

MINUTES
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON
CHAMPLAIN ROOM
18 FEBRUARY 1998
5:30 P.M.

PRESENT

Chair: D. Holmes

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

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Councillor Davis suggested the following statement be added to Mr. Hobb's comments at page 11: "He pointed out that several years ago, Westmount Avenue was closed for repairs and there was no problem for ambulances to find an alternative route to the Civic Hospital."

The councillor also distributed copies of amendments and clarifications she felt should be included in the Minute for Item 4, "Island Park, Kirkwood and Churchill Area Transportation Assessment and Traffic Calming Plan". Because of the extensive nature of these revisions, the Committee directed the Co-ordinator to review the tapes in conjunction with the councillor's comments and provide a revised version of the Minutes as appropriate.

That the Transportation Committee approve the Minutes of the meeting of 4 February 1998.

CARRIED as amended*

* Subject to confirmation.

Note: 1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.
2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 25 February and 11 March 1998 in Transportation Committee Reports 3 and 4 respectively.

TRAFFIC AND PARKING

1. TRAFFIC AND PARKING BY-LAW CONTROLLED-ACCESS ROADS/ HOV LANES

- Director, Mobility Services & Corporate Fleet Services report dated 29 Dec 97
- deferred on 4Feb 98

Doug Brousseau, Director of Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services indicated the Region now owns a portion of former Highway 17 (now Regional Road 174) from the split out to Cumberland and the regular components of the By-law do not address a “freeway” which this portion is and must therefore be amended accordingly. In addition, it is recommended that the By-law incorporate the Airport Parkway (now Regional Road 79) which is a limited access highway as well, although it is of a different character.

In response to concerns expressed by Councillor Meilleur, staff confirmed Recommendation 1(d) referred only to the freeway section of Regional Road 174 and is in accordance with standard freeway prohibitions; commuters traveling from the east should use Regional arterial roads instead. The Commissioner explained that what is being recommended is simply an adoption of the rules that existed on the freeway prior to the transfer to the Region. It was confirmed the recommendation does not include the Airport Parkway and the vehicles referred to will be permitted on that roadway. By designating the Airport Parkway a controlled access road, he explained that someone would not be able to gain access (e.g. driveway) just because they own a piece of property adjacent to the road.

Councillor Doucet related the concerns he received from a resident in Hunt Club with respect to the proposal to limit access to the Airport Parkway, especially since this is the only safe route for cyclists to the south end of the city. In addition, the individual believed the proposed designation would impair the ability of pedestrians to cross the Parkway at Cahill Avenue West and walk to the Southeast Transitway Station. D. Brousseau confirmed pedestrians will still be able to cross, but should do so with caution as there are no lights at that intersection. In response to a question posed by the councillor about the reasons for designating the Parkway a controlled access roadway, staff advised that not only would it prevent a resident from gaining access via their driveway, it would also prohibit vendors from selling alongside the road.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen questioned whether future consideration could be given to the Airport Parkway as a more specific bicycle access route. D. Brousseau confirmed that although it is a preferred cycling route, the paved shoulder is not up to Regional standards as a cycling lane. He agreed this could be considered in the future.

Avery Burdett, Ottawa Bicycle Club made the following comments:

- the Ottawa Bicycle Club is opposed to prohibiting bikes on roadways including the Airport Parkway and Regional Road 174;

- they were not overly concerned if an alternate route is close by; however, in the case of Regional Road 174, there are no alternatives;
- that road is designed for high speed travel, although if there is adequate width, the speed differential should make no difference to cyclists traveling on the same roadway; they recognize that the road is not safe for cyclists as a result;
- cycling on highways in Canada is a well-established right, where driving is a privilege granted by a license; therefore, rights should come before privileges; the Ottawa Bicycle Club see a potential threat to their right to use the Airport Parkway; cyclists have been using it since it was first opened so their right to use it is well-established;
- the Region has a moral and legal obligation to provide safe access for cyclists and pedestrians on the Airport Parkway and any upgrade or future twinning of this facility should accommodate cyclists;
- American interstate highways are used by cyclists because they are designed wide enough and interstates are similar to controlled access roads; there is no evidence of a safety problem and if there is, the evidence should be made available;
- he was concerned about reference in the report that allowed cyclists and others to use the Airport Parkway "at the present time", suggesting the use of this phrase could threaten future use; he recommended those words be deleted.

Lois K. Smith suggested Section 19(a) should go further to state how many people should be permitted in a vehicle in an HOV lane; she believed that at no time should there be less than three individuals in those vehicles. She made reference to a report which determined that the compliance rate for 2+ persons/vehicle was low and monitoring was difficult. She indicated the signs designating HOV lanes in Hull stipulate 3+ persons per vehicle and suggested there be consistency between the provinces in order to eliminate confusion for motorists traveling between Ottawa and Hull.

Robin Bennett, Regional Cycling Advisory Group (RCAG) spoke to the issue of controlled access roads, stating their support for the proposed designation for the Airport Parkway and the recommendation to ban cyclists from Regional Road 174 because it is not a safe route to use. With respect to the latter, he suggested proper signage be erected to assist those cyclists entering Ottawa from the east, indicating the alternative cycling routes. He noted that RCAG is cognizant of the different characteristics between Regional Road 174 and Regional Road 79 (Airport Parkway) and questioned whether there was a consolidated policy towards bicycles on controlled access roads for future situations. The Commissioner advised that staff would like to have bicycles on every road, but Regional Road 174 was not built wide enough to have such mixed use. He

confirmed Council policy states that staff proceed on the basis that they do everything possible to allow cyclists, unless there are reasons that make it impossible.

Mr. Bennett believed that bicycles should be permitted on HOV lanes because such encouragement would remove motor vehicles off the road. He did have some concerns however, with respect to 3(d) of 41B whereby it states cycling is permitted "by authorized signs"; by default, cyclists should be permitted to use HOV lanes except where it is not safe to do so. Since the text does not indicate that, he suggested the committee consider the following definition instead: "The operation of a bicycle except when signed otherwise."

With respect to the comment made by the delegation about signage for cyclists traveling from the east, Councillor Legendre referred to the Region's Cyclist Guide Map and noted that that area does not have signed cycling routes indicated and if signage is to be used, he questioned how staff will direct cyclists correctly. D. Brousseau indicated the Department's preference would be to make a positive statement rather than a negative one and suggested that for cyclists coming from the east and arriving at Regional Road 174, it would be better to direct them elsewhere rather than saying they cannot continue along the road. He noted these routes are not signed according to the map and agreed to consult with RCAG to solicit their input in this regard.

Chris Bradshaw stated that because of the different character of the Airport Parkway, he hoped that whatever the committee and Council adopt, it is clear what that difference is between it and Regional Road 174, for instance. From a pedestrian point of view, the Parkway is not as important a route to walk parallel to, as it is a point to cross. He referred to the two transitway stations along the Parkway between Hunt Club and Walkley and the reluctance of people to walk to those stations because of safety concerns. He suspected that fear will only increase when the access ramps are built. He hoped the Committee would direct staff to come forward with ways to improve the walking access to the transitway stations instead of people having to take a local bus to those locations. In response to one of his concerns, the Commissioner emphasized that pedestrian prohibition is very specific to Regional Road 174 only.

Dick Howey believed a lot of problems and questions raised today could have been avoided if both subjects were not brought forward together in one report. He realized staff were trying to cover different situations, but felt they should have been dealt with completely independent of each other.

Councillor Doucet was not in favour of recommending the Airport Parkway as a controlled access roadway at this time because of the ongoing dispute over the use of that road. He was concerned about limited, controlled access because the designation simply shifts the use of that road from a small to a much larger scale. In response to these comments, D. Brousseau advised that the character of the road may change if different

accesses are permitted and he maintained this is a way of ensuring the Parkway does not become like any other Regional road because it is different in that it connects to the Airport.

Councillor Meilleur agreed with the comments made by a previous speaker that the designation of HOV lanes should be a minimum of three persons per vehicle, especially since that is the stipulation in Hull; she was concerned that motorists traveling in the HOV lane from Ottawa to Hull may be fined since the two are not compatible. D. Brousseau advised that staff proposed that wording to provide committee and Council full flexibility to do whatever it wants.

It was noted that the National Capital Commission (NCC) have proposed the expanded Champlain Bridge be for 2+ persons in the HOV lane and Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen indicated that if committee agrees to increase the amount to a minimum of three persons per vehicle in an HOV lane, perhaps the NCC should be asked to amend their proposed designation for that bridge to reflect that change.

Moved by M Meilleur

That Section 1, Definition 19(a) be amended to read: “high occupancy vehicle or HOV means a motor vehicle carrying three or more persons including the driver.”

CARRIED

Moved by M. McGoldrick-Larsen

That a letter be sent to the National Capital Commission requesting their acceptance of the above Motion.

CARRIED

At the request of Councillor Doucet, the Committee separated Recommendation 1(b) to vote individually on the two roadway designations as follows:

That the Transportation Committee recommend Council approve:

- 1. That the Traffic and Parking By-law No. 1 of 1996 be amended to;**
 - (a) establish the new regulations for controlled-access roads and HOV lanes, as described in the report;**
 - (b) designate;**

- (i) **Regional Road 79 (the Airport Parkway) between Bronson Avenue and the MacDonald-Cartier International Airport, and;**

LOST

YEAS: M. Bellemare....1

NAYS: W. Byrne, L. Davis, C. Doucet, D. Holmes, J. Legendre,
M. McGoldrick-Larsen, M. Meilleur....7

- (ii) **Regional Road 174 (former Highway 17) between Highway 417 and Regional Road 57 (Trim Road);**

as controlled-access roads;

- (c) **amend Section 73 by adding the phrase “motor assisted bicycle” immediately following the word “bicycle”;**
- (d) **amend Schedule XXVIII to prohibit bicycles, motor assisted bicycles and animals on the section of Regional Road 174 designated as a controlled-access road;**
- (e) **amend Schedule XVIIIID to prohibit pedestrians on the section of Regional Road 174 designated as a controlled-access road, and;**
- (f) **amend Section 1 by deleting the phrase “Section 36 of the *Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act* or” from the definition of “controlled-access road”;**

2. **That the Environment and Transportation Commissioner be delegated the authority to establish HOV lanes and controlled-access roads, as required, subject to Council approved and Departmental policies, and in accordance with the provisions of the Traffic and Parking By-law No. 1 of 1996, as amended.**

CARRIED as amended

REGULAR ITEMS

2. SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION

- Co-ordinator, Transportation Committee report dated 9 Feb 98
- Report entitled "State of the Debate: The Road to Sustainable Transportation in Canada" *previously distributed via Co-ordinator, Transportation Committee memorandum dated 9 Feb 98*

For discussion

DEFERRED TO 18 MAR

3. LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT PILOT PROJECT

- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner report dated 4 Feb 98

Pamela Sweet, Director, Policy and Infrastructure Planning Division made the following comments:

- this process is new to the Region and is a whole new approach to a public/private partnership; it is important to achieve maximum benefit at minimum cost;
- in order to obtain innovative solutions, staff are seeking input from the private sector and others that have that expertise, through a Solicitation of Interest (SOI) process; vendors or consortiums that come forward will be encouraged to work together with various groups;
- in return for sharing some of the risk, the Region will be able to share some of the benefits through the competitive nature of the private sector;
- in order to ensure confidentiality at certain phases of the process, staff want to have the best legal and management services available - a management consulting firm that has been involved in similar public/private partnerships;
- one of the critical aspects of this process is the input from the public and during the SOI and Request for Proposal (RFP) stages, there will be opportunities to get public input;
- changes were made to the membership of the Sounding Board (Annex C) to include the City Centre Coalition, Public Works and the Public Advisory Committee on Light Rail; a member of Regional Council as well as a representative from STO were also recommended;
- staff are confident that a joint partnership with the private sector that have the expertise to plan and implement this rail system, will result in a maximization of

potential and will achieve Council's original objective to test this type of transit through a pilot project, the whole purpose being to increase transit ridership.

Councillor Davis made reference to the interest expressed by the Outaouais in 1993 with respect to commuter rail, and questioned whether there had been any outreach since that time to that community. P. Sweet advised there had not and although they were very interested, staff had not had any further input from them. The councillor further questioned whether staff have made contact with other commuter rail success stories in Canada and gained by that information. P. Sweet confirmed there have been some contacts made and staff will continue to do that throughout the process.

Councillor Davis further questioned whether staff had contacted Canadian Pacific (CP) or Canadian National Railways (CN) with a view to their input. Ms. Sweet stated that staff have had initial meetings with CP (St. Lawrence & Hudson), and also with CN representatives: VIA, Siemens and Bombardier. The councillor noted that when the Region initially envisioned this project, the line would run to the Outaouais and P. Sweet indicated that although the Region's Official Plan and Transportation Master Plan (TMP) recommended the Bayview southerly route, staff would like opportunities for expansion beyond e.g. across the river, down to the airport, other directions. The councillor inquired whether staff would be looking through this process to determine if CP and CN can work co-operatively together with a joint proposal and P. Sweet advised those companies were looking at that possibility.

Councillor Legendre questioned whether or not this project is in fact for a north/south pilot, noting the Motion approved by Council on 28 January 1998 referred to consideration of that link. Ms. Sweet agreed there was a lot of potential for that route, but indicated staff wanted to make this first step wide enough that it did not preclude an opportunity to provide access on the east/west CN corridor. The councillor was concerned that opening it up in that fashion would create a bigger process and could very well extend past the proposed launch in 1999. P. Sweet advised that through the SOI, there may be some interest put forward in meeting the time line, as well as interest in doing something beyond that and staff were reluctant to preclude that opportunity. The councillor recognized this pilot should be done at minimum cost and was concerned about the process getting bigger with a higher cost at the end. P. Sweet assured the councillor that one of the reasons staff recommend the SOI is to keep it at minimum cost.

Councillor Legendre further questioned how long the pilot will last and P. Sweet advised that the successful pilot project will take approximately 4 to 5 years in order for it to be properly tested. The affordability of that pilot depends on how the Region evaluates the project i.e. performance measurements will have to be established so it can be determined whether it is a success. Councillor Legendre noted a similar pilot project was carried out for only six months in Calgary and was deemed a success at the end of that period. He was concerned about the time line quoted by staff because of the additional costs that would be incurred. The councillor hoped the proposal will be widely distributed in order to capture the technology available in other cities. Ms. Sweet confirmed the SOI will be

distributed through a very wide network. With respect to the potential members of the Sounding Board, Councillor Legendre proposed that the Ottawa-Carleton Economic Development Corporation be added to that list.

Barbara Ramsay, Public Advisory Committee on Commuter Rail National Capital Transportation Task Force was very impressed with the report and commended staff for their efforts. She truly respected the quality of the document and could see in this document a serious attempt to develop and talk to a process that allows for a “win-win” situation. She believed the Region must recognize the serious challenges it faces and in her view, the overriding concern of the Committee should be the declining ridership at OC Transpo because it impacts funding, the future of the downtown core and the environment, and will have a serious impact on the economical growth of the Region.

Ms. Ramsay recognized staff’s technical limitations and experience with respect to this technology and that there could very well be limitations in the management of that process. She believed it is critical that in view of the acknowledged shortage of expertise, that staff seek a consultancy on this project - a management consultant with an abundant level of expertise developing private/public partnerships. She emphasized that the Committee must recognize that the technical expertise may lie outside the Region and suggested it is important to describe more fully the qualifications of the consultants the Region is seeking. She stated the Region will have no success if it does not have confidence in the process and all potential bidders, future partners and the public must also have confidence in the process; it has to be transparent. To ensure such a process, she suggested creating a Steering Group that would bring together the expertise the Region needs to build, manage and develop this process. This body would be made up of 9 members as follows: 1 management consultant, 1 technical consultant, 2 Regional councillors (members of the Transportation Committee), 1 representative from both the Transportation and Planning Departments, 1 representative from OC Transpo, a non-RMOC representative from the Office of the Regional Chair and a non-RMOC representative selected by the Transportation Committee. She recommended that this group report directly to the Transportation Committee, that it have the ability to review and ratify its own project process and to develop and ensure an effective process of communications.

With respect to the process, Ms. Ramsay believed the Statement of Requirements (SOR) is very well addressed by staff, but felt this document should be developed with the assistance of a fully complete management consultant to ensure that what is being built is sustainable.

Ms. Ramsay was concerned about some of the detail contained within the SOI phase, noting it will take up a substantial amount of staff’s working time. She believed the visioning in the SOI could well be included in a Request for Proposal (RFP) if it were properly developed and created. By removing the SOI from the process, she believed it would shorten the timelines to the point that staff will have no difficulty reporting to Council by June on where the process is and an RFP can be put out to the community

before the summer begins and would be two months faster than what is being proposed by staff. In addition, a bidder would better respond with their best ideas when they are answering to an RFP. She suggested that once the draft SRO is created, it should be provided to the Steering Committee for review and recommendation to the Transportation Committee. Following a review of the RFP, any modifications can then be made by the Steering Committee to the Transportation Committee as well.

Ms. Ramsay concluded by stating that while the Sounding Board is a viable body, it should not be considered as adequate outreach for a process as precedent-setting as this. The Steering Group being proposed will allow the Transportation Committee an opportunity to ensure all information is brought to bear in a timely fashion and will ensure what many would think a very transparent process to potential bidders. She urged committee members to give this serious consideration.

In response to these proposals, P. Sweet agreed there were some benefits to having a Steering Committee and it would be worth considering. She was reluctant, however, to eliminate the SOI phase because this report was drafted with a two-phase approach: the SOI then the RFP. She was concerned that if the Committee agreed to go directly with an RFP, it might limit the Region before it could distribute this proposal further. Further, if the RFP did not ask too much from the bidders at the beginning, staff would get back some good feedback they might not otherwise receive if they went to very detailed specifications.

Nick Tunnacliffe, Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner, added that when the SOI goes out, it might not be expressed in the same way but staff have used some of these more detailed points so the Committee and the public can get a sense of the things staff would want considered. With respect to the creation of a Steering Committee, he acknowledged there is a working committee of staff which the consultants would join when they are appointed, so the suggestion by Ms. Ramsay is essentially the same, with the exception of the addition of Regional councillors and public representatives. He went on to explain that this process must respect confidentiality of information that might be put forward in terms of bids and the larger the group, the more difficult it becomes to manage that confidentiality.

Councillor Meillen proposed that:

Under the Chairmanship of the Director, Policy and Infrastructure Planning Division, a Light Rail Transit Project Steering Committee be appointed composed of 9 members as follows:

- 1 Management Consultant (in public-private partnership)
- 1 Technical Consultant (in rail project)
- 2 Councillors (members of Transportation Committee)
- 1 staff from the RMOC Planning Department
- 1 OC Transpo representative

- 2 representatives from the community
- 1 staff from the Environment and Transportation Department

- the Committee will report on a regular basis to the Transportation Committee;
- the Committee will review and ratify the Project process;
- the Committee will ensure that the community is consulted throughout the process.

Councillor Doucet supported the Motion, because it provides an opportunity to get this project started and gives the Region some independence in seeing it through to completion. He agreed that participants are very reluctant to commit money and time to an SOI because they see it as a very unclear process. He believed people will want to be involved and if that means extending the RFP process to ensure there is adequate input at the various levels he would accept that.

David Jeanes, Transport 2000 indicated this is a volunteer advocacy group with over 20 years experience in transportation matters. They are interested in working with staff and are ready and willing to participate on the Sounding Board. They agreed that input should be received from more than just the potential bidders, because the public has a lot to say on issues such as service levels, location of stations, links with the transitway, et cetera. With respect to the latter, they strongly agree that light rail is complimentary to transit and in no way competes with or duplicates that service. Transport 2000 believes the SOR must be open to committee and public review because time is of the essence and in addition, the terms of the RFP should also be open for review. He agreed with public consultation at the earliest possible moment and that the meaning of the term "at minimum cost" referred to in the Transportation Master Plan be clearly set out. With respect to the selection of vehicle equipment he believed that could be started sooner while at the same time, allowing more consideration of other issues such as route selection, transitway interchange points, et cetera, independent of whether the vehicle is going to be supplied by one manufacturer or another. In closing, he emphasized that public consultation must be incorporated with this process and there must be input from more than just the potential bidders.

Cam Robertson, Linda Hoad, City Centre Coalition indicated the Coalition is made up of nine community organizations and they are very enthusiastic about the light rail pilot project going ahead, hopefully on the north/south line. They support the idea of a Steering Group and encouraged the committee to ensure that there is adequate budget and commitment to move this pilot project ahead on the time lines that have been laid out.

As the representative for the Hintonburg Community Association on the Coalition, Ms. Hoad indicated her community is bordered by the CP rail line and were active participants in the CP Rail Feasibility Study. She emphasized the importance of this being an open and transparent process and that the public be involved at the earliest possible phase. She believed the public should be involved in setting the parameters of the project

in order to avoid any misunderstanding or recriminations at the end. She emphasized there has to be an opportunity for the public to have input each step of the way and to this end, she supported the proposal for a Steering Committee. She wanted assurance that this group and any others, are aware of the need to keep the public informed.

David Gladstone, Centretown Citizens Community Association/Chair, Public Advisory Committee for the Airport Parkway Traffic Study distributed a letter dated 18 February 1998. He indicated that the implementation of light rail (specifically in the CP corridor) should be treated as a real planning reality for RMOC staff. In particular, he suggested committee give specific direction to the Airport Parkway Extended Traffic Impact Study that it address as integral to its study of the future of traffic in the Airport Parkway/Bronson corridor, options for light rail implementation. The basic aim is that light rail should be implemented in such a fashion as to remove the need for any significant expansion of the Airport Parkway in the future. He firmly believed that light rail in the CP corridor is a necessity if the objectives of the TMP and the Official Plan are to be addressed. With the anticipated growth around the airport and unless transit measures are implemented, there will be more people driving north toward centretown and he urged committee to consider his suggestion.

When questioned what staff think of the delegation's suggestion, N. Tunnacliffe advised the basic information used in the Airport Parkway Extended Traffic Impact Study came from the work that came out of the TMP in terms of the travel demand and modal splits, et cetera, but was not sure what else the delegation was looking for.

By way of clarification, Mr. Gladstone indicated that the principles of the TMP as he understands it are that wherever possible, increases in traffic demand are to be met through means other than road expansions. Therefore, he wanted to see those principles applied in the Airport Parkway/Bronson corridor. The terms of reference of the Traffic Impact Study do not have any real provision for how implementation of light rail on the CP corridor could contain or limit traffic along the roads in that corridor and that is what he wanted that study to address. Mr. Gladstone found it disturbing that there has been a resistance during the Traffic Impact Study to look at it that way and there has been a tendency to recognize the growing traffic problem and look at measures to reduce congestion. He believed the Region should look at how light rail can contain this growing traffic problem.

The Commissioner advised that if there is a fault, it lies in the terms of reference of that study because the two scenarios for the medium and long term both envisaged a twinned Airport Parkway. He made reference to recent Minutes of the Steering Committee where there was an indication that staff would be asked to change the terms of reference to reflect a two-laned Airport Parkway and that will have to be discussed by the Steering Committee. The idea of keeping a two-laned Parkway is also linked to increasing use of pilot rail and so it will be another component which will require a change to the terms of reference which staff will have to discuss with the Committee.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen made reference to the concerns raised by a previous delegation about declining ridership. She questioned whether this is an Ottawa-Carleton phenomenon or whether other large cities across Canada or North America experience this trend and whether light rail resolved the problems of decreased ridership in other cities. In response to these questions, Helen Gault, Manager, Planning and Development, OC Transpo indicated that in the early 1990's the trend was universal and Ottawa-Carleton did pretty well. In 1996, the work stoppage affected ridership, but she maintained the Region is back holding its own. With respect to the effect of light rail on ridership in Edmonton and Calgary, she indicated that their trips per capita are considerably lower than in Ottawa-Carleton. However, she did not believe that meant light rail would not enhance OC Transpo ridership, especially as a compliment to the rapid transit system. In the end, convenience, speed and reliability are what transit riders are looking for.

John Kane, Glebe Community Association spoke briefly to the committee, noting the proposal should include more than just a north/south rail link. He strongly supported the suggestion for a Steering Committee as well as public consultation early in the process. In this regard, the Glebe Community Association would like to participate and be involved in any way in this project.

Darrell Richards, Transport Concepts made the following comments:

- the timing as laid out will make it difficult to have successful implementation by December 1999 because by the time the agreement is finalized with the successful bidder, there would not be enough time to secure the acquisition of the equipment;
- the SOI, as described in the document, is confusing and adds eight weeks to the process and creates uncertainty for the private sector; when the Region sends out the RFP, it is with the hope the private sector will go the extra mile to contribute some innovative ideas, but through a SOI, those companies will hold back some of their best ideas in case the project is awarded to another company; therefore, by eliminating the SOI phase, the RFP will encourage the bidders to be more creative and this will also save more time;
- reference in the report to "minimum service" issue implies that the SOR will specify the minimum level of service while the private sector could have flexibility in other issues; this is a critical issue because that is what will determine the Region's operating and capital costs and if not handled properly, may result in a doubling of the capital costs if the minimum level of service is specified as too frequent a service;
- there is the risk and the future of the infrastructure itself; CP has restructured its freight operation away from the Ottawa area until the Region has determined whether it will proceed with light rail; if the rail company believes that process will be too drawn out, there may not be any tracks to run on by the time the Region decides what it wants to do;

- he supported the suggestion for the creation of a Steering Committee because that would increase confidence in the process; this will also be an opportunity for the Transportation Committee to ensure the project is implemented successfully.

It was questioned where the public consultation process fits in with the RFP and the Commissioner advised that unless there is public consultation around the “draft” RFP, there would not be any. With respect to the involvement of the Steering Committee, the Commissioner indicated they would be intimately concerned with drafting the RFP, but if a consultation period were to be added, it would add more time to the process. It was suggested the draft RFP come to the Transportation Committee and this would give the public an opportunity to comment.

Councillor Davis questioned whether staff objected to the suggestion to go directly to an RFP and N. Tunnacliffe advised the SOI is there to get ideas from different components in the private sector which could then be incorporated in the final RFP. Also, it allows time for interested parties in the private sector to form consortiums. The councillor noted that the local rail companies may be approached by various independent manufacturers of the different equipment with a view to a joint bid and felt the numbers would become tainted if there were that many people bidding and CN/CP also controlling the cost in terms of the use of their lines. The Solicitor advised that if they get to that stage, those rail companies will be very careful about consortium and making a joint bid and he felt they could handle it quite well. In response to another question posed by the councillor, he confirmed the rail companies could squeeze any consortium from using their line or could refuse them to use it.

In consider Councillor Meilleur’s Motion, Councillor Davis inquired whether there would be a budget requirement for the management or technical consultant and staff advised that if this is approved by the Committee, staff would go forward with a proposal for those positions and bring forward a report to the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee. Staff is proposing the establishment of a capital program for this project, but with the delay in the budget this year, it is suggested that surplus funds within the Departmental budget be used, in anticipation Council will establish a capital program.

Moved by M. Meilleur

That the Transportation Committee recommend Council approve:

That under the Chairmanship of the Director, Policy and Infrastructure Planning Division, a Light Rail Transit Project Steering Committee be appointed composed of 9 members as follows:

- 1 Management Consultant (in public-private partnership)**
- 1 Technical Consultant (in rail project)**
- 2 Councillors (members of Transportation Committee)**
- 1 staff from the RMOC Planning Department**
- 1 OC Transpo representative**
- 2 representatives from the community**
- 1 staff from the Environment and Transportation Department**

- **the Committee will report on a regular basis to the Transportation Committee;**
- **the Committee will review and ratify the Project process;**
- **the Committee will ensure that the community is consulted throughout the process;**

CARRIED

Moved by L. Davis

That the Solicitation of Interest (SOI) step be eliminated and staff go directly to a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the Light Rail Project.

CARRIED

Councillor Legendre proposed: “That Barbara Ramsay and Harry Gow be designated as the community representatives on the Steering Committee.” He explained that Barbara Ramsay is well known in the community and as she indicated, is very interested in light rail. He also recommended Harry Gow because he has been a long-standing member of Transport 2000 and is very interested in light and high speed rail and has a strong interest in the community. Some members believed it would be better to advertise for those positions and give members of the public an opportunity to come forward to express interest. In addition, there was reluctance on the part of some members to approve names of individuals they were not familiar with and whether those people would even be accepting of the nomination. It was also noted that some of the delegations that spoke had offered their assistance and perhaps they should be given the opportunity to voice their interest in serving on the Steering Committee. Conversely, other members agreed

that time was a serious consideration and were prepared to move ahead as quickly as possible to appoint the two community representatives.

Councillor Byrne suggested that members of the public who are interested in serving on the Steering Committee could submit their names or Councillors could submit their names and then at least a decision can be made within the next several days.

Councillor Legendre recognized the tight time line and believed the committee should move ahead quickly, keeping in mind that advertising and selecting candidates may take a month to complete. Some councillors recalled that people came forward quite quickly with names for the Disaster Relief Committee and it was questioned whether a similar process could be initiated. P. Sweet hoped the first meeting of the Steering Committee would be early in March and therefore agreed with an expedient process.

As the Committee could not come to an agreement on the principle of the Motion, the councillor agreed to withdraw it.

In considering the membership on the Sounding Board, the Committee agreed to add OCEDCO and the Société de transport de l'Outaouais (STO). Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen questioned whether the groups listed on the Sounding Board will be representative of issues facing suburban communities with regards to transportation. The Commissioner advised that the Sounding Board would include community groups along the selected corridor; however, the councillor felt there could be an impact on other corridors and it is important for a wider-spread input of the suburban communities. She suggested including representation from the eastern (Cumberland/Gloucester), western (Kanata) and southern (Nepean) suburban communities.

When questioned how those names will be selected, Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen suggested a Regional Councillor could bring forward a name or perhaps they could be selected through an advertising process. She then suggested that a request be sent to the three suburban cities asking for a representative and P. Sweet advised that staff have a list of community associations or they can leave it to the Selection Committee to make up the final composition of the Sounding Board. The councillor agreed with this suggestion and added that caveat to her Motion.

Moved by M. McGoldrick-Larsen

The Sounding Board also include one member each from the eastern, western and southern suburban communities of the Region and that the selection be made by the Steering Committee.

CARRIED

Councillor Davis noted that during discussions on commuter rail, there were lists of people who are involved and interested and suggested there may be additional names that should be added to the Sounding Board. Staff confirmed they do not intend to exclude those groups, but suggested it would be better to establish a list of interested people to be included on a mailing list and invited to special meetings. Councillor Davis did not share this view and stated many of those who are interested would sit quietly and take in the information being discussed and then report back to their communities. She hoped at least that the meetings of the Sounding Board would be in a large enough room so that others could attend and speak or observe as they feel necessary.

Councillor Legendre proposed that Councillor Doucet be designated a member of the Steering Committee.

Councillor Byrne proposed that Councillor Davis be named as the RMOC representative to the Light Rail Transit Pilot Project Steering Committee.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen indicated her interest in serving on the Steering Committee as well.

Councillor Meilleur suggested members of the Committee who are absent at this time should also be given an opportunity to express their interest and suggested the decisions for the public and elected representatives should be made at the same time.

On the process of appointing the two public representatives, the committee agreed that a notice would be sent to all members of Council asking for their suggestions for public representatives on the Steering Committee, as well as a canvas of Transportation Committee members to determine their interest in serving on that committee. They agreed the deadline for submission would be 25 February 1998 and immediately following the Council meeting that day, the Transportation Committee would convene to consider the elected and public nominations to the committee.

RESPONSE TO MOTIONS/INQUIRES

4. CLOSING AND SALE OF PART OF INNES ROAD - INQUIRY TC-3-98
- joint Regional Solicitor, Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner and Environment and Transportation Commissioner report dated 11 Feb 98

The Solicitor Ernest McArthur, provided a brief overview of this matter as detailed in the staff report.

Councillor Legendre questioned what happens with the objections that have been received as a result of the newspaper advertisement and Mr. McArthur advised that if the City of Gloucester agrees to continue the process, they will hold the public hearing and hear the

objections at that time. He confirmed nothing could be done by the Transportation Committee now.

Councillor Bloess, City of Gloucester believed the road was downloaded on the municipality, despite its objections, and the Region initiated the public hearing process which he claimed his staff had not been notified about. When he inquired about this matter to Regional staff, he recalled that there appeared to be some confusion as to the status of the matter. Mr. Bloess denied the statement in the report that the City had not responded to the Region's request and referred to a letter dated December 19 which clearly states the City's position. He explained Gloucester will not proceed with the sale and will not relinquish the land as it has not been determined whether or not there will be a future need for this right-of-way i.e. sidewalk. He suggested the Region not proceed with this issue, or request the money from the sale of the portion of Innes Road.

The councillor also inquired about the multi-coloured concrete blocks at this location and wondered when they will be removed.

That the Transportation Committee and Council receive this report for information.

CARRIED

INQUIRIES

Airport Parkway

Councillor Doucet distributed copies of a letter dated 4 December 1997 from the Ministry of the Environment to a resident of his ward. He noted the Ministry states that "none of the review agencies raised any significant concerns with the proposed project...however...I am requesting that the RMOC undertake a monitoring program to assess and confirm the effects of this project and to review the results of this monitoring prior to any other ramps or road work to the Airport Parkway". The councillor referred to the draft budget estimates distributed to Council and noted there is \$1.7M allotted for "Airport Parkway Structures", \$915,000 for Airport Parkway Ramps, \$1.1M for the Hunt Club Road Ramps. He questioned what that money is for. The Environment and Transportation Commissioner advised this is the rehabilitation of the existing structure. The councillor requested that in writing and the Commissioner agreed to comply.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

CO-ORDINATOR

CHAIR