

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON
MUNICIPALITÉ RÉGIONALE D'OTTAWA-CARLETON

REPORT
RAPPORT

Our File/N/Réf. **23 07-97-5000**
Your File/V/Réf.

DATE 06 May 1997

TO/DEST. Co-ordinator, Transportation Committee

FROM/EXP. Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner

SUBJECT/OBJET **TRANSMITTAL REPORT ON DRAFT TRANSPORTATION
MASTER PLAN**

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION

That the Transportation Committee recommend Council approve the Transportation Master Plan with the changes recommended in Annex "A".

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A wide variety of comments were received from agencies, community groups and the public on the Draft Transportation Master Plan and the detailed responses correspond to the sequence of chapters and sections in that document.

The following is a listing of the issues raised most frequently in the submissions.

Modal Share Targets

That the long term targets set for the pedestrian and bicycle modes should be increased.

Effects of Congestion on Local Roads

Concern expressed at the possible diversion of traffic from the Regional Road system to local roads as a result of increased congestion.

Sidewalks on Local Roads

A number of municipalities disagreed with RMO requirements for sidewalks on local roads where transit operates.

Bicycle Parking Standards

Several municipalities objected to the level of detail that was indicated in this policy and recommended either the deletion or a considerable modification.

Parking Requirements and Development Serviced by Transit

Again, a number of municipalities objected to the prescriptive nature of the proposed policy.

Transit Priority on Elizabeth Street

Objections to the development of a transit priority corridor on Elizabeth Street because of the possible impacts on houses, trees, etc.

Impacts of Truck Traffic

This was an issue raised by a number of respondents with various suggestions on how to alleviate the matter.

Interprovincial Bridge Location at Kettle Island

There were several comments received from individuals and community groups recommending the deletion of property protection for a future bridge at Kettle Island.

Traffic Calming

Support for traffic calming on Regional Roads was received from a number of respondents.

Funding and Priority of Walking and Cycling

Concern that adequate funds had not been identified for walking and cycling projects.

Bronson Avenue Widening

Some objections to the widening of Bronson Avenue north of the Dunbar Bridge.

Pilot Rail Rapid Transit

A number of respondents advocated the acceleration of the recommended pilot project to the first priority category.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to request Committee and Council approval of the Transportation Master Plan, circulated as a draft document in February 1997, with the changes recommended in Annex "A" which summarises the written comments received as of 25 April 1997, the official closing date, and provides staff's recommendations for each of the changes requested by individuals, agencies, and municipalities.

A separate report has been prepared for the Planning and Environment Committee and Council approval of the Water and Wastewater Master Plans and the Regional Official Plan.

Some recommended changes to the Transportation Master Plan will also effect the Regional Official Plan and will be included in the report to the Planning and Environment Committee being prepared for the meetings on 20-22 May 1997.

As a considerable number of written comments were received after the official closing date and were not able to be addressed in this document in time to meet the deadline for publication, staff will prepare an expanded version containing a response to all comments received at time of writing. This second document will be tabled at the Transportation Committee on 16 May 1997, thus providing the Committee with a complete summary of issues, responses and recommendations at that time.

FORMAT OF THE REPORT

Annex "A" provides a summary of comments received on the Draft Transportation Master Plan up to 25 April 1997, outlining overall comments on the Plan, as well as general and specific comments for each Section, along with staff's response and recommendations for any changes to the Master Plan. Every comment is attributed to the relevant source, indicated by a number corresponding to the original submission. Comments are listed in the same sequence as the chapters and sections of the Draft Master Plan.

Annex "B" to this report is an index of submissions received. A copy of the submissions received is available for viewing at the Resource Centre in the Regional Clerk's office.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

In May 1995, an Integrated Consultation Strategy was prepared for the Official Plan Review, the Transportation Master Plan, the Water Master Plan and the Wastewater Master Plan. The Integrated Consultation Strategy was a follow-up to the initial plan prepared for the Official Plan Review and the Scoping Document approved for the Water and Wastewater Master Plans in January of 1993. This document outlined the goals and objectives of the consultation program as well as a description of the consultation activities planned for all four studies. The Strategy was approved by Regional Council in May 1995. As it was carried out, it was modified where necessary to better meet the needs of the public and the requirement for input of the four studies.

Prior to the development of this strategy, consultation activities for the Official Plan Review had already been undertaken. These activities served as a basis for developing the Community Vision that guided the Official Plan Review and the associated Master Plans as well as providing some insight into appropriate consultation activities for the integrated studies.

The consultation program was designed to meet the ongoing consultation needs of the four studies as well as focusing on obtaining input at milestone decision points. The program was developed keeping in mind three key elements of effective consultation:

- informing the stakeholders;
- involving the stakeholders; and,
- incorporating input from stakeholders.

The program was aimed at a broad target audience including the general public; special interest groups and community associations; municipal staff; local, provincial and federal authorities and agencies; business groups; and the media.

Common consultation events were used where possible to help reinforce the interrelationship among the four studies and to make the most efficient use of both the public's and the Region's time.

Up to 25 April 1997, 60 and 321 individual comments had been received on the Transportation Master Plan, and the Official Plan, respectively.

Public consultation has been carried out in accordance with Provincial Environmental Assessment requirements. Schedule B projects occurring in the first ten years of the 2021 planning horizon will be filed publicly after the Master Plans have been approved by Regional Council.

A more detailed explanation and description of all consultation activities undertaken since the circulation of the Draft Official Plan, Transportation Master Plan and Water and Wastewater Master Plans can be found in the Official Plan Transmittal Report.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

When the Regional Development Strategy (RDS) was adopted by Regional Council, on 13 November 1996, it was accompanied by the Finance Department's report entitled "Regional Development Strategy (RDS): Municipal Financial Impact Update".

Since this time, the Province has proposed changes to the funding of a number of programs including transportation. Council has yet to take a position on these changes.

*Approved by
N. Tunnaclyffe, MCIP, RPP*

MC/BR/md
Attach. (2)

**Staff Responses to Comments on the
Transportation Master Plan
Received through 25 April 1997**

6 May 1997

- 1.0 Introduction
- 1.1 Purpose of the Plan
- 1.2 Planning Process
 - 1.2.1 Transportation Master Plan
 - 1.2.2 Environmental Assessment
 - 1.2.3 Economic and Financial Assessment
 - 1.2.4 Consultation
 - 1.2.5 Documentation
- 1.3 Foundation of the Plan

General Comments

1. Emphasis on non-auto modes - The Byward Market Business Improvement Area does not support transit/walking/cycling first approach since some communities, such as the Market, depend on automobiles. Many Market visitors (30% of "frequent" patrons and 47% of "regular" patrons) live 4 to 10 km away and rely on their autos, especially food shoppers. (221)

Response - A principal intent of the Master Plan is to maximize the attractiveness of non-auto modes and reduce automobile demand during the peak travel hours which determine the required size of roadway facilities. There is a lesser intent to achieve the same end during off-peak hours, such as mid-day, evenings and weekends, when visitors to areas such as the Market rely the most on accessibility by automobile.

Recommendation - No change required.

1.3.1 Transportation Vision and Principles

Specific Comments

2. Section 1.3.1, Table 2 - Delete Principles 4 and 11 due to conflict with Principle 2. (89)

Response - The Principles in Table 2 are taken from *Transportation Vision, Principles and Issues* (19-16) as approved by Regional Council in July 1995. Principles 4 and 11 are not considered to be contradictory to Principle 2. Principle 4 acknowledges that preservation of modal choice is required in a region which includes both low-density rural and high-density urban areas; in the face of this diversity, the provision of a range of modal choice to as many residents as possible is considered to improve quality of life. Principle 11 reflects the need for the transportation system to consider the needs of all residents but particularly transportation disadvantaged persons, such as those who are mobility-impaired, infirm or young.

Recommendation - No change required

3. Section 1.3.1, Table 2 - The National Capital Commission suggests including the National Capital Region in the geographic areas cited in Principle 10. Provide an explicit interprovincial goods movement statement, and a statement regarding control or reduction of emissions. (258)

Response - The Principles in Table 2 are taken from *Transportation Vision, Principles and Issues* (19-16) as approved by Regional Council in July 1995. The intent of Principle 10 is to be inclusive of areas within the National Capital Region. In keeping with the generic nature of the principles, interprovincial goods movement should be considered to be included within Principles 9 and 12, and vehicle emissions should be considered to be included within Principle 3.

Recommendation - No change required.

1.3.2 System Objectives

General Comments

4. Use of the term "mobility" - The term "mobility" is auto-biased and should not be used. Mobility improvements yield higher road speeds, detract from non-auto modes and create additional automobile travel demand (142).

Response - Mobility describes one component of accessibility. Its use in the Master Plan is intended to be multimodal in nature and reflect the fact that movement is needed to realise accessibility.

Recommendation - No change required.

1.3.3 Background Studies

1.3.4 Future Population and Employment Distribution

Specific Comments

5. Section 1.3.4, Table 3 - Clarify heading of rightmost column. (110)

Response - Agree

Recommendation - Change "2021 Dwelling Units" to "Dwelling Units by 2021".

1.3.5 Travel Demand and Capacity Analysis

General Comments

6. Pedestrian modal share target (also ref. OP 9.1, Policy 4) - The City of Ottawa and others suggest that the pedestrian modal share target is too low and will lead to little improvement to pedestrian facilities or policies, and suggest increasing the target from 10% to 12%. The need for policies to target lower pedestrian activity areas outside the Central Area was also noted. One submission objected to the apparent implication that walking is a "fair weather" mode, stating that survey data would not support the stated expectation that walking share at screenlines would reduce in winter. (89, 109, 142, 190)

Response - The target as stated is "not less than 10 percent" and is felt to be ambitious in the face of anticipated trends. Over the planning horizon, monitoring will determine if the pedestrian supportive plans and policies are successful in achieving a greater modal share than 10 percent, and if so then any additional measures required to accommodate this pedestrian travel will be addressed. In addition, the Master Plan does contain policies supportive of improved pedestrian facilities in lower activity areas such as business parks. The stated effect of winter weather on walking modal share is maintained based on observation and professional judgement, but will be qualified to indicate a lesser effect than that on cycling.

Recommendation - Propose changing the last sentence on page 13 to read: "It is important to note that screenline travel data are collected primarily during the summer when the weather favours walking and cycling, and that some of the cycling travel (and, to a lesser extent, walking travel) shown in Table 4 would likely shift to either transit or automobile at other times of the year."

7. Cycling modal share target (also ref. OP Section 9.1, Objective 4) - The City of Ottawa and others suggest that the current cycling modal share of 1.7%, as stated, under-represents the existing situation cycling modal share, and suggest that a target greater than 3% be established. (109, 190)

Response - The existing region-wide condition of 1.7% and the target of not less than 3% are seasonally-adjusted figures that specifically address autumn conditions (the time of year at which the comprehensive 1995 Origin-Destination Survey was taken). They represent the desire to achieve a proportional increase of approximately 75% in travel by bicycle region-wide in Ottawa-Carleton. It is acknowledged that cycling levels in summer will be significantly greater than in autumn, and appropriate seasonal adjustment factors will be determined to aid in monitoring as stated in Table 12, Section 3.2.

Some submissions commented specifically on the variation between the results of the 1995 OD survey and the results of the 1991 Cyclist Profile Survey which cited significantly higher rates for cycling during the "cycling season". These differences are considered to result from the different survey designs, sample sizes, method of survey participant selection, geographic coverage and definitions of key terms. Given the rigorous technical approach used in the 1995 OD Survey, the acknowledgement of the influence of seasonal variations on its results, and the commitment to use seasonal adjustment factors in comparing future conditions to the 3% modal share target that has been set, the consultant and staff are satisfied that the Master Plan is founded upon the most reliable and comprehensive travel behaviour information collected in the National Capital Region.

Recommendation - No change required.

8. Automobile modal share (also ref. OP Section 9.1, Objective 4) - The City of Gloucester requests an explanation of modal share projections to justify feasibility of optimistic reduction in automobile share (244)

Response - The automobile modal share target results from the targets set for other travel modes, as explained in Section 1.3.5.

Recommendation - No change required.

9. Definition of screenlines (also ref. OP Section 9.4, Policy 9) - Request clarification of unclear definition. (110)

Response - Agree.

Recommendation - Change sentence 2, paragraph 3, page 13 to read: "Figure 4 illustrates the screenlines that were used to define base year and future travel demands (note that a screenline is a line that crosses all major transportation facilities in a corridor, and is typically drawn along a feature such as a river or railway that serves to limit the number of crossing points)."

10. Interprovincial travel demand growth - In the third bullet on page 17, the link between the changes in Outaouais employment and population and interprovincial travel demand is unclear. (110)

Response - The 30% increase in travel demand is related more to the expected increase in households (40%) than the increase in population (25%). The increase in Quebec-side employment will, in fact, help to temper the resulting increase in interprovincial travel demand.

Recommendation - Reword the third bullet on page 17 to read:

- "Travel demand across the Interprovincial Screenline will increase by approximately 30 percent. The most significant factors tending to support this increase are the expected growths in Outaouais population (approximately 25 percent) and households (approximately 40 percent), while the expected increase in Outaouais employment (approximately 50 percent) will tend to counteract it."

11. Definition of passenger car units - Request definition of "passenger car units" (110)

Response - Agree.

Recommendation - Add a footnote to Table 8 that reads: "Note: The term 'passenger car unit' is a standard unit of measurement of capacity for roadways that serve motorised travel. The capacity required to serve any motorised vehicle may be expressed in terms of passenger car units (for example, a standard 12.0-m bus is equivalent to 2.0 passenger car units). The actual number of vehicles that may be carried on a roadway is therefore less than the passenger car unit capacity of that roadway."

12. Incorporation of effects of Regional Development Strategy - Request that travel demand analysis account for effects of proposed land use changes on trip length, and that road and transitway projects be placed on hiatus until this is done. (142)

Response - The analysis already accounts for effects on trip length (as well as trip generation and modal share) that are expected to occur as a result of land use changes.

Recommendation - No change required.

13. Travel demand targets at screenlines - Screenline targets should be set according to volume as well as modal share, with auto volumes decreasing annually. (142)

Response - Modal shares are the best indicator of travel behaviours, since they avoid problems that may arise from fluctuations in population or employment levels, and remain valid for a given horizon regardless of the accuracy of population or employment forecasts. While the target for automobile use is set to achieve a significant decline on a relative basis, the effects of growth will counteract this change and yield an overall increase in the absolute amount of automobile travel.

Recommendation - No change required.

14. Monitoring of roadway performance (also ref. OP Section 9.1) - The City of Gloucester suggests that the analysis of individual roadways should be used to supplement the analysis of screenlines when measuring future performance against established targets, and to identify local points of failure in the roadway system. (244)

Response - Agree with need to monitor system performance on a link-by-link basis -- Table 12 in Section 3.3, "Monitoring" presents indicators that will be used to do this.

Recommendation - No change required.

15. Need to mitigate effects of congestion on local streets (also ref. OP Section 9.1, Objective 3d) - The Cities of Ottawa and Gloucester suggest that the Master Plan address the need for care to ensure that expected increases in peak hour congestion (due to the lower quality of service target) do not cause diversion of non-local traffic to local streets (109, 244)

Response - This concern is recognised. Generally speaking, the use of local roads to assist in the provision of transportation service has not been assumed, and the Regional road system has been sized to provide an adequate level of service. In circumstances where undesirable spillover from Regional to local roads does occur, RMOC will continue to participate in monitoring and addressing specific problems.

Recommendation - No change required.

2 Components

2.1 Principles

General Comments

16. Minimising automobile use (also ref. OP Section 9.1, Objective 2c) - Targets should be set for automobile travel demand at off-peak times, and TDM measures for these trips should be identified. (142)

Response - Quantifying trip volume targets for off-peak would require a substantial revision to existing transportation models. All of the TDM measures identified in Section 2.5.1 are inclusive of off-peak travel.

Recommendation - No change required.

17. Minimising automobile use - Maximize travel by bus and rail to minimize number of autos and need to widen roads in the core area (73)

Response - This is a fundamental principle of the Master Plan, and an extensive system of bus and rail transit is proposed as a key component of the strategy to minimize the growth in automobile usage.

Recommendation - No change required.

18. Contradicting principles (also ref. OP 9.1) - The second principle on transportation systems management (TSM) seems to contradict the first and third principles on transportation demand management (TDM), by increasing the capacity for automobile travel. Suggest that TSM should be used to maximize the use of right-of-way by people, not just by automobiles. (142)

Response - Agree with latter point, as clearly expressed in this principle. However, even with the ambitious targets of the Master Plan, automobile volumes are expected to increase. In view of this, the goal of TSM is to minimize overall person-delay (including delay to pedestrians and cyclists, thereby supporting modal shift targets) and minimise or defer the need for new road construction.

Recommendation - No change required.

19. Optimise versus maximise - In principles 2, 3 and 4 replace the word “maximising” with the word “optimising”. (258)

Response - Disagree, since the intent is to maximise having due regard to the other relevant conditions.

Recommendation - No change required.

2.2 Walking

General Comments

20. RMOC role and objectives (also ref. OP Section 9.2) - Plan must include stronger RMOC role and more specific objectives for pedestrian travel (142)

Response - The supporting technical project *Pedestrian Facilities* concluded that the desired improvements to pedestrian facilities and services can be achieved within the existing jurisdictional framework; notwithstanding this, the Master Plan commits RMOC to co-operating with area municipalities to improve the quality of service for walking throughout the region. It is felt that the objectives set for pedestrian travel are appropriate for the level of detail generally addressed in the Master Plan.

Recommendation - No change required.

2.2.1 Supportive Measures

General Comments

21. Local area pedestrian plans (also ref. OP Section 9.2) - RMOC should fund and co-operate in conducting pedestrian plans for urban areas and villages by 1999. (142)

Response - RMOC will participate in local transportation planning studies when requested. Issues such as the funding of local area studies will be considered in the development of an action plan for Master Plan implementation.

Recommendation - No change required.

Specific Comments

22. Section 2.2.1, Policy 1 (Also ref. OP Section 9.2, Policy 6) - Broaden to address private costs as well as public costs. (142)

Response - Agree.

Recommendation - Amend the conclusion of Policy 1 to read: "...and awareness of the environmental issues and private and public costs of travel choices."

2.2.2 Facility Operations and Maintenance

General Comments

23. Developer provision of walkways - Require developers to provide walkways for pedestrian circulation to, from and within developments. (142)

Response - RMOC does not have authority to require developers to provide walkways through the site plan approval process. This is a responsibility of the area municipalities. However, these issues are touched on in Section 2.2.1, Policies 2 and 4; in Section 2.4.1, Policy 1; and in Section 2.4.6, Surrounding Land Uses Policies 2 and 3. Related issues are also addressed in greater detail in the Draft Official Plan.

Recommendation - No change required.

24. Pedestrian access (also ref. OP Section 9.2) - RMOC should assume responsibility for sidewalks to ensure pedestrian accessibility to public transit (89). Add pathways between Transitway stations and adjacent areas. (142)

Response - The supporting technical project *Pedestrian Facilities* concluded that the desired improvements to pedestrian facilities and services can be achieved within the existing jurisdictional framework.. Issues related to walkways and Transitway stations are adequately addressed in Policy 3 of Section 2.2.1 and in Policies 5 and 6 of Section 2.4.6, as well as in the Draft Official Plan.

Recommendation - No change required.

Specific Comments

25. Section 2.2.2, Policy 1 (also ref. OP 3.2, Policy 13d and Section 9.2, Policy 1) - Several municipalities noted that the requirement for sidewalks on local roads serving as transit routes appears to exceed RMOC jurisdiction and should be stated as a guideline to encourage sidewalk provision instead (87, 88, 244). The City of Vanier noted that flexibility should be provided when dealing with existing local roads (43). The City of Kanata requests addition of a schedule showing proposed locations and associated priorities, to assist area municipalities with capital planning. (212)

Response - The requirement for sidewalks on local roads serving transit routes should be maintained, but clarified to apply only to new roads under local jurisdiction. Through the Master Plan implementation process, RMOC will develop in conjunction with area municipalities a prioritised program of sidewalk improvements on Regional roads. In addition, since virtually all Regional roads in the urban area serve transit routes, the policy should be amended to require sidewalks on both sides of urban Regional roads.

Recommendation - Amend Policy 1 to read:

- **"Ensure the provision of sidewalks on both sides of all new roads serving transit routes, and on both sides of Regional roads in the urban area except those within or adjacent to the Greenbelt, where provision of a sidewalk or pathway on at least one side of those links abutting or connecting urban areas shall be ensured."**

26. Section 2.2.2, Policy 3 (also ref. OP Section 9.2, Policy 2) - Request a policy to: (a) phase out pedestrian push-buttons, and (b) provide pedestrian clearance intervals that eliminate the need to take refuge on median. (142)

Response - (a) Current practice is to use pedestrian push-buttons only where side-street vehicle and pedestrian volumes are low. Both vehicle emissions and total person-delay would increase if push-buttons were removed. The continued use of pedestrian push-buttons in selected locations will help to reduce the roadway infrastructure required to accommodate the travel growth projected in the Master Plan. (b) All signalised pedestrian crossings are now timed to enable a complete crossing of the roadway. A very small number of crossings (less than two percent) have the Walk indication timed to enable pedestrians to cross from the curb to one lane beyond the median and the flashing Don't Walk (clearance) indication timed to enable a complete crossing from the median to the curb. Where this type of timing is used, a few pedestrians who do not start to cross at the beginning of the Walk interval may have to wait on the median; however, it is generally favoured by pedestrians since it provides a much longer Walk display. This method of timing is only used at intersections with extremely long crossings with wide medians, and requires the installation of pedestrian signals and push-buttons on the median. While it is rarely used, in some cases it allows the best service possible to pedestrians.

Recommendation - No change required.

27. Section 2.2.2, Policy 4 (also ref. OP Section 9.2, Policy 4) - Suggest that RMOC establish a winter snow/ice clearance standard for sidewalks, requiring municipalities to provide winter quality equivalent to the rest of the year, with guaranteed mobility for infirm and mobility-impaired persons. Also suggest that RMOC fully fund sidewalks on Regional roads, and provide matching funds for sidewalks on local roads. (142)

Response -Policy 4 promotes the development of standards, with the details relating to quality to be negotiated. Currently sidewalks are a local responsibility. Any change to that is beyond the scope of the Master Plan.

Recommendation - No change required.

2.2.3 Facility Design and Construction

General Comments

28. Access to Transitway stations, and channelized right-turn lanes (also ref. OP Section 3.4.2, Policy 11 and OP Section 9.2) - Add new policies to (a) redesign existing pedestrian access to transitway stations to increase accessibility for nearby residential and commercial developments, and (b) to eliminate existing channelized right-turns where there is high pedestrian usage. (89)

Response - Agree with (a), but refer to discussion under Section 2.4.6 for recommended amendment. Suggestion (b) is addressed indirectly through suggested amendment, below.

Recommendation - Renumber Policy 2 to become Policy 3 and add new Policy 2:

- **"Identify and implement opportunities to eliminate intersection design or operational characteristics that are incompatible with safe pedestrian travel."**

29. Pedestrian travel in Transitway corridors (also ref. OP Section 9.2) - (a) Add pedestrian walkways in all transitway corridors, and (b) lift the ban on pedestrian crossings of the Transitway where paths intersect. (142)

Response - (a) Section 2.3.2, Policy 6 deals with the establishment of multi-use pathways in or adjacent to Transitway corridors. Because pedestrians would also be served by these facilities, a similar policy should be added to this section, as below. (b) There is no outright ban on pedestrian crossings where paths intersect the Transitway. They have been permitted, and will continue to be permitted, on a selective basis where safety is not compromised.

Recommendation - Add new Policy 4:

- **"Consider opportunities for and collaborate with others in providing separate multi-use pathways in or adjacent to Transitway corridors."**

30. Barrier-free design (also ref. OP Section 9.2, Policy 5) - Policies in this section should address barrier-free design to maximise accessibility, particularly in the Central Area. (258)

Response - Agree.

Recommendation - Add the following environmental guideline item to Section 2.2.3, Policy 2:

“apply barrier-free design principles, as far as is practicable, particularly in the Central Area.”

Specific Comments

31. Section 2.2.3, Policy 1 (also ref. OP Section 9.2, Policy 2) - Delete "as necessary". Add tilting of sidewalks for stormwater runoff to topics for review. (190)

Response - Removal of "as necessary" would not change the policy's meaning. Agree with remainder of comment.

Recommendation - Amend Policy 1 to read:

- **"Review and modify, as necessary, current standards and practices for pedestrian facilities such as pedestrian space at intersections, curb ramp design, sidewalk grading for stormwater drainage, and the use of channelized right-turn and multiple left-turn lanes at intersections, to ensure that they support walking."**

32. Section 2.2.3, Policy 2 (also ref. OP Section 9.2, Policy 5) - Suggest the following amendments to guidelines: (a) permit grade-separated walkways only where an at-grade connection is impossible, and provide specific criteria that would be used to warrant grade separations; (b) set sidewalk width of 4 persons for transit streets, 5 persons for main shopping streets, six persons for CBD streets; (c) reduce turning radii where required for pedestrian safety; (d) set crosswalk widths equal to sidewalk widths and be in line with them on side with widest width; (e) delete reference to "all modes" in fifth guideline and prioritise safety by walk/bike/bus/auto (142). Point (b) also supported by a second submission, requesting that sidewalk widths increase with pedestrian volumes. (206)

Response - (a) Disagree, since certain locations may warrant both grade-separated and at-grade connections, and criteria cannot be provided since the factors affecting such a decision are potentially greatly varied and highly location specific; (b) Agree with sidewalk width principle echoed by both submissions, above. Recommend amendment to sidewalk width and separation guidelines, as given below; (c) addressed indirectly through discussion for Policy 1, above; (d) addressed indirectly through discussion for Policy 1, above; (e) disagree, safety of each transportation system user must be considered equally.

Recommendation - Amend first guideline and add a new guideline within Policy 2 (now Policy 3) to read:

- **Apply the following environmental guidelines for pedestrian facilities on Regional roads:**
 - provide a minimum effective sidewalk width of 2.0 metres, with a 2.0 metre separation from vehicular traffic in the form of a boulevard where feasible;
 - under no circumstances shall an effective sidewalk width be less than 1.5 metres;
 - etc."

2.3 Cycling

2.3.1 Supportive Measures

Specific Comments

33. Section 2.3.1, Policy 4 - Reference to cycling-related policies in Section 2.4 does not appear to be warranted. (109)

Response - Agree.

Recommendation - Delete second sentence of Policy 4.

34. Section 2.3.1, Policy 5 (also ref. OP Section 9.3, Policy 8) - Several municipalities object to the level of detail in this policy (namely to the requirement to provide a specific standard of bicycle parking) and one questioned whether zoning bylaws may require bicycle parking at all. They generally suggest either deleting the policy or replacing it with one that encourages the adoption of standards in municipal zoning bylaws and provides suggested guidelines for specific rates at land uses. (43, 87, 88, 109, 163, 212, 244)

Response - Agree with the general substance of comments.

Recommendation - Amend Policy 5 to read:

- **"Require the zoning bylaws of area municipalities that are wholly or partially within the urban area of Ottawa-Carleton to provide for an appropriate capacity of secure bicycle parking at educational, community, retail, recreational and employment land uses, and at residential apartment buildings.**

2.3.2 Cycling Transportation Network

General Comments

35. Bicycle lanes (also ref. OP Section 9.3) - There should be bicycle lanes along major routes (75)

Response - Supported by plans

Recommendation - No change required.

Specific Comments

36. Section 2.3.2, Policy 2 (also ref. OP Section 9.3, Policy 1) - The Regional Cycling Advisory Group suggest amending this policy as follows: "Proactively implement the portions of the cycling transportation network under RMOC jurisdiction as shown on Map 1 by (a) identifying all cycling facilities which will be necessary to complete the RMOC portion of the CTN and (b) planning and budgeting the completion of those facilities over the life of this Plan". (214)

Response - The suggested rewording lengthens the policy as stated and does not change its intent, implications or requirements.

Recommendation - No change required.

37. Section 2.3.2, Policy 3 (also ref. OP Section 9.3, Policy 5a) - The Regional Cycling Advisory Group suggests amending this policy to replace "Consider" with "Implement, where feasible". (214)

Response - The suggested rewording would not significantly change this policy's intent, implications or requirements.

Recommendation - No change required.

38. Section 2.3.2, Policy 4 (also ref. OP Section 9.3, Policy 2) - The Regional Cycling Advisory Group suggests amending the second half of this policy as follows: "..., provided that the continuity and functionality of the affected network route is maintained by providing alternative provisions to replace the cycling facilities affected by the revision" (214). The City of Gloucester suggests requiring an Official Plan amendment to amend the CTN, to ensure due public notice and input (244)

Response - Agree to the principle of the former suggestion, with simplified wording recommended below. Disagree with the latter suggestion, since not requiring an Official Plan amendment will allow staff to take rapid advantage of opportunities as they present themselves, without needing to follow a cumbersome and costly process. It should be noted that the requirement to maintain the "continuity and functionality of the network... in the same general location" provides adequate defence of the network's integrity and effectiveness.

Recommendation - In Policy 4, replace the word "continuity" with the phrase "continuity and functionality".

39. Section 2.3.2, Policy 5 (also ref. OP Section 9.3, Policy 3) - The Regional Cycling Advisory Group suggests amending the second half of this policy to specify the nature of consultation with user groups, namely incorporation of user comments and the provision of staffing and financial resources to support advisory groups. (214)

Response - Disagree, since the nature of consultation with user groups already requires consideration of user comments, and stronger wording that requires incorporation of user comments would bypass the necessary evaluation of user input by staff. Staffing and financial resources are issues which will be considered in developing an action plan for Plan implementation.

Recommendation - No change required.

40. Section 2.3.2, Policy 6 (also ref. OP Section 9.3, Policy 6) - Replace "consider" with "implement" (109). Clarify that cycling facilities in or adjacent to Transitway corridors would be an RMOC responsibility, due to their commuter function. (88)

Response - Disagree with the first comment -- consideration must precede implementation, particularly where RMOC does not have unilateral authority. Also disagree with the second comment -- an individual municipality is under no obligation to participate, but in certain cases its interests may be served by co-operation, and cycling routes in question may jointly serve a feeder or recreational purpose.

Recommendation - No change required

2.3.3 Facility Operations and Maintenance

Specific Comments

41. Section 2.3.3, Policy 1 - Question: (a) if the examples of operational improvements will become part of RMOC operating procedures; and (b) if RMOC will require municipalities to adopt standards for sweeping and patching (109)

Response - (a) Yes, as stated in the policy; (b) Agree in principle.

Recommendation - Amend Policy 1 to conclude: "...as is practicable, and request local municipalities to adopt associated RMOC maintenance standards on local streets designated as part of the Cycling Transportation Network."

2.3.4 Facility Design and Construction

Specific Comments

42. Section 2.3.4, Policies 4 and 5 - Ask how these policies will be applied, since they are not carried forward to the draft Official Plan. (109)

Response - These policies will be implemented if approved by Council. Policy 3, which is carried forward to the Draft Official Plan, embodies the most important principle regarding the interaction of cycling and transit priority facilities.

Recommendation - No change required.

43. Section 2.3.4, Policies 3, 4 and 5 (also ref. OP Section 9.3, Policy 7) - The City of Ottawa requests that the Master Plan identify each conflict between proposed transit priority routes and cycling routes, and provide specific direction for resolution. (109)

Response - Such action would be premature at this point in time, as the optimal resolution of conflicts will depend on actual future conditions and should be conducted during the design process. The strategic direction provided is considered to be sufficient.

Recommendation - No change required.

2.4 Public Transit

General Comments

44. Focus on transit versus auto ownership (also ref. OP Section 9.4) - The Master Plan's focus on improving transit to serve work trips makes little effort to reduce car use for other trips -- as car ownership increases, transit becomes less competitive for both work and non-work trips. A major goal of the Master Plan should be a reduction in car ownership, leading to 24-hour trip reduction rather than current focus on work trip by choice transit riders. (142)

Response - Disagree, without wishing to downplay the suggested benefits of reduced auto ownership (which would be an anticipated result of several Plan policies, notably those in Section 2.5.1.). Increasing transit modal share for work trips is an effective way to counteract the need for dual-income households to purchase a second car, and the need for single-income households to purchase a first car in pedestrian-, cyclist- and transit-friendly neighbourhoods. Additional benefits arise from the fact that transit commuters do not use automobiles to make mid-day personal trips; and from the fact that the peak hour modal shares determine the required roadway system capacity (so that a high peak hour transit modal share will reduce the requirement for new road construction).

Recommendation - No change required.

45. Rapid transit modes (also ref. OP Section 9.4) - After 2010, the population living in the region will have an ever increasing reliance on communal transport.....other modes of mass transit should be considered and made an important part of the Master Plan. (111)

Response - For the most part, the Master Plan is neutral regarding different transit modes (i.e., does not restrict or prejudge the applicability of specific modes), and as such provides the RMO and OC Transpo with appropriate flexibility to fully exploit technological developments in addressing specific transit market needs. The Master Plan has to be more specific in relation to the proposed shared use of existing railways by transit and other railway traffic, as this limits the range of compatible transit technologies. In a similar vein, it also recognises that no practical, cost-effective alternative to bus technology currently exists for the existing rapid transit system for the foreseeable future, but continues to require that these corridors retain the capability for conversion to rail-based technologies.

Recommendation - No change required.

46. Transit capital versus operating expenditures (also ref. OP Section 9.4) - Suggest shift from building transitways to expanded transit service and reduced fares. (142)

Response - Funds for public transit should be directed at getting the best return for the total public dollar regardless of whether they are applied to capital projects or operating costs. The suggested approach does not recognise the interrelationship between such costs (i.e., operating cost savings that result from Transitway construction) and would not be effective in either minimising total long-term costs or maximising transit usage.

Recommendation - No change required.

47. Transit terminology (also ref. OP Sections 3 and 9) - The City of Ottawa suggests that definitions be provided for terms such as transit stop, transit station, transitway station and transit route, and that they be used in a consistent manner. (109)

Response - Agree, clarification and consistency are required.

Recommendation - These and related terms will be added to the Official Plan glossary, and to a glossary that will be added to the Master Plan.

2.4.1 Supportive Measures

Specific Comments

48. Section 2.4.1, Policy 1 (also ref. OP Section 9.4, Policy 3) - Add "and redevelopment" to "new urban development". (258)

Response - Agree.

Recommendation - Amend Policy 1 to begin with "Ensure that new urban development and redevelopment exhibits characteristics that..."

49. Section 2.4.1, Policy 1 (also ref. OP Section 3.2, Policy 13) - The Township of West Carleton suggests that road layout is beyond Regional interest to "ensure". Amend to read as a guideline. (163)

Response - Disagree, since RMOC has approval authority over subdivisions and has a direct interest in transit supportive land use matters, particularly the configuration of local roads.

Recommendation - No change required.

50. Section 2.4.1, Policy 4 (also ref. OP Section 9.4, Policy 15) - Several municipalities or agencies object to the prescriptive nature of this policy, and suggest that: (a) it be amended to request municipalities to review and selectively amend parking requirements where it can be demonstrated that the changes would actually benefit transit; (b) it be amended to recognise differences in relevance of transit among land uses; or (c) it be amended to allow municipalities to determine the most appropriate means to achieve a stated intent. (109, 221, 244) Other submissions supported this policy and recommended: (d) expanding it cover all urban areas with a high level of walking, with requirements reducing further as levels of local trip containment increase; or (e) requesting the City of Ottawa to all remove parking requirements for commercial buildings in the Central Area. (89, 142, 206)

Response - Disagree with comment (a) since a reduced parking supply near rapid transit service will almost always benefit transit. Disagree with comment (b) since the policy as written does not preclude the consideration of this issue by local municipalities. Disagree with comment (c) since the policy's intent is clear and municipalities have substantial flexibility to determine the most appropriate specific zoning tools within the policy framework. Agree with the principle of comment (d), but consider that it would best be expressed as an encouraged (rather than required) action by municipalities. Comment (e) is considered to be too specific -- as discussed for comment (c) previously, it is important that municipalities have latitude to determine appropriate zoning details independently. Central Area parking requirements must address a great complexity of issues as well as the critical importance of Central Area vitality to the achievement of overall transit objectives.

Recommendation - Amend Policy 4 to read:

- "Require area municipalities to review and amend parking requirements in zoning by-laws to a level which supports transit through the imposition of reduced parking requirements and maximum parking space provisions for developments in the vicinity of rapid transit service."

And add a new Policy 5 reading:

- "Encourage area municipalities to review and amend parking requirements in zoning by-laws to a level which supports transit through the imposition of reduced parking requirements and maximum parking space provisions for developments in areas that are served by transit and have a concentration and mix of community services that are conducive to pedestrian travel."

The existing Policies 5, 6 and 7 become new Policies 6, 7 and 8.

51. Section 2.4.1, Policy 6 - Ask if RMOC plans to ask senior levels of government to impose taxes allowing transit a competitive edge. (108)

Response - Rather than pursuing a competitive edge for transit, this policy attempts to redress the current imbalance of public subsidies that grant automobile travel a substantial competitive edge. However, it is important to note that modal share and travel demand forecasts are not predicated upon expectations of compliance.

Recommendation - No change required.

2.4.2 Transit Services

General Comments

52. Transit service to federal employment centres - Transit service should be enhanced to federal employment centres where subsidised parking for federal employees is discontinued. (258)

Response - Enhancement of transit service to selected federal employment centres is part of transit service strategy; no additional amplification is required.

Recommendation - No change required.

53. Low-floor buses - The introduction of low-floor buses should include predictable use on routes to encourage use by ParaTranspo users by helping them to avoid becoming "stranded" (110)

Response - Agree. This is part of OC Transpo's strategy, but is at a level of operational detail too specific for the Master Plan to address.

Recommendation - No change required.

54. Interprovincial busway proposal (also ref. OP Section 9.4, Policy 11) - Interprovincial operational transit problems would be alleviated by busway described in attachment to comment. (110)

Response - A substantial portion of the suggested busway is in the Province of Quebec and thus is outside the scope of the Master Plan. The portion in Ontario is in direct conflict with the concept plan for LeBreton Flats as adopted by the NCC, the RMOC and the City of Ottawa.

Recommendation - No change required.

55. Bus routes in Kanata - The City of Kanata suggests improving transit travel speeds within Kanata for commutes from south to north (212)

Response - This issue is more appropriately addressed through OC Transpo's routing strategy that is revised regularly through the TransPlan process.

Recommendation - No change required.

Specific Comments

56. Section 2.4.2, Interprovincial Transit Service Policy 1 (also ref. OP Section 9.4, Policy 11) - The National Capital Commission proposes inclusion of the Champlain Bridge with other bridges cited for the implementation of transit priority measures, given the conclusions of the JACPAT 1994 Study of Interprovincial Bridges, Phase 2 and the prospective reconstruction of the Champlain Bridge to accommodate high-occupancy vehicles. (258)

Response - The introduction of transit priority measures on the Portage and Chaudière Bridges and their approaches is a much more important objective than the same on the Champlain Bridge, since in relative terms the latter could make only a very minor contribution to the resolution of interprovincial transit service problems.

Recommendation - No change required.

2.4.3 Transit Priority

General Comments

57. Bus stop infrastructure (also ref. OP Section 9.4) - (a) Phase out existing bus bays, and (b) add bulb-outs in parking lanes where possible, to decrease sidewalk congestion and integrate bus service more naturally into the street parking. (142)

Response - (a) RMOC practice has recently been modified to ensure that in the design of new roads and the rebuilding or rehabilitation of existing roads, a review will be undertaken of every location where a bus bay is under consideration. Although the long-term consequences of this approach, coupled with the introduction of an extensive transit priority network, will see much less frequent use of bus bays, particularly at mid-block locations, they cannot and should not be eliminated entirely since in specific locations they may be required for safety reasons or as a component of a particular transit priority treatment. Any negative impacts on transit operations of existing or future bus bays will be minimised by pending legislation in Ontario giving buses legal priority when re-entering traffic from a bus bay. (b) As, over the life of the Master Plan, all available lanes on Regional roads will be required to accommodate traffic during at least one peak period, it will generally be impractical to introduce the measure suggested. It will continue, however, to provide a valuable technique to apply in specific very high transit use situations such as Albert and Slater Streets where it is currently employed, and as such will be used selectively. In general, the opportunities to introduce such measures would be more prevalent on area municipality streets.

Recommendation - No change required.

Specific Comments

58. Section 2.4.3, Table 9 - Delete the proposed Elizabeth Street extension to Bronson which will necessitate removal of houses and trees, adversely affect the residential nature of this area and be contrary to the policy to promote residential development in the Central area. OC Transpo has previously stated a preference to use existing streets to serve local residents. (89, 190)

Response - As there are a variety of options by which the proposed measure can be introduced without the removal of houses, it is not in conflict with the policy to promote housing in and around the Central Area. The circuitous and slow nature of existing cross-town transit service using local streets in this vicinity is not consistent with a high-quality cross-town transit service capable of attracting an increased share of travel by transit to the Booth Street employment complex and employment on Carling Avenue, or the diversion of some through transit trips from downtown (i.e., the primary purposes for recommending this service). Both west and east of this proposed link, high-quality cross-town transit service will be provided by an extensive system of transit priority measures entirely on the Regional road system. This one short link is critical in maintaining the integrity of a major element in the proposed transit priority network. Selection of the specific form of this link is appropriately the subject of a future environmental assessment process.

Recommendation - No change required.

59. Section 2.4.3, Policy 8 - Clarify use of phrase "in place of". (110)

Response - Agree.

Recommendation - Delete second half of Policy 8, which will now read:

- "Require that the annual update of the five-year plan includes new candidate locations for monitoring and analysis."

2.4.4 Transitways

General Comments

60. Use of CP corridor through Bridlewood (also ref. OP Section 9.4) - The City of Kanata (212) requests confirmation that the abandoned ex CPR right-of-way that traverses the north end of Bridlewood is no longer required for rapid transit purposes, as identified in the earlier West Urban Community Transit Integration Study.

Response - This earlier study investigated the potential value of this abandoned rail corridor in relation to the overall rapid transit needs for the City of Kanata area, and concluded that for full development of the current urban envelopes for both Kanata and Stittsville, use of this corridor for rapid transit purposes was not warranted. It also concluded that if the urban envelopes of Kanata and Stittsville were to significantly expand, particularly in the areas between the two communities and south of Highway 417, this would trigger the need for a Transitway. It confirmed that this corridor would be well located to serve the new population, and as such it should be protected for this future possible use.

As the draft new Official Plan does not provide for expansion into these lands, the implication is that there would be no need to introduce rapid transit in this corridor during the twenty-five year Plan. In a similar vein however, if any Official Plan Amendments were approved for urban development in these lands, the need for such use may be triggered sooner.

The study also acknowledges that RMOC would, at the time of developing implementation plans for transit use of this corridor through Bridlewood and the Greenbelt, fully evaluate alternative alignments for the facility; in particular the use of Eagleson Road and Hazeldean Road. It is noted that the ownership of this corridor is now that of the RMOC.

Nothing undertaken in the Master Plan has changed any of the above issues, therefore no action can be taken with regard to removing the possibility of introducing rapid transit on this corridor at some future time.

Recommendation - No change required.

61. Cycling requirements in rapid transit corridors - The City of Ottawa suggests that the planning and design of shoulder bus lanes on the Airport Parkway should maintain a commuter cycling facility in this corridor; this comment also applies to other corridors where transit and cycling needs may conflict.(109)

Response - Agree, as per intent of policies in Section 2.3.4.

Recommendation - No change required.

Specific Comments

62. Section 2.4.4, Policies 2 and 5 (also ref. OP Section 9.4, Policies 20 and 21) - The City of Nepean comments that protecting for full Transitway grade-separation and technology conversion is unreasonable in suburban areas, and will lead to sterilisation of significant corridors and impacts on the land use pattern needed to support ridership on the eventual transit facility. Revise to apply to existing Transitway corridors and areas inside Greenbelt only -- policy for other areas should focus on transit priority and separation for express buses. (88)

Response - It cannot be agreed that policies provided to ensure the capability of future grade-separation or rail conversion of rapid transit corridors in suburban areas are unreasonable, as these provide the most effective transportation planning tool for a "greenfield" situation to minimize future transportation infrastructure and its adverse environmental and social impacts in both short and long terms. Implementation of today's Transitway system would have been much simpler and less costly had similar policies been applied, for example, to the then-suburban areas of Alta Vista in Ottawa or Bayshore in Nepean.

It is nearly impossible to introduce a grade-separated facility through a future near-mature community if development incompatible with this future transit arrangement has been permitted to proceed. In such situations, the only practical means to retrofit a grade-separated rapid transit system with acceptable impacts on the then-established community would usually be to introduce a subway system. As the costs of this approach would vastly outweigh the level of transit use that could be generated, and could range from between 10 to 20 times that of a grade-separated Transitway, it would in reality never be introduced -- leading to a more automobile-oriented community with all of the associated adverse environmental and social impacts.

Where a community is planned from the outset with the recognition that at some time in the future it will be necessary to grade-separate the rapid transit system, the corridor protection requirements for grade-separated and non grade-separated transit systems are essentially identical. Contrary to the suggestion that the policies would sterilise land through the heart of the communities, the reverse opportunity presents itself, as it is possible to permit transitional transportation uses on such lands, such as parking for initial and typically less transit-oriented developments, to be displaced in the future when the transit corridor is required for rapid transit purposes and as more intense and transit-supportive development occurs.

Not only will the early identification of the corridor for regional-scale rapid transit provide the opportunity to incrementally introduce transit-supportive developments in the location where the Region will ultimately respond with the required transit services, but it will also provide critical reassurance to potential investors and developers regarding the Region's commitment to providing quality regional transit service as early as possible with incremental upgrades as needed.

Travel throughout the region to employment opportunities in the new urban communities is a prime candidate for improved transit market capture, as quality low-cost transit service can be readily provided by the Transitway and underutilised non-peak direction bus services. A fundamental requirement for success in this travel market will be that the rapid transit system deliver users directly to employment locations in the town centres. This important aspect of regional travel cannot be overlooked.

Recommendation - Introduce a new Policy 7 as follows, renumbering Policy 7 to become Policy 8:

- **"Develop, in co-operation with area municipalities, implementation plans for rapid transit corridors in the urban centres outside the Greenbelt that provide interim uses at various stages of development, while ensuring both the earliest introduction of quality regional-scale transit service and the ability to upgrade transit facilities to a full grade separated transitway on an incremental basis."**

2.4.5 Rail Rapid Transit

Specific Comments

63. Section 2.4.5, Policy 1 (also ref. OP Section 9.4 Policy 23) - The City of Gloucester suggests extending rail rapid transit south along the CP line towards the Airport and north to Hull, since the line is proposed for disposal by the railway and should be retained for rail transit use. (244)

Response - This comment refers to a separate portion of the same rail line that is proposed for use as a rapid transit corridor from Confederation heights to the West Transitway. It has not been identified for disposal by the owners, the St. Lawrence and Hudson Railway (a subsidiary of CP) but has been identified as a section of railway that the owners would be interested in having others operate under terms to be negotiated. In summary, CP wish the line to remain in operation.

Use of this line south of heron Road would duplicate the existing Southeast Transitway and its existing no-transfer service to the Airport with a parallel facility, and would not directly serve any land use south of Hunt Club Road. However, beyond the life of the Master Plan, the need for an extension to the Southeast transitway would be triggered by further developments in the South Urban Centre and Leitrim. The draft Master Plan acknowledges that this railway corridor would provide the most obvious location for part of such an extension (page 36).

Within the life of the Master Plan, a transit crossing to Hull at the location of this railway corridor is too far west of either downtown to attract any significant level of transit usage. No actions are proposed within either plan to preclude this future possibility.

Recommendation - No change required..

64. Section 2.4.5, Policy 1 (also ref. OP Section 9.4, Policy 23) - The National Capital Commission suggests that the rationale for the proposed rail transit demonstration project requires further study and discussion, and that the performance evaluation parameters require more precision. (258)

Response - Agree, and these matters will be addressed as part of the project.

Recommendation - No change required.

65. Section 2.4.5 Policy 3; 3.1 Table 11 (OP 9.4 Policy 23) - Transport 2000 (235) and others (232,235,250) expressed concern that a rail transit pilot project was not scheduled as an immediate priority.

Response - Throughout the life of the Plan peak period travel between residential areas and the downtown will continue to be the single largest market for public transit and that for which the highest share of travel by transit can be achieved. It will continue to grow in concert with Central Area employment growth. If the high transit share targets identified in the Plan are to be met, the primary emphasis on any transit strategy has clearly must be placed upon enhancing and maintaining a high quality of transit services directed at this market. The existing Transitway system and the range of proposed measures identified in the plan to further extend its effectiveness are the key to achieving this.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, if the transit share targets are to be achieved it will also be necessary to penetrate other travel markets within which transit traditionally has not been able to establish a significant share of travel. The two rail corridors indicated in the plan are identified as a means of doing so in terms of providing a marked enhancement in regional transit accessibility to employment and institutional land uses unable to be so served by conventional transit services. The success of either of the rail corridors is fully dependent upon having a complementary quality transit system bringing clientele from

their place of residence to the rail lines. For almost all suburban residential areas, the peak period, downtown oriented "Express Routes" via the Transitway system are the only means of realistically providing this. In other words the rail corridors are an important but secondary system whose success critically depends upon the success of the primary Transitway system.

The challenge faced by the Transportation Master Plan team was that of developing a strategy that not only continued to address the ongoing and future needs of transit travel to the Central Area, but at the same time provided a means to begin to introduce secondary services at the earliest possible opportunity. By developing a Transitway extension strategy incorporating the concept of "wherever the opportunity exists to provide a lower cost alternative to a Transitway that can provide an adequate quality of transit services for a significant period of time, then do so", they have advanced the time frame by about four or five years. Of the approximately 50 km of the bus based rapid transit network, either already in place or required to be added to the existing fully grade-separated Transitway system over the life of the Plan, all but three km. on the West and one km. on the Southwest Transitway can initially be introduced in a lower cost "non grade-separated" form.

In addition to the above, the intention of introducing a pilot rail project in Ottawa-Carleton is not that of demonstrating the viability of a specific technology, but more of a project to provide the basis for continued system expansion based upon actual operating experience. It is critical that appropriate budgetary and other contingency plans be established, in the event that initial service exceeds all reasonable expectations in terms of usage, requiring rapid service expansion. In addition to the above system priority and budgetary constraints, a reasonable period of time will also be necessary to negotiate acceptable agreements with the railway owners and or operators for joint operation with other rail traffic, to gain the necessary federal government approvals for operating what amounts to a streetcar in a freight train environment, and the design of any works required to provide appropriate access or address passenger safety.

Given the above, the introduction of a pilot rail transit project early in the second five year time frame represents the earliest practical time in terms of wider system priorities, budgetary constraints and implementation administration.

Recommendation: No change in policy or to Table 11.

2.4.6 Rapid Transit Stations

Specific Comments

66. Section 2.4.6, Amenities and Intermodal Facilities, Policy 1 (also ref. OP Section 9.4, Policy 17) - Add public washrooms and diaper-changing stations at transitway stations. Improve security at future stations by designing visibility from adjacent uses and streets. (142)

Response - Washrooms were studied and rejected by RMOC and OC Transpo in a 1995 study that cited high cost, security risks, and little demand or support from focus groups. Security, of which visibility is a fundamental component, is addressed in this policy.

Recommendation - No change required.

2.5 Roads

General Comments

67. Roadway projects (also ref. OP Section 9.5) - The proposed roadway projects are excessive and contradict modal shift objectives. The reduced level of service target should allow a ten-year hiatus in road construction. (142)

Response - Disagree, since the roadway projects proposed are consistent with the requirements of the reduced level of service target, and with full achievement of the ambitious modal share objectives. In addition, the proposed five and five-to-ten year capital infrastructure programs represents a minimum amount of investment in road construction.

Recommendation - No change required.

2.5.1 Limiting Growth in Automobile Use

General Comments

68. Public education - Educate public about true costs of lifestyle choices, especially auto ownership and housing-job location. Suggest an annual map rating areas according to ease of car-free living. (142)

Response - The first suggestion is already met through the general provisions of Policy 4. The second suggestion is a good idea that will require significant development work that will be considered for addition to the land use and monitoring program developed using the framework in Section 3.2 of the Master Plan.

Recommendation - No change required.

69. Municipal action on TDM (also ref. OP Section 9.5, Policy 1) - It is not clear how municipalities will proceed with envisioned TDM measures. (212)

Response - RMOC will encourage and co-operate with municipalities in proceeding with TDM programs during the implementation phase of the Master Plan.

Recommendation - No change required.

70. Need for objectives (also ref. OP Section 9.5, Policy 1) - The National Capital Commission suggests the establishment of qualitative and quantitative objectives and targets, and monitoring of progress towards limiting growth in auto use. (258)

Response - The Master Plan establishes qualitative targets for this activity in Section 1.3.2, and quantitative targets for modal share in Section 1.3.5. The policies in Section 2.5.1 provide direction on how these objectives are to be achieved, and policies related to improving walking, cycling and transit in Ottawa-Carleton also contribute directly to their achievement. The establishment of more specific objectives, such as a quantified reduction in average trip length, could only be done in an arbitrary fashion; such goals are nevertheless supported by policies throughout the Master Plan. As discussed in Section 3.2, monitoring activities will be sufficiently broad to describe progress in many aspects of the efforts to constrain the growth of automobile use.

Recommendation - No change required.

2.5.2 Transportation System Management

2.5.3 Goods Movement

General Comments

71. Reduction of truck impacts (also ref. OP Section 9.6) - Several suggestions were received: (a) encourage industrial warehousing in peripheral areas to reduce average truck sizes and resist the widening of urban intersections to accommodate large trucks (89); (b) encourage depots at corner stores, charges or permits for loading zones, and central depots to make better use of truck capacities (142); (c) establish a maximum allowable truck length, requiring transfer of loads to rail or smaller trucks (190); (d) note that truck requirements must not conflict with needs of other road users and residents or businesses along arterial roads (190)

Response - Each of these comments addresses the community impacts of goods movement by truck within the urban area. The related issues are highly complex and their resolution could have substantial impacts on the local economy including the costs of goods and services to regional residents. Any progress must involve the community, business and industry. The objective of reducing community impacts is supported, but it is also necessary to realise that RMOC is limited in terms of available policy options. For these reasons, it is not considered appropriate to direct specific solutions through the Master Plan, but improvements to trucking practices are a worthy objective and should be supported.

Recommendation - Amend Section 2.5.3, Policy 6 as follows to include a clear reference to practices:

- "Encourage industry to explore new technologies and practices that can reduce community impacts, improve goods movement efficiency and enhance regional competitiveness."

72. Goods movement in the Central Area - The National Capital Commission suggests a policy to enhance the condition of goods movement in the Central Area , including the use of demand management measures to improve the movement of truck traffic. (258)

Response - Policies 1, 2, 3, 6, 7 and 8 address this concern. It should be noted that Section 2.5.5, Interprovincial Bridges Policy 1 also provides strong support for this objective, since the addition of an interprovincial bridge will have significant benefits for goods movement conditions in the central Area.

Recommendation - No change required.

Specific Comments

73. Section 2.5.3, Policies 4 and 7 (also ref. OP Section 9.6, Policy 3; OP Section 9.7, Policy 2; OP Section 9.9, Paragraph 4) - Suggest that sites identified at CPR/Walkley/Bank and CPR/Wellington (indicated on map included with submission) be purchased by RMOC under Sec. 41 of the Planning Act to facilitate the distribution of goods using the “piggyback” concept and thereby help reduce the interprovincial through truck traffic in the central area. (110)

Response - This is an example of the kind of solution that could arise from application of Policy 7, in support of Policy 4. However, the scope of such a solution dictates the need for it to be driven by the private sector.

Recommendation - No change required.

74. Section 2.5.3, Policy 4 (also ref. OP Section 9.6) - Policy should require consultation with the City of Ottawa and the King Edward Avenue Task Force (109). Policy should be expanded to target reduced truck traffic in all community cores, not just the Central Area (142).

Response - All stakeholders are included within the intent of Policy 4, as written. The policy was intended to address a major existing problem in the Central Area. No significant evidence is available to indicate a similar problem in other existing community cores, and new communities are planned to avoid this kind of problem.

Recommendation - No change required.

75. Section 2.5.3, Policy 4 (also ref. OP Section 9.6) - The City of Ottawa notes that the policy to implement a trial night-time truck ban on King Edward Avenue is not carried forward to the Draft Official Plan, and asks if it will be undertaken. (109)

Response - The Master Plan policy will be implemented if approved by Council. The Official Plan will be adopted under the Planning Act which does not provide for such detail.

Recommendation - No change required.

76. Section 2.5.3, Policy 6 (also ref. OP Section 9.6, Policy 4) - Strengthen policy to commit to funding study of goods movement efficiency. (142)

Response - RMOC regularly monitors and participates in studies of goods movement, and will continue to do so.

Recommendation - No change required.

2.5.4 High-Occupancy Vehicle Lanes

General Comments

77. Benefits of carpool lanes (also ref. OP Section 9.5, Policy 7) - Comment that use of carpool lanes could increase carpooling rates in employment areas where high levels of transit service are not cost-effective. (109)

Response - This possibility was noted in the supporting technical project *High-Occupancy Vehicle Strategy* that developed a framework for consideration of HOV lanes and concluded that their merits would have to be proven on a case-by-case basis. The use of carpooling support measures, where appropriate, was considered to have relatively greater advantages and fewer disadvantages.

Recommendation - No change required.

Specific Comments

78. Section 2.5.4, Policy 2 (also ref. OP Section 9.4, Policy 22) - The Ontario Ministry of Transportation indicates that a Queensway high-occupancy vehicle lane through the inner urban area for transit priority purposes can be supported as long as it can be shown to improve the overall transportation system. (321)

Response - That is the intent of the policy, which will lead to additional study.

Recommendation - No change required.

2.5.5 Regional Road Network

Specific Comments

79. Section 2.5.5, Interprovincial Bridges Policy 1 (OP 9.5, Policy 9) - Several comments were received from individuals and community groups, as well as the City of Ottawa, that recommend deletion of the reference to protecting lands for a future interprovincial bridge at Kettle Island. Submissions cite previous Council positions opposing a Kettle Island Crossing, impacts on residential areas and impacts on businesses in Cumberland and Angers. (100, 109, 111, 136, 146, 225, 228, 267)

Response - The need for an additional bridge crossing toward the end of the planning horizon of the Master Plan has been confirmed by supporting technical work, based principally upon interprovincial roadway capacity requirements and the need to reduce the impacts of through truck traffic on the Central Area. This policy requires action to protect two crossing locations, but does not preclude the consideration of additional locations -- in fact, federal and provincial Environmental Assessment requirements will require consideration of all reasonable alternatives before a final location can be established. The Kettle Island crossing location has been recommended by the Joint Administrative Committee on Planning and Transportation (JACPAT), and adopted by the Société de Transport de l'Outaouais (STO) and the Québec Ministry of Transportation (MTQ) in subsequent major studies. In view of the fact that the provision of the next crossing will be the responsibility of the federal, Québec and Ontario governments, it is the opinion of the consultant and staff that corridors that have been recommended by agencies on either side of the Ottawa River should continue to be recognised in the Master Plan and the Official Plan, to ensure protection until a final decision can be made with full technical analysis and public consultation. The Kettle Island corridor should continue to be a candidate for detailed evaluation, along with the Cumberland-Angers corridor and any other that might be identified east of the Central Area.

Recommendation - No change required.

80. Section 2.5.5, Table 10 - The Township of Goulbourn suggests: (a) capacity improvements to Main Street in Stittsville; (b) Hazeldean Road and Carp Road reconstruction within the urban area to reflect the urban environment; (c) Perth Street reconstruction in Richmond to incorporate new proposed road design guidelines; (d) removal of the requirement for the Township of Goulbourn to build the first two lanes of Terry Fox Drive (Fernbank Road to Eagleson Road). (87)

Response - Disagree with comment (a) due to lack of established Regional need. Comments (b) and (c) refer to rehabilitation work that is not growth-related and therefore lies outside the scope of the Master Plan, to be addressed through normal priority setting and budget processes (note, however, that a change to recommend widening of Hazeldean Road in the five-to-ten year program is discussed in this report under Section 3.1, Table 11). The requirement referred to in comment (d) is a normal practice in developing areas, where local municipalities are required to construct the first two lanes of future Regional roads to provide access to local properties. However, should a situation arise that better serves the Regional interest, staff would recommend a departure from this practice.

Recommendation - No change required.

2.5.6 Design Guidelines

General Comments

81. Traffic calming (also ref. OP Section 9.5) - Plan seems to under-emphasise the benefits of traffic calming, and postpone action in favour of road construction. (41)

Response - Disagree. Policies 1 through 4 of this section all deal with changes to roadway design to better address the safe and effective provision of facilities for travel by all modes in a manner that maximises benefits and minimises negative community impacts.

Recommendation - No change required.

Specific Comments

82. Section 2.5.6, Policy 4 (also ref. OP Section 9.5, Policy 10) - (a) The City of Ottawa supports the traffic calming evaluation criteria cited, and suggests that potential impacts on local roadways and neighbourhoods also be considered. and that the policy should place priority on mitigating the impacts of Regional road traffic on residential communities (109). (b) The policy should articulate that the purpose of traffic calming is to reduce vehicle speeds and improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists. Disagree with operational problems as a justification for traffic calming (89). (c) Expand reasons to support traffic calming, and suggest that traffic calming should be undertaken when municipalities and local communities request it to enhance liveability, particularly in and adjacent to the Central Area. Encourage development of provincial and national design standards which recognise the green hierarchy and concepts such as traffic calming (190). (d) Object to consideration of potential traffic calming impacts on "regional mobility needs" (142). (e) Clarify that policy does not imply RMOC intent to implement traffic calming on local roads (244)

Response - (a) Agree -- the continued efficiency and integrity of the Regional road system is an important tool in preventing the diversion of regional traffic into local neighbourhoods. (b) Agree with first comment. Maintain that operational problems (which usually represent safety problems as well) are valid justification. (c) Agree with first comment, as discussed above. Policy does not restrict the source of requests for traffic calming, and allows consideration of traffic calming to occur in response to problems identified by staff, community members or local municipalities. National design standards

for traffic calming are currently under development with the participation of RMOC. (d) Disagree - "mobility needs" refers to roadway capacity, not simply vehicle speed, and Regional roads do have an accepted role in providing mobility as one component of accessibility, which is a primary objective of the Master Plan. (e) No such intent is implied.

Recommendation - Amend Policy 4 as follows:

- **Recognise that traffic calming is a possible solution to safety and operational problems stemming from excessive automobile speeds or poor driver behaviour, and may improve the safety of the transportation environment for pedestrians and cyclists as well as motorists. Traffic calming on Regional roads is not appropriate when it would displace traffic to adjacent local roads. In assessing the appropriateness of traffic calming measures on Regional or other roads several factors shall be considered, such as:**
 - a) **impacts on public safety;**
 - b) **impacts on the functional role of the Regional road in serving regional mobility needs and providing access to adjacent land uses;**
 - c) **impacts on public and emergency services;**
 - d) **impacts on adjacent local roadways or neighbourhoods;**
 - e) **liability, if any, where accepted design standards are not met; and**
 - f) **cost.**

2.5.7 Maintenance

General Comments

83. Co-operative road and sewer rehabilitation - The City of Ottawa suggests an indication that joint Regional road/sewer rehabilitation needs will be adequately addressed, expresses concern about the effectiveness of the budget process in this regard, and considers the absence of points specifically addressing this to be a significant oversight. (109)

Response - Co-operative rehabilitation planning with municipalities is not addressed in the TMP, although the affordability of Regional road maintenance has been confirmed through financial analysis. Issues related to rehabilitation programming will be dealt with during Plan implementation.

Recommendation - No change required.

2.6 Interprovincial Issues

2.7 Interregional Travel

3 Implementation

General Comments

84. Application of TMP policies - The City of Ottawa asks how TMP policies will be applied if they are not carried forward to the Official Plan. (109)

Response - The Official Plan directs and supports future development, while the TMP sets long-term priorities of Regional departments, including those related to budgets, administration, planning principles and operational practices. While some TMP policies may not be carried forward to the Official Plan, their adoption by Council in the TMP will nevertheless provide clear ongoing direction for staff in managing and improving the transportation system.

Recommendation - No change required.

3.1 Priorities

General Comments

85. Funding requirements for operating versus capital programs for walking, cycling and transit - The City of Ottawa comments that the adequacy of financial support for walking, cycling, transit and TDM programs is not clear, due to the focus on road and transit capital costs as opposed to operating costs (109).

Response - Agree. The explanatory text of Section 3.1 is insufficiently clear regarding the process for identifying and obtaining Council support for measures not related to infrastructure.

Recommendations - Insert the following text in Section 3.1 as a new Paragraph 1:
"The implementation of this Master Plan over the planning horizon will require improvements to transportation infrastructure, as well as to transportation services and programs. Subsequent to Council approval of this Master Plan, it is the intention of staff to develop an implementation action plan that responds to the approved direction, addressing issues related to program funding and staffing, administrative operations, technical standards and practices, and intergovernmental relations. Council's financial support for this action plan will be secured through the annual budget process."

86. TMP implementation suggestions - Set aside \$4 million per year for demonstration projects, incentives and studies to ensure plan objectives are met, and establish a committee of Councillors and residents to recommend spending priorities. Reallocate staff resources to create new positions for pedestrian and cycling co-ordinators and for a public education specialist in transportation, environmental and land use behaviours. Set up a pedestrian advisory committee. (142)

Response - As discussed in the previous point, Departments will respond to Council approval of the Master Plan by developing an implementation action plan that addresses a variety of issues including resource allocation and administrative structures and brings forward related budget recommendations, which may contain ideas similar to these suggestions.

Recommendation - No change required.

87. Balance of roadway and walking/cycling projects (also ref. OP Section 9.0) - There is an imbalance of roadway projects over walking/cycling projects. The proposed reduction in the target level of service on Regional roads and the proposed reduction in automobile modal share should reduce the need for new roadways. However, road projects appear to predominate over walking/cycling infrastructure projects. (142)

Response - The Master Plan's ambitious targets have indeed resulted in a substantial reduction in the need for new roadways over that identified in the current Official Plan. An extensive number of cycling projects are identified jointly by Map 1 and Section 2.3.2, and it should also be noted that the roadway projects proposed in the Master Plan generally include improvements to walking and cycling facilities in the right-of-way. Table 11 will be changed to clarify this.

Recommendation - Add a new row to Table 11, as follows:

All	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walking and cycling facility improvements included in the above projects • Walking and cycling facility improvements independent of the above projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walking and cycling facility improvements included in the above projects • Walking and cycling facility improvements independent of the above projects
------------	---	---

Specific Comments

88. Section 3.1, Table 11 (also ref. OP Section 2.6.1, Table 6) - Any widening of Bronson Avenue north of Fifth Avenue would be undesirable, so suggest deletion of Bronson widening from Dunbar Bridge to Rideau Canal as unnecessary. (89, 190)

Response - The proposed widening of Bronson Avenue from Dunbar Bridge to the bridge over the Rideau Canal is part of the previously approved Dunbar Bridge project which is being implemented as funds permit. No widening of Bronson Avenue north of the Rideau Canal bridge is proposed.

Recommendation - No change required, other than to clarify project identification in Table 11 to read:

- **"Bronson Avenue widening (Dunbar Bridge to Rideau Canal, to complete the approved Dunbar Bridge project)"**

89. Section 3.1, Table 11 (also ref. OP Section 2.6.1, Table 6) - The City of Kanata suggests that March Road (Solandt to Klondike) and Carling Avenue (March to Moodie) widenings should be first priority projects to serve employment areas. (212)

Response - Disagree. While these projects are a priority for the first ten years of Master Plan implementation, they are programmed in the latter half of that time frame to respect existing Council commitments elsewhere for the next five years.

Recommendation - No change required.

90. Section 3.1, Table 11 (also ref. OP Section 2.6.1, Table 6) - The Township of Goulbourn suggests identification of the immediate need to upgrade Hazeldean Road to four lanes to improve cycling facilities. (87)

Response - This comment correctly identifies an unintended omission from the first draft of the Master Plan. This project is recommended for implementation in the period from 2002 to 2006.

Recommendation - Amend Section 3.1, Table 11 to add the following in the column headed by "Second priority (by approximately 2006)" column, and in the row headed by "Kanata Urban Centre & Stittsville":

- **"Hazeldean Road widening (Regional Road 5 to Terry Fox Drive)"**

91. Section 3.1, Table 11 (also ref. OP Section 2.6.1, Table 6) - Suggests that design of Walkley/Airport Parkway ramps not preclude piggybacking buses. (110)

Response - It is anticipated that normal railway clearances will be provided.

Recommendation - No change required.

92. Section 3.1, Table 11 (also ref. OP Section 2.6.1, Table 6) - Asks why LeBreton Transitway Station is not documented in the Environmental Assessment Report. (110)

Response - This project is "grandfathered" under the original Transitway system approval and does not require further Environmental Assessment work.

Recommendation - No change required.

93. Section 3.1, Table 11 (also ref. OP Section 2.6.1, Table 6) - The following comments were received regarding the priority of cycling and pedestrian facility projects: (a) add Cycling Transportation Network and Pooley's Bridge to first priority projects (190); (b) pedestrian and cycling facility projects are lacking, especially Pooley's Bridge, and a walking/cycling bridge across the Rideau Canal at Somerset Street should be a second priority project (206).

Response - (a) Cycling facilities improvements are identified inside the Greenbelt as first priority projects. Provision for the Pooley's Bridge linkage is made in the trilateral agreement among the National Capital Commission, the City of Ottawa and RMOC for LeBreton Flats redevelopment. (b) Pedestrian facilities are not specifically identified in this table, since required sidewalks will be introduced coincident with roadway construction activities. The introduction of other pedestrian facility improvements will be developed in conjunction with area municipalities, while a Rideau Canal bridge at Somerset Street is shortly to be under preliminary study.

Recommendation - No change required.

3.2 Monitoring

General Comments

94. Effects of reduced level of service target (also ref. OP Section 9.8 and OP Section 9.1, Objective 1) - The City of Kanata suggests annual monitoring and reporting to Council of effect on vehicular delay of change from LOS 'D' to 'E'. (212)

Response - Travel time and delay surveys are identified in Table 12.

Recommendation - No change required.

95. Monitoring and review of spending priorities (also ref. OP Section 9.8) - Large sums of money to be spent to increase use of non-auto modes without a benchmark for determining success. Defined, flexible review periods should enable redirection of spending if targets are not achieved. (108)

Response - This valid concern is addressed by TMP Section 3.2, Paragraph 1 and Policy 1; and in OP Section 9.8, Policy 1

Recommendation - No change required.

3.3 Financial Impacts

General Comments

96. Capital requirement breakdowns for walking, cycling and transit - Provide a breakdown of projected spending for walking, cycling and transit projects inside and outside the Greenbelt, as done for the Water and Wastewater Master Plans (108).

Response -Pedestrians and cyclists facilities typically will be provided as part of specific roadway capital projects. The estimated total capital costs in Table 13 reflect the inclusion of these facilities. Other initiatives will address mode specific pedestrian and cycling problems, and the costs in Table 13 includes an allocation for these projects. Table 13 does identify transit-related capital costs separately from the others.

Recommendation - Amend the text “Road (includes pedestrian and cycling facilities)” to read “Roadway facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and motor vehicles”. Amend the text “Transit (includes rapid transit and transit priority facilities)” to read “Rapid transit and transit priority facilities”.

97. Balanced spending priorities - Two comments received suggest that: (a) TMP expenditures for first 10 years seem to grant more weight to transit than justified by the pursuit of a "balanced" transportation system (108); and (b) a more balanced approach to spending would ensure that road improvements are carried out in a timely manner, particularly in areas such as Stittsville and Richmond that are not directly served by rapid transit (87).

Response - (a) The balance desired is qualitative, rather than quantitative in terms of spending. Transit expenditures appear relatively high in the first 10 years for a number of reasons: (i) expenditures concern only Regional roads, rather than local, provincial or federal roads; (ii) transitway infrastructure is the sole responsibility of the Region; (iii) much of the required road system is in place due to substantial historical expenditures, while significant portions of the rapid transit system must be developed to provide a balanced level of service. (b) The recommended spending priorities will ensure that road and transit improvements can be made as appropriate.

Recommendation - No change required.

98. "Transit first" policy not apparent in spending requirements - Roadway spending exceeds transit spending. Roadway capacity should be converted to transit use, to meet objectives and minimize cost (89)

Response - Total capital spending is, in fact, split almost evenly between facilities for transit and facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and motor vehicles. The roadway capacity identified to meet requirements at 2021 is required to provide the minimum acceptable level of service, assuming full achievement of the ambitious modal share objectives. On those parts of the transit priority network where it is not possible to introduce any widenings to provide priority to buses, transit priority can only be achieved by both time and spacial allocations biased towards transit. This is converting road (general traffic) capacity to transit.

Recommendation - No change required.

99. Cost recovery by transit - The transit system should be operated primarily on "user-pay" principles, with residential and commercial levies for those who benefit (108)

Response - This is how the transit system operates. Cost recovery from the fare box is maximised along with ridership, while Regional subsidies and the cost of transit infrastructure are raised through a transit levy on properties in the urban transit service area.

Recommendation - No change required.

100. Cycling link identification (also ref. OP Schedule F) - The City of Ottawa suggests showing the following as "Cycling facility - maintained by other jurisdiction": Stewart Street, Wilbrod Street, Percy Street, Bay Street, Lancaster Road, St. Laurent Boulevard (Russell to Walkley) (109). The Regional Cycling Advisory Group recommends identifying names of all relevant road sections (i.e., Stewart, Wilbrod, move Richmond to Byron). Should show all of existing and proposed Terry Fox. Should contain all roads in the agreed CTN which are under RMOC jurisdiction, including all routes on 1994 CTN schedule as secondary routes: Hawthorne (Hunt Club - Walkley), Blair (Innes to Baseline), Sussex (St. Patrick to Rockcliffe Driveway), Smyth (Alta Vista to Othello), Coventry/Belfast (Hardy to Tremblay), Merivale (Hunt Club to River), Gladstone (Parkdale to Cartier), Sunnyside. (214)

Response - Some of the mentioned routes (e.g., Stewart, Wilbrod, Percy and Bay) are indeed designated as part of the Regional Cycling Transportation Network (CTN) as "maintained by other jurisdiction" but were not illustrated exactly due to the scale of the map. Considering the longer term, the Smyth/Alta Vista Parkway/Walkley link is preferred to the suggested Smyth/Lancaster link. Sufficient coverage on a regional scale is provided without the addition of St. Laurent Boulevard (Russell to Walkley) to the network at this time. The existing and proposed Terry Fox Drive is situated at the edge of the urban area; for the foreseeable future service to newly developing areas to the east will be provided by other designated routes. Merivale Road (Hunt Club to Meadowlands) was incorrectly illustrated on the draft Map 1; it should have shown the section of Merivale south of Hunt Club. Secondary routes identified on the 1994 CTN schedule provided continuity for local municipality cycling networks. In order to emphasise the regional priorities for cycling network development, secondary routes have not been shown on Schedule F. Instead, a note has been included on Map 1 to say: "Cycling facilities on any Regional road may be required for continuity of local cycling routes."

Recommendation - On Map 1 show bicycle routes in precise detail wherever possible; identify and name all Regional roads that are part of the recommended CTN. Wherever possible, name every illustrated link under local municipal jurisdiction that forms part of the Regional CTN. Provide the following note: "Not all local road names are indicated on this Schedule". Show Sunnyside (Bank to Bronson) as "Cycling facility (other jurisdiction)" and Merivale (Hunt Club to Fallowfield) as "Cycling facility (RMOC jurisdiction)".

101. Hunt Club Road/Richmond Road cycling route (also ref. OP Schedule F) - The Hunt Club Road/Richmond Road cycling route should be moved to the Hope Side Road extension alignment, as shown on Map 3. (258)

Response - This may be done when the Hope Side Road is confirmed as the preferred right-of-way.

Recommendation - No change required.

Map 2 Official Plan - Schedule E: Transit Network

102. Legend and base mapping (also ref. OP Schedule E) - Correct colour of rail corridor and transit priority lines in legend to light grey. Note error in route of CP rail corridor at Confederation Heights. (110)

Response - Agree

Recommendation - Amend as suggested.

103. Rapid transit stations (also ref. OP Schedule E) - The City of Ottawa wishes to have rapid transit station locations identified to enable local municipalities to carry out their planning in accordance with regional objectives (109)

Response - Agree

Recommendation - Amend Map 2 to indicate existing and future station locations.

Map 3 Official Plan - Schedule C1: Future Urban Regional Roads Plan

and

Map 4 Official Plan - Schedule D1: Future Rural Regional Roads Plan

104. Future Regional roads (also ref. OP Schedule C1) - The City of Gloucester suggests the designation of Bowesville Road and Limebank Road (both south of Armstrong) as future Regional roads due to anticipated traffic demands from the south -- the City may not be able to rationalize their continued role as through routes if they remain local roads. Also request clarification that RMOC intent is not to remove Regional designation of Anderson Road (Russell to Innes) before provision of an alternative route, since that would impose a liability on local roads to deal with regional traffic (244)

Response - In agreement with this comment, Maps 3 and 4 will designate Bowesville Road and Limebank Road as future Regional Roads as far south as Regional Road 8. Map 4 indicates that by 2021, Anderson Road will cease to be of Regional interest. The timing of Regional road designation removal is not necessarily linked to the provision of an "alternative" route, however completion of the Innes-Walkley-Base Line-Russell connection would likely be an important factor in the decision.

Recommendation - Amend Maps 3 and 4 to designate Bowesville Road and Limebank Road as future Regional roads as far south as Regional Road 8.

105. Future Regional roads (also ref. OP Schedules C1, D1) - Township of Goulbourn suggests that an oversight was made in not identifying Huntmar Road extension to Hazeldean Road as a Regional road to relieve long-term growth constraints in Stittsville. Benefits include the most direct linkage between Stittsville and Corel Centre Transitway terminus; linkage between two Regional roads; direct access from Stittsville to 417 interchange; alleviation of traffic problems on Bryanston Gate (John Street) resulting from Corel Centre. Also suggest addition of Fernbank Road between Main Street and Eagleson Road as a Regional facility, and a major arterial road along east side of Stittsville (87)

Response - Without additional development in the vicinity of the Corel Centre, the Huntmar Road extension is not justified as a Regional facility by 2021. However, the Township is not prevented from completing it as a local road. The West Transitway will not extend west of Terry Fox Drive over the life of the Master Plan, so no terminus is envisioned at the Corel Centre. Fernbank Road cannot be justified as a Regional facility at 2021.

Recommendation - No change required.

106. Future Regional roads (also ref. OP Schedules C1, D1) - The Ontario Ministry of Transportation favours the retention of the Outer Transportation Corridor and the Champagne Corridor as, respectively, conceptual and future Regional roads as per their designations in the current Official Plan, until related Ministry studies can be completed over the next few years.

Response - No Regional need for these roads was identified in the supporting work for the Master Plan. Should future studies result in a need being identified, it is possible to amend the Master Plan and Official Plan at that time.

Recommendation - No change required.

107. Future Regional roads (OP Schedules C1, D1) - Ensure that the Ottawa River Parkway (east) is not included as a future Regional Road (37)

Response - Agree, it is not.

Recommendation - No change required.

108. Urban versus rural Regional roads (also ref. OP Schedules C1, D1) - The Township of Goulbourn wishes to have Hazeldean Road and Main Street in Stittsville identified as "urban Regional roads" (87)

Response - Agree

Recommendation - Modify Map 3 accordingly.

109. Hope Side Road extension (OP Schedules C1, C2, D1) - The City of Nepean wishes to see Maps 3, 4 revised to include consideration of West Hunt Club to Richmond/Moodie as alternatives to Hope Side Road extension. Revise Map 3 and Schedules C1, C2 to realign Greenbank south of Strandherd, Woodroffe south of Strandherd, and Jockvale north of Jock River according to proposals in South Nepean Amendment No. 7 (88)

Response - There is no current intention to remove the identified alternative routes to the Hope Side Road extension from the Regional road system, and they may remain as Regional Roads. Therefore, they are not truly "alternatives" to the Hope Side Road extension. The proposed revisions to bring the Master Plan into accordance with the South Nepean Amendment No. 7 are premature and will be considered when full documentation supporting the Amendment is received.

Recommendation - No change required.

INDEX OF SUBMISSIONS

<u>SUBMISSION NO.</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>CATEGORY</u>
1	W. W. Johnston	Rural Landowner
1	Mr. William Parks	Rural Landowner
2	Mr. David J. Smith	Rural Landowner
3	Mr. Andrew Baldwin	Rural Landowner
4	Mr. Harold Higginson	Rural Landowner
5	Mr. Newill	Rural Landowner
6	Mr. Delmer Wilson	Rural Landowner
7	Mr. John Poole	Rural Landowner
8	Mr. Jeff Davis	Rural Landowner
9	D. Laidlaw	Rural Landowner
10	Mr. Marcel Bisson	Rural Landowner
11	Mr. & Mrs. William Whelan	Rural Landowner
12	Mr. Vilmars Rasa	Rural Landowner
12	Mr. Arnold C. Rice	Rural Landowner
12	Mr. William J. Seabrook	Rural Landowner
12	Mr. James Slattery	Rural Landowner
12	Mr. David Wright	Rural Landowner
13	Mrs. Ruth H. Curry	Rural Landowner
14	Andre Hauschild	Rural Landowner
15	Mr. Brian Carry	Rural Landowner
16	Kingdon Holdings Ltd.	Developer
17	Mr. Russell Craig	Rural Landowner
18	Mr. Frank Argue	Rural Landowner
19	Eric & Anne Wimberley	Rural Landowner
20	Mr. Herb Campbell	Rural Landowner
21	Deerwood Estates Partnership	Developer
22	Mr. Robert J. Higgins	Rural Landowner
23	Mr. Joseph Sladic	Rural Landowner
24	Mr. Ross Nicholson	Rural Landowner
25	Mr. Stephen P. O'Connor	Individual
26	Mr. Keith Langley	Rural Landowner
27	Mr. & Mrs. Dave Forsyth	Rural Landowner
28	Mr. Vern Rampton	Rural Landowner
29	Wilson, Prockiw Barristers & Solicitors	Rural Landowner
30	Angela & Bryon Tyler	Rural Landowner
31	Mr. David Underwood	Rural Landowner
32	Farley, Smith and Murray Surveying Ltd.	Developer
33	Mr. Nick Gulis	Rural Landowner
34	Mr. Brian Kinsella	Rural Landowner

35	Mr. Andrew Renia	Individual
36	Carolyn Robertson	Individual
37	Mr. Ken Charlebois	Urban Landowner
38	Mrs. Phyllis Thatcher	Individual
39	Matthew & Cheryl Clark	Rural Landowner
40	Mr. Mike O'Connell	Individual
41	Don Lockwood	Rural Landowner
42	Ms. Maria K. Sell	Rural Landowner
43	City of Vanier	Municipalities
44	Mr. Stephen Musy	Rural Landowner
45	Mr. Carl Killeen	Rural Landowner
46	Ms. Ann Simpson	Individual
47	Mr. Len Russell	Individual
48	Mr. Frank Marchington	Rural Landowner
49	Mr. Robert Lytle	Rural Landowner
50	Mr. Graham Hudson	Rural Landowner
51	Arn Snyder	Rural Landowner
52	Mr. T. P. Voroley	Rural Landowner
53	Mr. Tajammul Khan	Rural Landowner
54	Mr. Clarence Madhosingh	Rural Landowner
55	Mr. Ken Foulds	Rural Landowner
56	Mr. Steve Berry	Rural Landowner
57	Mr. Ken Purdy	Rural Landowner
58	Mr. Leonard W. Purdy	Rural Landowner
59	Mr. Joseph L. Purdy	Rural Landowner
60	Mr. Kenneth Brennan	Rural Landowner
61	Mr. J. G. Herbert	Rural Landowner
62	City of Ottawa	Municipalities
63	City of Ottawa	Municipalities
64	City of Ottawa	Municipalities
65	Mr. William Davidson	Developer
66	Mr. Sid Bradley	Rural Landowner
67	Ms. Grace Bell	Individual
68	A.T. and Marilyn Hansen	Rural Landowner
69	Mr. Robert Glendinning	Individual
70	David & Judith Wall	Rural Landowner
71	Mr. Lino Simioni	Rural Landowner
72	Mr. Mark Riley	Individual
73	Mr. Burt Collins	Individual
74	H. E. Alter	Rural Landowner
75	M.L. McKay	Rural Landowner
76	Mr. Vlado Pollak	Rural Landowner
77	Mr. John Charania	Rural Landowner
78	Mr. Chris Cummins	Rural Landowner
79	Urbandale Corporation	Developer

80	Mr. Duncan Campbell	Urban Landowner
81	Mr. Paul Kelly	Rural Landowner
82	Dr. Louis DiRaimo	Rural Landowner
83	Donald & Lorraine Halchuk	Developer
84	Mr. Wayne Patterson	Rural Landowner
85	Leo & Stella Rouble	Rural Landowner
86	Mr. Douglas Dods	Business Owner
87	Township of Goulbourn	Municipalities
88	City of Nepean	Municipalities
89	Dianne Holmes	Regional Councillor
90	Mr. Ronald Charlebois	Developer
91	Corelean Robertson	Rural Landowner
92	Mr. Owen Colton	Rural Landowner
93	Armbro Construction Limited	Business Owner
94	Russell & Eleanor McKay	Rural Landowner
95	Revtor Company Limited	Rural Landowner
96	Mark & Michelle Bainbridge	Rural Landowner
97	Anonymous	
98	Anonymous	
99	Anonymous	Rural Landowner
100	Anonymous	Urban Landowner
101	Mr. Mike Bell	Rural Landowner
102	Ms. Tallulah Macvean	Rural Landowner
103	Mr. Donald H. Rine	Rural Landowner
104	United Aggregates Ltd.	Business Owner
105	Ottawa Macdonald-Cartier International Airport Authority	Agencies
106	Mr. William Shaw	Rural Landowner
107	Ms. Mary M. Nash	Community Asso.
108	D.W. Kennedy Consulting Ltd.	Consultant
109	City of Ottawa	Municipalities
110	Lois Smith	Individual
111	R.E. Williams	Individual
112	Genstar Development Company	Developer
113	Lithwick Corp	Developer
114	Bob & Liz Metcalfe	Rural Landowner
115	Mr. Tamba Dhar	Rural Landowner
116	Qualicum/Graham Park	Community Asso.
117	Mr. Murray McComb	Urban Landowner
118	Mr. Henry Benoit	Rural Landowner
119	Ms. Barbara Rotar	Rural Landowner
120	Mr. Bob W. Hosler	Individual
121	Ms. Janet Belzile	Individual
122	Ms. Jane Berlin	Individual
123	Ms. Loraine Saumure	Rural Landowner

124	Alex Cullen	Regional Councillor
125	Chief Justice Brian Dickson (Retired)	Rural Landowner
126	Mr. Paul Kruyne	Rural Landowner
127	Simmering & Associates Ltd.	Developer
128	Centretown Citizens Ottawa Corp.	Special Interest Group
129	Mr. Jean Paul Lemay	Rural Landowner
130	Mr. Weldon Birch	Rural Landowner
131	Chris Rhodes	Individual
132	Robert van den Ham	Regional Councillor
133	Mr. Robert A. Broomfield	Rural Landowner
134	Mr. Barry Cavanagh	Rural Landowner
135	Mr. Al Crosby	Individual
136	Dianne McCormack	Individual
137	Anonymous	Rural Landowner
138	Pat and Mary Timmins	Rural Landowner
139	Alta Vista Community Association	Community Asso.
140	Mr. Leo Brown	Rural Landowner
141	Mr. Charles D. Foster	Rural Landowner
142	Ottawalk	Special Interest Group
143	Betty Hill	Regional Councillor
144	Mr. Don Wiles	Rural Landowner
145	Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders Asso.	Developer
146	Hoi and Julia Tsao	Urban Landowner
147	Ms. Ann Deugo	Rural Landowner
148	Dwight and Connie Johnson	Rural Landowner
148	Mr. Gordon Mulligan	Rural Landowner
149	History Dept. Carleton University	Institutional
150	Bonnie L. Brown	Rural Landowner
151	Ms. Diane Penney	Rural Landowner
152	Pat Chojnacki	Rural Landowner
153	Mr. Mark Foley	Rural Landowner
154	Agricultural Advisory Committee	Special Interest Group
155	Mr. Daniel Raymond	Rural Landowner
156	Terrace Corporation	Developer
157	Mr. Dale Argue	Rural Landowner
158	Dr. George W. Sander	Rural Landowner
159	Mr. Yash Paul Lamba	Rural Landowner
160	Walker, Nott, Dragicevic	Business Owner
161	Kanata Rural Conservation Group	Special Interest Group
162	Mr. Arthur Bickerstaff	Rural Landowner
163	Township of West Carleton	Municipalities
164	Mr. Dale Murphy	Rural Landowner
165	Arnold Faintuck & Asso. Ltd.	Consultant
166	Mr. William (Bill) Coady	Rural Landowner
167	Mrs. Lilli Smith	Rural Landowner

168	Mr. Ronald Walker	Rural Landowner
169	J.L. Richards & Asso. Ltd.	Consultant
170	Mr. Glenn Falls	Rural Landowner
171	Mr. Rolf Meier	Rural Landowner
172	Jack and Susan McCoy	Rural Landowner
173	Mr. Seaton Findlay	Urban Landowner
174	Mr. William S. Davidson	Rural Landowner
175	Wilson, Prockiw Barristers & Solicitors	Rural Landowner
176	Gisele and Murray MacDonald	Rural Landowner
177	Bruce B. MacNabb, Ltd.	Consultant
178	Ms. Rina Petrelli	Rural Landowner
179	Ms. Mary-Ellen Kennedy	Rural Landowner
180	T.G. Otto	Rural Landowner
181	Mr. Eric Mussell	Rural Landowner
182	Paul and Grace Mussell	Rural Landowner
183	Anna and Clarence Mussell	Rural Landowner
184	J.A. Carruthers	Rural Landowner
185	Mr. Philip Smith	Rural Landowner
186	Charlene and Craig Bagshaw	Rural Landowner
186	Dan DesRoches & Lori Bustard DesRoches	Rural Landowner
186	Marc Pinault & Lise Hetu Pinault	Rural Landowner
187	Arnprior Region Federation of Agriculture	Agencies
188	Novatech Engineering Consultants	Consultant
189	Novatech Engineering Consultants	Consultant
190	Dalhousie Community Association	Community Asso.
191	Mr. Ken Valcamp	Rural Landowner
192	Kanata Rural Conservation Group	Community Asso.
193	Mr. Gordon Pike	Rural Landowner
194	Mr. John J. Beaton	Urban Landowner
195	Mr. Dan Howard	Individual
196	Alice and John MacLaurin	Urban Landowner
197	Dr. Richard W. Macmillan	Rural Landowner
198	Mr. Ivan Flockton	Rural Landowner
199	North West Goulbourn Community Asso.	Community Asso.
200	H.W. Gow & J. Mathieu	Individual
201	Mr. Donald R. Borden	Rural Landowner
202	Copeland Park Community Alliance	Community Asso.
203	Community Petition	Rural Landowner
204	Richard and Henry Hobbs	Rural Landowner
205	Bernie & Georgette St. John	Rural Landowner
206	Mr. David Gladstone	Individual
207	Sherry and Gary Belding	Rural Landowner
208	A.F. & H.A. Baskin	Rural Landowner
209	Community Petition	Rural Landowner

210	Mr. John B. Wilson	Rural Landowner
211	City of Kanata	Municipalities
212	City of Kanata	Municipalities
213	Glabar Park Community Alliance	Community Asso.
214	Regional Cycling Advisory Group	Special Interest Group
215	Gary & Connie Bazil	Rural Landowner
216	Santo Zacconi	Rural Landowner
217	Ms. Vivian R. Catling	Rural Landowner
218	Mr. Waldo Hordichuk	Rural Landowner
219	Association of Rural Property Owners	Special Interest Group
220	Mr. J. Ray Bell	Rural Landowner
221	Byward Market BIA	Business Group
222	Rideau Street BIA	Business Group
223	Township of Goulbourn	Municipalities
224	Ronald & Tina Clarke	Rural Landowner
225	Manor Park Community Asso.	Community Asso.
226	R.H. Kilburn	Rural Landowner
227	Township of Osgoode	Municipalities
228	Communities Before Bridges	Special Interest Group
229	Rideau Valley Conservation Authority	Agencies
230	Tartan Development Corp	Developer
231	J.L. Richards & Asso. Ltd.	Consultant
232	Transport 2000	Agencies
233	Tina Cockram & Stephen Farrell	Rural Landowner
234	Robert Grant & Laurel Schock	Rural Landowner
235	Transport Concepts	Special Interest Group
236	Parks Canada	Agencies
237	David & Margaret Thorsell	Rural Landowner
238	R & D Berube	Rural Landowner
239	Mr. & Mrs. Sandy Keir	Rural Landowner
240	Mr. John R. Cavanagh	Rural Landowner
241	Mr. John van Riel	Rural Landowner
242	R. Favrin	Urban Landowner
243	Save the Pinecrest Creek Corridor Committee	Special Interest Group
244	City of Gloucester	Municipalities
245	Mr. Rob Shaver	Rural Landowner
246	Lori-Ann Morley	Rural Landowner
246	Mr. Ernie Simpson	Rural Landowner
246	Mr. Randy Simpson	Rural Landowner
247	Gowling, Strathy & Henderson	Business Group
248	Christine Hanrahan	Urban Landowner
249	Don Stephenson	Municipal Councillor
250	Ottawa-Carleton Board of Trade	Business Group
251	Mr. Fred Zlepnig	Rural Landowner

252	Connelly-McManus Engineering Ltd	Consultant
253	Novatech Engineering Consultants Ltd.	Consultant
254	Joan & Glenn Ilott	Rural Landowner
255	Novatech Engineering Consultants Ltd	Consultant
256	Township of Rideau	Municipalities
257	Rosalind Riseborough	Urban Landowner
258	National Capital Commission	Agencies
259	National Capital Commission	Agencies
260	Bernadine J. Harris	Rural Landowner
261	Myrna Bush	Rural Landowner
262	Donald R. Baskin	Rural Landowner
263	R.G. Essiambre & Asso.	Consultant
264	David McNicoll	Urban Landowner
265	Sommerset Heights BIA	Business Group
266	Gail Stewart & Others	Special Interest Group
267	Mr. Derek Chase	Urban Landowner
268	Mr. Richard Bendall	Rural Landowner
269	Glebe Community Asso.	Community Asso.
270	Gowling, Strathy & Henderson	Rural Landowner
271	Bank Street Promenade	Business Group
272	March Rural Community Asso	Community Asso.
273	Gowling, Strathy & Henderson	Rural Landowner
274	Richcraft Quality Home Bldrs	Developer
275	John & Norma Richardson	Rural Landowner
276	Sylvie Morissette	Individual
277	Public Works & Gov't Services Canada	Agencies
278	The Planning Partnership	Consultant
279	Township of Cumberland	Municipalities
280	Kanata Arts Advisory Cttee	Special Interest Group
281	Mr. Gordon Semple	Rural Landowner
282	Mr. Derek Oudit	Individual
283	Novatech Engineering Consultants Ltd	Consultant
284	Mr. Frank Argue	Developer
285	Terry & Danny MacHardy	Rural Landowner
286	Barbara Barr	Urban Landowner
287	Bruce & Karen Geddes	Rural Landowner
288	Laurie Curtis	Rural Landowner
289	Mr. Henri Joly	Rural Landowner
290	Mr. Scott Toll	Rural Landowner
291	Pri-Tec Int'l Inc	Consultant
292	D.R. Barker & Asso Ltd	Consultant
293	Somerset Village BIA	Business Group
294	Mr. Hugh Gribbon	Individual
295	Centretown Citizens' Community Asso.	Community Asso.
296	The Regional Group	Consultant

297	Farano Green	Consultant
298	Irv & Shirley Cockwell	Rural Landowner
299	Mr. Jack MacLaren	Rural Landowner
300	Mr. Graydon Patterson	Individual
301	Ottawa Cycling Advisory Group	Special Interest Group
302	Ottawa Pedestrian Advisory Group	Special Interest Group
303	Citizens for Safe Cycling	Special Interest Group
304	Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority	Agencies
305	Riverside Park Community Asso.	Community Asso.
306	Balys & Associates Inc	Rural Landowner
307	Arthur & Mary Van Gaal	Rural Landowner
308	Oliver, Mangione, McCalla	Consultant
309	Agriculture & Agri-Food Canada	Agencies
310	Federation of Citizens' Asso.	Community Asso.
311	King Edward Ave Task Force	Community Asso.
312	Mr. Jim Armstrong	Individual
313	Ottawa Field-Naturalists' Club	Special Interest Group
314	Mr. Al Crosby	Urban Landowner
315	Relocatable Homes Ltd	Rural Landowner
316	Ministry of Municipal Affairs & Housing	Agencies
317	Action Sandy Hill	Community Asso.
318	Robert & Huguette Copeland	Rural Landowner
319	Federation of Citizens' Asso	Community Asso.
320	Fairlawn Sod (Ottawa)	Rural Landowner
321	Ministry of Municipal Affairs & Housing	Agencies

NAME	CATEGORY	SUBMISSION NO.
Action Sandy Hill	Community Association	317
Agricultural Advisory Committee	Special Interest Group	154
Agriculture & Agri-Food Canada	Agencies	309
Alta Vista Community Association	Community Association	139
H. E. Alter	Rural Landowner	74
Anonymous		97
Anonymous		98
Anonymous	Rural Landowner	99
Anonymous	Rural Landowner	137
Anonymous	Urban Landowner	100
Mr. Dale Argue	Rural Landowner	157
Mr. Frank Argue	Developer	284
Mr. Frank Argue	Rural Landowner	18
Armbro Construction Limited	Business Owner	93
Mr. Jim Armstrong	Individual	312
Arnold Faintuck & Asso. Ltd.	Consultant	165
Arnprior Region Federation of Agriculture	Agencies	187
Association of Rural Property Owners	Special Interest Group	219
Charlene and Craig Bagshaw	Rural Landowner	186
Mark & Michelle Bainbridge	Rural Landowner	96
Mr. Andrew Baldwin	Rural Landowner	3
Balys & Associates Inc	Rural Landowner	306
Bank Street Promenade	Business Group	271
Barbara Barr	Urban Landowner	86
A.F. & H.A. Baskin	Rural Landowner	208
Donald R. Baskin	Rural Landowner	262
Gary & Connie Bazil	Rural Landowner	215
Mr. John J. Beaton	Urban Landowner	194
Sherry and Gary Belding	Rural Landowner	207
Ms. Grace Bell	Individual	67
Mr. J. Ray Bell	Rural Landowner	220
Mr. Mike Bell	Rural Landowner	101
Ms. Janet Belzile	Individual	121
Mr. Richard Bendall	Rural Landowner	268
Mr. Henry Benoit	Rural Landowner	118
Ms. Jane Berlin	Individual	122
Mr. Steve Berry	Rural Landowner	56
R & D Berube	Rural Landowner	238
Mr. Arthur Bickerstaff	Rural Landowner	162
Mr. Weldon Birch	Rural Landowner	130
Mr. Marcel Bisson	Rural Landowner	10
Mr. Donald R. Borden	Rural Landowner	201
Mr. Sid Bradley	Rural Landowner	66

Mr. Kenneth Brennan	Rural Landowner	60
Mr. Robert A. Broomfield	Rural Landowner	133
Bonnie L. Brown	Rural Landowner	150
Mr. Leo Brown	Rural Landowner	140
Myrna Bush	Rural Landowner	261
Byward Market BIA	Business Group	221
Mr. Duncan Campbell	Urban Landowner	80
Mr. Herb Campbell	Rural Landowner	20
J.A. Carruthers	Rural Landowner	184
Mr. Brian Carry	Rural Landowner	15
Ms. Vivian R. Catling	Rural Landowner	217
Mr. Barry Cavanagh	Rural Landowner	134
Mr. John R. Cavanagh	Rural Landowner	240
Centretown Citizens Ottawa Corporation	Special Interest Group	128
Centretown Citizens' Community Asso.	Community Association	295
Mr. John Charania	Rural Landowner	77
Mr. Ken Charlebois	Urban Landowner	37
Mr. Ronald Charlebois	Developer	90
Mr. Derek Chase	Urban Landowner	267
Pat Chojnacki	Rural Landowner	152
Citizens for Safe Cycling	Special Interest Group	303
City of Gloucester	Municipalities	244
City of Kanata	Municipalities	211
City of Kanata	Municipalities	212
City of Nepean	Municipalities	88
City of Ottawa	Municipalities	62
City of Ottawa	Municipalities	63
City of Ottawa	Municipalities	64
City of Ottawa	Municipalities	109
City of Vanier	Municipalities	43
Matthew & Cheryl Clark	Rural Landowner	39
Ronald & Tina Clarke	Rural Landowner	224
Mr. William (Bill) Coady	Rural Landowner	166
Irv & Shirley Cockwell	Rural Landowner	298
Mr. Burt Collins	Individual	73
Mr. Owen Colton	Rural Landowner	92
Communities Before Bridges	Special Interest Group	228
Community Petition	Rural Landowner	203
Community Petition	Rural Landowner	209
Connelly-McManus Engineering Ltd	Consultant	252
Copeland Park Community Alliance	Community Association	202
Robert & Huguette Copeland	Rural Landowner	318
Mr. Russell Craig	Rural Landowner	17
Mr. Al Crosby	Individual	135
Mr. Al Crosby	Urban Landowner	314

Alex Cullen	Regional Councillor	124
Mr. Chris Cummins	Rural Landowner	78
Mrs. Ruth H. Curry	Rural Landowner	13
Laurie Curtis	Rural Landowner	288
D.R. Barker & Asso Ltd	Consultant	292
D.W. Kennedy Consulting Ltd.	Consultant	108
Dalhousie Community Association	Community Association	190
Mr. William Davidson	Developer	65
Mr. William S. Davidson	Rural Landowner	174
Mr. Jeff Davis	Rural Landowner	8
Deerwood Estates Partnership	Developer	21
Dan DesRoches & Lori Bustard DesRoches	Rural Landowner	186
Ms. Ann Deugo	Rural Landowner	147
Mr. Tamba Dhar	Rural Landowner	115
Chief Justice Brian Dickson (Retired)	Rural Landowner	125
Dr. Louis DiRaimo	Rural Landowner	82
Mr. Douglas Dods	Business Owner	86
Fairlawn Sod (Ottawa)	Rural Landowner	320
Mr. Glenn Falls	Rural Landowner	170
Farano Green	Consultant	297
Farley, Smith and Murray Surveying Ltd.	Developer	32
R. Favrin	Urban Landowner	242
Federation of Citizens' Asso	Community Association	319
Federation of Citizens' Asso.	Community Association	310
Mr. Seaton Findlay	Urban Landowner	173
Mr. Ivan Flockton	Rural Landowner	198
Mr. Mark Foley	Rural Landowner	153
Mr. & Mrs. Dave Forsyth	Rural Landowner	27
Mr. Charles D. Foster	Rural Landowner	141
Mr. Ken Foulds	Rural Landowner	55
Gail Stewart & Others	Special Interest Group	266
Bruce & Karen Geddes	Rural Landowner	287
Genstar Development Company	Developer	112
Glabar Park Community Alliance	Community Association	213
Mr. David Gladstone	Individual	206
Glebe Community Association	Community Association	269
Mr. Robert Glendinning	Individual	6
Gowling, Strathy & Henderson	Business Group	247
Gowling, Strathy & Henderson	Rural Landowner	270
Gowling, Strathy & Henderson	Rural Landowner	273
Mr. Hugh Gribbon	Individual	294
Mr. Nick Gulis	Rural Landowner	33
H.W. Gow & J. Mathieu	Individual	200
Donald & Lorraine Halchuk	Developer	83
Christine Hanrahan	Urban Landowner	248

A.T. and Marilyn Hansen	Rural Landowner	68
Bernadine J. Harris	Rural Landowner	260
Andre Hauschild	Rural Landowner	14
Mr. J. G. Herbert	Rural Landowner	61
Mr. Robert J. Higgins	Rural Landowner	22
Mr. Harold Higginson	Rural Landowner	4
Betty Hill	Regional Councillor	143
History Dept. Carleton University	Institutional	149
Richard and Henry Hobbs	Rural Landowner	204
Dianne Holmes	Regional Councillor	89
Mr. Waldo Hordichuk	Rural Landowner	218
Mr. Bob W. Hosler	Individual	120
Mr. Dan Howard	Individual	195
Mr. Graham Hudson	Rural Landowner	50
Joan & Glenn Ilott	Rural Landowner	254
J.L. Richards & Asso. Ltd.	Consultant	169
J.L. Richards & Asso. Ltd.	Consultant	231
Dwight and Connie Johnson	Rural Landowner	148
W. W. Johnston	Rural Landowner	1
Mr. Henri Joly	Rural Landowner	289
Kanata Arts Advisory Cttee	Special Interest Group	280
Kanata Rural Conservation Group	Community Association	192
Kanata Rural Conservation Group	Special Interest Group	161
Mr. & Mrs. Sandy Keir	Rural Landowner	239
Mr. Paul Kelly	Rural Landowner	81
Ms. Mary-Ellen Kennedy	Rural Landowner	179
Mr. Tajammul Khan	Rural Landowner	53
R.H. Kilburn	Rural Landowner	225
Mr. Carl Killeen	Rural Landowner	45
King Edward Ave Task Force	Community Association	311
Kingdon Holdings Ltd.	Developer	16
Mr. Brian Kinsella	Rural Landowner	34
Mr. Paul Kruyne	Rural Landowner	126
D. Laidlaw	Rural Landowner	9
Mr. Yash Paul Lamba	Rural Landowner	159
Mr. Keith Langley	Rural Landowner	26
Mr. Jean Paul Lemay	Rural Landowner	129
Lithwick Corporation	Developer	113
Don Lockwood	Rural Landowner	41
Mr. Robert Lytle	Rural Landowner	49
Gisele and Murray MacDonald	Rural Landowner	176
Terry & Danny MacHardy	Rural Landowner	285
Mr. Jack MacLaren	Rural Landowner	299
Alice and John MacLaurin	Urban Landowner	196
Dr. Richard W. Macmillan	Rural Landowner	197

Bruce B. MacNabb, Ltd.	Consultant	177
Ms. Tallulah Macvean	Rural Landowner	102
Mr. Clarence Madhosingh	Rural Landowner	54
Manor Park Community Asso.	Community Association	225
March Rural Community Asso.	Community Association	272
Mr. Frank Marchington	Rural Landowner	48
Mr. Murray McComb	Urban Landowner	117
Dianne McCormack	Individual	36
Jack and Susan McCoy	Rural Landowner	172
M.L. McKay	Rural Landowner	75
Russell & Eleanor McKay	Rural Landowner	94
David McNicoll	Urban Landowner	264
Mr. Rolf Meier	Rural Landowner	171
Bob & Liz Metcalfe	Rural Landowner	114
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	Agencies	321
Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority	Agencies	304
Sylvie Morissette	Individual	276
Lori-Ann Morley	Rural Landowner	246
Mr. Gordon Mulligan	Rural Landowner	148
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	Agencies	316
Mr. Dale Murphy	Rural Landowner	164
Anna and Clarence Mussell	Rural Landowner	183
Mr. Eric Mussell	Rural Landowner	181
Paul and Grace Mussell	Rural Landowner	182
Mr. Stephen Musy	Rural Landowner	44
Ms. Mary M. Nash	Community Association	107
National Capital Commission	Agencies	258
National Capital Commission	Agencies	259
Mr. Newill	Rural Landowner	5
Mr. Ross Nicholson	Rural Landowner	24
North West Goulbourn Community Asso.	Community Association	199
Novatech Engineering Consultants	Consultant	188
Novatech Engineering Consultants	Consultant	189
Novatech Engineering Consultants	Consultant	255
Novatech Engineering Consultants	Consultant	283
Novatech Engineering Consultants.	Consultant	253
Mr. Mike O'Connell	Individual	40
Mr. Stephen P. O'Connor	Individual	25
Oliver, Mangione, McCalla	Consultant	308
Ottawa Cycling Advisory Group	Special Interest Group	301
Ottawa Field-Naturalists' Club	Special Interest Group	313
Ottawa Macdonald-Cartier Int'l Airport Authority	Agencies	105
Ottawa Pedestrian Advisory Group	Special Interest Group	302
Ottawa-Carleton Board of Trade	Business Group	250

Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders Asso.	Developer	145
Ottawalk	Special Interest Group	142
T.G. Otto	Rural Landowner	180
Mr. Derek Oudit	Individual	282
Parks Canada	Agencies	236
Mr. William Parks	Rural Landowner	1
Mr. Graydon Patterson	Individual	300
Mr. Wayne Patterson	Rural Landowner	84
Ms. Diane Penney	Rural Landowner	151
Ms. Rina Petrelli	Rural Landowner	178
Mr. Gordon Pike	Rural Landowner	193
Marc Pinault & Lise Hetu Pinault	Rural Landowner	186
Mr. Vlado Pollak	Rural Landowner	76
Mr. John Poole	Rural Landowner	7
Pri-Tec Int'l Inc	Consultant	291
Public Works & Gov't. Services Canada	Agencies	277
Mr. Joseph L. Purdy	Rural Landowner	59
Mr. Ken Purdy	Rural Landowner	57
Mr. Leonard W. Purdy	Rural Landowner	58
Qualicum/Graham Park	Community Association	116
R.G. Essiambre & Asso.	Consultant	263
Mr. Vern Rampton	Rural Landowner	28
Mr. Vilmars Rasa	Rural Landowner	12
Mr. Daniel Raymond	Rural Landowner	155
Regional Cycling Advisory Group	Special Interest Group	214
Relocatable Homes Ltd.	Rural Landowner	315
Mr. Andrew Renia	Individual	35
Revtor Company Limited	Rural Landowner	95
Chris Rhodes	Individual	131
Mr. Arnold C. Rice	Rural Landowner	12
John & Norma Richardson	Rural Landowner	275
Richcraft Quality Home Bldrs	Developer	274
Rideau Street BIA	Business Group	222
Rideau Valley Conservation Authority	Agencies	229
Mr. Mark Riley	Individual	72
Mr. Donald H. Rine	Rural Landowner	103
Rosalind Riseborough	Urban Landowner	257
Riverside Park Community Asso.	Community Association	305
Robert Grant & Laurel Schock	Rural Landowner	234
Carolyn Robertson	Individual	36
Corelean Robertson	Rural Landowner	91
Ms. Barbara Rotar	Rural Landowner	119
Leo & Stella Rouble	Rural Landowner	85
Mr. Len Russell	Individual	47
Dr. George W. Sander	Rural Landowner	158

Ms. Loraine Saumure	Rural Landowner	123
Save the Pinecrest Creek Corridor Cttee	Special Interest Group	243
Mr. William J. Seabrook	Rural Landowner	12
Ms. Maria K. Sell	Rural Landowner	42
Mr. Gordon Semple	Rural Landowner	281
Mr. Rob Shaver	Rural Landowner	245
Mr. William Shaw	Rural Landowner	106
Mr. Lino Simioni	Rural Landowner	71
Simmering & Associates Ltd	Developer	127
Ms. Ann Simpson	Individual	46
Mr. Ernie Simpson	Rural Landowner	246
Mr. Randy Simpson	Rural Landowner	246
Mr. Joseph Sladic	Rural Landowner	23
Mr. James Slattery	Rural Landowner	12
Mr. David J. Smith	Rural Landowner	2
Mrs. Lilli Smith	Rural Landowner	167
Lois Smith	Individual	110
Mr. Philip Smith	Rural Landowner	185
Arn Snyder	Rural Landowner	51
Somerset Village BIA	Business Group	293
Sommerset Heights BIA	Business Group	265
Bernie & Georgette St. John	Rural Landowner	205
Don Stephenson	Municipal Councillor	249
Tartan Development Corp	Developer	230
Terrace Corporation	Developer	156
Mrs. Phyllis Thatcher	Individual	38
The Planning Partnership	Consultant	278
The Regional Group	Consultant	296
David & Margaret Thorsell	Rural Landowner	237
Pat and Mary Timmins	Rural Landowner	138
Tina Cockram & Stephen Farrell	Rural Landowner	233
Mr. Scott Toll	Rural Landowner	290
Township of Cumberland	Municipalities	279
Township of Goulbourn	Municipalities	87
Township of Goulbourn	Municipalities	223
Township of Osgoode	Municipalities	227
Township of Rideau	Municipalities	256
Township of West Carleton	Municipalities	163
Transport 2000	Agencies	232
Transport Concepts	Special Interest Group	235
Hoi and Julia Tsao	Urban Landowner	146
Angela & Bryon Tyler	Rural Landowner	30
Mr. David Underwood	Rural Landowner	31
United Aggregates Ltd.	Business Owner	104
Urbandale Corporation	Developer	79

Mr. Ken Valcamp	Rural Landowner	191
Robert van den Ham	Regional Councillor	132
Arthur& Mary Van Gaal	Rural Landowner	307
Mr. John van Riel	Rural Landowner	241
Mr. T. P. Voroley	Rural Landowner	52
Walker, Nott, Dragicevic	Business Owner	160
Mr. Ronald Walker	Rural Landowner	168
David & Judith Wall	Rural Landowner	70
Mr. & Mrs. William Whelan	Rural Landowner	11
Mr. Don Wiles	Rural Landowner	144
R.E. Williams	Individual	111
Mr. Delmer Wilson	Rural Landowner	6
Mr. John B. Wilson	Rural Landowner	210
Wilson, Prockiw Barristers & Solicitors	Rural Landowner	29
Wilson, Prockiw Barristers & Solicitors	Rural Landowner	175
Eric & Anne Wimberley	Rural Landowner	19
Mr. David Wright	Rural Landowner	12
Santo Zacconi	Rural Landowner	216
Mr. Fred Zlepnig	Rural Landowner	251