

MINUTES

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

19 MAY 1999

1:30 P.M.

PRESENT

Chair: D. Holmes

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

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That the Transportation Committee confirm the Minutes of the meeting of 5 May 1999.

CARRIED

POSTPONEMENTS AND DEFERRALS

1. RED LIGHT CAMERAS - STATUS REPORT

- A/Deputy Commissioner, Environment and Transportation Department report dated 1 Apr 99

Chris Brinkman, Traffic Control Engineer, provided a detailed overview of what has transpired since the passing of the legislation last December regarding red light cameras. The more salient points noted were as follows:

- Bill 101, Red Light Camera Pilot Projects Act, allows municipalities to test red light camera systems that will allow for the prosecution of red light offenders and once proclaimed, the legislation will be in effect for two years after which time it may or may not be continued;

Note: 1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.
2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 26 May and 9 June 1999 in Transportation Committee Reports 37 and 38.

- one of the key parts of the legislation is that municipalities who choose to participate must also implement stepped-up police enforcement at high risk intersections; the goal is to compare the effectiveness of this technology vs stepped- up police enforcement blitzes;
- last March, several municipalities (including Ottawa-Carleton, Toronto, Peel, Mississauga, Hamilton, Oakville, Windsor, Waterloo and others) formed a joint municipal Steering Committee to address the common issues involved in setting up such a project and to address provincial requirements for the comparison of enforcement options;
- funding of the installation and operation of the cameras rests with the municipalities and all costs the province incurs will have to be reimbursed through a portion of the fine revenues collected;
- there will be financial implications involved in the stepped-up police enforcement; however, the Insurance Corporation of Canada have recently established the “Road Safety Value Partnership Fund” in the amount of \$1M; this amount has been met by the province and municipalities will be required to match those funds; however, the money can be put towards additional police enforcement and not necessarily for the red light camera pilot project;
- the Region has not established a budget for this pilot project or the additional police enforcement required to operate the program;
- revenue generated by red light running is currently remitted to the province, however, the transfer of the Provincial Offences Act (POA) to the Region may make those revenues available to the RMOC as early as this fall.

In response to a question posed by Councillor Cantin, Mr. Brinkman anticipated the Act to be proclaimed before the end of the year, or as soon as the municipalities are ready to start. In this regard, the Steering Committee is attempting to endorse a joint start date of municipalities. The Director of Mobility Services, Doug Brousseau reminded committee this is a two-year pilot project and, theoretically, will start when the first municipality is ready to go. He indicated that Toronto has already established a budget for this activity and its Mayor is eager to start; however, other municipalities, including the Region, will not be ready any time soon and therefore may not have the benefit of the full two years to monitor and evaluate the pilot.

Councillor Cantin recollected that several months ago when this issue was considered by the committee and Council, staff were requested to investigate whether local suppliers of this technology would be willing to participate and provide an opportunity to evaluate the various equipment. D. Brousseau confirmed that while staff did meet with the two main

suppliers, they were concentrating their efforts on this initiative. He added that staff are confident this technology will be successful, as shown by the results of testing in other areas. The councillor indicated the previous direction was to evaluate the equipment under "local" conditions. D. Brousseau doubted the suppliers would be willing to come in at this point in time because of the anticipated start-time of the pilot and the Department does not have the time or resources to run a pilot *and* be involved in weekly meetings in Toronto.

When questioned whether staff were perhaps suggesting this issue not be pursued further, D. Brousseau indicated this should be an option for consideration, but suggested it may be best to direct staff to prepare a budget for 2000 and the pilot could be discussed during the committee's budget deliberations.

When questioned whether the revenues generated by the fines would come to the municipalities, the Legal Department representative, David White, advised that the province has made a commitment that POA revenue (which has been accumulating as of January 1998), is being held in trust for municipalities. The Region will be in a position by September or October to have an agreement in place with the province that will allow the ongoing remittance of POA fine revenue to the Region.

Councillor Byrne requested clarification that any way the Region can finance the cameras is permitted, as long as it is not through the Insurance Corporation of Canada. D. Brousseau confirmed this is how staff understand it, and added that Council will have to come up with a third of the cost of enforcement, the cost of which is not yet known since the province has not defined what stepped-up enforcement means.

In response to a previous staff comment, Councillor Doucet did not care whether or not the supplier makes money on this venture, but whether or not the Region can actually get red light cameras. He maintained that the debate for this technology is not being fought for because it generates revenues, but because it increases safety.

Councillor Legendre remarked that red light cameras are a proven technology and the real issue before committee is the question of enforcement. Whether the Region gets the revenue from elsewhere, he still believed funds should be put into the budget and therefore proposed that funding be provided in next year's budget to install two red light cameras and eight casings (housings for the cameras). There was some discussion about including a dollar figure in the Motion, but the Commissioner suggested using the term "approximately" to describe the number of cameras and casings. Councillor Legendre concurred with this amendment. It was explained that staff are currently charging their time on this to the Safety Improvement Program.

Moved by J. Legendre

That funding be provided in the 2000 budget to install approximately 2 red light cameras with approximately 8 casings.

CARRIED as amended

D. Brousseau directed the committee's attention to the large boards in the room, illustrating "Red means stop"; these panels will be mounted on the sides of the Region's large trucks and the campaign itself will be officially unveiled as part of Road Safety Challenge Week beginning 31 May. This campaign is being lead by staff in conjunction with community partnerships. In light of the fact there are no funds to air this message over radio and television, it was suggested the media be requested to broadcast the message, free of charge, as a public service announcement, perhaps even including an interview with the Committee Chair. D. Brousseau confirmed such initiatives will be undertaken, in consultation with Information and Public Affairs.

Councillor Doucet indicated "Good Neighbour Driving Day", a Glebe Traffic Group initiative, will be happening the same week and questioned whether this campaign can be incorporated with the Region's. Mr. Brousseau agreed to investigate, with a view to partnering with the Glebe Traffic Group.

Councillor Cantin made note of some Regional trucks he had seen which had space for advertising panels but had nothing in them. He suggested if a campaign has ended and staff are waiting for another one to kick off, then perhaps the old panels should remain until such time as they are replaced. D. Brousseau noted it is a challenge to keep the fleet in operation while making changes to the panels, but he agreed with the suggestion. The councillor further suggested using bumper stickers to convey this message on their vehicles.

2. **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT STUDY - LIGHT RAIL PILOT PROJECT**
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner report dated 4 May 99

Following a general overview of the report, Vivi Chi, Senior Project Manager, stated that parallel to the environmental assessment process (EAS) discussions are ongoing with CP Rail to develop a public/private partnership to deal with the construction/operation of the pilot project and this will be the subject of a future report to committee. She reminded committee the EAS does not look at station design solutions, but rather, the impact of the station envelopes on the surrounding communities. The preferred stations will be decided later on, outside the EA approach. The EA will also examine the operational impacts of the entire line, siding locations, natural environment, noise, vibration and air quality.

Mike Flainek, Dillon Consulting provided a general overview of the station designs as proposed in the report, as well as the issues and impacts surrounding the project and the mitigating measures to be taken with the proposed designs.

Councillor Cantin inquired how much money has been spent on this project to date and Ms. Chi advised that approximately \$350,000 has been spent for the EAS, and approximately six months of staff time. While she recognized there is a budget cap for the pilot project, she advised that the recommendations of the EA show that within the station envelopes, there can be any number of design options, with each bearing their own cost ramifications. Staff did not take that on as part of the EA study because that is CP's responsibility.

Councillor Bellemare questioned whether the costs associated with the mitigation factors identified in the report are part of the original budget of \$16M. Pamela Sweet, Director, Policy and Infrastructure Planning Division advised that it was not entirely known at the time the original estimates were made, what mitigation would be necessary. However, staff are trying to impress upon CP Rail the fact that these are costs of the project and must be included in their proposal. She added that the fencing for the noise barriers also has to be included as a potential expense, depending on the outcome of a monitoring process once the pilot is underway.

The councillor was somewhat uncomfortable with the wording of the recommendation because the committee was being asked to approve specific recommendations regarding infrastructure requirements, but which have not been costed. Ms. Chi explained that the committee is not being asked to approve a dollar amount at this time; an EA is a stand-alone from the other negotiations with CP and will feed into their proposal i.e. if noise levels are high, CP will have to budget for a noise wall. Staff have identified areas of mitigation and whoever picks up this project will have to adhere to the conclusions of the study. She indicated that detailed design for the stations will still have to come forward for approval and committee would have an opportunity to discuss it at that time. Simply put, staff are seeking committee and Council's approval of the location of the five stations (and the three additional stations should the system be expanded), the siding location at Carleton University and the three potential sites for noise barriers and the privacy fence at Traverse Drive. Ms. Chi confirmed that the costs associated with the infrastructure requirements out of the EA will be part of the budget that will be brought forward from CP Rail.

David Jeanes indicated his support for the whole process, noting it has been very open and extremely thorough. He was very impressed with the level of public volunteer time commitment to this project and made note of how well-attended and well-represented the meetings had been. He believed that the EA process has been meticulous and perhaps a little over-cautious, but it has been a good process and has had a high level of scrutiny. He reminded committee that this is a pilot project and believed that not all questions can be answered before proceeding further. He maintained that the Region must be prepared to take a few risks because if it doesn't, it runs the risk of using the rail network currently being made available. He encouraged committee to accept the EA and that the project move forward as expeditiously as possible.

Lois K. Smith was concerned that the “pedestrian maze” being proposed will not prevent people from getting across the railway and she strongly suggested that a gate be installed to ensure people cannot cut across the tracks when a train may be coming. In addition, caution should be taken to ensure that any future details for the station platforms e.g. sidings and spurs, are not accessible to pedestrians. She further suggested that any privacy fences required should be installed to avoid any future problems. With respect to the visual impact of the train tracks, she suggested artwork could be put in at various stations.

That the Transportation Committee recommend Council approve:

- 1. The recommendations of the Environmental Assessment Study regarding infrastructure requirements and mitigation plans for light rail operations in the CP Rail corridor;**
- 2. The preparation and submission of the Environmental Assessment Report for approval, in compliance with the Provincial Environmental Assessment Act and the Federal Environmental Assessment Act.**

CARRIED

3. PRESTON STREET - PROPOSED PORTAL ARCH
- Director, Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services report dated 30 Apr 99

That Transportation Committee recommend Council approve the construction of a portal arch across Preston Street at a point 9 m south of Sydney Street as illustrated in Annex B, subject to the Preston Street Business Improvement Association:

- 1. Funding the total construction, annual maintenance, and operational costs; and;**
- 2. Executing a legal agreement with respect to the above.**

CARRIED

4. FUNDING TRANSPORTATION IN OTTAWA-CARLETON

- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner report dated 4 May 99

Pamela Sweet, Director, Policy and Infrastructure Planning Division advised that prior to provincial restructuring, the province collected over \$200M from the Region and spent, through subsidies, \$115M in Ottawa-Carleton, plus \$15M for its own highways, for a total of \$130M. Following this restructuring, however, the province continues to collect the same amount of money from transportation taxes from gasoline, licenses and registration fees, even though it has downloaded 40% of its roads to the Region. And, while it spent approximately \$10M for those roads, it gave nothing to the Region by way of subsidies. She further indicated that the federal government collects \$100M from Ottawa-Carleton as fuel taxes and while it spends 10% of that nationally, it has spent next to nothing on the Region and virtually nothing on transit.

Ms. Sweet explained that prior to 1997, property taxes provided more than half of the Region's funding sources, with 25% coming from provincial subsidies, 20% from transit fares and 2% from regional development charges (RDC). With the lack of provincial subsidies however, more funding will come from the property tax base and transit fees. In calculating the anticipated expenditures (operating and capital) associated with the Transportation Master Plan and the Official Plan to 2021 and based on the revenues anticipated, staff estimate a shortfall of \$700M (\$32M per year) on transportation. Without those funds, there will be a decrease in transit service, increased congestion and pollution and overall economic cost to the community.

Councillor Legendre questioned whether the intent of Recommendation 4(a) is to request the province to vacate tax room so the Region would assume it. If this was the case, he did not want the public to perceive this to be another tax load. Ms. Sweet clarified that what is being requested is the federal government continue to collect those monies, but then transfer the recommended amount to the Region. She confirmed there would be no difference to the taxpayer. The councillor requested clarification of the meaning of "promoting" in the recommendation and Ms. Sweet advised it meant "supporting" as opposed to "advertising". The councillor proposed an amendment to the recommendation, therefore, to change that word accordingly.

Councillor Legendre did not believe it was necessary to list the transportation modes in Recommendation 4(a), and felt the use of the term "transportation" in general would be more appropriate. P. Sweet explained the "environmentally friendly modes" were identified because of the connection to the Kyoto Protocol. While the councillor agreed this was an argument for doing this, he believed that in order to get the support of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) as requested by Recommendation 5, the recommendation should be made more generic because not all regions across the province have transit, for example. Ms. Sweet confessed that staff had not thought about this in terms of other urban municipalities and agreed with the suggested wording change.

Councillor Cantin believed the anticipated shortfall was incorrect and suggested it be what the province is now spending, deducted from what they used to spend, for a total of \$120M. The Environment and Transportation Commissioner agreed that \$32M is an extremely modest amount and that roads and transit should be funded from user pay and should therefore be removed from the property tax. However, he believed it was necessary to start modestly, so the Region can move towards a partnership with other municipalities in Ontario and across Canada. Despite these comments, the councillor was still adamant that the figure appears to be a much smaller amount than it should be and believed it required further examination. Staff reminded committee that the new Official Plan is less expensive than the previous Plan for infrastructure and Ms. Sweet added that the total cost for the 23-year period between 2000 and 2021, is \$562M of which 68% is transit costs. She explained that staff took that total and subtracted the total projected revenues of \$530M, for a final figure of \$32M.

In response to further questions about the anticipated shortfall, Ms. Sweet reiterated that the calculations included certain assumptions e.g. a tax increase comparable to inflation, but the fact that this has not been happening in the last few years means there will definitely be an even greater shortfall. However, she did not believe the Region had any basis for increasing anticipated expenditures at this point. While she agreed that Official Plans change from time to time, staff predict the \$32M is an appropriate figure at the present time.

Councillor Loney referred to a recent debate he participated in with the Board at FCM at which time he thought there was a need to use these funds especially for transit. However, while that argument appealed very much to those municipalities that had such systems, it was agreed that the vast majority of those participating in the debate did not and he emphasized the importance of having a united and unanimous voice speaking on behalf of all municipalities. In the end, he explained, it was agreed to leave it as "transportation", but suggested including reference to the environmentally friendly modes. He opined that if committee supports the recommendation as written, it runs the risk of not having what otherwise could be almost unanimous support in moving forward as an initiative from municipalities across Canada. In closing, he referred to some information he had from the TTC in Toronto on transit funding and indicated he would circulate this material to committee members for their information.

Councillor Kreling questioned whether Recommendation 3(b) speaks to the issue of finding other revenue sources in order to reduce the property tax component. The Commissioner indicated that the Comprehensive Study for OC Transpo did suggest the possibility of removing that cost; however, he believed it should be removed from the property tax and be paid through these user fees as proposed in the report; it would give a lower transportation cost and the community will actually spend less when there is a utility fee. The councillor urged members not to support 3(b) because he believed it meant the Region was seeking tax powers - a move which he did not feel would be supported by the province and he strongly believed it would undermine what the Region is attempting to

do. While he believed the senior levels of government should live up to their obligations in Ottawa-Carleton, he feared the recommendation would give the government a reason not to fulfil those obligations. He asked that Recommendation 3 be divided for voting purposes.

Councillor Doucet agreed somewhat with the previous comments because that portion of the recommendation would give the Region a new tax source, however, while he believed there was a very remote possibility the province would ever grant the Region such power, he felt it was worthwhile exploring.

It was questioned whether the downtown business community had been asked to comment on Recommendation 3(a) and P. Sweet advised they had not; however, the next part of the strategy would be to obtain that kind of feedback. Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen felt this recommendation could have an adverse effect on downtown businesses because their customers should be accommodated by all means of transportation. She too supported any initiative that would explore more funding avenues for the public transportation system, but was somewhat concerned about Recommendation 3(b) because there are some transportation issues that need to be dealt with.

Councillor Meilleur shared the view of the previous speaker, because she recognized the need to encourage businesses in the downtown and she did not want to adversely affect them by putting an additional tax on fuel. She welcomed another source of revenue to accelerate major infrastructure projects, projects which have been delayed year after year because of the lack of funds.

In closing and with respect to the proposed shortfall of \$32M, Councillor Legendre indicated he did not want to send the message to the province that it is all the Region requires, when it is in fact \$115M. He firmly believed the Region should be asking for that amount, at a minimum and was seeking assurance from staff that the shortfall being requested will not be the final word on the matter. It was pointed out that the proposed shortfall is based on the Official Plan, which has no provincial funding, however, Councillor Legendre remarked that the Official Plan includes property taxes for the transportation system and in his view, coverage for all modes of the transportation system should come from user pay, not from property taxes. While he did not believe it was necessary to amend Recommendation 2, he wanted to send a suggestion to the way that the message is conveyed to the province, so that the Region does not close off some avenues for the future. Ms. Sweet reiterated that the shortfall is based on today's forecast, the Official Plan and current methods of collecting revenues, and if there is a change in that, the figure will change.

Moved by J. Legendre

That Recommendation 4(a) be amended to read as follows:

- a) **transfer part of the Federal fuel tax revenues, at 3 cents per litre of fuel sold annually in Ottawa-Carleton, to be used exclusively for supporting transportation systems, with particular emphasis on environmentally friendly modes in view of Canada's commitment to the Kyoto Protocol;**

CARRIED

While he supported the recommendation for a communication strategy, Councillor Doucet suggested having a press conference immediately, with the Regional Chair, and the Chairs of the Transportation Committee and the OC Transpo Commission, outlining this report and the difficulties the Region faces.

Moved by C. Doucet

That the Chair of the Region, the Chair of the Transportation Committee and the Chair of the OC Transpo Commission hold a press conference within 7 days, (immediately after the Council meeting of 26 May 1999), in which they describe to the public the difficulties of operating a transit system and maintaining a road system without access to the taxes collected in Ottawa-Carleton from gas, registration and licensing fees.

CARRIED

The Committee voted separately on Recommendations 3(a) and (b) as follows:

3. **That the Region of Ottawa-Carleton request the Province of Ontario to:**
- a) **amend the Municipal Act to allow municipalities to levy a fee on non-residential parking spaces as a disincentive to automobile usage;**

CARRIED

YEAS: W. Byrne, L. Davis, C. Doucet, D. Holmes, H. Kreling, J. Legendre,
M. Meilleur....7

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

- b) **investigate the feasibility of implementing fuel surtax, insurance surcharge, distance/weight based vehicle registration fees, congestion pricing, and road pricing in the urban Regions in Ontario, with the revenue from these sources to be used to proportionately reduce the transportation component of the property tax;**

CARRIED

YEAS: W. Byrne, L. Davis, C. Doucet, D. Holmes, J. Legendre, M. Meilleur....7
NAYS : M. Bellemare, R. Cantin, H. Kreling, M. McGoldrick-Larsen....4

That the Transportation Committee recommend Council approve the following:

1. **That the Region of Ottawa-Carleton actively support and promote a Transportation Funding Partnership with the Provincial and Federal Governments, and put in place a dedicated transportation fund for the Region;**
2. **That the Region of Ottawa-Carleton, as part of the proposed Transportation Funding Partnership, request the Province of Ontario to transfer, effective 1 January 2000, \$32M per year, from the existing fuel tax, driver license and vehicle registration fee revenues and the 8% Provincial sales tax on parking charges in Ottawa-Carleton, to meet Ottawa-Carleton's transportation funding shortfall;**
3. **That the Region of Ottawa-Carleton request the Province of Ontario to:**
 - a) **amend the Municipal Act to allow municipalities to levy a fee on non-residential parking spaces as a disincentive to automobile usage;**
 - b) **investigate the feasibility of implementing fuel surtax, insurance surcharge, distance/weight based vehicle registration fees, congestion pricing, and road pricing in the urban Regions in Ontario, with the revenue from these sources to be used to proportionately reduce the transportation component of the property tax;**
4. **That the Region of Ottawa-Carleton, as part of the proposed Transportation Funding Partnership and the proposed national strategy under the Kyoto Protocol, request the Government of Canada to:**
 - a) **transfer part of the Federal fuel tax revenues, at 3 cents per litre of fuel sold annually in Ottawa-Carleton, to be used exclusively for promoting the use of transit, cycling and walk modes, and**

implementing Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures;

b) provide tax exemption to employer-provided transit passes;

- 5. That the Region of Ottawa-Carleton request the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, Association of Municipalities of Ontario, and the Transportation Association of Canada to support the above requests to the Provincial and Federal governments;**
- 6. That staff be directed to develop a communication strategy to provide a clear message for the Provincial and Federal governments regarding the merits of the proposed Transportation Funding Partnership, and of implementing a dedicated transportation funding system in Ottawa-Carleton; and;**
- 7. That staff be directed to circulate the recommendations in this report, as approved by Council, to senior levels of government, municipalities, other interested organizations, and community groups and businesses in Ottawa-Carleton.**

CARRIED as amended

5. MARCH ROAD AT MARCHVALE DRIVE - LEFT TURN LANE
- Director, Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services report dated 3 May 99

That the Transportation Committee recommend Council approve:

- 1. The construction of a westbound left-turn slip around lane on March Road as described in the report and illustrated in Annex "B", subject to the proponents, Marchvale Developments Limited, indicating in writing the funding of the total cost of the proposed roadworks, and;**
- 2. The initiation of the public hearing process as required by Sections 297 and 300 of the *Ontario Municipal Act*.**

CARRIED

6. KING EDWARD AVENUE & ST. PATRICK STREET - SAFETY IMPROVEMENT
- Director, Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services report dated 30 Apr 99

Following a brief staff presentation on the proposed alterations to the intersection, Councillor Cantin inquired whether the traffic signal could be lowered so it is more visible to northbound motorists turning right from St. Patrick onto King Edward. The Safety Improvement Engineer, Penny Palmer, advised this could be investigated.

Councillor Cantin was concerned the proposal will add almost one additional lane to the pedestrians' crossing distance and with the removal of the island, there will be no pedestrian refuge. Ms. Palmer advised the modification adds a very marginal amount of crossing distance and pedestrians were not using the island in any case. In response to his query about eliminating the right turn on red, she advised that the volume of traffic moving through this intersection would back-up, making it even less safe for pedestrians. She confirmed the signal timing will be adjusted to accommodate the new geometry at the intersection and that it will make minimal difference to motorists.

Some councillors questioned how the modification will make it safer for pedestrians and Ms. Palmer explained that at the present time, cars and pedestrians share a green signal and conflicts occur. With prohibited right turns on the red, and a protected crossing cycle for pedestrians, there should be no such interference from vehicles turning right at either ends of the intersection. She confirmed that on the south side pedestrians will have a conflict with left turning vehicles, but there is nothing staff can do at this time to address that problem.

Angie Todesco, King Edward Avenue Task Force was grateful the Region was looking at this intersection from a safety point of view, but recollected that improvements were part of the negotiations for the King Edward Avenue Community Improvement Plan. And yet, she believed staff were looking at this road as a highway and therefore did not see this as a very substantial improvement to the community. She indicated that sub-committees were created within the community to examine various alternatives for this intersection and recommendations were sent to the Regional Chair, although these did not appear to have been brought before committee. It was the intent of the Task Force to bring community-based solutions to committee for consideration and referred to their comments appended to the report, in which several recommendations were made.

Councillor Legendre referred to the King Edward Avenue Revitalization Project and recollected the discussion held several years ago at which time it was thought there would be a very different picture of King Edward and yet he has not seen any improvements in that direction. While Mr. Brousseau was not sure of the final status of that report, he indicated it is a question of funding and the Region does not have enough to do the things it wants to do in this area. The councillor referred to the recommendation of the Task Force to apply the Walking Security Index to this intersection to determine the comfortability of pedestrians and thought this was one of the locations Regional Council agreed to include as part of that report. Staff confirmed it was.

Councillor Meilleur read a deputation from a resident, Sonia Myles, who was unable to stay for the duration of the meeting. Mrs. Myles advised that she uses this intersection several times a day and is extremely concerned about the safety of pedestrians because of illegal movements by motorists. While she understood there was opposition to the new

turning lanes, she emphasized that pedestrian safety is paramount and while this may not be the ideal situation, it is definitely a step in the right direction.

Staff were requested to address some of the recommendations put forward by the Task Force, in particular, the removal of one of the right turn lanes and the introduction of a bicycle lane along St. Patrick and King Edward. Ms. Palmer advised that removing one of the right turn lanes will result in traffic backing up for several blocks, creating frustration among drivers and may encourage more illegal movements such as running the red light. With respect to the installation of a bicycle lane, she recommended that if this facility was to be introduced, it would have to stretch the length of the street and there are no funds to cover the costs associated with such a project. Staff further indicated that the curb lane on King Edward between Rideau Street and the MacDonald-Cartier Bridge is already painted sufficiently wide to accommodate bicycles.

As a frequent cyclist of this roadway, Councillor Doucet agreed it is like biking on a highway in the middle of a community. He believed that such roads can still be made pedestrian friendly, yet opined the short-term modifications will make little difference. For the long term, however, he recognized the need to change the whole character of the road to bring it back to the type of road it should be, which can be safely used by everyone.

While she agreed the proposal is not the ideal situation and is a small improvement, Councillor Meilleur nevertheless believed it will mean a lot for the community. She referred to the public open houses which were well attended and the majority of those in attendance supported the plan for the modifications. She hoped that one day there will be another interprovincial bridge further east which will help to reduce the amount and type of traffic currently flowing down King Edward Avenue.

The Committee Chair reminded committee that this intersection was one of the intersections that Council agreed to add to the Walking Security Index and hoped there would be some recommendations brought forward as part of that study. At her suggestion, the committee agreed to bring back the King Edward Avenue Revitalization Study back for review. Chair Holmes further noted that the median on the south side of the intersection does not enter into the pedestrian walk area, which would provide a refuge for pedestrians crossing this busy street. Ms. Palmer advised that no construction is planned for that section of the intersection.

Moved by D. Holmes

That staff investigate the extension of the median on the south side of King Edward Avenue through the pedestrian walk area.

CARRIED

That Transportation Committee recommend Council approve:

- 1. the construction of the proposed modifications for the intersection of King Edward Avenue and St. Patrick Street identified in Annex A; and;**
- 2. the initiation of the public hearing process as required by Sections 297 and 300 of the *Municipal Act* (Ontario).**

CARRIED as amended
(D. Holmes dissented)

7. **BLAIR ROAD ACCESS TO GLOUCESTER CITY HALL AND THE NAISMITH BUILDING**
- Director, Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services report dated 30 Apr 99

That the Transportation Committee recommend that Council:

- 1. Approve the functional design for the modifications to Blair Road (Regional Road 27) as illustrated in Annex C, subject to the City of Gloucester;**
 - a. funding the total cost of the proposed road works and traffic control signal modifications;**
 - b. executing a Legal agreement with respect to (a) above;**
- 2. Authorize the initiation of the public hearing process as required by Sections 297 and 300 of the *Ontario Municipal Act*.**

CARRIED

8. **ST. JOSEPH BOULEVARD REGIONAL POLICE FACILITY - ACCESS**
- Director, Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services report dated 30 Apr 99

That the Transportation Committee recommend that Council approve:

1. **The modification to the median on St. Joseph Boulevard approximately 125 m east of Tenth Line Road (Regional Road 47) and associated changes to the access at the CHS Access Road A as illustrated in Annex B;**
2. **The initiation of the public hearing process as required by Sections 297 and 300 of the *Ontario Municipal Act*.**

CARRIED

9. BANK STREET AT SIEVERIGHT ROAD

- Director, Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services report dated 30 Apr 99

That the Transportation Committee recommend Council approve:

1. **The roadway modifications at the intersection of Bank Street and Sieveright Road as described in the report and illustrated in Annex C, subject to the proponent, Minto Developments Incorporated;**
 - a. **funding the total cost for the roadway modifications and the associated utility relocations;**
 - b. **executing a legal agreement with respect to the above, and;**
2. **The initiation of the public hearing process as required by Sections 297 and 300 of the *Ontario Municipal Act*.**

CARRIED

10. ROCKDALE ROAD (VARs) - STOP CONTROL

- Director, Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services report dated 30 Apr 99

In consultation with the Mayor of Cumberland, Councillor van den Ham agreed with the recommendation of no stop control at Rockdale and Devine Roads, but at the request of residents in the area, asked the committee to approve stop control at Rockdale and Bearbrook Roads, because of the proximity of the intersection to École St. Guillaume.

Moved by H. Kreling

That Transportation Committee recommend Council approve the installation of all-way stop control at the intersection of Rockdale Road and Bearbrook Road.

CARRIED

That Transportation Committee recommend Council not approve the installation of all-way stop control at the intersection of Rockdale Road and Bearbrook Road, or at Rockdale Road and Devine Road in the Village of Vars, as requested by the City of Cumberland.

CARRIED as amended

11. COMMUNITY SAFETY ZONES

- Director, Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services report dated 30 Apr 99

Councillor Legendre wondered what would be gained by implementing community safety zones (CSZ) for short-term periods as suggested. Stu Marshall, By-Law Administrator, advised that staff are attempting to establish CSZ on a long, median and short range basis, located in various scenarios and then conduct an evaluation as to their effectiveness. The councillor believed that regardless of the length of time, the zones will be shown to be effective, and yet once they are removed, he believed motorists will revert to their old driving habits. He asked that once the pilot phase is complete, whether it is the intent to ever install these zones for two-month periods. S. Marshall confirmed this was in fact the intent, because they are meant to address specific safety concerns that ordinary measures have not addressed. He explained it is not known whether two months is long enough to accomplish that or whether it should be for a longer period of time, but staff are trying to experiment a bit and should have those kinds of answers when the evaluation report is complete. The councillor believed the pilot should be examining the zones for long-term use.

D. Brousseau added that part of this pilot is to educate drivers to modify their behaviour in specific areas. While he agreed that the zones may be effective only when the signs are up, hopefully this education process will improve driver behaviour as the zones are moved around within the community. S. Marshall referred to a correction in the report whereby staff recently learned that provincial fines will increase, but will not be doubled in these zones; the only fine that has been approved to be doubled is if there are red light violations.

When questioned whether these zones are enforceable, Sergeant Kirkland of the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service confirmed this was one of their concerns, but the division of zones is in such a way that the police can trim some of their resources to enable them to give attention to these zones and yet still not be overworked. He noted, however, that some things will not get done because officers will be assigned to monitor these zones.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen agreed this program should be implemented and tested, but questioned its effectiveness and value because of the costs associated with signage and police and staff time (regional and municipal). She asked that when the evaluation report

is brought back, she wanted it to include the total hours involved with staff and police, so the total costs can be known.

Councillor Byrne was aware of a new section in police services which would concentrate on traffic issues and questioned whether this pilot would add extra cost to the police. Sergeant Kirkland indicated no additional costs would be incurred; however, it will require a redeployment from other jobs the officers would have been doing. Essentially, CSZ formalizes what used to occur, when they would respond to complaints from residents. He further explained that a variety of time periods for review i.e. 2, 6 and 12 months, addresses the needs of some areas where there are chronic complaints, but where there is not a particularly high volume of vehicles. Those places will require less time involved and can be monitored to determine if the zones made a difference. He strongly suspected that many of the areas to be zoned will have a lasting affect, while others will be more limited, but the purpose of this experiment is to determine those areas.

That the Transportation Committee recommend Council approve:

- 1. Implementation of the community safety zone pilot project, as described in the report;**
- 2. That staff report back with an evaluation of the community safety zones and recommended designation criteria for future zones; and;**
- 3. That the Traffic and Parking By-law No. 1 of 1996 be amended, as described in the report.**

CARRIED

12. ENCROACHMENT APPLICATION - 137 MURRAY STREET

- Director, Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services report dated 7 Apr 99

Lois K. Smith indicated she would be slightly less concerned if there were no laneways close to this property, but in her experience as a pedestrian in the central core, there are many places where motorists stick their cars out very fast, suddenly stop, then continue driving and pedestrians have to always be on guard. This is a particular concern for those who are visually impaired or physically challenged. She noted that the proposal from the proponent will actually generate pedestrian traffic, even though it has been suggested this area is not safe for pedestrians. She fully supported the staff recommendation.

Councillor Cantin was in favour of granting the encroachment, but suggested a condition be added that should something happen as a direct result of the encroachment, the Region would be released from any indemnification. Also, if the encroachment impedes the visibility of people leaving that driveway, it should be removed. D. Brousseau advised

that should committee approve the encroachment, it should be handed over to the Real Estate Services Branch to negotiate a cost for the use of this space.

Councillor Meilleur explained that people do not walk on that part of Murray Street because it is not a pedestrian friendly area. She emphasized that the encroachment will not impede pedestrian movement on the sidewalk, and should hopefully encourage more people to walk in the area because the atrium to be constructed will act as a window onto the street and people will feel more secure because there will be activities there. She added that the business community supports this proposal and urged committee members to do likewise.

Moved by M. Meilleur

That the Transportation Committee recommend Council approve the proposed permanent surface encroachment at 137 Murray Street.

CARRIED as amended

In light of the above, and in accordance with the staff report, the committee agreed that the matter be referred to the Real Estate Services Branch for the purposes of negotiating a lease at fair market value.

D. Brousseau advised that because staff recommended against the encroachment, no public consultation had taken place. Usually, when an encroachment application is approved by the Department, the practice is to consult with the residents and businesses within 60 metres of the property in question. In light of the committee's recommendation, Councillor Meilleur agreed that some consultation should take place and the Director advised staff will take that as direction and if there are problems they will report back.

INFORMATION PREVIOUSLY DISTRIBUTED

1. 1999 RESURFACING PROGRAM
- Director, Infrastructure Maintenance Division memorandum dated 31 March 1999

INQUIRIES

Traffic Conditions at McKellar Plaza - Sherbourne and Carling

Councillor Davis indicated there have been difficulties of access to McKellar Plaza with many near misses and this has caused great concern to the community. She questioned whether originally controversial accesses are monitored to determine the impact and whether restrictive access should go in if problems occur. D. Brousseau advised that unless staff receive explicit direction, they generally only respond to complaints raised by the public. The Department does

not have the resources to review these developments over time. The councillor indicated she would pursue this further with staff.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

CO-ORDINATOR

CHAIR