along the frontage of the St. Laurent Shopping Centre as described in the report and shown in Annexes B, C, and D subject to the proponent, Morguard Real Estate Investment Trust (REIT):

- a. **funding the total cost of the roadway modifications and structures plus any associated utility relocations; and,**
- b. **executing a legal agreement with respect to the above.**

CARRIED

2. FRANK KENNY ROAD AT RUSSELL ROAD/DEVINE ROAD AND AT
ROCKDALE ROAD AT RELOCATED FRANK KENNY ROAD

- Director Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services report dated 18 May 00

Having held a public hearing, that the Transportation Committee recommend Council approve the construction of intersection modifications to Russell Road and Frank Kenny Road, Devine Road at Frank Kenny Road, and construction of a new intersection at Rockdale Road and relocated Frank Kenny Road as described in the report and shown in Annexes "C1", "C2", and "C3" respectively, subject to the City of Cumberland funding the total cost of the proposed road works as outlined in the report.

CARRIED

3. TRAFFIC CONTROL SIGNAL ON ST. JOSEPH BOULEVARD
AT EDGAR BRAULT STREET

-Director, Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services report dated 4 May 00

Philippe Landry, Safety and Traffic Studies Engineer advised that at this intersection, St. Joseph Boulevard is a four-laned urban arterial roadway surrounded by light commercial shopping facilities, a fast-food restaurant, a school and a church. Edgar Brault Street is a two-lane local road with residential homes. Currently, 102 vehicles turn left onto that street from St. Joseph in an 8-hour period, but this volume is expected to increase if a traffic signal is installed. There

would have to be 255 vehicles/hour using this intersection before signals would be warranted. While staff do not recommend the installation of signals (Recommendation 1), as requested by the City of Gloucester, the Committee may wish to approve Recommendation 2, which provides for signal installation, with a westbound left-turn lane. While the City has requested that the Region forego this particular requirement, Mr. Landry pointed out that the lane is necessary to allow the traffic light to operate effectively and efficiently. A left-turn lane will:

- eliminate the need for motorists to weave around left-turning vehicles;
- reduce the potential for collisions;
- minimize delaying congestion to the westbound through traffic;
- allow for the future implementation of a left-turn arrow.

On behalf of Councillor Cantin, who was unable to attend the meeting, Councillor Doucet inquired about the funds available in an existing budget for this intersection. Mr. Brousseau confirmed there were monies set aside to do a study of an environmental assessment of the improvements to St. Joseph Boulevard some years ago. There is approximately \$600,000 left in that account, but those monies are not meant specifically to be used for these intersection modifications. The councillor conveyed the fact that the problem is the number of seniors crossing in the area, even though the warrants are low. D. Brousseau advised that over an 8-hour period only 12 pedestrians crossed the road.

Claude Lalonde spoke on behalf of residents of Edgar Brault, St. Joseph's Parish and the retailers and owners of the restaurants in the periphery of the intersection. They are in total opposition to staff Recommendation 1. He pointed out that the City of Gloucester is well aware of the importance of signals at this intersection for safety reasons and to provide an improved quality of life for residents. The City has received numerous suggestions for signals at this intersection over the years and a study conducted by the municipality determined there was a need for signals.

Mr. Lalonde did not like the fact that staff were not willing to recommend signal installation without a left-turn lane. Residents were not convinced by their argument that such a facility is required, despite the fact other intersections along St. Joseph are signalized but do not have left turn lanes and there are no undue delays at those locations. In the 20 years he has lived in the area, there has been no increase in the number of accidents or potential for collisions, despite the increases in traffic volumes. Mr. Lalonde commented that the issue of speed is a major concern for residents because drivers accelerate quite a bit through the straight stretches on St. Joseph Boulevard and this makes it especially difficult for pedestrians to cross safely through this area. In addition, the distance between this intersection and the next intersection which is signalized is .5 km, a rather far walk for people to have to travel just to cross the road. He indicated that merchants at this intersection constantly receive complaints from and lose their clients because they want to avoid this intersection. Mr. Lalonde believed the pedestrian counts

provided by staff were low because people have changed their habits to avoid the intersection and are crossing elsewhere. He implored committee members not to wait for an accident to happen before taking action and to ensure signals are installed as soon as possible.

Councillor Legendre noted the low vehicle count turning at this intersection and questioned whether that count was taken before all the connections to the residential development were opened. D. Brousseau advised that the count was taken at a time when most of the development was already in place. He explained that staff believe more drivers would be attracted to this intersection if there is a traffic light there.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen wondered whether staff had given any consideration to installing a pedestrian signal instead of a traffic control signal. D. Brousseau advised that they were responding to the request from the City of Gloucester, but he did not think the intersection warrants such a signal.

Roger Trudel spoke on behalf of the Préseault Homeowners Association which includes residents from Rocque, St. Pierre, Maisonneuve and Gabriel Streets. He stated that when Gloucester zoned this area for high-rise and office buildings, there was agreement to protect the residential component of the area and residents have had to fight to ensure that any large development does not prejudice that component. He referred to the high volume of pedestrian activity in the area generated by some 450 students attending Ecole Préseault on St. Pierre Street and thousands of parishioners attending the five masses held each weekend at St. Joseph's Parish. He noted that this whole area is considered to be the heart and soul of the Village of Orléans, yet motorists treat St. Joseph Boulevard like a racetrack. He added that there is anticipated to be a large development (Loblaws) to the north which will generate more traffic. Mr. Trudel supported the views expressed by the previous delegation that a left turn lane is not required at this intersection, because there other intersections further along which allow motorists to make that movement, but without the protection of a left-turn lane. In closing, Mr. Trudel explained that as a solicitor whose business is located at the corner of Edgar Brault and St. Joseph, he often requires a witness to the signing of wills and the only way this individual will come to his office, is if he picks them up because it is too dangerous for them to cross.

Councillor Kreling advised that in his contacts with some of the businesses along St. Joseph Boulevard on the north side in the vicinity of Edgar Brault, there are a number of driveways which lead to parking areas behind the buildings there. He questioned whether the delegation had discussed with those particular business neighbours, any difficulties they may have had either entering or exiting their driveways. Mr. Trudel advised that he had not, but suggested that if they experience the same difficulty as he does, they would know it is impossible to turn left from their driveways and they would have to turn right and make a U-turn further down the road in order to go in the direction they really wanted.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen questioned how many new residential developments are proposed for the area south of Edgar Brault and parallel to St. Joseph Boulevard. Mr. Brousseau explained that he was not aware of any new development currently underway in that area and while the traffic count was conducted over a year ago, he did not think there has been a lot of change in volume since that time. He referred to the comment by the delegation of the significant development on the north side of St. Joseph and should that occur, Mr. Brousseau opined that that is all the more reason for a left-turn lane.

Councillor Meilleur proposed that the committee approve staff Recommendation 2. As stated by both presenters, she noted that there are many pedestrians in the area, but the road is simply too dangerous for them to cross at this intersection. While traffic signals are not warranted under the Region's criteria, in light of the City of Gloucester's request for traffic lights and to respond to the needs of residents, she believed the signals should be approved, with the municipality paying for such installation, including the intersection modifications.

Councillor Legendre supported the Motion, especially given the distance to the next closest signalized intersection. He felt it was an inappropriate distance to expect people to walk to those signals just to be able to cross safely.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen could not support the Motion at this time because the warrant for signals, either traffic or pedestrian actuated, have not been met. Also, with the potential for redevelopment on the north side she questioned the City's decision to spend money to install signals now, when the intersection might very well be modified in the future to accommodate the increased traffic flow as a result of that development.

Councillor Kreling recognized the difficulties experienced by pedestrians at this intersection and stated that the Region now has an opportunity, in conjunction with the City of Gloucester, to address the safety concerns for all users. He was somewhat concerned, however, that the Region may lose this opportunity if Gloucester does not agree to cover the cost of the roadway modifications. He asked that staff apprise committee of how discussions go with the municipality, and that the item be revisited should there be unsuccessful conclusion to those discussions, with perhaps another cost-sharing approach. The Director advised they would certainly do so as directed by committee and suggested that one option that might be explored is the installation of half signals (pedestrian signals) which do not require turn lanes as part of that installation.

Councillor Legendre noted that this whole issue raises for him the problem of the warrant system the Region uses. Mr. Brousseau advised that it is a provincial system, but it has been adopted by Council for use. The Commissioner added that the warrant system is not an arbitrary system, but is based on many years of research. The councillor referred to the

transportation hierarchy adopted by Council in 1997 and the fact the focus was on moving people. In this particular situation, he recognized the counts were extremely low for motor vehicles, but it is in fact the people that want to cross and that is what he believed causes difficulty when determining the warrants. The Commissioner advised that there are separate warrants for pedestrians and there are many signals that are put in to serve the needs of pedestrians and not motor vehicles. The councillor was quite interested in the committee discussing this system at a future date.

Moved by M. Meilleur

Having held a public hearing, that the Transportation Committee recommend Council approve the installation of a traffic control signal at St. Joseph Boulevard and Edgar Brault Street, subject to the City of Gloucester;

- a. paying the total cost of the signal installation;**
- b. paying the total cost to construct the intersection modification, including the westbound left turn lane as shown in Annex B;**
- c. paying the annual maintenance and operating costs, and;**
- d. executing a legal agreement with respect to a. b. and c.**

CARRIED
(M. McGoldrick-Larsen
dissented)

TRAFFIC CONTROL SIGNALS

4. WALKLEY ROAD WEST OF CONROY ROAD - TRAFFIC CONTROL SIGNALS
- Director Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services report dated 19 May 00

That the Transportation Committee recommend Council approve the installation of traffic control signals on Walkley Road at the main access to the Chello Development site approximately 130 m West of Conroy Road subject to the developer, Chello Building Corporation:

- a. funding the total cost of the traffic control signal installation, the associated roadway modifications and any applicable utility relocations which includes paying the annual maintenance costs for the traffic control signals until such**

time as they meet the Ministry of Transportation of Ontario installation warrants and Council approves the assumption of the costs; and,

b. executing legal agreements with respect to the above.

CARRIED

REGULAR ITEMS

5. PROPOSED NOISE BARRIER DESIGN STANDARD

- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner report dated 29 May 00

Mr. Hazem Gidamy, Acoustical Consultant, S.S. Wilson, Toronto provided a brief overview of the comments received from manufacturers/suppliers of sound barrier materials, as well as from the Ottawa-Carleton Home Builder's Association. Some of the comments noted were:

- Prestige Fencing supports the use of the Ontario Highway Bridge Design Code (OHBDC) because this standard will ensure noise barriers of a higher quality, durability and will require lower maintenance costs;
- International Fence suggests using products with a 20-year warranty; the consultant noted, however, that a barrier is a total system and no one single company can give such a lengthy warranty;
- many of the companies consulted supported the use of a geotechnical consultant to be responsible for base design; staff examined the mandate of geotechnical engineer and noted that most of the problems associated with noise barrier installation is within the expertise/job specifications of a geotechnical consultant, i.e., detailed site investigation, physical sampling/testing of soils, preparation of design plans etc.

Mr. Gidamy briefly reviewed the revisions to the Noise Barrier Design, emphasizing that they are still looking at durable and high quality noise barrier systems with a life expectancy of 20 years. The standard will apply to all barriers constructed in the region, including the Noise Barrier Retrofit Policy and development approvals, where the Region is responsible for approving residential subdivisions. Staff accept the proposal to involve a geotechnical consultant with installations and also propose that the Guidelines reflect acceptance of either OBC or OHBDC standards for noise barriers. Landscaping will be included in all noise barrier projects.

Councillor Kreling questioned who would make the decision as to which design standard, OBC or OHBDC, will be used in a particular location. Mr. Gidamy advised that the decision will have to be made once the acoustical consultant determines how high the facility should be and what the soil conditions are. He added that the engineer would indicate suitability of the area where the barrier is to be installed.

In response to a question posed by Councillor Legendre, Mr. Gidamy confirmed the 20 year warranty is on materials only. The total system warranty is for 5 years, with intermittent inspections. The councillor requested confirmation that when the acoustical engineers are hired, that they be made aware of the Region's use of Leq 30 minutes. Mr. Reid confirmed they will be made aware of this requirement.

Tracey Hagyard, Kanata Council of Community Associations submitted a letter dated 7 June 2000. The Association does not support the proposal to allow for noise barriers to be built to either the OHBDC or the OBC design standard because they fear developers would opt for the lower standard to save money. This will lead to increased maintenance costs and will allow for the installation of inadequate noise barriers which will not hold up to wind pressures/snow loading etc. Noise barriers that have failed are not only unattractive, but they have a tendency to lean, making it unsafe, especially for children. She believed it unlikely that home owners would accept the responsibility to replace failing noise barriers. Mrs. Hagyard emphasized that the Region should expect noise barriers to have a minimum 20-year life expectancy in order to eliminate the expense of replacing failed noise barriers after 7 or 10 years.

Nicholas Heins, Prestige Fence was concerned that allowing for the design to comply with the OBC or the OHBDC will result in more cheaper quality installations. He advised that what is in place in Ontario now is the OHBDC, and fences installed under this standard are more robust and last longer than those designed under the OBC. There are no provisions in the OBC addressing the types of fences installed and therefore, there will be an entire array of fences. He believed that having both codes only creates confusion and he urged committee to delete reference to the OBC.

Councillor Kreling inquired about his company's experiences with the OHBDC and the life expectancies of fences built to that standard. Mr. Heins advised that there is very little comparison between either codes; however, the OBC does not address sound barriers, whereas the OHBDC does and structures constructed under that code have an inherent life expectancy of 50 years. When asked why the OBC does not have noise barrier criteria, Vinni Sahni, Manager, Structures advised that if those fences are constructed in conjunction with other features, such as landscaping, then the provisions of the OBC could be used because all they are, are fences. Where the OHBDC differs is in its strength requirements. For example, if a barrier were to be installed along Regional Road 174, a higher standard would apply.

Councillor Byrne questioned how the Canadian Standards Association (CSA) standard interacts with the OBC and the OHBDC. Mr. Sahni advised that the CSA standards deal with individual components such as wood, aluminum or bricks and the whole system (barrier) must be designed according to one of the codes. He confirmed that the CSA standard fits the requirements of both standards.

David Harmer, Harmer, Podolack Engineering Consultants explained that he has had almost 30 years fence-building experience using both codes. He stated that to design a noise barrier to the OBC is difficult because there is nothing in that code about noise barriers. He suggested that since the OBC does not apply to noise barriers, it might actually be interpreted that there is no requirement for an engineer to design the facility. Therefore, since the Region's proposed guidelines specifically asks for the facility to be engineered, the design code should be clear as to what the engineer is designing to eliminate problems. The OHBDC deals specifically with the support of the noise barrier, not the noise barrier material itself. He suggested that foundation and inherent support could be separated from the materials of the actual panels. He believed it was important to have the OHBDC as the standard for the support of the noise barrier, including the foundations and posts as a minimum. He believed that engineering, both the geotechnical study and structural design should be done for *all* noise barriers. He noted that a noise barrier on a regional roadway is different than a fence between properties and that a 50-year design on a foundation will provide that built-in durability and integrity and should be the intent of the design standard for noise barriers in the region.

Lois Smith supported the comments made by the previous speakers. She noted that wind pressures can be extreme and distortion of the fence can occur to the point where some of the structure becomes weak and unsightly gaps are created which are not easy to repair because the materials may be different. These gaps can be of further annoyance because they will allow the wind to whistle through. Therefore, she believed the Region's standard should be coherent throughout the materials and that they be able to withstand such variable wind pressures.

Harvey Parisien, ALCUF International Inc., stated that there has been some confusion that the OBC is not adequate to design a noise barrier system, but for over 20 years, his company has been using the OBC, taking into consideration wind pressure, et cetera, to design their systems. And the RMOC has approved their systems based on that code. He believed, therefore, that enough detail was contained in the OBC that a professional engineer can design an appropriate noise barrier. He indicated he has seen systems installed to the bridge code that have failed and look equally as bad as any other system and he believed that the main problem is quality control. He noted that for the past 20 years, his company has installed those types of systems with flawless results. In summary, he believed the specification as it stands is correct and that it has elevated the awareness of the problems with noise barriers and fencing design in general.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen referred to subdivision agreements and the Region's requirements for noise attenuation within those developments. She asked whether the standards would drop under current subdivision requirements for noise fences, if the Guidelines allowed the OBC to be an option in this policy. Mr. Gidamy advised that subdivision agreements include requirements for noise fencing in accordance with Regional requirements and therefore, there is no lowering of the standard.

Councillor Byrne proposed that #2 of Section 6 of the Design Standard in Annex A, be amended to delete reference to the Ontario Building Code (OBC). She noted the support of some of the engineering consultants for designing to the OHBDC for longevity, cost effectiveness and because the OBC has no provision itself for the design of noise barriers. She was cognisant of the concerns raised by the community that the OHBDC should be the one to have in place and will stand the Region in better stead in the long run.

Moved by W. Byrne

That #2 of Section 6 of the Design Standard in Annex A, be amended to read: “*The design of the system shall be site specific and in accordance with the Ontario Highway Bridge Design Code (OHBDC)...*”.

LOST

YEAS: W. Byrne, C. Doucet, M. McGoldrick-Larsen....3

NAYS: D. Holmes, H. Kreling, M. Meilleur....3

That the Transportation Committee recommend Council:

- 1. Adopt the "Proposed Noise Barrier Design Standard" attached at Annex "A" (dated May 2000);**
- 2. Adopt the provisional list of products and suppliers/manufacturers listed in Annex "B" to be acceptable for installation in RMOC;**
- 3. Allow staff to amend Annex "B" subject to the presentation of appropriate evidence from new suppliers/manufacturers that their product complies with the proposed noise barrier design standard at Annex "A".**

CARRIED

6. AIRPORT PARKWAY EXTENDED TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY (APETIS) REPORT
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner report dated 4 Apr 00

The Committee received the following public delegations:

David Gladstone, Chair, Steering Committee for APETIS & City Centre Coalition stated that the real issue before committee is the future of the Airport Parkway/Bronson corridor. Following the Region's acquisition of the Parkway from the NCC in the 1990's and to address the residential and commercial growth in the areas, two major changes have been made to the Parkway: in 1992, it was connected to Bank Street and Albion Road via an extension of Lester Road and six years later, northbound ramps from Hunt Club Road were constructed. Consequently, both links have generated substantial volumes of additional car traffic, with the Lester Road extension being a key connection between the Rideau-Carleton Raceway/Casino and downtown Ottawa. As a direct result, these changes have brought parts of the Parkway and Bronson to capacity at peak hours, leading to cut-through traffic in Old Ottawa South and The Glebe and to delays in travelling to the Airport. He emphasized that Bronson has become a hazardous and unpleasant road for pedestrians and cyclists.

Mr. Gladstone indicated that the 1997 Official Plan foresaw the Airport Parkway reaching capacity and included two ways of addressing this via the twinning of the Parkway and building the Alta Vista Parkway. However, such measures would substantially increase car capacity in the area between the Rideau River and the Airport, and he wondered where those vehicles would go north and west of the Rideau River since there is clearly no room for more cars in peak hours on Bronson, Bank, Queen Elizabeth Driveway, Colonel By Drive, or Nicholas Street.

In summary, Mr. Gladstone pointed out that the recommendations of the Steering Committee call for the Region to emphasize its investment in bus and light-rail transit as a flexible and cost-effective means of handling the growth in transportation demand in the areas between the Airport and downtown Ottawa.

Greg Wright, Old Ottawa South Community Association supported the recommendations of the Steering Committee. He stated that the APETIS report means more and more traffic, with more cross-cutting through the various communities of City Centre. It also means that the effect of the Hunt Club ramps has made it evident that the traffic problems have simply been moved from one area to another. Prior to the ramps being installed, there were 2300 vehicles/hour at the intersection of Sunnyside and Bronson. It is projected there will be 3550 in 20 years, a phenomenal increase. The Association does not want to see any further expansion along this corridor such as the twinning of the Parkway or construction of the ramp at Walkley Road. He recommended that the committee adopt some of the innovative suggestions proposed by the Steering Committee and to give light rail a chance and to move aggressively towards traffic

demand management instead of traffic supply demand management. Further, the Region should take steps to meet the legitimate transportation needs of all people in the region as they move north/south.

Joel Hugues, Airport Authority stated that the twinning of the Airport Parkway has been a part of the Region's Official Plan for a long time and given the importance of the airport for the community and the observed and forecasted increases in traffic, not following through with this proposal would not constitute sound planning. In regards to staff Recommendation 3, he advised that at this point in time there is no provision for earmarking money for the extension of light rail to the airport in their plans.

In response to a question raised by Councillor Legendre, Mr. Hugues advised that the Authority has a mandate to operate the airport facilities, but no mandate to operate or finance any infrastructure located outside of its property. The councillor interpreted his comments to light rail to be rather negative to which Mr. Hugues responded by stating very few airports have rail links to their facilities and even in the vast majority of cases, such links are not financially viable and are generally subsidized by the government. The councillor referred to a comment he made to the Authority's Chief Executive Officer about whether they would still be in favour of the ramps at Hunt Club Road if the twinning of the Airport does not proceed. He was never provided an answer so the councillor hoped Mr. Hugues would convey to his Board that the Region has limitations on what it can do and it should try to put those things in the balance as well.

Mrs. Erwin Dreessen spoke on behalf of her husband who was suffering from laryngitis. She read the following statements from his prepared text:

- commended all who were responsible for the process that was followed in this study; there was broad representation by affected communities with strong participation and leadership, as well as generous consultant and staff support for the work needed to be undertaken;
- he supported all the recommendations on which the consultants' and the Steering Committee's reports agree, except their support for a new inter-provincial bridge to the east; he has not seen convincing evidence it would alleviate truck traffic through the downtown or that any such alleviation outweighs the negative effect of providing further infrastructure for urban sprawl;
- he strongly supported staff Recommendation 3, to involve the Airport Authority in extending light rail to the Airport and suggested the Region offer incentives to make this happen;

- the monitoring report revealed that the ramps at Hunt Club achieved the intended reduction in misuse of local roads, but contributed to even more traffic on Bronson north of the Rideau Canal; however the effect of the Walkley ramps will be more efficient and will produce the proper use of local roads as well as the Parkway between Brookfield and Hunt Club southbound;
- he disagreed with the recommendation of the Steering Committee to install gates at the Hunt Club ramps should traffic become too heavy;
- a study should be undertaken to determine the positive and negative ramifications of twinning the Airport Parkway, but that it be postponed at least until the light rail pilot project has run its course.

A copy of Mr. Dreessen's submission dated 7 June 2000 is held on file.

Wayne Goodfellow, a resident of Findlay Avenue, explained that he has witnessed a major increase in traffic over the last few years. While his and other neighbourhood streets, are residential, they in fact act as feeder lanes taking traffic from Bronson and directing it to the Queen Elizabeth Driveway. As a result, there has been a degradation in the quality of life in their community and has threatened the safety of their children. He believed that commuter/regional traffic should be kept on regional roads and the RMOC must be aggressive in how it deals with commuters, especially given the increasing growth to the south. The development of businesses and the high tech sectors locating outside the Region, in the long term is good news for traffic because it is going to be spread more Regionally and not concentrated so much in the core. He urged the Region to be very aggressive in protecting the quality of life in its inner core communities.

Claus Hafner asked that the committee refrain from adding more vehicular and truck traffic and to proceed with light rail. He stated that many studies indicate that the pressure on the drivers and passengers in cars in congestion is such that it adds significantly to the mental deterioration of the population. The intangible disadvantages include the affects on the health care system because more traffic means more chances for accidents. He believed such pressures would be very much alleviated by allowing people to use a train.

Pat Steenberg indicated that the Hunt Club ramps were justified on the grounds they would reduce cut-through traffic in the southern communities bordering the Parkway. Assurances were made at that time, that it was not an issue of additional cars but that the proposed ramps would merely redistribute existing traffic. However, she maintained that the study includes inconsistencies and omissions in the data makes it difficult to compare the before and after ramp conditions. Where the community has attempted to verify the volume figures in Appendix H, they have found them to be inconsistent with intersection counts drawn from the Region's own

data base. More importantly, she noted the intersection counts sometimes lead to conclusions that are the opposite of those cited in Appendix H. Also, there is no context given for those figures, i.e., when were the counts taken, might there be factors other than the opening of the ramps which could have accounted for the changes noted.

In her analysis of Appendix H, Ms. Steenberg stated that the report says the traffic volume changes resulting from the construction of the ramps, have emerged as anticipated, when in fact, increases in peak hour traffic on Bronson are double and triple the consultants projections. While the report says that the Bank Street corridor has benefited considerably from the new Hunt Club ramps, north of the Rideau River peak hour volumes on Bank Street have mostly increased or remained the same and the only reduction in traffic there occurred between Hunt Club and Heron. Further, Appendix H states that the volume of cars transferring from Bronson to the Queen Elizabeth Driveway has increased as has the volume on Fifth Avenue and minor roads in the Bronson Avenue corridor do not appear to have experienced any consistent negative impact. In fact, she exclaimed, 1000 cars use Findlay, Broadway and Torrington every morning in the peak period. And morning rush hour traffic on Glebe Avenue has increased by 67%.

In conclusion, Ms. Steenberg noted that the justification for building the ramps in the first place was seriously flawed and therefore the decision to proceed with their construction was based on faulty information. She maintained that neglecting to incorporate into those projections induced volumes is a serious deficiency. The results of the monitoring study clearly reveal that all the gain has accrued to communities in the south.

Councillor Meilleur inquired why there appeared to be discrepancies between the figures in the APETIS report and those referred to by the speaker. B. Reid, Manager, Infrastructure and Project Planning advised that the figures used in that report are counts that were carried out before and after, approximately one year following the opening of the ramps.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen inquired when the last origin-destination study was conducted for increased traffic volumes in the Region and staff advised it was last done in 1995 as preparatory work for the Transportation Master Plan (TMP). The councillor stated that since then and in the past couple of years, the TMP has been unable to keep pace with transportation needs. She was aware that staff are in the process of examining the priorities identified in 1997 and will be reporting back to committee. Mr. Reid confirmed that staff are in the process of updating the TMP to the extent of reporting on issues that have changes and will be reporting back before the end of the year.

Ed Foohey, Dow's Lake Residents Association stated that as a visually-impaired individual, he has particular problems crossing the Bronson Avenue corridor. He explained that twice a day, he has the occasion to cross Bronson at Fifth Avenue and over the past two years, has

seen the situation get much worse. Without the aid of an audible signal at this particular intersection, he often relies on the sounds of traffic to tell him whether or not to cross. However, during peak periods, this becomes nearly impossible because there is so ambient noise, he cannot discern whether a car with a quiet motor is turning or moving through the intersection. He asked that the committee do what it can to alleviate the situation and to make this road safer, especially by the elderly and by school children who have to cross Bronson twice a day during peak hours.

John Legg, Action Sandy Hill (ASH) believes the recommendations of the Steering Committee are more balanced than those of the consultant, because they attempt to reconcile the problem of moving people in and out of the central area, with the desire of the people living in the central area, to have communities which are safe, quiet and not polluted. The recommendations of the consultant, however, are based on an approach which usually seeks to accommodate automobile traffic. ASH believes staff Recommendation 4 to be the most objectionable in terms of maintaining the livability of the central communities; it takes a step towards studying the ramifications of twinning the Airport Parkway, which, in their view, is premature. Because the light rail pilot project has not been implemented or evaluated, this project will diminish some of the load on the Parkway and it is not known how much this will be.

Mr. Legg commented that the consultant estimates that light rail will reduce volumes on Bronson/Parkway by at least 100 vehicles/hour. However, to arrive at that figure, a number of assumptions have been made, all of which could vary significantly. The study which monitored the effects of connecting Hunt Club to the Parkway concluded that the actual amount of traffic attracted to the Bronson corridor has been greater than previously anticipated. Any step, therefore, which increases the capacity of arteries to carry more cars into the central core should only be taken following completion of the trial period for the light rail pilot project.

With respect to the Steering Committee Recommendation 5, to initiate a study on replacing the plan to build an Alta Vista Parkway with an Alta Vista public transit corridor, Mr. Legg commented that should that corridor be built, it would bring a new flood of cars into the central area through Nicholas Street in Sandy Hill. The twinning of the Parkway and the construction of an Alta Vista Parkway would result in more congestion, cut-through traffic and disruption of residential parking. Both these pro-automobile projects would contribute to the deterioration of the core of Ottawa and would result in increased use of automobiles for commuting, increased pollution and encouragement of more urban sprawl across the Region. He believed that Recommendation 2 of the Steering Committee sums it up nicely by suggesting “that the ROP’s emphasis on livable communities and mass transit be given priority over twinning the Airport Parkway”.

John Kane, Glebe Community Association questioned where the twinning of the Airport Parkway would be. Further, he questioned what the Region plans to do with the problems it

has put upon the downtown communities, problems which have occurred since the Hunt Club ramps were built. He urged committee to proceed quickly with the recommendations of the Steering Committee.

In response to his question of where the twinning would take place, Mr. Reid advised that one of the unexpected results of introducing the ramps at Hunt Club is that there is now quite a clear distinction between the traffic volumes north and south of Hunt Club. While the ramps have added considerably to the Parkway between Hunt Club and Brookfield, the reverse is happening in the south and less on the Parkway south of Hunt Club because motorists can now travel north on Bank and get onto the Airport Parkway at Hunt Club. There is now a clear break in the volumes of traffic on the Parkway and the twinning can now be divided into two distinct phases; north and south of Hunt Club Road.

David Jeanes, Transport 2000 advised that his main concern is access to and from the Airport from the point of view of public transportation, inner modalism and the needs of the high-tech sector in Ottawa. In 1997, he raised his concerns with the Airport Authority, the Board of Trade, the Tourist and Convention Bureau and taxi companies, because he felt the process was being advertised mainly in the south end of the city for the residents who would benefit from these ramps and the airport matter was not being addressed. He projected there would be severe problems for reliable access to the airport and these problems have materialized. He explained that one of the reasons there is less traffic south of Hunt Club is because there is less traffic in and out of the airport because some of it is being forced to find other ways of getting into town. He indicated that it has been proved everywhere that the most effective way of keeping traffic flowing on congested roadways is to have an alternative transit facility parallel to that road. Therefore, he supports the improvement of both bus and light rail facilities parallel to the Parkway. He noted that light rail can also provide good transit links to the high tech industry in the east and west of the Region, through links with the transitway and through development of the available east-west rail lines. He stood firmly behind the findings of the Steering Committee of the Light Rail project and issued his support for Recommendation 3 in the staff report.

Cam Robertson, City Centre Coalition spoke to the issue of the quality of life in the various communities along the Bronson corridor as well as in the communities further east which would be affected by the proposed Alta Vista expressway. The Max Group report and the City Centre Coalition's response to that report, both provide an idea of the congestion and cut-through traffic that affect the communities during peak periods. The length of the rush hour congestion has increased as a result of increased volumes. The Steering Committee report addresses the overall movement of traffic in and around the areas, as well as recommending specific measures to ameliorate traffic at particular locations. It recommends putting transit solutions first, instead of providing more roads and ramps which will only generate more traffic. He believed the light rail project should have a chance to prove itself before any further work is done to twin the Parkway.

Garry Lindberg, Alta Vista Drive Residents Association spoke against Recommendation 5 of the Steering Committee, which suggests the initiation of a study to replace the plan for an Alta Vista parkway with an Alta Vista public transit corridor. He reminded committee that the Alta Vista parkway has been a transportation corridor for more than 50 years and has been included in the ROP since its formation 30 years ago. Its present configuration was developed for the current ROP after more than two years of environmental assessment. It presented a comprehensive set of recommendations on the transportation demands to and from the southeast sector. It recommended that the Alta Vista Parkway be for vehicles and HOV/buses. The Steering Committee's recommendation should not be considered until there has been full consultation with community associations such as Canterbury, Alta Vista, Faircrest Heights, Ridgemount, Alta Vista Drive, Riverview, Southkeys Greenboro, as well as interest groups directly affected by the recommendation. He believed that Recommendation 5 is premature given the current study being conducted in the Alta Vista Drive/Smyth Road transportation strategy. He urged that should this recommendation be on the table for consideration, that the committee reject or defer consideration until after the Alta Vista Drive/Smyth Road transportation strategy is complete and until all the community associations are consulted.

Lois K. Smith suggested that the Audible Pedestrian Signals Committee be consulted as part of the Glebe Area Transportation Study, as referenced at Section (b) under "Discussion of Consultants Recommendations". The intersections of Bronson and Carling and Bronson and Fifth are of particular concern for the installation of audible signals. Also referenced in that section, is the proposal to install a speed bump on Broadway Avenue and she believed this should more appropriately be a *hump*. Ms. Smith was not in favour of allowing parking on Carling west of Cambridge at all times except week-day peak periods, and if approved, that the peak times be extended to ensure congestion does not occur. In reference to the Bronson/Sunnyside traffic circle which was mentioned in the City of Ottawa's letter at Annex C, Ms. Smith believed that these facilities only work when there is a very small amount of traffic.

Harry Halliwell opined that building wider roads does not solve the problems of traffic; it simply offer motorists another route of travel and when that route fills up, people will be demanding a wider road.

Ida Henderson, Dalhousie Community Association fully endorsed the report and recommendations put forward by the Steering Committee. Their community has a great deal of experience with traffic and given the geographic realities of Ottawa, they do require major north/south routes. However, they are not prepared to have their community seriously damaged in order to accommodate this. As indicated in the ROP, the DCA believe it is time to focus on moving people, not cars, hence their disappointment with the consultant's report which starts with the premise that keeping cars moving is the desirable outcome. The DCA feel that moving

people in the most environmentally-friendly cost-efficient manner is the desirable outcome. She urged committee to support the recommendations of the Steering Committee.

Patrick O'Brien, Carleton University advised that they have been involved in the Steering Committee and its report. He noted that a number of commuters using Bronson Avenue are coming to the university and he recognized that these numbers will increase. Their major concerns, however, include the volume of traffic and the speed at which motorists are travelling down Bronson. He strongly endorsed the recommendation to give the light rail pilot project a true assessment period in the hopes it may be an answer to some of the traffic problems.

Linda Hoad, City Centre Coalition indicated that from this exercise, they have learned that transportation engineers do not have the tools to accurately predict induced traffic. This is evidenced by the exceeded anticipated volumes as a result of the opening of the Hunt Club ramps. The same can be applied to a new transitway infrastructure; more people will use something that wasn't formally there, or that has been improved, but it is not known exactly how many people and what will be the magnitude of the change. She recognized the importance of taking things slower; to evaluate new infrastructure and find out what it will actually do before rushing ahead to build more, particularly in the same corridor. She suggested the Region should be working on transportation demand management, stating it has a greater potential than some experts believe it has and it should be given a fair chance before moving ahead with more road building.

Councillor Doucet proposed the following:

That the committee consider the staff recommendations as amended as follows:

- 1. Receive the Steering Committee Report on the Airport Parkway Extended Traffic Impact Study (APETIS) and the consultants report (issued separately to Council: 23 September 1999), the Hunt Club Ramps Monitoring Report (Annex H of the consultant's report) and the City Centre Coalition's response to the consultants monitoring report;*
- 2. Refer the above named reports and the proposed remedial measures suggested to the NCC, RCAG, OC Transpo and Carleton University for comment and/or action; and staff return to Transportation Committee with a report back on the actions taken and the status of the outstanding recommendations;*
- 3. Request the Airport Authority to include a substantial light-rail investment in its future expansion plans and make the necessary provisions for timely implementation;*

4. *Direct staff to bring forward to Planning and Environment Committee and Transportation Committee, the draft Terms of Reference for the study necessary to address Motion #34 adopted by Regional Council on 28 January 1998, attached at Annex "A"; and that this study shall include public transit options to twinning the Airport Parkway;*
5. *Defer the construction of the new Walkley Road off-ramp until the study referred to in Recommendation #4 is completed and Council has reconsidered the matter.*

Councillor Meilleur proposed the addition of the following to Recommendation 4, above: “not until the Light Rail Pilot Project has been completed and evaluated.”

If Recommendation 4, as amended, is approved, Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen questioned how long it would be before the report for the twinning of the Parkway could be brought forward. B. Reid advised that since the light rail project is anticipated to be in place by June 2001, operate for two years and then assessed, it is unlikely the report requested of staff (Motion 34) would be brought forward until approximately 2005. Pam Sweet, Director, Policy and Infrastructure Planning, clarified that staff would report back after the first year of the implementation of the light rail project and at the end of the second year, Council will have to decide whether to continue it as a pilot project, to make it permanent or to drop it altogether. In light of these clarifications, Councillor Legendre proposed that the amendment proposed by Councillor Meilleur be further amended to incorporate “that the evaluation be *after* two years of the Pilot Rail Project”. Councillor Meilleur concurred with this amendment.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen referred to a recent announcement in the newspaper that there is a possibility the Region’s population will expand 100% and not 40% as projected in the OP. She questioned what the anticipated rate of growth actually is and how a higher population projection will affect transportation planning in the next few years. The Commissioner of Planning and Development Approvals, Nick Tunnacliffe, advised that since the Region last reviewed its OP, growth as a whole is almost exactly what has been predicted. While staff do not have good figures for economy and growth of employment as a whole, those quoted in the announcement the councillor referred to, were based on projections of high tech employment, which were then extrapolated to the rest of the economy as a whole. He was doubtful there would be growth of the order speculated.

Councillor Doucet spoke passionately about the concerns expressed today by the residents and communities living along the Bronson Avenue corridor. He recognized and understood their concerns, fears and anger at the unbelievably high volume of traffic that has been pumped through this corridor since the ramps were open at Hunt Club. The result of the monitoring report clearly shows the devastating impact it has had on the communities, especially with an increase in the traffic on local streets. He empathized with the comments made today by

residents who have to live with this burden of additional traffic and the danger it poses to their lives and the impact on their quality of life. He believed his Motions address these concerns and will provide an opportunity for an in-depth review of the recommendations brought forward by the Steering Committee.

Councillor Stewart requested clarification of Recommendation 2 as proposed by Councillor Doucet. The Committee Chair confirmed that the matters which relate to the NCC, RCAG, OC Transpo and Carleton University would be referred to those agencies and anything that relates to the Region would be brought back and reported to the appropriate committee by staff.

The Committee Chair excused herself from the meeting to attend another function, but conveyed her support for the Motions before committee. The committee meeting was resumed, with Councillor Legendre as Acting Chair.

Councillor Stewart referred to the increasing growth in the south and how the communities in Capital and River wards will be impacted. She noted that many community associations from her ward had submitted comments on this issue, including Canada Post, supporting the immediate construction of the Walkley ramps. The monitoring report clearly shows that building that one off-ramp will have no negligible impact on the Glebe as it affects southbound traffic only. The two major benefits of the ramp are that it will allow residents heading to the communities of Riverside south and Hunt Club north, to get off at Walkley instead of having to go all the way to Brookfield Road and cutting through a residential community. It will actually alleviate that congestion on the Parkway and will not put a single additional car into the Glebe or Ottawa south communities. She believed it was unacceptable to continue to defer this simple, logical infrastructure project which is a high priority for the Region.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen stated that residents living in the suburbs do not have the level of public transit they need to get in and out of the city. And until that occurs, there will be no relief on Bronson Avenue. She agreed that the light rail pilot project is a great idea, but until there is an established ridership, there will be no change. She opined that all communities in the Region will be affected by the projected population growth and she believed some of the remedial measures suggested by the Steering Committee were the appropriate steps to be taken, until it is understood more clearly where the traffic growth is being generated. She suggested that it was time for another origin/destination study before moving forward with many of the transportation planning issues.

Councillor Meilleur believed that communities should work collaboratively to address these issues, but was not in favour of moving traffic from one community to another. With respect to the differences in statistics referred to by one of the delegations, she suggested staff and community representatives meet to discuss where and why there are differences. She

encouraged committee to support her amendment because to do a study when it is not known what the positive or negative effect of light rail will be, is a waste of money because the facts will be different.

The Committee voted on the Motions as follows:

Moved by C. Doucet

That the Transportation Committee recommend Council:

1. **Receive the Steering Committee Report on the Airport Parkway Extended Traffic Impact Study (APETIS) and the consultants report (issued separately to Council: 23 September 1999), the Hunt Club Ramps Monitoring Report (Annex H of the consultant's report) and the City Centre Coalition's response to the consultants monitoring report;**

CARRIED

2. **Refer the above named reports and the proposed remedial measures suggested to the NCC, RCAG, OC Transpo and Carleton University for comment and/or action; and staff return to Transportation Committee with a report back on the actions taken and the status of the outstanding recommendations;**

CARRIED

3. **Request the Airport Authority to include a substantial light-rail investment in its future expansion plans and make the necessary provisions for timely implementation;**

CARRIED

Moved by M. Meilleur

That Recommendation 4 (as proposed by Councillor Doucet) be amended to include: "not until the Light Rail Pilot Project has been completed and evaluated after two years."

CARRIED

(M. McGoldrick-Larsen
dissenting)

4. **Direct staff to bring forward to Planning and Environment Committee and Transportation Committee, but not until the Light Rail Pilot Project has been completed and evaluated after two years, the draft Terms of Reference for the study necessary to address Motion #34 adopted by Regional Council on 28 January 1998, attached at Annex "A"; and that this study shall include public transit options to twinning the Airport Parkway;**

CARRIED
(H. Kreling and
M. McGoldrick-Larsen
dissenting)

5. **Defer the construction of the new Walkley Road off-ramp until the study referred to in Recommendation #4 is completed and Council has reconsidered the matter.**

CARRIED
(H. Kreling and
M. McGoldrick-Larsen
dissenting)

Moved by M. McGoldrick-Larsen

That a study be conducted to determine:

1. **In what geographic areas of the Region is the traffic growth being generated;**
2. **What are the principle origins and destinations of this traffic.**

CARRIED

That Transportation Committee approve the report, as amended by the foregoing.

CARRIED

All public submissions received are referenced in Transportation Committee Report 64 and are held on file with the Regional Clerk.

INQUIRIES

Proposal for Installation of Waste Receptacles

Councillor Legendre requested information with respect to the proposal about the installation of waste receptacles in the urban area. He was advised through his office that this is an item being considered by the City of Ottawa. The Environment and Transportation Commissioner confirmed there was a proposal that was to come forward on waste receptacles. Staff decided it would wait until next year with the new City of Ottawa and the city now wishes to proceed and it is to come to the Transportation Committee and Council because these receptacles will be on Regional roads.

On a similar issue, Councillor Meilleur expressed concern about the bench/waste receptacle that has been installed at the bus stop on Beechwood Avenue because it appeared to block visibility of the shelter. The Commissioner indicated that staff would examine this particular location and if there is a problem, the seat/receptacle can be moved.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

CO-ORDINATOR

CHAIR