

MINUTES
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

30 MAY 1997

9:00 A.M.

PRESENT

Chair: R. Cantin

Members: D. Beamish, P. Clark, A. Cullen, L. Davis, D. Holmes, H. Kreling,
J. Legendre, M. Meilleur

GENERAL

1. TRANSMITTAL REPORT ON DRAFT TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN
 - Commissioner, Planning & Development Approvals Addendum report dated 15 May 97 and supplementary report dated 28 May 97
 - Finance Commissioner report dated 29 May 97

Councillor Beamish noted that in the last ROP, some lands were protected for transitway corridors although they are not shown on the Schedules and since they back onto residential neighbourhoods, questioned what is intended for those lands. Brendan Reid, Manager, Program and Infrastructure Planning Branch recalled that lands were originally protected for the Inner Provincial Highway By-pass. This road has since been eliminated from the Official Plan and it was recommended that the corridor be retained for other transportation purposes. There is some property in that vicinity that has been protected for future transportation purposes e.g. bicycle corridors, pathways, et cetera; however, there has been no decision on what the final use of that corridor should be, but confirmed it is not to be a road.

Note: 1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.
2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 9 July 1997.

The councillor indicated that if it is not shown on any of the Schedule as part of the cycling, rail or transitway network, how does the Region identify for the communities nearby what the potential future use will be. The Commissioner of Planning and Development Approvals, Nick Tunnacliffe, advised this is more of an Official Plan matter than a Transportation Master Plan issue, but there are several Schedules that show recreational corridors, rail corridors, development potential, et cetera, and there will be further studies carried out to determine how all those competing interests are balanced. The councillor asked that staff prepare something more definitive for the Planning and Environment Committee's review of the Official Plan Review. He was specifically referring to the corridor from Conroy Road east to Hawthorne Road.

TRANSPORTATION VISION AND PRINCIPLES

Section 1.3.2 System Objectives (pg. 8 of TMP)

Councillor Meilleur noted the different levels of efficiency at intersections and questioned whether this has changed in the past year. B. Reid advised that the Region has become more responsive to the number of persons utilizing intersections, rather than the number of vehicles and this recognition is reflected in the design of intersections and signal timing. He noted the level of service D is the standard of the current Regional Official Plan, but the Transportation Master Plan and the Draft Regional Official Plan recommend operating at a lower quality of service as opposed to a lower level of service. The councillor was concerned about pedestrian safety in the downtown, particularly at intersections such as King Edward/Rideau and Nicholas/Laurier and wanted assurance they were considered before "goods" when intersections are designed. With regard to safety, B. Reid advised there are a number of policies in the TMP which will address this.

Councillor Cullen proposed that Principles 4 and 11 of Table 2 be amended to add: "Based on the hierarchy of walking, cycling, transit and automobile use." Councillor Kreling did not believe this was necessary because these are principles which committee and Council are mindful of and maintained the Principles on Table 2 are quite sufficient to indicate the Region recognizes there are various methods of transportation and that a balance has to be provided. Councillor Cullen stated, and staff confirmed, that the ROP includes a section on transportation which is based on the hierarchy.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Principles 4 and 11 of Table 2 of Section 1.3.2 be amended to add: "Based on the hierarchy of walking, cycling, transit and automobile use."

CARRIED
(H. Kreling dissented)

Councillor Legendre proposed that supporting Principle 5 in Table 2 be amended by adding the words: "and that mass transit is not subsidized less than other modes of transport." Councillor Beamish opposed that amendment and questioned how that can even be carried out because studies carried out to determine subsidy levels would be in support of one particular mode and he did not believe it was possible to arrive at a subsidy level which would be acceptable to all users. Councillor Legendre accepted the comment; however, he suggested that during budget deliberations, the committee and Council will direct staff to make known what the numbers are so that every year Council would know the balance of subsidies and it will be up to Council to decide to shift it one way or the other. He emphasized that if committee accepts the first part of Principle 5, it needs to know what society is contributing to mass transit compared to other modes.

Councillor Holmes questioned what the subsidy level is for the various modes and the consultant, John Schnablegger, indicated this is difficult to answer because the public component of financing is so small in relation to the overall cost of travel. Further, because of the rate of capital investment, a return is not realized for 15-20 years. He believed that subsidy level is best dealt with by analyzing it on an annual basis (performance to investment). He added that another problem is the delivery of the service i.e. there are several modes of which only one has been selected and it is difficult to determine whether the Region would be subsidizing an efficient or inefficient operation because proponents of the other modes will have similar concerns with respect to investment levels and proportion. In the end, it would simply pit components of the travel market against each other, when all the Region is trying to accomplish is to minimize auto travel and the investment that goes with it.

Councillor Holmes noted that each year the Region attempts to reduce vehicle use and increase transit and other modes and questioned whether it would be useful to put into the supporting principles that there be an annual measurement of that. P. Sweet confirmed staff can monitor how much is spent in each mode, but the councillor wanted to see a measurement of how well the Region is succeeding in its efforts to reduce vehicle dependency and increasing the use of other modes; she suggested an additional principle that speaks to how well the Region is doing each year, and which would drive the budget decisions for the following year. P. Sweet suggested that in order to reflect what the councillor is trying to achieve through his Motion, the word "subsidized" be replaced with "supported" which would mean more than just financial.

The Commissioner indicated that Table 12, which speaks to monitoring on an annual basis, addresses Councillor Holmes' concerns so staff would in fact be able to track transit to determine whether or not it is increasing its share. With respect to the Motion, he was hesitant to suggest that just one mode be selected. Councillor Legendre noted the suggested modification by staff and questioned if the support was not a subsidy, what might it be. P. Sweet indicated it could be supported through parking standards, intersection improvements to give priority to transit, et cetera. The councillor agreed to change the wording accordingly.

Moved by J. Legendre

That supporting Principle 5 in Table 2 of Section 1.3.2 be amended to read as follows: “5. Ensure that OC Transpo increases its share of the Regional travel market and that mass transit is not supported less than other modes of transport.”

CARRIED

Councillor Holmes suggested the Region bring itself into line with the federal government’s emission standards and suggested the addition of a Principle 15 to reflect this. Staff indicated the Federal Green Plan objective is to stabilize emissions at 1990 levels by the year 2000; however, the target adopted by Council in February is to *achieve* a 20% reduction in the 1990 levels of greenhouse gas emissions by the year 2007 and therefore the objective set by Council is more ambitious.

Moved by D. Holmes

That a Principle 15 be added to Table 2 of Section 1.3.2 as follows: “Pursue a transportation strategy to contribute to achievement of a region-wide 20% reduction in 1990 greenhouse gas emissions by the year 2007.”

CARRIED

Councillor Holmes proposed that the Region ensure that the commuting private vehicle mode is not subsidized to the detriment of the TMP. Councillor Kreling voiced his opposition to this Motion because it ties in a Principle with the word “subsidy” and the discussion prior to this could also apply to this proposal. He felt it could restrict the Region somewhat if it starts itemizing money issues in the vision statement when there is no clear benchmark to move forward from.

In response, Councillor Holmes questioned the purpose of having principles and statements if they can never be measured to determine if the Region is moving in the right direction. Her Motion speaks to how much money is put into the budget on an annual basis for vehicles, pedestrians, transit and cyclists, and making sure the private vehicle is not being overly subsidized at the expense of those other modes the Region is trying to promote. Further, each year this would be examined to determine if more vehicle users are switching to other modes and therefore, monies have to be allocated in the budget to support that philosophy and that policy. Questions arose as to whether this Motion would allow for measurements of modal use and the consultant advised it could not be done very accurately. He believed the intent of the Motion is to ensure the Region’s expenditure plan is in line with the philosophy it is espousing; however, he suggested nothing further than that because it would become too complicated. The councillor withdrew her Motion.

Councillor Meilleur questioned where the vision illustrates that the Region is going to design its transportation system to avoid producing what already exists on King Edward Avenue. She wanted to be able to show her community something that proves the Region is serious about wanting to resolve that problem. Staff agreed the councillor's example is a specific problem that needs to be addressed and noted there were several Principles which address this problem in general. To address the councillor's concerns, the Committee Chair suggested amending Principle 8 to add the words "through traffic in downtown areas" and the councillor agreed to that amendment.

Moved by M. Meilleur

That Principle 8 of Table 2 be amended to read as follows: "Design and implement future transportation systems to correct/avoid present problems such as avoiding urban sprawl through traffic in downtown areas and encouraging public transit."

CARRIED

Moved by D. Holmes

That a Principle 16 be added to Table 2 of Section 1.3.2 as follows: "The expenditure plan be consistent with the principle."

CARRIED

Section 1.3.4 Future Population and Employment Distribution (pg. 11 of TMP)

Moved by A. Cullen

That Transportation Committee approve the staff recommendation to amend Table 3 as shown at page 5 of the Addendum Report dated 15 May 97.

CARRIED

Section 1.3.5 Travel Demand and Capacity Analysis (pg. 13 of TMP)

Councillor Holmes proposed a Motion to set the cycling modal objective to 8%. She stated the figures should reflect seasonably adjusted modal shares, since cyclists use their bicycles more during the summer. She also supported further increases to the pedestrian modal share as this, along with cycling and transit, are environmentally friendly and should be encouraged.

When questioned whether the percentage for cycling was on a seasonal basis, B. Reid advised it is based on the number of cyclists riding during the autumn and that the origin-destination survey was the fundamental basis for coming up with the current Region-wide situation and the survey for establishing future targets was carried out between September

and early December. The results of a Region-wide origin-destination survey of over 20,000 dwelling units indicated that on a Region-wide basis, the walking, cycling, transit and automobile shares are as indicated on Table 5. He indicated that staff intend to come back with targets recognizing that an average figure over the Region is not particularly useful because there are wide variations in walking, cycling and transit use between the central, suburban and rural areas. The report will set out sub-area targets and a monitoring proposal recognizing there are different modal shares et cetera in the Region. He pointed out the Table makes reference to increasing the cycling modal share by 75% which is a major goal. He noted a road system should not be designed based on summer conditions or winter conditions - the transportation network has to operate successfully and efficiently all year, which is what Table 5 attempts to capture.

Councillor Legendre made reference to a document produced by the consultant that spoke to modal shares and which sets future targets for cycling by 2021 to 3%, even though that figure has already been achieved in the rural areas and all other areas have surpassed that. Based on this information, he fully supported the Motion and further, maintained that a target should exceed what already exists. P. Sweet indicated those figures were from a working draft and the subsequent numbers were updated following the results of the origin-destination survey. Mr. Schnablegger advised that before the origin-destination survey was done, a work survey was conducted to determine work trips and when the origin-destination survey was finalized, the numbers were adjusted accordingly. B. Reid confirmed that the table refers to the afternoon peak hour and includes all trips of which approximately 50% constituted work trips.

Councillor Holmes questioned what was wrong with proposing a higher target then for pedestrians and cyclists and Mr. Schnablegger responded by stating the target should be achievable or at least within reach and if future demographics are taken into consideration, a decrease in walking, cycling and transit share would likely result. He stressed the importance of consistency in order to accurately measure performance on the same basis. To measure this, B. Reid indicated staff are proposing a monitoring strategy as detailed at Table 12 which can track how the Region is progressing.

With respect to the Motion, Councillor Kreling questioned where the 5% would come from to increase the cycling modal share and staff responded that while the figures in Table 5 are the best advice they can give to committee, within a few years if the targets have been successful, they can be modified accordingly, but that the auto share should be decreased to reflect the increased walking and cycling targets. The councillor noted an increase in the cycling modal share will undoubtedly come from the auto modal share and could not support the concept of setting unreasonable targets which cannot be met and then having to build additional cycling facilities to try and increase that share, even though it is the public who will dictate what mode they prefer to travel by.

Councillor Holmes indicated Table 5 reveals that the Region has failed in any kind of transportation priority setting in the past and have failed in trying to keep emissions down. She was not proud of the fact that 73% of the people go to work via private automobile

and based on the air quality in the Region, emphasized that everyone should be interested in trying to improve the modal splits. She felt the objectives in Table 5 were weak to set for a 20-year plan where the Region is trying to move into a more environmentally-conscious Official Plan.

Councillor Cullen echoed his colleagues comments, noting the Region should not set the standards so low they are simply achieved because they should be surpassed. He maintained that if the Region is going to try to redirect how it uses cycling and put the appropriate amount of investment in the infrastructure to achieve that, then the appropriate targets should be set.

Moved by D. Holmes

That Table 5 be amended to show the cycling modal share objective be at least 8% of peak hour person trips by 2021, region-wide. This is a seasonally adjusted figure which represents cycling activity in the early fall. The cycling modal share is higher in summer and lower in winter.

CARRIED
(D. Beamish and H. Kreling
dissented)

Moved by D. Holmes

That the first bullet under Table 5 be amended to read: "The pedestrian modal share will increase from 9.6% to 12%."

CARRIED
(D. Beamish and H. Kreling
dissented)

That Transportation Committee approve page 16 of the TMP as amended.

CARRIED
(D. Beamish and H. Kreling
dissented)

Moved by A. Cullen

That Transportation Committee approve page 17 of the TMP as amended by staff at page 7 of the Addendum Report dated 15 May 1997.

CARRIED

That Transportation Committee approve, as amended, the staff recommendations as shown at pages 6 to 8 of the Addendum Report dated 15 May 97 and at page 2 of the Supplementary Report dated 28 May 1997.

CARRIED

COMPONENTS

Section 2.2.1 - Supportive Measures (pg. 22 of TMP)

That Transportation Committee approve the staff recommendation to amend Policy 1 as shown at page 12 of the Addendum report dated 15 May 97.

CARRIED

WALKING (pg. 22 of TMP)

Section 2.2.2 Facility Operations and Management (pg. 23 of TMP)

Councillor Cullen proposed the following Motion: “That the policies under Section 2.2.2 be amended to add the following bullet: “Assume responsibility for sidewalks along Regional Roads.”

Councillor Beamish questioned whether the policies at Section 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 essentially means that when the Region builds or widens Regional roads, it will no longer ask the area municipalities to contribute to the sidewalk construction. Staff explained they would still want the local municipality to contribute to the construction and maintenance of a new sidewalk and if the area municipality refuses to pay for it, this policy implies that the Region has to ensure it. Staff are recommending that the current policy not be changed.

The Committee Chair questioned how the Region ensures it is not misinterpreted by a local council, that the Region is now responsible for building a sidewalk when the road is rebuilt. Staff indicated the ROP suggests that if the Region is serious about encouraging pedestrian movements, it should then ensure that when a Regional road is constructed or reconstructed, that sidewalks are provided. However, staff still recommend that the area municipalities be responsible for the maintenance of these facilities. Councillor Meilleur was concerned the Region would need the support of the local municipality if they are to be responsible for maintaining it and questioned whether this was considered by the municipalities. B. Reid advised there had been concerns expressed, but if the local municipality is going to be responsible for the cost, they would need a schedule of improvements so they know what the Region intends to do over the next five years.

Councillor Cullen indicated the intention of his Motion is that since sidewalks are within the Regional right-of-way, it should be responsible for them. If the Motion were to be approved, Councillor Davis questioned how the issue of parking revenues would be dealt

with and was informed by the Solicitor that sidewalks are the responsibility of area municipalities and the Business Plan suggested that sidewalks not become the responsibility of the Region. However, it did recommend that the Region be responsible for enforcement on its roads and would therefore retain the fines associated with such enforcement.

Councillor Cullen was of the opinion it was important to include this bullet as the Region's objective as this will ensure the Region continues to seek to assume that responsibility. Because snow plowing may have an impact on sidewalks, and keeping in mind there are a high volume of pedestrians, particularly in the downtown, he believed there is a Regional interest in setting the standards and meeting Regional objectives.

Councillor Meilleur could not support the Motion and suggested that before the Region moves in this direction, there should be an evaluation of the costs and liability associated with this proposal. Councillor Holmes agreed, noting there must be a full assessment of this proposal between the Region and the municipalities.

Moved by D. Holmes

That the following Motion be referred to staff for a multi-departmental analysis: "Amend the policies under Section 2.2.2 to add the following bullet: "Assume responsibility for sidewalks along Regional Roads"

CARRIED

Moved by A. Cullen

That Transportation Committee approve the staff recommendation to amend Policy 1 of Section 2.2.2 Walking - Facility Operations and Maintenance as shown at page 4 of the Supplementary Report dated 28 May 97.

CARRIED

Section 2.2.3 Facility Design and Construction (pg. 23 of TMP)

The Committee Chair noted that piling snow along sidewalks can be hazardous to pedestrians when the snow melts and then refreezes on the walking surface. He questioned whether some form of drainage could be incorporated on the sidewalks to eliminate this problem. The Director of Mobility Services advised this could be examined; however, he advised there are competing interests with respect to snow storage so there are a lot of issues to be examined before staff could recommend anything. The Committee Chair noted he was speaking about areas where this is a perennial problem and D. Brousseau indicated this could be considered, but it is a question of how much money should be spent on a solution.

Councillor Holmes made note of rural roads and the lack of busing over the next 5 years and the possible need for sidewalks on many of those roads. She wondered whether the TMP should include a statement that the Region will endeavor to discuss with the school boards the continuation of busing on rural roads so it is not forced to build sidewalks in those areas. Staff advised they had not visited this issue yet and the councillor suggested this could be discussed by committee at another time.

Councillor Cullen suggested that the proposed staff amendment to add a new Policy 4 be further amended to read: *“Ensure, where feasible, the provision of separate multi-use pathways in or adjacent to transitway corridors.”* He explained this makes the policy that much stronger and assures the option will not just be “considered”, unless it is not practical or feasible to implement.

Moved by A. Cullen

That the staff amendment to add a new Policy 4 to Section 2.2.3 Facility Design and Construction, (page 15 of the Addendum Report dated 15 May 97), be amended to read: “Ensure, where feasible, the provision of separate multi-use pathways in or adjacent to Transitway corridors.”

CARRIED

Moved by D. Holmes

That the words “as necessary” be deleted from bullet 1 of Section 2.2.3 Facility Design and Construction.

CARRIED

That Transportation Committee approve the staff recommendation to amend Section 2.2.3 Walking (Facility Design and Construction), as amended, as shown at pages 15 and 16 of the Addendum Report dated 15 May 97.

CARRIED

CYCLING (pg. 24 of TMP)

Section 2.3.1 Cycling Transportation Network

That Transportation Committee approve the staff recommendation to amend Section 2.3.1, as shown at page 17 of the Addendum report.

CARRIED

It was questioned how the term “secure” is defined for bicycle parking as contained in the amendment and P. Sweet explained it was put in to describe the type of properly positioned bicycle facility. Following a brief discussion about the implication of leaving the word in, the following Motion was proposed:

Moved by H. Kreling

That the word “secure” be deleted from staff amendment to Policy 5 (page 18 of the Addendum Report dated 15 May 97).

CARRIED

YEAS: R. Cantin, D. Holmes, H. Kreling, M. Meilleur....4
NAYS: A. Cullen, J. Legendre....2

Moved by A. Cullen

That the staff amendment to Policy 5 of Section 2.3.1 be amended to read as follows: “Require the zoning bylaws of area municipalities that are wholly or partially within the urban area of Ottawa-Carleton to provide for an appropriate capacity of bicycle parking at educational, community, retail, recreational and employment land uses, and at residential apartment buildings. The Region in consultation with bicycle groups and area municipalities shall develop standards in this regard.”

CARRIED

That Transportation Committee approve the staff recommendation to amend Policy 4 of Section 2.3.2 Cycling, as shown at page 20 of the Addendum report.

CARRIED

That Transportation Committee approve the staff recommendations, as amended to amend Section 2.3.3 and 2.3.4 Cycling Transportation Network as shown at pages 21 and 22 of the Addendum Report dated 15 May 97.

CARRIED

Moved by A. Cullen

That Policy 3 of Section 2.3.2 Cycling Transportation Network be amended to read:
“Implement, where feasible, cycling requirements in the design of all new, reconstructed or rehabilitated Regional roads not included in the Cycling Transportation Network.”

CARRIED

YEAS: A. Cullen, D. Holmes, J. Legendre....3
NAYS: R. Cantin, H. Kreling....2

Moved by A. Cullen

That Policy 6 of Section 2.3.2. be amended to read: “Ensure, where feasible, the provision of separate cycling facilities or multi-use pathways in or adjacent to Transitway Corridors.”

CARRIED

PUBLIC TRANSIT (pg. 27 of TMP)

Section 2.4 (pg. 27)

That Transportation Committee approve the staff recommendation to amend Section 2.4 Public Transit as shown at page 24 of the Addendum Report dated 15 May 97.

CARRIED

Section 2.4.1 Supportive Measures (pg. 28 of TMP)

With respect to the proposed staff amendment at page 26 of the Addendum report, the Committee Chair suggested changing the word “imposition” to “promotion” because this would provide an incentive for the developer to build higher density development in the vicinity of rapid transit service. The Commissioner suggested the text read “...supports transit through reduced parking requirements...” The Committee Chair agreed with this suggestion.

That the staff recommendation to amend Policy 4 as shown at the top of page 26 of the Addendum Report dated 15 May 97 be amended to delete the words “the imposition of” to read as follows: “Require area municipalities to review and amend parking requirements in zoning by-laws to a level which supports transit through reduced parking requirements and maximum parking space provisions for developments in the vicinity of rapid transit service.”

CARRIED

With respect to the staff amendment to Policy 5, Councillor Holmes hoped the Region would ‘require’ the municipalities rather than ‘encourage’ them. The Solicitor advised the Region cannot require area municipalities to do anything. The Commissioner confirmed the local zoning by-laws have to conform to the Regional Official Plan although the ROP does not include standards and therefore there is nothing to enforce; if, however, the Region were to include parking standards in its OP, then that is the way to ensure the municipalities conform accordingly. That being the case, the councillor suggested her amendment stand.

Moved by D. Holmes

That the staff recommendation to add a new Policy 5 to Section 2.4.1 as shown at the top of page 26 of the Addendum report be amended to read: “Require area municipalities to review and amend parking requirements in zoning by-laws to a level which supports transit through the imposition of reduced parking requirements and maximum parking space provisions for developments in areas that are served by transit and have a concentration and mix of community services that are conducive to pedestrian travel.”

CARRIED
(M. Meilleur dissented)

Councillor Cullen proposed an amendment to Policy 6 of Section 2.4.1 by inserting: “- federal government elimination of subsidized parking for its employees;”. Councillor Meilleur could not support that Motion because in many collective agreements it is the employees right to use their car for work purposes. The Committee Chair suggested and Councillor Cullen agreed that the word “elimination” be changed to “reduction”.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Policy 6 of Section 2.4.1, Supportive Measures, be amended by inserting: “- federal government reduction of subsidized parking for its employees;”

CARRIED

Section 2.4.2 Interprovincial Transit Service (pg. 31 of TMP)

Councillor Cullen suggested it may be appropriate to add the Champlain Bridge to the bullet under this heading. Helen Gault from OC Transpo indicated that for transit in Ottawa-Carleton and the Outaouais, the important bridges are the Chaudiere and the Portage and she was hesitant to see that point weakened; she explained the Champlain Bridge is not central to either bus operations. Given this, the councillor suggested adding “in particular” prior to the reference to the two bridges. The consultant suggested it may be more appropriate to include reference to “high occupancy vehicle (HOV)” which would exclude all other modes. In response to a question posed by the councillor, Mr. Schnablegger confirmed that “transit priority measures” includes HOV and in light of this the councillor withdrew his amendment.

That Transportation Committee approve the staff recommendation to amend Section 2.4.2 Transit Services as shown at page 27 of the Addendum report dated 15 May 97.

CARRIED

Section 2.4.3 Transit Priority (pg. 32 of TMP)

Moved by D. Holmes

That the first paragraph after the bullets of Section 2.4.3 Transit Priority be amended to read as follows: “Transit priority corridors may involve operational and geometric improvements, bus lanes, signage and regulatory measures...”

CARRIED

With respect to Table 9, Councillor Holmes questioned what report the recommendation for Elizabeth Street came from and staff advised this roadway is an essential link in completing the arterial road transit priority network to connect to employment areas in the Booth Street area. The councillor was not prepared to accept something that has not been based on an appropriate study which she and her community have been involved in. She proposed that it be deleted from Table 9. When questioned whether there was some urgency to this extension, staff indicated they had no precise indication; however, it is one of the links needed to be introduced to ensure that downtown transit service can continue to operate successfully, although several factors would influence the timing such as whether there will be transit on the CP rail corridor and how soon that can be in place, whether adjustments can be made in the central area to improve transit and how successful the Region is in introducing a cross-town HOV lane on the Queensway.

It was questioned that if it were to be removed from the Table, it would be subject to a separate environmental assessment process and staff advised the purpose of the EA work done to date is to estimate the need and justification for the projects identified including

this link. Where the actual link goes would be the next step carried out at a later stage. Staff confirmed this has been in the draft document throughout the whole process. Councillor Holmes suggested that should the Region decide to pursue this project in the future, she would expect a full EA with public participation.

Moved by D. Holmes

That Elizabeth Street be deleted from Table 9 of Section 2.4.3. Transit Priority Projects.

CARRIED
(R. Cantin dissented)

That Transportation Committee approve the staff recommendation to Amend Section 2.4.3 Transit Priority as shown at page 29 of the Addendum report dated 15 May 97.

CARRIED

Section 2.4.4 Transitways (pg. 34 of TMP)

Moved by A. Cullen

That Transportation Committee approve the staff recommendation to Amend Section 2.4.4 Transitways as shown at page 32 of the Addendum Report dated 15 May 97.

CARRIED

Moved by A. Cullen

That the following bullet be added as Policy 9 under Transitway Conversion to Rail Technology, Section 2.4.4 Transitway: “Ensure, where feasible, the provision of separate cycling facilities or multi-use pathways in or adjacent to Transitway corridors.”

CARRIED

Section 2.4.5 Rapid Rail Transit (pg. 39 of TMP)

Moved by A. Cullen

That the words “*by the turn of the century*” be added to the end of the first sentence of the first bullet at page 41 following the words “Council shall:”.

CARRIED

With respect to the first bullet under “Council shall:” at page 41 of the TMP, Councillor Legendre wanted assurance that the absolute minimum is spent for this pilot project and, depending on its success, the Region can broaden its financial contribution for the long term. He believed the addition of “at minimum cost” after the words “pilot project” would address his concern. Councillor Cullen opined that if the project is done at an absolute minimal cost, no one will use it, which thereby defeats the purpose of the pilot project.

Moved by J. Legendre

That the words “*at minimum cost*” be inserted following the words “pilot project” in the first bullet at page 41 under “Council shall:”.

CARRIED

(A. Cullen and M. Meilleur
dissented)

The bullet will now read as follows: “Introduce, *at minimum cost*, a pilot project rapid transit service on a portion of the rail rapid transit corridor shown on Map 2 *by the turn of this century (i.e. by the year 2000).*”

Councillor Beamish proposed that “a point south of Billings Bridge” be added as a candidate station location under Section 2.4.5 Rail Rapid Transit - CP Corridor. (This Motion was not voted on at this point but was later approved by Committee in its consideration of Schedule E.)

Moved by D. Beamish

The schedules and text of the TMP and Regional Official Plan be amended to protect the CP right-of-way from Billings Bridge to Hunt Club Road for future rail rapid transit (this text be added to the bottom of page 39 of the TMP)

CARRIED

2.5. ROADS (pg. 43 of TMP)

The Committee noted that the percentages included in the first paragraph under this section would have to be amended to reflect what has been adopted by committee.

Section 2.5.1 Limiting Growth in Automobile Use (pg. 43 of TMP)

Moved by A. Cullen

That Policy 2 of Section 2.5.1 be amended to add the following statement: “-encouraging the federal government, as a model employer, to reduce subsidized parking for its employees.”

CARRIED

Section 2.5.3 Goods Movement (pg. 46 of TMP)

Councillor Meilleur was concerned that bullet 4 would essentially do nothing to reduce the amount of night-time truck traffic on King Edward Avenue. She noted it is the only truck route between Hawkesbury and Pembroke and questioned what other solutions staff will be examining to reduce that traffic. J. Schnablegger indicated the initial night time ban can be implemented immediately which will lead shippers to move their goods via inter-modal terminals along rail corridors; that will provide sufficient time to get the final solution, which would be another river crossing.

Councillor Holmes believed the Region should encourage warehousing in outlying municipalities; this would prevent the larger-sized vehicles coming into the downtown and encourage the goods to be stored on the outskirts of the city, with smaller trucks bringing the cargo into the city.

Moved by D. Holmes

That the following bullet be added to Section 2.5.3 Goods Movement: “Encourage warehousing in outlying municipalities in order to discourage large size truck traffic through the Region.”

CARRIED

Councillor Legendre noted that if trucks were banned from using King Edward during the night, they would come across the Chaudiere Bridge and he was concerned about the impact this would cause on the community to the south. Staff indicated that before the ban is implemented, a detailed investigative study would be carried out with regards to the impacts to other communities and on the trucking industry. The councillor questioned that if the night-time ban is successful, could the trucking industry be requested to shift its movements to daytime hours and that this be part of the assessment and evaluation. B.

Reid advised this would involve discussions with the industry and they could report back on that suggestion. Councillor Holmes indicated a desire to see the effect on Preston Street when the ban comes into effect and what mitigating measures should be taken to alleviate the traffic.

Councillor Legendre proposed that the night-time ban on truck traffic on interprovincial corridors be considered as an integrated whole i.e. the effect on other truck crossing corridors, the effect on daytime crossing movements, should all crossing corridors be closed to night time movements, should all crossing corridors be considered for truck traffic.

Councillor Holmes suggested the above Motion be amended to include “as a result of the 6-month study”. The Committee Chair felt this should be carried out while the ban is in place and B. Reid indicated staff would come back with terms of reference to ensure they have covered all the issues. J. Schnablegger advised this will be very difficult to analyze because the Region must ensure there is mitigation, keeping in mind that traffic changes day by day; it is difficult to predict the reaction and therefore it is necessary to carry out a trial period before implementing mitigating measures.

Moved by J. Legendre

The night-time ban on truck traffic on interprovincial corridors be considered as an integrated whole i.e.:

- effect on other truck crossing corridors;
- effect on day-time crossing movements;
- should all crossing corridors be closed to night-time movements;
- should all crossing corridors be considered for truck traffic.

LOST

YEAS: A. Cullen, J. Legendre....2

NAYS: R. Cantin, D. Holmes, H. Kreling, M. Meilleur....4

Councillor Beamish proposed that bullet 5 be deleted. J. Schnablegger indicated Hunt Club has completely replaced the need for a truck route on Walkley and concluded there is no need to have trucks on this portion of Walkley Road.

Moved by D. Beamish

That Policy 5 of Section 2.5.3 Goods Movement be deleted.

CARRIED

Councillor Cullen proposed that Policy 4 of Section 2.5.3 be amended to replace “enact” with “investigate” because this is only for a trial period, not to implement a law. Following a brief discussion about this, the councillor decided to withdraw his motion.

Moved by J. Legendre

The following text be added to Policy 4 of Section 2.5.3 Goods Movement: “That there be appropriate mitigation measures to ensure that there not be a shift from this corridor to any other corridor because of the night time ban.”

CARRIED

That Transportation Committee approve, as amended, the staff recommendations to Amend Section 2.5.3 Goods Movement as shown at pages 37, 39 and 40 of the Addendum Report dated 15 May 97.

CARRIED

Section 2.5.5 Regional Road Network (pg. 49 of TMP)

Councillor Legendre was disturbed that the action taken by Council to delete reference to Kettle Island as a possible river crossing was not reflected in the TMP and wanted assurance that this does not happen again. He proposed the following:

Moved by J. Legendre

That the second sentence in the paragraph entitled “Interprovincial Bridges” be deleted.

CARRIED

Moved by J. Legendre

That the second sentence of the “bullet” under Interprovincial Bridges be amended to read: “Pending an agreement on the location of the new crossing, Council shall protect the approaches to the Cumberland-Angers crossing, and request the federal government and affected agencies to do the same.”

CARRIED

Moved by J. Legendre

That a bullet be added under the paragraph entitled Interprovincial Bridges to read: “Reaffirm its opposition to new interprovincial bridge corridors within the urban area inside the greenbelt.”

CARRIED

That Transportation Committee approve the staff recommendation, as amended to change Interprovincial Bridges Policy 1 of Section 2.5.5 as shown at page 42 of the Addendum Report dated 15 May 97.

CARRIED

Section 2.5.6 Design Guidelines (pg. 49 of TMP)

Councillor Cullen proposed the deletion of Carling Avenue widening (2 to 4 lanes) from March Road to Moodie Drive from Table 10 because he did not want to provide additional capacity for east/west traffic through the greenbelt. He maintained that if it is easy for traffic to get through the greenbelt to get downtown, it defeats the Region's efforts to promote public transit.

Moved by A. Cullen

That the widening of Carling Avenue from two to four lanes from March Road to Moodie Drive (5.7 km) be deleted from Table 10 of the TMP.

CARRIED

Councillor Holmes proposed the deletion of Bronson Avenue widening from four to six lanes from the George Dunbar Bridge to the Rideau Canal. She believed it was a mistake to change the road width because the traffic from those additional lanes will veer off onto the Queen Elizabeth Driveway and she feared what the impact might be on the community. She explained there is already a merging problem from the 6 to 4 lanes and this expansion will only serve to move it further north.

Moved by D. Holmes

That the Bronson Avenue widening from four to six lanes from George Dunbar Bridge to Rideau Canal be deleted from Table 10 of the TMP.

CARRIED

Councillor Holmes proposed the deletion of the twinning of the Airport Parkway. She believed the issue of traffic on the Parkway also relates to the proposal to construct the

ramps at Hunt Club Road and believed if they were not constructed, the Airport would not have to be twinned because the demand would not be there. She maintained it should be retained as a facility to serve the airport and the growth in that area and stressed that the southeast transitway was constructed to serve transit users through that corridor and another roadway parallel to this facility could very well make it not as attractive to commuters. The Councillor also proposed a Motion to delete the ramps to/from the Airport Parkway at Hunt Club Road and Walkley Road.

The Commissioner advised that a public hearing is scheduled next week at which time committee will be asked to consider the design of the ramps at Hunt Club Road and the Parkway; should committee vote to delete the twinning and Council sustains that recommendation, there would be no reason to proceed with the public meeting.

Councillor Meilleur was concerned about the safety problem at Brookfield Road and the Parkway and the implications additional traffic would have on that situation. She agreed that adding more traffic to the Parkway will bring more traffic on Bronson Avenue and subsequently through the residential community. The Commissioner indicated the widening of Bronson Avenue was recommended as part of the Transportation Demands to and from the Southeast Sector Study which identified a number of projects to provide for future need. If there is a safety problem in a particular area, he confirmed it would be addressed as part of the construction. B. Reid added that usually a twinned roadway is safer than a two-laned roadway because there is that degree of separation between opposing traffic. He went on to state that the reason there is a need for additional capacity in the southeast part of the Region is attributed to the growth in Leitrim and River Ridge which will generate the need for additional north/south capacity. As part of the Southeast Sector Study, the Airport Parkway was identified as one of the corridors for this purpose and not twinning the Parkway will have severe ramifications on the Region's ability to deal effectively with that growth.

The Committee Chair noted Council has taken a position with respect to the construction of the ramps at Hunt Club, and thought Council had also decided on the twinning of the parkway based on the Southeast Sector Study. The Solicitor confirmed the ramps have been dealt with by Council i.e. to construct them, and have directed that a public hearing be held with respect to the final design. It was his opinion that the matter should proceed accordingly. The Committee Chair therefore ruled the Motion to delete the ramps Out of Order. Councillor Holmes challenged the Chair's ruling and a vote to Sustain the Chair was "Carried" as follows:

Shall the Chair be sustained.

CARRIED

YEAS: R. Cantin, P. Clark, H. Kreling, J. Legendre....4
NAYS: A. Cullen, D. Holmes, M. Meilleur....3

With respect to the Motion to delete the twinning of the Airport Parkway, staff indicated the Southeast Sector Study recommended the construction of the ramps and the twinning of the Parkway; however, at the time the current Official Plan was prepared, the Parkway was not a Regional road and in the new Official Plan it will have to be addressed if it is to be shown as twinned. Councillor Meilleur believed that since the Region was not the owner of the Parkway when the current Official Plan was prepared, the issue of the twinning should rightly be before committee for consideration. In addition, it was noted there is no capital project for the twinning of the Airport Parkway and therefore this project has not been approved by Council.

The Committee Chair ruled the Motion to delete the twinning of the Airport Parkway Out of Order. Councillor Holmes challenged the Chair's ruling and a vote to Sustain the Chair was "Lost" as follows:

Shall the Chair be sustained.

LOST

YEAS: R. Cantin....1

NAYS: A. Cullen, D. Holmes, H. Kreling, J. Legendre, M. Meilleur, P. Clark....6

A brief discussion ensued about the projects listed in Table 10 and whether they are rightly before committee to consider deleting or leaving in. The Solicitor advised there are some specific projects which Council has already determined and those cannot be reviewed except by the full Council.

Moved by D. Holmes

That the Airport Parkway twinning from the Macdonald-Cartier International Airport to Brookfield Road be deleted from Table 10 of the TMP.

CARRIED

YEAS: A. Cullen, D. Holmes, J. Legendre, M. Meilleur....4

NAYS: D. Beamish, R. Cantin, H. Kreling....3

Councillor Meilleur proposed the deletion of the Alta Vista Parkway from Table 10 because it will send traffic through the community via Nicholas, Rideau and King Edward and she was very strongly opposed to that. The Regional Chair reminded committee that this project is for the long term and suggested it would not increase traffic through the community if the access routes are built properly. In response, Councillor Meilleur believed that unless measures are put in place to relieve some of the traffic those residents are already suffering from, she will continue to fight for the deletion of this project.

Moved by M. Meilleur

That the Alta Vista Parkway project be deleted from Table 10.

LOST

YEAS: A. Cullen, D. Holmes, M. Meilleur....3

NAYS: D. Beamish, R. Cantin, P. Clark, H. Kreling, J. Legendre....5

Moved by D. Holmes

That Catherine Street/Chamberlain Street - extension of Elizabeth Street to Bronson Avenue be deleted from Table 10.

CARRIED

The Committee Chair questioned why the Mer Bleu Road widening was included in Table 10. He could not understand why it was included because he believed the Blackburn Hamlet By-pass will serve that need. B. Reid advised this has been identified as a long term requirement to serve the proposed growth of the Orléans community south of Innes Road in conjunction with the extension of the Blackburn Hamlet By-Pass and the widening of Tenth Line Road. With the anticipated need for Regional road capacity, it is proposed that this portion of Mer Bleue Road be assumed into the system between now and 2021. The Regional Chair added it is still a local collector even with the amount of growth projected and did not support keeping it in the Table.

Moved by P. Clark

That Mer Bleu Road widening from two to four lanes from Blackburn Hamlet By-Pass to Innes Road (1 km) be deleted from Table 10.

CARRIED

With respect to the proposed widening of Scott Street from four to six lanes, Councillor Holmes indicated Regional Council recently agreed to leave it as it is and suggested it be referred to the Planning and Environment Committee as part of its reconsideration of the Lebreton Flats issue.

Moved by D. Holmes

That Scott Street widening from four to six lanes from the CPR line to Empress Street (1 km) on Table 10 be referred to the Planning and Environment Committee.

CARRIED

Moved by A. Cullen

That the first bullet after Table 10 at page 55 be amended to add the following at the end of the sentence: “following the hierarchy of walking, cycling, transit and automobiles.”

CARRIED

Councillor Legendre proposed a change to the staff amendment to amend Policy 4 with respect to traffic calming. He believed some of the factors referenced by staff were not necessary and could be deleted, namely: a), b) and e) and proposed the following be added to that Policy: “Council will encourage the development of provincial and national design standards which recognize the green hierarchy and concepts such as traffic calming.” He suggested the deletion of the three points because they seem to be viewed as negative impacts, so in his opinion, they were not needed. The Committee Chair initially spoke against the removal of a) because the Region has been concerned with whether or not the traffic calming measure will affect public safety. Councillor Legendre indicated standards would have to be developed, which is why he was proposing the additional text.

Moved by J. Legendre

That Policy 4 of Section 2.5.6 (page 56 of the TMP) be amended by deleting parts a), b) and e) in the proposed modified text and relabelling the remaining factors listed.

CARRIED

YEAS: A. Cullen, D. Holmes, J. Legendre....3
NAYS: R. Cantin, H. Kreling....2

Councillor Cullen proposed deleting the words “or other” in the first bullet at page 44 of the Addendum report. He believed if there is a local traffic calming project he did not want that slowed down because the municipality has to consult with the Region. After some debate with staff, he suggested inserting the words “or measures that impact Regional roads” instead of using the words “or other”. The consultant made note of a traffic calming project whereby a simple rephrasing on the Regional road could have solved the problem, but instead the effect was a tremendous impact on the community when it could easily have been solved extraneous to the community. He noted, therefore, there is a connection between the two and the councillor withdrew his amendment.

Moved by J. Legendre

That the following bullet be added to the Section: “Council will encourage the development of provincial and national design standards which recognize the green hierarchy and concepts such as traffic calming.”

CARRIED

That Transportation Committee approve, as amended, the staff recommendation to Amend Policy 4 of Section 2.5.6 Design Guidelines as shown at page 44 of the Addendum Report dated 15 May 97.

CARRIED

Section 2.6 Interprovincial Issues (pg. 56 of TMP)

Moved by J. Legendre

That the second sentence of the second paragraph and the third paragraph in its entirety under Interprovincial Needs in Section 2.6 (pg. 57 of TMP), be deleted and replaced by: “To this end, Council shall protect approaches to the Cumberland-Angers crossing and request other agencies to do likewise, as indicated in Section 2.5.5 of this plan.”

CARRIED

Moved by J. Legendre

That the first sentence of the second paragraph under Interprovincial Needs (pg. 57 of TMP) in Section 2.6 be amended by addition to read: “...and that an additional river crossing in the eastern part of the Region is required by the end of the planning period.”

CARRIED

That Transportation Committee approve the staff recommendation to Amend Section 2.6 Interprovincial Bridges as shown at page 45 of the Addendum Report dated 15 May 97.

CARRIED

IMPLEMENTATION (pg. 61 of TMP)

Section 3.1 Priorities (pg. 61 of TMP)

Councillor Cullen noted that since the Committee has already approved that a pilot rail rapid transit project happen by the turn of the century, he proposed the following:

Moved by A. Cullen

That Table 11 be amended by adding to the First Priority (and removing from the Second Priority) the Pilot Rail Rapid Transit Project.

CARRIED

In conjunction with the Motion previously approved by committee to delete the widening of Carling Avenue between March Road and Moodie Drive, the following Motion was proposed:

Moved by A. Cullen

That Table 11 be amended by deleting Carling Avenue widening (March Road to Moodie Drive).

CARRIED

Councillor Legendre opined that the words “and intergovernmental relations” did not have to be included and suggested their deletion from the explanatory text of Section 3.1. Staff advised the wording was included to reflect the fact the Region has to deal with all levels of government.

Moved by J. Legendre

That the words “and intergovernmental relations” be deleted from the proposed explanatory text of Section 3.1. as shown at page 47 of the Addendum report dated 15 May 1997.

CARRIED
(R. Cantin dissented)

In view of previous Motions, Councillor Holmes proposed the following:

Moved by D. Holmes

That the Airport Parkway twinning be deleted from the Second Priority column of Table 11.

CARRIED

Moved by D. Holmes

That the Bronson Avenue widening (George Dunbar Bridge to Rideau Canal) be deleted from the Second Priority column of Table 11.

CARRIED

Councillor Holmes recognized the significant transitway projects included as “First Priority” in Table 11, but believed the Region should include something for pedestrians and cyclists in that column as well.

Moved by D. Holmes

That Pooley’s Bridge rehabilitation be included in First Priority of Table 11.

CARRIED

That Transportation Committee approve, as amended, the staff recommendations to Amend Section 3.1 Priorities, as shown at pages 47, 48, 49 and 50 of the Addendum report dated 15 May 97.

CARRIED

MONITORING (pg. 62 of TMP)

Moved by A. Cullen

That Table 12 be amended to add the following bullet: “arterial traffic spillover onto local streets” under the heading System Performance.

CARRIED

FINANCIAL IMPACTS (pg. 64 of TMP)

The Commissioner indicated it will be in this section where staff will include something to measure the expenditure by mode as previously considered by Committee. The Committee noted the heading “Travel costs for all modes” under “Elements to Monitor” in

Table 12 and the consultant suggested staff could explain what “cost” means in terms of those modes. Councillor Holmes hoped it would also include provincial and federal costs.

That Transportation Committee approve the staff recommendation to Amend Section 3.3 Financial Impacts as shown at page 52 of the Addendum report dated 15 May 97 and to amend Table 13 as shown at page 6 of the Supplementary Report dated 28 May 97.

CARRIED

That Transportation Committee approve the staff recommendation to add an executive summary of the Select Link Analysis report to Appendix A as shown at page 54 of the Addendum report dated 15 May 97.

CARRIED

Schedule F - Cycling Transportation Network (Map 1 of TMP)

Moved by A. Cullen

That Schedule F be amended to show the proposed pathway not yet built on the north side of Carling Avenue, east of Moodie Drive and west of Andrew Haydon Park.

CARRIED

Moved by D. Holmes

That Schedule F be amended to show the current and proposed cycling facility on Terry Fox Drive.

CARRIED

That Transportation Committee approve, as amended, the staff recommendations to Amend Map 1 as shown at pages 54 and 55 of the Addendum report dated 15 May 97.

CARRIED

Schedule E - Transit Network (Map 2 of TMP)

On behalf of Councillor Beamish who was absent from this portion of the meeting, the following Motion was proposed:

Moved by A. Cullen

That Schedule E be amended to include “a point south of Billings Bridge” as a candidate station location under Section 2.4.5 Rail Rapid Transit - CP Corridor.”

CARRIED

When asked how far south the councillor was suggesting, the Committee Chair advised it should be to the vicinity of Leitrim Road, which would serve the proposed growth south of the Airport. Staff advised there was some overlap because Council does have a policy to protect all railway corridors for this potential, but they wanted to concentrate on the urban areas.

That Transportation Committee approve the staff recommendations to Amend Map 2 as shown at pages 55 and 56 of the Addendum report dated 15 May 97.

CARRIED

Schedule C-1 - Future Urban Regional Roads Plan (Map 3 of TMP)

Schedule D-1 - Future Rural Regional Roads Plan (Map 4 of TMP)

That Transportation Committee approve the staff recommendations to Amend Maps 3 and 4 as shown at pages 56 and 58 of the Addendum report dated 15 May 97.

CARRIED

With respect to page iv of the background document in the TMP entitled “Bicycle Implementation”, Councillor Holmes suggested the third bullet on that page be deleted or that the word “minimized” be changed to “maximized”. She explained that what she really wanted was to have a pilot project for the provision of bicycles on buses. Staff advised that since that is a background document, it would be best to include something in the text of the TMP under Section 2.3. Cycling. They suggested they would add a new bullet 7 to the top of page 25 of the TMP, “That a pilot project be undertaken utilizing bicycles on buses.”

That the Transportation Committee recommend Council approve, as amended, the Transportation Master Plan.

CARRIED as amended

Staff advised the changes made today which also impact the Official Plan, will be brought to the attention of the Planning and Environment Committee during their deliberations on 12, 13 and 16 June 1997.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

CO-ORDINATOR

CHAIR