



NORTH–SOUTH CORRIDOR LRT PROJECT

(Rideau Centre to Barrhaven Town Centre)

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Consultation Group Summary Report



June 2005



McCORMICK RANKIN
CORPORATION



**Hatch Mott
MacDonald**

Table Of Contents

Consultation	1
Membership in Consultation Groups	1
Public Consultation Groups Concerns.....	4
Business Consultation Groups Concerns.....	4
Agency Consultation Groups Concerns.....	5
Appendix A - Consultation Plan	
Appendix B - Presentations	
Appendix C - Notes of Meetings	

Consultation

Consultation with stakeholders was considered an important component of the Environmental Assessment process. A “Consultation Plan” was developed for the North South LRT EA that identified key consultation objectives, target groups and activities to address consultation (Appendix A).

The document also established the roll of the consultation groups as advising and commenting on issues that directly affected their group. The groups did not have an approval roll for the project.

Three groups were formed representing: Public, Businesses, and Agency groups. The Agency Group was subsequently divided into and Internal and External to the City. The groups met prior to each of the four “Open House” sessions.

The first meetings were held in May 2004, where the following were discussed: Project Initiation, Roles of the Consultation Groups, Provincial and Federal Process, Draft Terms of Reference, Technology Choices, and Project Schedule. The second meetings were held on October 2004, where: the Approved Terms of Reference, Technology Choices and Ridership, Needs and Justification, Alternative Solutions, Alternative Corridors, Evaluation Process and Technologies were discussed. The third meeting held in March 2005 presented: Preliminary Routes, Station and park and Ride Locations, Yard locations, locations for Grade Separations, Downtown Screen of Corridors and Preliminary Downtown Concept plan. The fourth meeting was held in June 2005 where the: Input from the previous Public Meeting, Revised Downtown Concept, changes to Station locations and Park and Ride lots, an update on Yard locations and LeBreton Flats update were discussed.

At each meeting the materials to be presented at the subsequent Public meeting were reviewed. A PowerPoint presentation was given; notes of the meetings and copies of the presentations were provided to the groups prior to the next meeting. Copies of the presentations are included in Appendix B and copies of the Notes are included in Appendix C.

Membership in Consultation Groups

Membership in the group was developed through dialogue with City staff and supplemented with requests for various groups as the project advanced.

The Following Tables includes the invited membership list for each of the Consultation Groups.

Public Consultation Group
Alta Vista Community Association
City Centre Coalition
City of Ottawa
Forests and Greenspace Advisory Committee
City of Ottawa
Pedestrian and Public Transit Advisory Committee
City of Ottawa
Roads and Cycling Advisory Committee
City of Ottawa
Accessibility Advisory Committee
City of Ottawa
Environmental Advisory Committee
City of Ottawa
Local Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee
City of Ottawa
Arts, Heritage and Culture Advisory Committee
Dalhousie Community Association
Disabled and Proud
Emerald Woods Community Association
Federation of Citizens Association
Greely Community Association
Heart's Desire Community Association
Heron Park Community Association
Hintonburg Community Association
Hunt Club Community Organization
Hunt Club Park Community Association
Manotick Community Association
Ontario Disability Directorate
Ottawa Youth Cabinet
Quinterra-Riverwood Community Association
Ridgemont Community Association
Riverside Park Community and Recreation Association
Riverside South Community Association
Sawmill Creek/Blossom Park Community Association
South Keys/Greenboro Community Association
Southpointe Community Association
Transport 2000
Upper Hunt Club Community Association
Uplands on the Rideau Community Association

Business Consultation Group
Barrhaven Business Group
Building Owners and Managers Association
ByWard Market BIA
Carleton University
Capital Hill Hotels and Suites
Downtown Rideau BIA
Equity management International Limited

Business Consultation Group
Greater Ottawa Chamber of Commerce
Ottawa-Gatineau Hotel Association
Ottawa Macdonald-Cartier International Airport Authority
Ottawa Tourism and Convention Authority
Preston Street BIA
Sparks Street Mall Management Board
Sparks Street BIA
University of Ottawa

Internal Agency Group
Planning & Growth Management
<i>PEIP – Community Design & Zoning</i>
<i>PEIP – Transportation Policy</i>
<i>PEIP – Infrastructure Planning</i>
<i>PEIP – Environmental Management</i>
<i>PIA</i>
<i>Business Development</i>
Public Works & Services
<i>Transit Services – Planning</i>
<i>Transit Services – Rail</i>
<i>TPO – Mobility & Area Traffic Management</i>
<i>TPO – Traffic & Safety Services</i>
<i>TPO – Traffic Operations</i>
<i>TPO – Parking Operations Unit</i>
<i>Infrastructure Services – Infrastructure Management</i>
<i>Infrastructure Services – Construction Services</i>
<i>Surface Operations</i>
<i>Utility Services – Drinking Water Services</i>
<i>Utility Services – Wastewater and Drainage Services</i>
Corporate Services
<i>Financial Services</i>
<i>RPAM – Strategic Asset Management</i>
<i>RPAM – Real Estate Services</i>
<i>Fleet Services</i>
Emergency & Protective Services
<i>Fire Services</i>
Ottawa Police Services

External Agency Group
Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency – Ontario Regional Office
Canadian Transportation Agency – Rail Infrastructure Directorate
Environment Canada – Environmental Policy and Assessment Division
Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Health Canada
Environmental Health Assessment Services
Safe Environments Program, Healthy Environments and Consumer Safety Branch
Infrastructure Canada-Policy & Priorities
National Capital Commission - Design and Land Use Division

External Agency Group
National Capital Commission - Transportation Capital Planning and Real Asset Management
National Capital Commission - Environmental
National Research Council - Centre for Surface Transportation Research
Ontario Ministry of Culture
Ontario Ministry of the Environment - Environmental assessment and Approvals Branch
Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources
Ontario Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal
Ontario Ministry of Transportation - Transit & Policy Programs Office
Ontario Ministry of Transportation - Planning & Design – Eastern Region
Parks Canada
PWGSC – Environment & Sustainable Development Services
PWGSC – Real Property Service Branch
Rideau Valley Conservation Authority
Société de Transport de l'Outaouais (STO)
Transport Canada – Project Management
Transport Canada - Rail Safety
Transport Canada - Railway Equipment

Public Consultation Groups Concerns

The concerns of this group with respect to the process were due to the accelerated schedule. This resulted in limited time to review materials prior to the meetings. In addition they were concerned that they would not have an opportunity to review all the documented “task reports” prior to the filing of the EA Report. Some members of this group felt that this could put the consultation and EA process in jeopardy.

Specific concerns with the concept plan included concerns regarding:

1. Elimination of traffic and the through cycle lane on Mackenzie King bridge,
2. Location of Maintenance Yard near Blossom Park Community,
3. Desire to consider use of the DMU in staging,
4. LRT service should continue across the Prince of Wales Bridge to Gatineau,
5. Consider extensions of LRT to the new Exhibition and Race Track grounds,
6. Integration with the East West LRT project and the Interprovincial Transit Study, and
7. Service to the Airport should be included in the initial construction.
8. Number of stations within Barrhaven and Riverside South Communities would result in increased travel time
9. Pedestrian access to stations
10. The ability to add trains to the bus mix on Albert and Slater

Business Consultation Groups Concerns

The concerns of this group with respect to the process were due to the accelerated schedule. This resulted in limited time to review materials prior to the meetings. In addition they were concerned that they would not have an opportunity to review all the

documented “task reports” prior to the filing of the EA Report. Some members of this group felt that this could put the consultation and EA process in jeopardy.

Specific issues were:

1. The existing number of buses on Albert and Slater is impacting on the traffic flow and the environment of the streets,
2. Existing bus operations must be readdressed to reduce the number of buses downtown,
3. Any reduction in parking or loading area would impact on business operations,
4. Reduction in traffic lanes would effect emergency vehicle operations and access,
5. Addition of LRT to the bus fleet would exasperate current traffic and access problems,
6. Addition of LRT vehicle to the bus fleet and vehicle traffic would result in a congested and dangerous situation for traffic, cyclists and pedestrians,
7. The project was not considering a tunnel as a serious option,
8. The tunnel option was not as expensive as indicated and was the best solution to adding LRT to the Downtown area,
9. Removal of traffic from Mackenzie King Bridge would effect emergency services and result in traffic congestion during special events when Laurier Bridge was closed to Traffic.
10. How impacts to businesses during construction would be mitigated, and
11. If businesses would be compensated for losses during the construction period.

Agency Consultation Groups Concerns

The Agency Groups concerns were:

1. Justification for the project and use of LRT as the vehicle,
2. Operation constraints from the Walkley Yard location,
3. Details for crossovers and traffic configurations for service operations,
4. Impact on the Greenbelt and Transport Canada Lands,
5. Access to the Cliff Street parking lot,
6. Coordination with NCC’s revised approach to the development of LeBreton Flats,
7. Impact on development potential of the Bayview and Escarpment sites,
8. Coordination with the CEAA process,
9. Operation of the LRT under Transport Canada jurisdiction,
10. Removal of traffic and through cycle lanes from Mackenzie King Bridge, and
11. Impact on traffic and current bus operations.

Appendix A – Consultation Plan



NORTH–SOUTH CORRIDOR LRT PROJECT

(Rideau Centre to Barrhaven Town Centre)

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT Consultation Plan

Prepared By:



**Williamson
Consulting Inc.**



September 2004



**McCORMICK RANKIN
CORPORATION**



**Hatch Mott
MacDonald**

Table of Contents

1.0	Executive Summary	1
2.0	Situation Analysis	2
3.0	Key Consultation Objectives	3
4.0	Target Groups for Consultation	4
5.0	Key Messages	5
6.0	Recommended Consultation Activities	6
6.1	Consultation Groups	6
6.2	Project Website	8
6.3	Advertising for Public Open Houses	8
6.4	Public Open Houses	9
6.5	Project Master Mailing List	10
6.6	Newsletter	10
6.7	Comment Sheets	10
6.8	Project Contact	10
6.9	Final Consultation Report	10
7.0	Conclusions	11

1.0 Executive Summary

The City of Ottawa is proceeding with the preparation of an Individual Environmental Assessment (EA), in accordance with the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act (OEAA), for expansion of its rapid transit network to accommodate existing and future demand between Barrhaven, Riverside South and downtown Ottawa and the areas in between. The intent of this expansion is to support the modal split objectives of the City's Transportation Master Plan (TMP) and existing and future developments in accordance with the City's Official Plan (OP). This project is only one component of the City's overall plan for transportation improvements required to support future growth.

This EA study will require an enhanced public consultation program since transportation initiatives that span many neighbourhoods involve a large number of stakeholders, including community groups, property owners, businesses, institutions, approval agencies and special interest groups. The purpose of this consultation plan is to establish the framework by which these groups and the general public can bring forward issues and concerns and review and provide feedback on the study process and findings. Given the need for an enhanced public consultation process, the consulting team will adhere to the Official Plan's Guiding Principles by conducting an open and participatory process, building partnerships and creating public awareness as outlined in this consultation plan.

2.0 Situation Analysis

A number of themes and key considerations have emerged during the development of this consultation plan that are likely to impact the implementation of the plan. They represent both opportunities and constraints for consultation and will influence how the consultation plan is implemented.

- § Council's stated goal of the immediate expansion of LRT operations in the North-South corridor and the resulting aggressive schedule that should be respected in order to ensure the study's timely completion will require interested groups and residents to work closely with City and consulting team members to provide timely feedback;
- § The tight study timelines and large amounts of information to be reviewed will require the commitment of all consultation committee members to ensure the goals of the consultation process are met;
- § Residents and many special interest groups are keenly aware of the North-South Corridor LRT Project and will attend open houses and other consultation activities to provide feedback to the City and the consulting team;
- § The entire study area consists of a wide range of uses. The southern portion of the study area consists of mixed density residential, developing communities, agricultural resource areas and open space. Institutional, employment, commercial and mixed density residential areas dominate the central and northern portions of the study area. These divergent areas will each have differing consultation needs and expectations; and
- § Media interest in the project is high; this interest can be used to promote the consultation process to ensure a high level of participation from the community.

3.0 Key Consultation Objectives

The following communications objectives have been set out for the North-South Corridor LRT Project EA study:

- § Raise the profile and understanding of the North-South Corridor LRT Project EA with the residents of the City of Ottawa;
- § Ensure that all groups, including the general public, business community, and agency groups understand the need for the North-South Corridor LRT Project EA;
- § Ensure that the general public and key stakeholders have ample opportunity to have input on the study and provide feedback on the proposed alternatives;
- § Ensure the Public Consultation Group (PCG) is used effectively for input, feedback and comment on the study's findings and that the PCG members participate in all PCG consultation activities;
- § Ensure the Business Consultation Group (BCG) is used effectively for business input, feedback and comment on the study's findings and that the BCG members participate in all BCG consultation activities;
- § Ensure the internal and external Agency Consultation Groups (ACG-I, ACG-E) are used effectively to address the full range of technical issues and to comment on all of the special studies required to fully assess the various alternatives to ensure that the City is following the correct procedures, legislation and addressing appropriate policies;
- § Ensure that all stakeholders and the consultation groups are provided with timely and useful information during the consultation process; and
- § Ensure that the media are provided with timely and useful information in order to relay information to the general public about the consultation process.

4.0 Target Groups for Consultation

To satisfy the objectives of this consultation plan, target groups should be identified and regarded as distinct. The following list encompasses the audiences considered critical for the success of the consultation plan:

The General Public and Special Interest Groups, including:

- § Residents of the City of Ottawa
- § City of Ottawa Public Advisory Committees
- § Community Associations and Interest Groups

Business Groups, including:

- § Greater Ottawa Chamber of Commerce
- § Ottawa Macdonald-Cartier International Airport Authority
- § Ottawa Tourism and Convention Authority
- § Local BIAs
- § Carleton University

Government and Agency Groups, including:

- § City of Ottawa Mayor and Councillors
- § City of Ottawa Departments and Staff
- § Provincial Ministries and Federal Government Departments
- § Regulatory Agencies
- § Other identified Stakeholders

Local and regional media, including:

- § Community Newspapers
- § Radio and TV outlets (including cable television stations)
- § Ottawa Dailies, (Ottawa Citizen, Ottawa Sun, Le Droit)

5.0 Key Messages

Consistent messages with the appropriate tone and content will improve understanding among target audiences and encourage support for North-South Corridor LRT Project EA. The message statements listed below are built on an understanding of the existing audiences, constraints and opportunities.

- § The Environmental Assessment seeks the input of residents, businesses, community and special interest groups to develop and assess transportation and technology alternatives for the North-South Corridor LRT project;
- § One set of two Open Houses was held in May 2004 to introduce the study to the general public and obtain feedback on the draft Terms of Reference (ToR). Three sets of Public Open Houses will be held during the course of the EA study at up to 3 separate locations to present and obtain feedback on project information. The meetings are tentatively scheduled for October 2004, March 2005 and June 2005; and
- § All suggestions and discussions received during the Public Open Houses will be used to refine the final plan for Council approval in September 2005 and the Environmental Assessment Report.

6.0 Recommended Consultation Activities

A variety of consultation vehicles and mechanisms are recommended to achieve the objectives of this consultation plan. Care has been taken in selecting activities that recognize the needs of the local communities, business and special interest organizations, governmental agencies and city-wide stakeholders. Given the need for an enhanced public consultation process, the consulting team will adhere to the City's Official Plan's Guiding Principles by conducting an open and participatory process, building partnerships and creating public awareness.

6.1 Consultation Groups

As approved by Council through their approval of the Study Statement of Work, three invited Consultation Groups involving community and special interest groups, business interests and government agencies have been established. These Groups will meet in advance of each round of Public Open Houses. The roles of these groups will be to provide input, opinions and interactive dialogue with the Study Team. They are not intended to be approving bodies or the sole source for public and other stakeholder input.

Public Consultation Group (PCG)

A PCG has been formed to enable community and special interest groups to provide direct input to the study, advising and commenting on local issues and concerns. PCG members include:

- § Alta Vista Community Association
- § Carleton University Students Association
- § City Centre Coalition
- § City of Ottawa
 - Pedestrian and Public Transit Advisory Committee
 - Roads and Cycling Advisory Committee
 - Accessibility Advisory Committee
 - Environmental Advisory Committee
 - Local Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee
 - Arts, Heritage and Culture Advisory Committee
- § Dalhousie Community Association
- § Disabled and Proud
- § Federation of Citizens Association
- § Greely Community Association
- § Heart's Desire Community Association
- § Heron Park Community Association
- § Hintonburg Community Association
- § Hunt Club Community Organization

- § Hunt Club Park Community Association
- § Manotick Community Association
- § Ottawa Youth Cabinet
- § Ontario Disability Directorate
- § Quinterra-Riverwood Community Association
- § Ridgemont Community Association
- § Riverside Park Community and Recreation Association
- § Riverside South Community Association
- § Sawmill Creek/Blossom Park Community Association
- § South Keys/Greenboro Community Association
- § Southpointe Community Association
- § Transport 2000
- § Upper Hunt Club Community Association
- § Uplands on the Rideau Community Association

Business Consultation Group (BCG)

There are many business, commercial and institutional interests within or adjacent to the study area that may be affected by this undertaking. Accordingly, a BCG has been established to enable these groups to provide input to the study, and advise and comment on issues of concern. BCG members include:

- § Building Owners and Managers Association
- § ByWard Market BIA
- § Carleton University
- § Downtown Rideau BIA
- § Greater Ottawa Chamber of Commerce
- § Ottawa Macdonald-Cartier International Airport Authority
- § Ottawa Tourism and Convention Authority
- § Preston Street BIA
- § Sparks Street BIA
- § Sparks Street Mall Management Board

Agency Consultation Group (ACG)

An ACG has been formed to address the full range of technical issues and to comment on all of the special studies required to fully assess the various alternatives and to ensure that the City is following the correct procedures, legislation and addressing appropriate policies. Because of the size of this group, it has been divided into an Internal (City) Consultation Group (ACG-I) and External Agency Consultation Group (ACG-E). ACG members include experts in their related fields from government agencies and approval bodies including:

- § Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency – Ontario Regional Office

- § City of Ottawa
 - Public Works and Services (including OC Transpo)
 - Planning and Growth Management
 - Corporate Services
 - Community and Protective Services
- § Environment Canada – Environmental Policy and Assessment Division
- § Fisheries and Oceans Canada
- § Health Canada
- § Infrastructure Canada
- § National Capital Commission
- § National Research Council – Centre for Surface Transportation Research
- § Ontario Ministry of Culture
- § Ontario Ministry of the Environment
- § Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources
- § Ontario Ministry of Public Infrastructural Renewal
- § Ontario Ministry of Transportation
- § Ottawa Police Services
- § Parks Canada
- § PWGSC – Investment Management Directorate
- § Rideau Valley Conservation Authority
- § Société de Transport de l’Outaouais (STO)
- § Transport Canada

Consultation will also take place with other identified stakeholders as required.

6.2 Project Website

A bilingual project website (www.ottawa.ca/lrt) will be established for this study to provide information to interested parties and to provide a means to directly contact the project representatives. Project websites have proven to be a very effective tool for making available project information such as reports and supporting documents. The website can also be used to solicit input through the use of electronic comment sheets.

6.3 Advertising for Public Open Houses

As part of the City’s public consultation policy, each Public Open House will be advertised in English and French daily newspapers two weeks prior to each series of meetings. This provides sufficient advance notice and ensures appropriate awareness of the Public Open Houses to encourage participation. Notices of the Public Open Houses will also be posted on the project web site, at all City Client Service Centres and forwarded to individuals on the Project Mailing List.

6.4 Public Open Houses

Three sets of Public Open Houses will be held during the course of the EA study at up to 3 separate locations to present and obtain feedback on project information. Public Open Houses will take place in the Downtown, South and in Barrhaven areas. The meetings are tentatively scheduled for October 2004, March 2005 and June 2005.

Each Public Open House will involve explanatory panels set up in a walk through and 'drop-in' style format with adequate staff on hand to respond to any questions and discuss the study on a one on one basis. Handouts and comment sheets will also be provided in both official languages. Formal presentations will be considered for the Public Open Houses in the latter stages of the study to present the project findings.

Public Open House #1

These Public Open Houses will be held in late October 2004. Information to be presented will include:

- § Physical/environmental features;
- § Assessment of "Alternatives To the Undertaking";
- § Documentation and display of all of the reasonable rapid transit technologies;
- § Evaluation and conclusions with respect to bus versus rail;
- § Maps and characteristics of potential alignment variations in the corridor including potential station locations, potential yard alternatives; and
- § Proposed evaluation method.

Public Open House #2

These Public Open Houses will be held in March 2005.

The information and presentation at this round of public consultations will build on the previous work and previous public input. The key information presented will include:

- § The analysis and selection of the preferred corridor(s) including alignments, stations and yards, and supporting infrastructure requirements;
- § The recommended ultimate technology; and
- § The suggested interim staging plan.

Public Open House #3

These Public Open Houses will be held in June 2005.

The information and presentation at this final round of public consultations will be the draft recommended functional plans including the staging and implementation strategy.

Based on the feedback received during these meetings refinements will be made to the final plan for Council approval and the Environmental Assessment report.

6.5 Project Master Mailing List

A Master Mailing List for the project will be established and maintained. The Mailing List will be updated via Public Open Houses, general enquires, e-mails and other forms of consultation.

6.6 Newsletter

Prior to each Public Open House, a bilingual newsletter will be produced to outline the study findings to date; providing information on the material to be presented at the Public Open Houses, and; respond to frequently asked questions (FAQs). The proposed newsletter layout will use 11x17 paper folded to present a professional image.

6.7 Comment Sheets

At all Public Open Houses, comment sheets will be available for residents and interested parties to provide written feedback to the consulting team. These comment sheets will be reviewed and a consultation report developed following each series of open houses. In addition, feedback mechanisms will be provided on the website in order to allow residents and interested parties to provide comments on information provided through the web.

6.8 Project Contact

The contact for the study is:

Peter Steacy, P. Eng.
City of Ottawa - Planning and Growth Management Department
110 Laurier Avenue West, 4th Floor
Ottawa, ON K1P 1J1

Tel: 613-580-2424 ext. 21827

Fax: 613-580-2578

E-mail: peter.steacy@ottawa.ca

Project information can be obtained by going to the City of Ottawa's website at:

www.ottawa.ca/lrt, and in French at www.ottawa.ca/tlr

6.9 Final Consultation Report

At the conclusion of the consultation process, a final consultation report will be prepared by the consulting team that outlines all consultation activities and reports on the findings, themes and comments received from all stakeholders.

7.0 Conclusions

The North-South Corridor LRT Priority Process EA is one of the most important transportation EAs initiated since the final construction of the Transitway in the 1990s. The size of the study area and the interest already shown toward the project from the general public and special interest groups dictate that an enhanced consultation process is required. The planning for three Public Open House sessions in three locations along the study corridor will help ensure that the consultation process is open and transparent and accessible by residents and special interest groups.

The project website will also be used to provide immediate access for residents and special interests via computer. By providing a two-stream consultation process involving Public Open Houses and web-based information, the maximum number of people will be able to comment on the study process and findings.

Given the tight timelines to complete the EA process, all parties involved in the study including the City of Ottawa, the consulting team and the consultation groups will need to work closely to ensure that sufficient time is provided for each phase of the consultation process.

Appendix B – Presentations

May 2004

October 2004

March 2005

June 2005

NOT INCLUDED IN THIS SUMMARY
To be included in final EA document

Appendix C – Notes of Meetings

PCG

BCG

ACG Internal

ACG External

MRC/HMM

McCormick Rankin Corporation/
Hatch Mott MacDonald

McCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION

1145 Hunt Club Road, Suite 300
Ottawa, Ontario K1V 0Y3
Tel: (613) 736-7200
Fax: (613) 736-8710
E-mail: mrc-ott@mrc.ca
Website: www.mrc.ca

NOTES OF MEETING

PROJECT: North-South Corridor LRT Project EA Study

MEETING: Public Consultation Group #1

FILE NO.: D06-01 04-NSLRT (City of Ottawa) / 5648-7043 (MRC)

DATE: May 12, 2004

TIME: 6:00 pm

PLACE: Ottawa City Hall, Colonel By Room, 2nd Floor

PRESENT:

Public Consultation Group		
Garry Lindberg	Alta Vista Community Association	
Cam Robertson	City Centre Coalition	
David Gladstone (part time)	City Centre Coalition	
Pat Spearey	City of Ottawa – Pedestrian and Public Transit Advisory Committee	
Diane Dupuis	City of Ottawa – Roads and Cycling Advisory Committee	
Keith Hobbs	City of Ottawa – Accessibility Advisory Committee	
Heather McArthur	City of Ottawa – Local Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee	
Ida Henderson	Dalhousie Community Association	
Madeline Stewart-Dmaj	Hintonburg Community Association	
Keith Parker	Riverside South Community Association	
David Jeanes (part time)	Transport 2000	
Tim Lane	Transport 2000	
Study Team		
Peter Steacy	City of Ottawa - Chair	
Ken Gosselin	McCormick Rankin Corp.	
Dennis Callan	McCormick Rankin Corp.	
Thom Budd	Hatch Mott Macdonald	
Judi Cohen	Hatch Mott Macdonald	
Mike Bricks	Ecoplans Limited	
Howard Williamson	Williamson Consulting	
Robert Hunton	McCormick Rankin Corp.	

PURPOSE: To introduce the Public Consultation Group representatives to the project, and discuss aspects of the draft Terms of Reference.

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

- 1.1 Following introduction of the Consultant Team and Public Consultation Group Members, a PowerPoint presentation was given that outlines:

- Project Background
- Corridor Overview
- Study Schedule
- Ontario EA Process
- Definition of Terms of Reference
- Federal EA Process
- EA Co-ordination
- Next Steps

A copy of that presentation is attached to these notes of meeting.

- 1.2 Mr. Callan explained that the project schedule was 18 months in duration. This is an Individual Environmental Assessment Study and the Terms of Reference (ToR) is the first document that has to be submitted to the Ontario Ministry of Environment (MOE) for approval. Members of the group were emailed a copy of the draft ToR prior to the meeting for review.

- 1.3 M. Bricks described the Federal and Provincial EA process and how they would be coordinated during this study. Mr. Bricks explained there is a 12-week MOE approval period of the Terms of Reference and 30-week approval period for the EA document.

- 1.4 Mr. Callan indicated that future group meetings would be held prior to the upcoming Public Open House meetings at 3 additional phases of the study. Mr. Callan explained that the group role would be further defined in a "Consultation Plan" which is being drafted.

H. Williamson

In general, the group is to act as a sounding board bringing specific community feedback and concerns to the study.

- 1.5 Mr. David Jeanes of Transport 2000 provided written copy of Transportation 2000's comments (attached) on the draft ToR. Mr. Jeanes' written comments will be reviewed and responded to.

M. Bricks

Other comments and responses are as follows are as follows:

- 1) How often will the group meet?

Response: *The group will meet before the Public Open Houses.*

- 2) Are comments to be documented?

Response: *Comments are to be documented in the Notes of this Meeting, which will be appended to the ToR and the final EA Report.*

- 3) More lead time is required for the group to respond (3-4 weeks).

Response: *The City will provide as much lead-time for future meetings as possible. It is recognized that the project is on a fast tracked schedule.*

- 4) If group members need to report to their communities two (2) months will be required to obtain responses.

Response: *That will not be possible if this study is to keep to schedule. As representatives of their respective community associations, given the tight study timelines Public Consultation Group members are expected to bring their association's views directly to the table at each PCG meeting without the need to return to their group for feedback.*

- 5) Why must the study undertake reviews of technology, this was resolved through RTES?

Response: *The study must document all aspects of the EA Process. Council recommendations are not binding on MOE, therefore rational for previous Council decisions must be documented and examined in the context of the EA process.*

- 6) Will fuel supply be examined during the technical review of vehicles?

Response: *Yes.*

- 7) The Terms of Reference should include **positive** health impacts of LRT.

Response: *Positive as well as negative impacts will be considered and documented.*

8) Will evaluation criteria be included in Terms of Reference?

Response: *The Terms of Reference will not include evaluation methodology. This will be developed during the study to reflect the level of need and data.*

9) Establish dates of future meeting well in advance.

Response: *Dates will be established for upcoming meetings and circulated to the group.*

10) Why is the study not including a route into Gatineau?

Response: *The approved study Statement of Work has indicated that this study will be coordinated with the proposed NCC-led Interprovincial Rapid Transit Integration Study, which has not yet started. The results of this study will ensure that all options for interprovincial connection are not precluded.*

11) Will the study consider STO Bus routes?

Response: *The study will co-ordinate with STO. STO will be members of the Agency Consultation Group.*

The foregoing represents the writer's understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the undersigned within 48 hours of receiving these minutes at 613-736-7200.

Notes prepared by,

McCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION



Robert Hunton , P. Eng.

cc: All Attendees
Carleton University Students Association
Anne Coffey – City of Ottawa Environmental Advisory Committee
Nick Masciantonio – City of Ottawa Arts, Heritage and Culture Advisory Committee
Linda Hoad – Federation of Citizens Association
Kerry Charron – Greely Community Association
Mike Cotter – Heart's Desire Community Association
James McLaren – Heron Park Community Association
Fred McLennan – Hunt Club Community Association
Eric Dormer – Hunt Club Park Community Association
Mike O'Neil – Manotick Community Association
Michael Presley – Quinterra-Riverwood Community Association
Frank Licari – Ridgemont Community Association
Carolyn Gauthier – Riverside Park Community and Recreation Association
Tom Breuer – Sawmill Creek/Blossom Park Community Association
Jim Holton – South Keys/Greenboro Community Association
Tanya Thompson – Southpointe Community Association
Colin Lindsay – Upper Hunt Club Community Association
Donna Allen – Uplands on the Rideau Community Association
Vivi Chi – City of Ottawa

MRC/HMM

McCormick Rankin Corporation/
Hatch Mott MacDonald
Joint Venture

c/o McCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION

1145 Hunt Club Road, Suite 300
Ottawa, Ontario K1V 0Y3
Tel: (613) 736-7200
Fax: (613) 736-8710
E-mail: mrc-ottawa@mrc.ca
Website: www.mrc.ca

NOTES OF MEETING

PROJECT: North-South Corridor LRT Project EA Study

MEETING No. 3: Public Consultation Group

FILE NO.: D06-01 04 (City of Ottawa) / 5648-7043 (MRC)

DATE: March 9, 2005

TIME: 6:30 pm

PLACE: Colonel By Board Room, 2nd Floor, 110 Lisgar Street

PRESENT:

City of Ottawa		
Peter Steacy	Program Manager Transportation – EA Program	
Vivi Chi (Part Time)	Manager, Transportation Infrastructure	
Consultant Team		
Dennis Callan	MRC Project Manager	
Thom Budd	HMM Manager, Infrastructure	
Robert Hunton	MRC Assistant Project Manager	
Public Consultation Group		
David Gladstone	City Centre Coalition	
Nicole Parent	City of Ottawa Forests and Greenspace Advisory Committee	
Ida Henderson	Dalhousie Community Association	
Diane Dupuis	City of Ottawa Roads and Cycling Advisory Committee	
Keith Parker	Riverside South Community Association	
Mark Nездoly	City of Ottawa Local Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee	
Nan Griffiths	City of Ottawa Arts, Heritage and Culture Advisory Committee	
James McLaren	Heron Park Community Association	
Michel Haddad	City of Ottawa Pedestrian and Public Transit Advisory Committee	
David Jeanes	Transport 2000	

PURPOSE: To update the group on the study progress and obtain comments with respect to the preliminary recommended plan to be presented at the upcoming Public Open Houses (21, 22, & 23 March 2005).

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

- 3.1 Following introductions of the attendees, the notes of the 04 October 2004 meeting were circulated.

Mr. Steacy informed the PCG that within the City there are two parallel LRT project ‘streams’ – one addressing the planning (EA) aspects and the other addressing future project implementation which are working in close concert. In its 01 March 2005 report to the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee concerning the proposed procurement approach, it was identified that Albert and Slater Streets were the preferred downtown LRT

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

corridors. This information was subsequently presented in detail to Albert & Slater Street stakeholders at formal presentations on 07 March.

The PCG was advised this was the beginning of a consultation process to obtain feedback and hear the concerns of all stakeholders. Based upon the feedback received, the City shall be modifying/enhancing its plans to best address everyone's concerns.

3.2 Mr. Callan narrated a PowerPoint presentation of materials which outlined:

- Project Schedule
- Current Activities
- Development Issues
- Alternative Corridors Considered (South)
- Preferred Route
- Station Locations
- Park and Ride Lot Locations
- Grade Separations
- Maintenance Yard Locations
- Downtown Alignment Choices
- Screening of Downtown Alignment Choices
- Albert/Slater Options
- Next Steps in the Study

3.3 The schedule was described as:

- Project commencement April 2004
- Two POH's held to date (May/October, 2004)
- Third POH to be held March 21, 22, 23, 2005
- Fourth POH to be held June 2005
- EA recommendations to Council July 2005
- EA to MOE September 2005
- MOE approval late 2005

3.4 Mr. Callan described the material to be presented at the March POH as:

- Preliminary Alignments
- Station, Park and Ride and Maintenance Yard Locations
- Preliminary Downtown Options
- Staging elements

The meeting was advised that although staging will be considered in the EA, the MOE would be approving only the ultimate project.

PROCEEDINGS:**ACTION BY:**

- 3.5 The community planning elements that contributed to the alignment choice were described as:
- Development potential of LeBreton Flats and Bayview Yard
 - South Nepean Town Centre Community Design Plan
 - City's Downtown Ottawa Urban Design Strategy
 - Leitrim Community Community Design Plan
 - Riverside South Community Design Plan
- 3.6 Plans of alternative alignments were presented. Some of the alignments were identified as being developed in previous studies for the development of Riverside South. The analysis of these alternatives will be included in the EA documentation. Consultant Team
- 3.7 Thirty-five station locations were identified on the key plan. The attending were informed that the station locations respected the development concept for Riverside South and South Nepean Town Centre. The attending were advised that the EA would identify and protect the property for all these potential locations, but would not compel the City to construct any of them until the city had determined a need. City
- 3.8 Five park and ride lot locations along the corridor were identified:
- Existing lot at Greenboro Station
 - Two alternatives at Leitrim Road
 - Future lot at Bowesville
 - Interim lot at Limebank
 - Lot at Woodroffe Road
- 3.9 Major grade separations were identified at:
- Two Rideau River crossings (immediately south of Carleton University, and adjacent to the Strandherd/Earl Armstrong Bridge)
 - Two rail to rail crossings (VIA Rail – Beachburg Subdivision, CNR – Walkley Subdivision)
 - New tunnel to twin existing at Dow's Lake
 - Existing structures along current O-train corridor.

Mr. Callan informed the attendees that as an interim solution the Southerly crossing of the Rideau River would be constructed on the proposed six-lane Strandherd Road structure for which an ESR was completed in 1993. The concept is for the rail to use 2 of the lanes resulting in a 4-lane road structure between River Road and Prince of Wales Road.

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

- 3.10 Maintenance yard locations were identified at the existing Walkley yard site and South of the airport lands. The attendees were informed that the City was carrying out negotiations with the rail company for purchase of the Walkley yards, failing that negotiations with Transport Canada will be required to purchase these lands.

City

- 3.11 Downtown corridor options were identified as:

- Wellington Street
- Sparks Street
- Queen Street
- Albert Street
- Slater Street
- Laurier Avenue

The screening analysis was presented that led to the selection of Albert and Slater Streets as the preferred corridors.

The options for development of LRT on Albert and Slater were defined as:

- 2 way LRT on Albert with 2 way BRT on Slater
- 1 way LRT and BRT on Albert and Slater

The attendees were informed that the 1 way option was determined to be the preferred option. Renderings of the concept were presented.

- 3.12 Next steps in the project were described as:

- March 21, 22, 23 (POH's)
- Adjust plans to reflect comments
- Develop staging plan
- Present final option in June (POH's)
- Modify as required to reflect input
- Present EA recommendations to City Council in July
- Submit to MOE
- MOE approval late 2005

3.13 Q & A

Q: How is the removal of cyclists from the Mackenzie King bridge being resolved?

A: The study team will be working with the City and advisory Consultant Team

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

committee to resolve this issue. Options may include using the future pedestrian crossing of the canal at Somerset Street and other secondary roads.

Q: How can the buses on Albert and Slater be reduced? The application of LRT will compound that situation.

A: The City's Transit Services Branch (OC Transpo) will be undertaking an operational study to address this issue. The results of this study are expected in the Fall.

Q: Why not transfer all passengers to the rail outside of downtown?

A: Transfer sites for bus to rail on the limits of downtown would take up extensive amounts of land, there would be significant inconvenience and delays to all bus passengers resulting in some reduced ridership, and a much larger number of LRT vehicles (perhaps 3 to 4 times as many as for the NS LRT alone) would be required to accommodate the additional passenger load in the downtown.

Q: Will the train time from Bowesville to LeBreton Flats be less than 28 minutes?

A: The study team will model this to determine what the time is.

Consultant Team

Q: Will the concept include aesthetic aspects at the Walkely rail grade separation, and will the EA consider water quality in Sawmill Creek?

A: The concept will include comments on aesthetics but the actual look of the structures will be determined during the design process. As required, mitigation measures to protect the water quality at Sawmill Creek will be included in the EA.

Q: Were centre island platforms considered in the downtown?

A: Centre island concept were considered. It was concluded that an insufficient amount of space within the Albert and Slater corridors, combined with pedestrian safety and winter plowing concerns precluded this option.

Q: The centre island platform on the Mackenzie King bridge should be widened.

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

A: Measures to increase the width of the centre island platform will be investigated.

Q: Is the connection to the airport part of the EA recommendation?

A: The EA is for the 2021 project and will include a link to the airport. The construction timing of the link will be subject to the City's determination and budget.

Q: How were the 35 station locations chosen?

A: The stops in the downtown were selected to match the existing bus stops. The stops along the existing O-train were part of the existing system and included those identified in the pilot-project EA. Through Riverside South and Barrhaven the community design planning process established the locations.

Q: How will trains be scheduled to the airport?

A: The future operational strategy will address this; options could include alternative trains or shuttles.

Q: The concept includes several at grade roadway crossings. Will this not impact on the schedule?

A: Outside of the downtown the LRT will be given priority. The roadway crossings will be controlled/protected through the use of railway type barriers.

Q: Why is there not a park and ride at River Road to catch the traffic from the south?

A: A park and ride at Limebark and Bowesville are proposed to accommodate this demand. A site at River Road is currently not identified in the Community Design Plan. This issue will be given further consideration by the EA team and will be pursued within the CDP.

Q: Will the park and ride lots include cameras, bike racks and security?

A: The detail design will address these issues. The EA will define the locations and suggest features.

The foregoing represents the writer's understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the undersigned within 48 hours of receiving these minutes at 613-736-7200.

Notes prepared by,

McCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION

Robert Hunton, P. Eng.

MRC/HMM

McCormick Rankin Corporation/
Hatch Mott MacDonald

McCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION

1145 Hunt Club Road, Suite 300
Ottawa, Ontario K1V 0Y3
Tel: (613) 736-7200
Fax: (613) 736-8710
E-mail: mrc-ott@mrc.ca
Website: www.mrc.ca

NOTES OF MEETING

PROJECT: North-South Corridor LRT Project EA Study
MEETING: Public Consultation Group #2
FILE NO.: D06-01 04-NSLRT (City of Ottawa) / 5648-7043 (MRC)
DATE: October 4, 2004 **TIME:** 6:00 pm
PLACE: Ottawa City Hall, Colonel By Room, 2nd Floor

PRESENT:

Public Consultation Group		
Brian C. Nelson	Southpointe Community Association	
Bill Smith	Riverside Park Community & Recreation Association	
James McLaren	Heron Park Community Association	
Diane Dupuis	City of Ottawa – Roads and Cycling Advisory Committee	
Mark Nesdoly	City of Ottawa Local Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee	
Garry Lindberg	Alta Vista Community Association	
Charles Matthews	Disabled and Proud	
Keith Parker	Riverside South Community Association	
Ida Henderson	Dalhousie Community Association	
David Jeanes	Transport 2000	
Tim Lane	Transport 2000	
David Gladstone	City Centre Coalition	
Study Team		
Peter Steacy	City of Ottawa - Chair	
Dennis Callan	McCormick Rankin Corp.	
Thom Budd	Hatch Mott Macdonald	
Mike Bricks	Ecoplans Limited	
Howard Williamson	Williamson Consulting	
Robert Hunton	McCormick Rankin Corp.	

PURPOSE: To update the group on the approval of the ToR and work completed to be presented at the upcoming POH (Oct. 19, 20 , 21).

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

- 2.1 Following introductions of the attendees, Mr. Steacy asked if all the members had been able to download and print the packages sent to them, if not packages were available for them at this meeting to take. Mr. Steacy explained that the intention was to provide the materials earlier due to technical difficulties it was not possible. Since there was insufficient time for the group to fully review and respond to the material, Mr. Steacy suggested that they respond by October 28th, which is the same deadline for POH comments, and that this meeting be used to explain the material and address initial

questions.

Materials provided by email and available as hand outs:

- Members Roles and Responsibilities (PCG, ACG, BCG)
- Needs and Justification/Alternative Solutions (Sept. 27/04, Working Paper)
- Evaluation Process (Sept. 27/04 Discussion Paper)
- Core Area Corridor Plans (Draft, Sept. 27/04)
- Central Area Cross Sections Alternatives (Draft Working Paper, Sept. 27/04)
- Consultation Plan (Sept./04)
- Information Package (Sept./04)

In addition, a plan “Alignment/Development through South Communities” which was too large to email was available as a hand out.

Some members of the PCG indicated that they were displeased with the lack of time for them to review and properly digest the massive amount of materials provided to them.

Mr. Steacy apologized and reiterated that the group had until October 28th to respond.

2.2 Mr. Callan narrated a PowerPoint presentation of materials which outlined:

- Terms of Reference Approval
- Existing Conditions Data
- Problem Statement
- Alternative Solutions to the Problem
- Alternative Rapid Transit Modes
- Alternative Corridors to be considered
- Evaluation Criteria
- Next Step

The group was informed that the ToR were approved by MOE on September 15th. A copy of the approved ToR will be translated and placed on the City Web Page.

P. Steacy

The PCG asked if a web site with email address was being established for this project. Mr. Steacy told them that a LRT page with links to this and the East-West Study was on the City's Web. Any email for this project should be addressed to Mr. Steacy.
peter.steacy@ottawa.ca

PCG enquired if the Ministry had placed any conditions on the approval of the ToR. Mr. Steacy informed the meeting that the approval did not have any conditions.

- 2.3 Mr. Callan described the existing conditions panels that will be presented at the POH, the panels include existing conditions for:
- Natural Environment
 - Geotechnical Conditions
 - Heritage Features
 - Built Environment

PCG suggested that urban cycle routes be included as part of the existing conditions display for the Core Area.

MRC

- 2.4 Mr. Callan explained the growth issues that resulted in the “Problem Statement” and “Purpose of the Undertaking”.

The Problem Statement was described as:

- 75% increase in population, 50% increase in employment
- existing infrastructure will not accommodate this growth.

- 2.5 Mr. Callan presented the alternative solutions as:
- Do Nothing
 - Expand Arterial Road Network
 - Expand Rapid Transit Service Outside the Study Corridor
 - Expand Rapid Transit Service Within the Corridor
 - Combination of Expansion of Arterial Road Network and Rapid Transit Service

Following an explanation of what each of these alternatives meant and the evaluation, Mr. Callan informed the group that the initial recommendation will be for the “Combination Solution” which results in improved transit and some roadway improvements. This alternative complies with the balanced approach set out in the TMP with transit being established first. Mr. Callan advised the group that this EA would address the transit component only.

The group discussed the merits of this approach, there was a mix in points of view regarding the perceived promotion of roadways. Some members felt this was an appropriate approach with transit being the priority, while others objected to any recommendation that could result in future road widenings.

The group suggested stronger wording on the panels and reports was required to ensure that the transit component was clearly the

MRC

desired direction to be undertaken.

Mr. Callan told the meeting that this approach was in harmony with the TMP and OP goals and that by establishing transit early in the development of the communities that the need for future road works which would be subject to Council approval and another EA process may be postponed or eliminated.

- 2.6 Mr. Callan informed the group that the EA process required that after identifying transit as the solution, transit network using rail or bus technologies must be investigated in the corridor.

Several examples of electric and diesel LRT and bus BRT vehicles were presented to show what the vehicle could look like. Mr. Callan informed the group that this EA would not be recommending the vehicle, but would establish design criteria to be applied for a future procurement process.

A table illustrating various characteristics of BRT and electric and diesel LRT was presented. As well, comparative LRT/BRT network schemes were presented to the group.

- 2.7 Mr. Callan told the group that the “Ridership Study” being carried out for the City was nearing completion. Based on the work completed an estimate of 2021 ridership has been set at 60,000 daily riders and if a sensitivity analysis was used that ridership between the Rideau Centre and Barrhaven Town Centre was estimated to be between 60,000 and 70,000. Mr. Callan advised the group that these numbers were being refined but it was not expected to change to any significant degree.

- 2.8 A table showing comparable North American LRT networks was presented. That table indicated that for the projected ridership of 60,000 – 70,000 on a 31 km network, it was reasonable to consider a LRT network to service the transit needs.

Mr. Callan presented a table which illustrated the potential headways and number of vehicles required for LRT and BRT to accommodate the 60,000 – 70,000 demand. Mr. Callan informed the group that a relative cost comparison had been carried out for the BRT and LRT networks. The comparison included:

- capital
- annual operating
- life cycle replacement

- 2.9 Mr. Callan said that the study was recommending LRT Technology be used in this corridor because:
- used existing infrastructure
 - higher capital but lower ongoing cost
 - reduced exhaust emissions in corridor
 - the central area is currently saturated with buses
 - there is a perceived potential to attract more riders
 - there is a perceived potential to attract development at stations.

PCG suggested that the LRT was even more desirable because of its ride comfort and versatility of connecting units to address demand.

It was suggested that the choice of LRT could be made on these points alone.

Mr. Callan informed the group that the funding partners would require more detail support for the conclusion.

- 2.10 Mr. Callan presented the corridors being considered, in the core area; Wellington, Sparks, Queen, Albert, Slater and Laurier Streets were identified as possible corridors. Various links to LeBreton Flats and Rideau Centre were also shown on the core area plan. Mr. Callan indicated that these were preliminary corridors and alignments and impacts would be assessed in the next stage of the study.

A plan of the southern area illustrated the development constraints to the alignment of rapid transit. Mr. Callan identified the studies and planning projects that have helped define the current corridor.

PCG asked if the corridors extend to the new exhibit grounds or the racetrack. Mr. Steacy told the group that this was not part of the project but the project would not preclude these connections.

- 2.11 Mr. Callan presented several DRAFT typical sections that were being developed for further analysis. Copies of the sections were included in the pre-meeting package. PCG was asked to review and comment on these preliminary concepts by October 28th.

2.12 PCG had the following comments on the presentation:

- Staging alternatives should include the use of DMU and should not be delayed;
- Travel time should be considered in the evaluation, the number and location of the station identified should be minimized to improve travel time on LRT;
- Impact and benefits to cycle network should be included in evaluation of alternatives;
- The design should include cycle facilities on road and at stations;
- EA should include recommendations for cycle access and storage;
- The design of stations should reflect the new "ODA (Ontario Disability Act)" to ensure unrestricted access for all riders;
- Designers should be aware of changes to Ontario Building Code with respect to accessibility;
- The EA should consider the use of two distinct rail vehicles using LeBreton Flats as transfer area;
- Staging should consider service to Leitrim;
- Service should extend across Prince of Wales Bridge;
- Staging should be identified in EA;
- PCG should be provided with a copy of the PowerPoint presentation;
- Ridership study should reconsider "0" population table 2.1 at Carleton University;
- Bus feeder routes are an important part of LRT network;
- Do not preclude connection to Prince of Wales, Racetrack, Central Exhibition lands or the access of freight to NRC testing grounds and Gatineau; and
- A copy of the presentation to be sent to PCG.

MRC

The foregoing represents the writer's understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the undersigned within 48 hours of receiving these minutes at 613-736-7200.

Notes prepared by,

McCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION

Robert Hunton , P. Eng.

cc: All Attendees

Absentees:

Fred McLennan	Hunt Club Community Organization
Eric Dormer	Hunt Club Park Community Association
Mike O'Neil	Manotick Community Association
	Ontario Disability Directorate
	Ottawa Youth Cabinet
Michael Presley	Quinterra-Riverwood Community Association
Frank Licari	Ridgemont Community Association
Carolyn Gauthier	Riverside Park Community and Recreation Association
Tom Breuer	Sawmill Creek/Blossom Park Community Association
Jim Holton	South Keys/Greenboro Community Association
Colin Lindsay	Upper Hunt Club Community Association
John Logan	Uplands on the Rideau Community Association
	Carleton University Students Association
Michel Haddad	City of Ottawa Pedestrian and Public Transit Advisory Committee
Keith Hobbs	City of Ottawa Accessibility Advisory Committee
Ann Coffey	City of Ottawa Environmental Advisory Committee
Nick Masciantonio	City of Ottawa
Linda Hoad	Federation of Citizens Association
Kerry Charron	Greely Community Association
Mike Cotter	Heart's Desire Community Association
Madelaine Stewart-Dmaj	Hintonburg Community Association
Vivi Chi	City of Ottawa

MRC/HMM

McCormick Rankin Corporation/
Hatch Mott MacDonald
Joint Venture

c/o McCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION

1145 Hunt Club Road, Suite 300
Ottawa, Ontario K1V 0Y3
Tel: (613) 736-7200
Fax: (613) 736-8710
E-mail: mrc-ottawa@mrc.ca
Website: www.mrc.ca

NOTES OF MEETING

PROJECT: North-South Corridor LRT Project EA Study

MEETING No. 4: Public Consultation Group

FILE NO.: D06-01 04 (City of Ottawa) / 5648-7045 (MRC)

DATE: June 1, 2005

TIME: 6:00 p.m.

PLACE: 110 Lisgar Street, Colonel By Boardroom, 2nd Floor

PRESENT:

City of Ottawa	
Peter Steacy	Program Manager Transportation – EA Program
Consultant Team	
Dennis Callan	Senior Project Manager
Thom Budd	HMM Manager, Infrastructure
Robert Hutton	MRC Assistant Project Manager
Howard Williamson	Williamson Consulting Inc.
Public Consultation Group	
James McLaren	Heron Park Community Association
Ida Henderson	Dalhousie Community Association
Diane Dupuis	Roads and Cycling Association
Keith Parker	Riverside South Community Association
Pamela Morse	Emerald Woods Residents Association
Garry Lindberg	Alta Vista Planning Group
David Jeanes	Transport 2000
David Gladstone	City Centre Coalition / CCCA

PURPOSE: To update the group on the study's progress, changes since the last meeting and obtain comments with respect to the recommendations/conclusions to be presented at the upcoming POH.

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

- 4.1 Following introductions of the attendees and circulation of the March meeting notes, Mr. Steacy explained that the main change to the preliminary plan since the last meeting was to the downtown concept to address concerns expressed by business and landowners.
- 4.2 Mr. Callan narrated a PowerPoint presentation of materials which outlined:
 - Study progress / schedule;
 - Recommended project;
 - Staging elements;
 - Next steps in the study.

4.3 Study progress / schedule was described as:

- Project commenced April 2004;
- Three public meetings to-date;
- Fourth public meeting to be held in June
- Presentation to Transportation Committee July 6th;
- Council – July 13th.

4.4 Changes to the recommended project were outlined as:

- Adjustment to Park and Ride Lot;
- Adjustment to Bayview alignment;
- Revisions to downtown concept plan.

4.5 Changes to Park and Ride lots were described as:

- Removal of the Limebank site (675 spaces);
- Addition of the River Roadsite (1,000 spaces);
- Leitrim lot on TC lands as provisional (1,500 – 2,000);
- Leitrim lot east side (1,200) choice location.

4.6 Changes to station locations were described as:

- River Road station moved to new Park and Ride lot;
- Leitrim station moved slightly south to match both lots;
- Gladstone station moved south of Gladstone.

4.7 There were no significant changes to the major structures presented in March.

4.8 Three maintained yard locations were presented:

- Walkley
- North of Leitrim
- South of Airport

Mr. Callan informed the meeting that the City has expressed concern regarding operation of a yard at Walkley for the north-south line. That location can only accommodate a northerly spur, requiring all operators of southbound trains to move to the other end of the train once on the main line.

The City had confirmed that operation at either of the other lots would better suit the north-south line.

The Consultant is preparing an evaluation of the sites to determine which is most suitable.

TB

- 4.9 Mr. Callan informed the meeting that the EA team and NCC have been working closely to resolve an alignment through the flats which would best service the redevelopment of those lands.

Mr. Callan told the meeting the current approach is an alignment closer to the open aqueduct. NCC is reviewing this internally with their design group.

- 4.10 Mr. Callan presented sections that illustrated the change in the downtown option to now have both LRT and BRT share a lane rather on the same side of the road.

Mr. Callan explained that the concerns of the downtown stakeholders were:

- Loss of parking, delivery zones, taxi stands;
- Cars trapped between BRT/LRT;
- Too many buses;
- Consideration of a tunnel;
- Impacts on Mackenzie King Bridge traffic;
- Impacts on cyclists;
- Construction impacts.

Mr. Callan informed the meeting that an extensive process of consultation with the downtown merchants and stakeholders had been undertaken.

- 4.11 Mr. Callan informed the meeting that in developing the new plan the EA team had investigated other transit sites. An example from Portland was reviewed but determined to have too much impact on the curb lane. From that example the current concept was generated that shared a transit travel land with bus bay stop and LRT on-line stops.

- 4.12 Mr. Callan presented a table which indicated that the off-peak parking restriction of the new concept resulted in only an 8% reduction, an improvement over the 59% reduction of the original concept.

- 4.13 Mr. Callan presented a VISSIM traffic simulation of the downtown Slater at Elgin Street which showed that the new concept will work.

4.14 Mr. Callan explained that to accommodate the volume of passengers projected the City needed both BRT and LRT through the downtown. Transferring all passengers to exclusively one mode or the other would result in extensive disruption to the user.

4.15 Mr. Callan informed the meeting that the EA team had reviewed the previous twin tunnel concept and updated the cost estimate. An estimated cost of \$720 M has been determined. That estimate did not include track work, signalling or power.

4.16 Mr. Callan informed the meeting that the staging options were under review. Once the updated cost estimate was completed the staging options could be finalized. Mr. Callan reminded the meeting that the EA did not seek approval of the strategy and that this work was being carried out for the City's interest.

4.17 Next steps were described as:

- Public Open Houses June 6, 7, 8 and 9;
- Update costs;
- Finalize staging;
- Transportation Committee July 6th;
- City Council – July 13th;
- Post Notice of completion – Sept. 9th;
- MOE approval Nov/Dec 2005;
- CEAA approvals as required.

4.18 **Questions and Answers**

Mr. Lindberg requested that the notes indicate that he felt, because he has not been provided with material in advance of the meetings and that copies of the task reports were not currently available for the for the committees review, that the EA process had been compromised.

Q: Were under passes at Walkley and Via lines considered as an option to the proposed over pass?

R: Yes, they were considered but were determined not to physically meet the design requirements.

Q: Will fencing be installed along the LRT Corridor and in particular at the section south of Hunt Club Road where at grade pedestrian crossings occur?

R: Fencing is not currently proposed in that area.

Q: Can the Lester station be relocated to service Blossom Park area (Max Street)?

R: OC Transpo will be asked to comment on the relocation of Lester Station.

Q: Can Mackenzie King LRT platform be set to provide for cycle crossing?

R: Options will be reviewed with OC Transpo for an interim solution. The ultimate will require trains on both platforms thus the cycle lane cannot be accommodated.

C: Colours of Bayview plans are hard to see. Displays should be reconsidered.

R: Presentation panels will be re-evaluated.

C: A transit video would help at the POH.

R: This will be considered.

Q: Why not place a LRT stop at Elgin for NAC and stairs on Mackenzie King for City Hall access? Also, another stop at Bronson?

R: This will be considered.

C: The OMCIA link is important to the LRT service plan. It should be constructed ASAP.

R: The staging will review this option. Current thinking is to postpone this link because of budget constraints.

Q: Will cost updates be available for public review?

R: The budget will be part of the EA document filed but not available for this POH.

Q: What is the travel time from Limebank to Bayview to attract riders?

It should be 30 minutes or less.

R: This time will be estimated.

The foregoing represents the writer's understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the undersigned within 48 hours of receiving these minutes at 613-736-7200.

Notes prepared by,

McCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION

Robert Hunton, P. Eng.

cc: All Attendees
Absentees
B. Townsend

MRC/HMM

McCormick Rankin Corporation/
Hatch Mott MacDonald

McCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION

1145 Hunt Club Road, Suite 300
Ottawa, Ontario K1V 0Y3
Tel: (613) 736-7200
Fax: (613) 736-8710
E-mail: mrc-ott@mrc.ca
Website: www.mrc.ca

NOTES OF MEETING

PROJECT: North-South Corridor LRT Priority Project EA
MEETING: Business Consultation Group #1
FILE NO.: D06-01 04-NSLRT (City of Ottawa) / 5648-7043 (MRC)
DATE: May 13, 2004 **TIME:** 1:30 pm
PLACE: Ottawa City Hall, Colonel By Room, 2nd Floor
PRESENT:

Business Consultation Group		
Meg McCallum	ByWard Market BIA	
Brian Billings	Carleton University	
Peggy DuCharme	Downtown Rideau BIA	
David Glastonbury	Greater Ottawa Chamber of Commerce	
Krista Kealey	Ottawa MacDonald-Cartier International Airport	
Catherine Lindquist	Ottawa Tourism and Convention Authority	
Sharon McKenna	Sparks Street Mall Management Board	
Bill Parsons	Sparks Street Mall Management Board	
Phil Wasserman	Courtyard Restaurant	
Study Team		
Peter Steacy	City of Ottawa	
Ken Gosselin	McCormick Rankin Corp.	
Dennis Callan	McCormick Rankin Corp.	
Thom Budd	Hatch Mott Macdonald	
Mike Bricks	Ecoplans Limited	
Howard Williamson	Williamson Consulting Co.	
Robert Hunton	McCormick Rankin Corp.	

PURPOSE: To introduce the project and study team, and to discuss and solicit feedback on the draft Terms of Reference (ToR).

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

- 1.1 Following introduction of the Consultant Team and Business Consultation Group Members, a PowerPoint presentation was given that outlines:
- Project Background
 - Corridor Overview
 - Study Schedule
 - Ontario EA Process
 - Definition of Terms of Reference

- Federal EA Process
- EA Co-ordination
- Next Steps

A copy of that presentation is attached to these notes of meeting.

- 1.2 Mr. Callan explained that the project schedule was 18 months in duration. This is an Individual Environmental Assessment Study and the Terms of Reference (ToR) is the first document that has to be submitted to the Ontario Ministry of Environment (OMOE) for approval. Members of the group were emailed a copy of the draft ToR prior to the meeting for review
- 1.3 M. Bricks described the Federal and Provincial EA process and how they would be coordinated during this study. Mr. Bricks explained there is a 12-week MOE approval period of the ToR and 30-week approval period for the EA document.
- 1.4 Mr. Callan indicated that future group meetings would be held prior to the upcoming Public Open House meetings at 3 additional phases of the project. Mr. Callan explained that the group's role would be further defined in a "Consultation Plan" which is being drafted.

H. Williamson

In general, the group would provide input to the study and review and comment on the different phases of the study as it progresses

- 1.5 Following the presentation comments on the Draft Terms of Reference and questions were taken from the group. A summary of those comments and responses are as follows:

- 1) Does the existing background work completed (i.e. RTES, ORTEP, MP) help to streamline the process and work?

Response: *Existing background materials helps but reference to that work has to be documented in the EA. In addition the original EA for the O-Train Pilot Project did not include an amending procedure, so it requires full documentation for any changes to that project including extensions or double tracking and grade separations. In this EA, the TMP, OP and RTES will all help to document need.*

- 2) Will diesel and electric be considered in the review of bus versus rail?

Response: *Yes.*

- 3) Will the relocated exhibition grounds be considered in the study?

Response: *Not directly, only in as much as any location of a generator of transit ridership will be a factor in the EA. The approved study Statement of Work did not include a link to that location.*

- 4) What is the communications strategy for this project?

Response: *A communications plan is being developed by Mr. Williamson. The plan will include the role of the study consultation groups*

- 5) Does the study include a crossing of the Rideau River?

Response: *Yes – in two locations: immediately south of Carleton University; and, in the vicinity of the Strandherd-Armstrong link.*

- 6) How will the local bus network be integrated?

Response: *The RTES network plan includes both LRT and BRT complementing each other. This study will insure proper integration with all intersecting transit services.*

- 7) How were the north study limits established?

Response: *The Rideau Centre was chosen as the end location for the priority project in accordance with the RTES and ORTEP project description.*

- 8) What is NCC's role in the project?

Response: *NCC will manage the approvals for property purchase on lands under Federal control. NCC will have an influence on the design elements.*

- 9) How will the ToR consider the interprovincial rapid transit study?

Response: *The ToR will re-iterate the City's commitment to co-ordinate with the interprovincial study, to insure that options for interprovincial connections are not precluded.*

- 10) How is STO involved in the project?

Response: *STO will be included in the Agency Consultation Group.*

- 11) Will smart City growth be part of the analysis?

Response: *The expansion of the City's rapid transit network is a key 'Smart-Growth' initiative set out in the OP and TMP. For example, the development of the Riverside South Community is centred on the Smart-Growth principle of an early introduction of rapid transit services.*

- 12) Will someone investigate how the choice of a location for stations will impact the adjacent community?

Response: *Impacts on adjacent communities will be considered in the future evaluation*

- 13) Will the study comment on impact of LRT on road network (i.e. reduction in traffic)?

Response: *The study will consider all impacts on the adjacent road system including reductions in traffic.*

- 14) Will the study consider tunnelling the LRT through downtown?

Response: *Tunnelling downtown will be very expensive and only considered as a last resort. It was studied a number of years ago.*


1.6 Other Issues/Comments:

- 1) Sparks Street Mall should not be considered as potential route because of the impact on the existing pedestrian environment, and the resultant loss of use of the mall for festivals and events
- 2) LRT should not be located on Queen Street, as it acts as a Downtown service street to the Sparks Street Mall and to businesses along Albert Street.
- 3) Carleton University is expanding and sees LRT as a benefit.
- 4) Byward Market is concerned about impacts on gateways into the market area. They wish to keep area as open as possible. Any loss in parking is considered critical.
- 5) Ottawa Chamber of Commerce is concerned that double track may push costs too high. Project should be developed for half the current budget.
- 6) Rideau Street BIA considers twin tracks important to LRT operations and that staging is a very important aspect of the project.
- 7) OMCIA would like to see plans as soon as possible so they can discuss impacts with their clients.

The foregoing represents the writer's understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the undersigned within 48 hours of receiving these minutes at 613-736-7200.

Notes prepared by,

McCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION

A handwritten signature in black ink on a light yellow rectangular background. The signature is stylized, starting with a large 'R' and ending with a horizontal line.

Robert Hunton , P. Eng.

cc: All Attendees
Daniel Bourdeau –Building Owners and Managers Association
Lori Mellor – Preston Street BIA
Hollander Layte – Sparks Street BIA
Vivi Chi – City of Ottawa

MRC/HMM

McCormick Rankin Corporation/
Hatch Mott MacDonald

McCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION

1145 Hunt Club Road, Suite 300
Ottawa, Ontario K1V 0Y3
Tel: (613) 736-7200
Fax: (613) 736-8710
E-mail: mrc-ott@mrc.ca
Website: www.mrc.ca

NOTES OF MEETING

PROJECT: North-South Corridor LRT Project EA
MEETING: Business Consultation Group #2
FILE NO.: D06-01 04-NSLRT (City of Ottawa) / 5648-7043 (MRC)
DATE: October 6, 2004
PLACE: Ottawa City Hall, Honeywell Room
PRESENT:

Business Consultation Group		
David Cordick	Sparks Street NIA	
David Glastonbury	Greater Ottawa Chamber of Commerce	
Meg McCallum	ByWard Market BIA	
Phil Waserman	Courtyard Restaurant	
Jacques Burelle	Ottawa Tourism and Convention Authority	
Krista Kealey	Ottawa Macdonald-Cartier International Airport Authority	
Laura Boutilier	Downtown Rideau BIA	
Peggy DuCharme	Downtown Rideau BIA	
Study Team		
Peter Steacy	City of Ottawa	
Vivi Chi	City of Ottawa	
Dennis Callan	McCormick Rankin Corp.	
Robert Hunton	McCormick Rankin Corp.	
Thom Budd	Hatch Mott Macdonald	
Howard Williamson	Williamson Consulting Inc.	

PURPOSE: To update the group on the approval of the ToR and work completed to be presented at the upcoming POH (Oct. 19, 20, 21).

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

- 2.1 Following introductions, Mr. Steacy apologized for the lateness of the materials provided. He explained that although we had planned to provide the material earlier, that technical difficulties prevented that.

Mr. Steacy suggested that this meeting will present the material and address any immediate questions the group had. Formal response by the group could be submitted as late as October 28th.

Materials provided by email and available as hand-outs included:
- Members Roles and Responsibilities (PCG, ACG, BCG).

- Needs and Justification / Alternative Solutions (Sept. 27/04)
- Evaluation Process (Sept. 27/04 Discussion Paper)
- Core Area Cross Sections Alternatives (Draft paper Sept. 27/04)
- Consultation Plan (Sept./04)
- Information Package (Sept./04)

In addition, a plan “Alignment/Development through South Communities” which was too large to email was available as a handout.

2.2 Mr. Callan narrated a PowerPoint presentation of materials which outlined:

- Terms of Reference Approval
- Existing Conditions Data
- Problem Statement
- Alternative Solutions to the Problem
- Alternative Rapid Transit Modes
- Evaluation Criteria
- Next Steps

Copies of the presentation were provided to the group to follow along.

2.3 Mr. Callan informed the group that MOE approved the ToR on September 15th. A copy of the approved ToR will be translated then placed on the Web page.

Mr. Callan said there were no conditions set on the ToR.

2.4 Mr. Callan described the existing conditions panels that will be presented at the POH. The panels include existing conditions for:

- Natural Environment
- Geotechnical Conditions
- Heritage Features
- Built Environment

2.5 Mr. Callan explained the growth issues that resulted in the “Problem Statement” and “Purpose of the Undertaking”.

The problem statement was described as:

- 75% increase in population, 50% increase in employment
- Existing infrastructure will not accommodate this growth.

- 2.6 Mr. Callan presented the alternative solution as:
- Do Nothing
 - Expand Arterial Road Network
 - Expand Rapid Transit Service Outside the Study Corridor
 - Expand Rapid Transit Service Inside the Study Corridor
 - Combination of Expansion of Rapid Transit and Arterial Roads

- 2.7 The group was informed that the “Ridership Study” was not yet complete. Based on the work to-date, an estimate of 2021 ridership has been set at 60,000 between Rideau and Riverside South. Considering sensitivity analysis and connection to Barrhaven a range of 60,000 –70,000 riders was being proposed. Mr. Callan indicated that these number were under refinement at this time and may change a little.

- 2.8 A table showing comparable North American LRT networks was presented. That table indicated that for the projected ridership of 60,000 – 70,000 on a 31 km network, it was reasonable to consider a LRT network to service the transit needs.

Mr. Callan presented a table which illustrated the potential headways and number of vehicles required for LRT and BRT to accommodate the 60,000 – 70,000 demand. Mr. Callan informed the group that a relative cost comparison had been carried out for the BRT and LRT networks. The comparison included:

- capital
 - annual operating
 - life cycle replacement
- 2.9 Mr. Callan said that the study was recommending LRT Technology be used in this corridor because:
- used existing infrastructure
 - higher capital but lower ongoing cost
 - reduced exhaust emissions in corridor
 - the central area is currently saturated with buses
 - there is a perceived potential to attract more riders
 - there is a perceived potential to attract development at stations.

- 2.10 Mr. Callan presented the corridors being considered, in the core area; Wellington, Sparks, Queen, Albert, Slater and Laurier Streets were identified as possible corridors. Various links to LeBreton Flats and Rideau Centre were also shown on the core area plan. Mr. Callan indicated that these were preliminary corridors and alignments and impacts would be assessed in the next stage of the

study.

A plan of the southern area illustrated the development constraints to the alignment of rapid transit. Mr. Callan identified the studies and planning projects that have helped define the current corridor.

- 2.11 Mr. Callan presented several DRAFT typical sections that were being developed for further analysis. Copies of the sections were included in the pre-meeting package. BCG was asked to review and comment on these preliminary concepts by October 28th.

- 2.12 The BCG had the following comments:

- Provide approved ToR to Consultation Groups
- Consider elevated or tunnel for downtown

P. Steacy

Q. Can talent vehicle be converted to electrical?

R. *Assumed it can, but has too big a turning radius for downtown.*

Q. What is relative speed of LRT/BRT?

R. *BRT 100 kmph, electric LRT 80 kmph, diesel LRT 110 kmph.*

Q. Why must LRT /BRT comparison be carried out?

R. *To address funding partner questions.*

Q. How were costs estimated?

R. *BRT costs were obtained from OC Transpo, LRT costs were calculated and compared to existing systems.*

Q. Is EMF a concern with LRT?

R. *No voltage is low and has not been an issue to date.*

Q. Will there be an electric back-up system?

R. *No, if there is a massive power failure all transportation will be shut down.*

- Consider parade routes and events that could affect the LRT Service on roadways.

MRC

- Saving on travel time should be included in criteria.

MRC

Q. Why is the study looking at a system that provides direct access to downtown from Barrhaven?

R. *That is not the rationale for the system, it provides access between the two southern communities as well as*

- destinations along the corridor and downtown.*
- The study should consider the potential to integrate with new downtown development. MRC
- Q. How will this study reduce STO and OC Transpo bus services on Rideau?
- R. *It will not reduce bus services, but will reduce the need to expand it on downtown streets.*
- Q. Will LRT and BRT downtown be on the same lane?
- R. *No both will where possible be in separate exclusive lanes.*
- Q. Why not use streetcars downtown loop with transfers outside the core area?
- R. *Transfers will result in reduction of ridership.*
- Rideau Street area concerned about loss of any traffic lanes.
 - Concern downtown is being smothered by transit.
 - On-street parking must be retained in downtown should be added to criteria. MRC

The foregoing represents the writer's understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the undersigned within 48 hours of receiving these minutes at 613-736-7200.

Notes prepared by,

McCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION

Robert Hunton, P. Eng.

cc: All Attendees

Absent		
Daniel Bourdeau	Building Owners and Managers Association	
Nancy Meloshe	Building Owners and Managers Association	
Brian Billings	Carleton University	
Lori Mellor	Preston Street BIA	
Sharon McKenna	Sparks Street Mall Management Board	

MRC/HMM

McCormick Rankin Corporation/
Hatch Mott MacDonald
Joint Venture

c/o McCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION

1145 Hunt Club Road, Suite 300
Ottawa, Ontario K1V 0Y3
Tel: (613) 736-7200
Fax: (613) 736-8710
E-mail: mrc-ottawa@mrc.ca
Website: www.mrc.ca

NOTES OF MEETING

PROJECT: North-South Corridor LRT Project EA Study

MEETING No. 3: Business Consultation Group

FILE NO.: D06-01 04 (City of Ottawa) / 5648-7043 (MRC)

DATE: March 9, 2005

TIME: 1:30 pm

PLACE: 110 Lisgar Street, Colonel By Board Room, 2nd Floor

PRESENT:

City of Ottawa		
Peter Steacy	Program Manager Transportation – EA Program	
Vivi Chi (Part Time)	Manager, Transportation Infrastructure	
Consultant Team		
Dennis Callan	Senior Project Manager	
Thom Budd	HMM Manager, Infrastructure	
Robert Hunton	Assistant Project Manager	
Business Consultation Group		
Bob Ralph	Downtown Rideau BIA	
Brian Billings	Carleton University	
Claudio Brun del Re	University of Ottawa	
David Glastonbury	Greater Ottawa Chamber of Commerce	
Dick Brown	Ottawa-Gatineau Hotel Association	
Donna Williams	Ottawa Arts Court Foundation	
Jacques Burelle	Ottawa Tourism	
Joshua Moon	Perley-Robertson Hill & McDougall LLP	
Meg McCallum	ByWard Market BIA	
Nancy Meloshe	Business Owners and Managers Association (BOMA)	
Peggy DuCharme	Downtown Rideau BIA	
Sharon McKenna	Sparks Street Mall Management Board	

PURPOSE: To update the group on the study progress and obtain comments with respect to the preliminary recommended plan to be presented at the upcoming Public Open Houses (21, 22, & 23 March 2005)

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

- 3.1 Following introductions of the attendees, the notes of the 06 October 2004 meeting were distributed.

Following introductions of the attendees, the notes of the 04 October 2004 meeting were circulated.

Mr. Steacy informed the BCG that within the City there are two parallel LRT project ‘streams’ – one addressing the planning (EA)

PROCEEDINGS:**ACTION BY:**

aspects and the other addressing future project implementation which are working in close concert. In its 01 March 2005 report to the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee concerning the proposed procurement approach, it was identified that Albert and Slater Streets were the preferred downtown LRT corridors. This information was subsequently presented in detail to Albert & Slater Street stakeholders at formal presentations on 07 March.

The BCG was advised this was the beginning of a consultation process to obtain feedback and hear the concerns of all stakeholders. Based upon the feedback received, the City shall be modifying/enhancing its plans to best address everyone's concerns.

3.2 Mr. Callan narrated a PowerPoint presentation of materials which outlined:

- Project Schedule
- Current Activities
- Development Issues
- Alternative Corridors Considered (South)
- Preferred Route
- Station Locations
- Park and Ride Lot Locations
- Grade Separations
- Maintenance Yard Locations
- Downtown Alignment Choices
- Screening of Downtown Alignment Choices
- Albert/Slater Options
- Next Steps in the Study

3.3 The schedule was described as:

- Project commencement April 2004
- Two POH's held to date (May/October)
- Third POH to be held March 21, 22, 23, 2005
- Fourth POH to be held June 2005
- EA recommendations to Council July 2005
- EA to MOE September 2005
- MOE approval late 2005

3.4 Mr. Callan described the material to be presented at the March POH as:

- Preliminary Alignment
- Station, Park and Ride and Maintenance Yard Locations
- Preliminary Downtown Options

PROCEEDINGS:**ACTION BY:**

- Staging elements

The meeting was advised that although staging was re-considered in the EA, MOE would be approving only the ultimate project.

- 3.5 The community planning elements that contributed to the alignment choice were described as:

- Development potential of LeBreton Flats and Bayview Yard
- South Nepean Town Centre Community Design Plan
- City's Downtown Ottawa Urban Design Strategy
- Leitrim Community Design Plan
- Riverside South Community Design Plan

- 3.6 Plans of alternative alignments were presented. Some of the alignments were identified as being developed in previous studies for the development of Riverside South. The analysis of this alternative will be included in the EA documentation.

D.C

- 3.7 Thirty-five station locations were identified on the key plan. The attending were informed that the station locations respected the development concept for Riverside South and South Nepean Town Centre. The attending were advised that the EA would identify and protect the property for all these potential locations, but would not compel the City to construct any of them until the city had determined a need.

City

- 3.8 Five park and ride lot locations along the corridor were identified:

- Existing lot at Greenboro Station
- Two alternatives at Leitrim Road
- Future lot at Bowesville
- Interim lot at Limebank
- Lot at Woodroffe Road

- 3.9 Major grade separations were identified at

- Two Rideau River crossings (immediately south of Carleton University, and adjacent to the Strandherd/Earl Armstrong Bridge).
- Two rail-to-rail crossings (VIA Rail – Beachburg Subdivision, CNR – Walkley Subdivision).
- New tunnel to twin existing at Dow's Lake
- Existing structures along current O-train corridor.

Mr. Callan informed the attendees that as an interim solution the Southerly crossing of the Rideau River would be constructed on the

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

proposed six-lane Strandherd Road structure for which an ESR was completed in 1993. The concept is for the rail to use 2 of the lanes resulting in a 4-lane road structure between River Road and Prince of Wales Road.

- 3.10 Maintenance yard locations were identified at the existing Walkley yard site and South of the airport lands. The attendees were informed that the City was carrying out negotiations with the rail company for purchase of the Walkley yards. Failing that, negotiations with Transport Canada will be required to purchase these lands.

- 3.11 Downtown corridor options were identified as:

- Wellington Street
- Sparks Street
- Queens Street
- Albert Street
- Slater Street
- Laurier Avenue

The screening analysis was presented that led to the selection of Albert and Slater Streets as the preferred corridors.

The options for development of LRT on Albert and Slater were defined as:

- 2 way LRT on Albert with 2 way BRT on Slater
- 1 way LRT and BRT on Albert and Slater

The attendees were informed that the 1 way option was determined to be the preferred option. Renderings of the concept were presented.

- 3.12 Next steps in the project were described as:

- March 21, 22, 23 (POH's)
- Adjust plans to reflect comments
- Develop staging plan
- Present final option in June (POH's)
- Modify as required to reflect input
- Present EA recommendations to City Council in July
- Submit to MOE
- MOE approval late 2005

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

3.13 Q & A

Q: Can the buses on Albert and Slater be removed if the LRT is placed there?

A: The LRT will not replace the buses on Albert and Slater. The LRT and BRT provide services to different geographic locations. The City is reviewing alternative bus routing that may reduce the numbers of buses routed through downtown. In addition, LRT by itself cannot provide sufficient capacity to accommodate all passengers through downtown.

Q: Has the City considered running the rail as a spine with bus service feeding into it?

A: The City will be developing an operational strategy for the O-train extension.

Q: Will the removal of general traffic from the Mackenzie King Bridge result in traffic congestion at Elgin Street, because of the forced left turn across the LRT?

A: A traffic model is being developed to determine what the impact of this change in traffic pattern will have on the intersection. Consultant Team

Q: Currently Hotel patrons are experiencing problems accessing and leaving hotel property because of the volume of buses. Will the proposed concept resolve this issue?

A: Given that the current proposal has LRT on the opposite side of the street as the BRT, the LRT operation will not impact BRT operations. That said, the City's current review of downtown operations may aid in addressing this.

Q: Why does the concept end on the Mackenzie King bridge rather than extend to Ottawa University?

A: The 2021 rapid transit network identified in the TMP identifies the future eastern extension of the LRT along Rideau Street towards Montreal Road.

Q: How will business interruption be addressed?

A: This issue will be addressed through the implementation process.

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

Q: Is there any safety concerns related to operating BRT, LRT and mixed traffic on the same street?

A: Safety for pedestrians and public is paramount and will be looked at in the assessment of the concept. Consultant team

Q: Why can't the LRT and BRT share the same lane?

A: It could, however since the train cannot move off its lane to pass a bus, the possibility exists that a train could be held up by the buses and not be able to maintain its schedule. Therefore, preference is to separate these operations.

Q: Can all the buses except the 95 and express buses operate in the same lane?

A: The City will review all options when developing the operational strategy for the LRT.

Q: Is a park and ride lot being proposed for the Lester Road site?

A: No.

The foregoing represents the writer's understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the undersigned within 48 hours of receiving these minutes at 613-736-7200.

Notes prepared by,

McCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION

Robert Hunton, P. Eng.

cc: All Attendees
Barry Townsend, City of Ottawa

MRC/HMM

McCormick Rankin Corporation/
Hatch Mott MacDonald
Joint Venture

c/o McCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION

1145 Hunt Club Road, Suite 300
Ottawa, Ontario K1V 0Y3
Tel: (613) 736-7200
Fax: (613) 736-8710
E-mail: mrc-ottawa@mrc.ca
Website: www.mrc.ca

NOTES OF MEETING

PROJECT: North-South Corridor LRT Project EA Study

MEETING No. 4: Business Consultation Group

FILE NO.: D06-01 04 (City of Ottawa) / 5648-7046 (MRC)

DATE: June 1, 2005

TIME: 1:30 p.m.

PLACE: 110 Lisgar Street, Colonel By Boardroom, 2nd Floor

PRESENT:

City of Ottawa	
Peter Steacy	Program Manager Transportation – EA Program
Consultant Team	
Dennis Callan	Senior Project Manager
Thom Budd	HMM Manager, Infrastructure
Robert Hunton	MRC Assistant Project Manager
Howard Williamson	Williamson Consulting Inc.
Business Consultation Group	
Bill Parsons	Sparks Street Mall
Meg McCallum	ByWard Market BIA
Phil Wasserman	ByWard Market BIA
John Toth	Coalition
Ian Fisher	Coalition
Mark Cuhaci	Coalition
Dick Brown	Ottawa Gatineau Hotel Association
Ann Tremblay	Ottawa Macdonald-Cartier International Airport
Krista Kealey	Ottawa Macdonald-Cartier International Airport
David Glastonbury	Greater Ottawa Chamber of Commerce

PURPOSE: To update the group on the study's progress, changes since the last meeting and obtain comments with respect to the recommendations/conclusions to be presented at the upcoming POH.

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

- 4.1 Following introductions of the attendees and circulation of the March meeting notes, Mr. Steacy explained that the main change to the preliminary plan since the last meeting was to the downtown concept to address concerns expressed by business and landowners.
- 4.2 Mr. Callan narrated a PowerPoint presentation of materials which outlined:
- Study progress / schedule;
 - Recommended project;

- Staging elements;
- Next steps in the study.

4.3 Study progress / schedule was described as:

- Project commenced April 2004;
- Three public meetings to-date;
- Fourth public meeting to be held in June
- Presentation to Transportation Committee July 6th;
- Council – July 13th.

4.4 Changes to the recommended project were outlined as:

- Adjustment to Park and Ride Lot;
- Adjustment to Bayview alignment;
- Revisions to downtown concept plan.

4.5 Changes to Park and Ride lots were described as:

- Removal of the Limebank site (675 spaces);
- Addition of the River Road site (1,000 spaces);
- Leitrim lot on TC lands as provisional (1,500 – 2,000);
- Leitrim lot east side (1,200) choice location.

4.6 Changes to station locations were described as:

- River Road station moved to new Park and Ride lot;
- Leitrim station moved slightly south to match both lots;
- Gladstone station moved south of Gladstone.

4.7 There were no significant changes to the major structures presented in March.

4.8 Three maintained yard locations were presented:

- Walkley
- North of Leitrim
- South of Airport

Mr. Callan informed the meeting that the City has expressed concern regarding operation of a yard at Walkley for the north-south line. That location can only accommodate a northerly spur, requiring all operators of southbound trains to move to the other end of the train once on the main line.

The City had confirmed that operation at either of the other lots would better suit the north-south line.

The Consultant is preparing an evaluation of the sites to determine which is most suitable.

TB

- 4.9 Mr. Callan informed the meeting that the EA team and NCC have been working closely to resolve an alignment through the flats which would best service the redevelopment of those lands.

Mr. Callan told the meeting the current approach is an alignment closer to the open aqueduct. NCC is reviewing this internally with their design group.

- 4.10 Mr. Callan presented sections that illustrated the change in the downtown option to now have both LRT and BRT share a lane rather on the same side of the road.

Mr. Callan explained that the concerns of the downtown stakeholders were:

- Loss of parking, delivery zones, taxi stands;
- Cars trapped between BRT/LRT;
- Too many buses;
- Consideration of a tunnel;
- Impacts on Mackenzie King Bridge traffic;
- Impacts on cyclists;
- Construction impacts;

Mr. Callan informed the meeting that an extensive process of consultation with the downtown merchants and stakeholders had been undertaken.

- 4.11 Mr. Callan informed the meeting that in developing the new plan the EA team had investigated other transit sites. An example from Portland was reviewed but determined to have too much impact on the curb lane. From that example the current concept was generated that shared a transit travel land with bus bay stop and LRT on-line stops.

- 4.12 Mr. Callan presented a table which indicated that the off-peak parking restriction of the new concept resulted in only an 8% reduction, an improvement over the 59% reduction of the original concept.

4.13 Mr. Callan presented a VISSIM traffic simulation of the downtown Slater at Elgin Street which showed that the new concept will work.

4.14 Mr. Callan explained that to accommodate the volume of passengers projected the City needed both BRT and LRT through the downtown. Transferring all passengers exclusively to one mode or the other would result in extensive disruption to the user.

4.15 Mr. Callan informed the meeting that the EA team had reviewed the previous twin tunnel concept and updated the cost estimate. An estimated cost of \$720 M has been determined. That estimate did not include track work, signalling or power.

4.16 Mr. Callan informed the meeting that the staging options were under review. Once the updated cost estimate was completed the staging options could be finalized. Mr. Callan reminded the meeting that the EA did not seek approval of the strategy and that this work was being carried out for the City's interest.

4.17 Next steps were described as:

- Public Open Houses June 6, 7, 8 and 9;
- Update costs;
- Finalize staging;
- Transportation Committee July 6th;
- City Council – July 13th;
- Post Notice of completion – Sept. 9th;
- MOE approval Nov/Dec 2005;
- CEAA approvals as required.

4.18 **Questions and Answers**

Q: Who is looking at integration with East-West LRT?

R: The North-South EA team has met with representatives from the East-West study team to provide background information. The East-West study process is still at the Terms of Reference stage. A number of corridor options will be examined for the East-West line. The location of a crossing of the North-South corridor will be subject to the findings of the east-west EA, which will address the issue of integration. The North-South EA will note that this integration must take place.

Q: When will the noise analysis be carried out?

R: The noise analysis is underway with on-site visits scheduled for next week, including the National Arts Centre.

Q: What is the comparison of Bus versus LRT noise?

R: LRT noise levels are less. MRC will provide a table showing the difference. D.C.

Q: What is the confidence level in the current estimated cost?

R: The estimates are at a 75% confidence level.

Q: What are the traffic impacts because of the diverted Mackenzie King traffic?

R: The current traffic volumes are low (500 vph). Therefore, the impact is considered to be minimal. The traffic report will document the impact. D.S.

The foregoing represents the writer's understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the undersigned within 48 hours of receiving these minutes at 613-736-7200.

Notes prepared by,

McCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION

Robert Hunton, P. Eng.

cc: All Attendees
Absentees
B. Townsend

MRC/HMM

McCormick Rankin Corporation/
Hatch Mott MacDonald

McCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION

1145 Hunt Club Road, Suite 300
Ottawa, Ontario K1V 0Y3
Tel: (613) 736-7200
Fax: (613) 736-8710
E-mail: mrc-ott@mrc.ca
Website: www.mrc.ca

NOTES OF MEETING

PROJECT: North-South Corridor LRT Project EA

MEETING: Agency Consultation Group #1

FILE NO.: D06-01 04-NSLRT (City of Ottawa) / 5648-7043 (MRC)

DATE: May 12, 2004

TIME: 1:30 pm

PLACE: Ottawa City Hall, Colonel By Room, 2nd Floor

PRESENT:

Agency Consultation Group		
Dave Powers	City of Ottawa	
Joe Lavictoire	City of Ottawa	
Ziad Ghabban	City of Ottawa	
Claudio Colaiacovo	City of Ottawa	
Mona Abouhenidy	City of Ottawa	
Rob Orchin	City of Ottawa	
Bob Spicer	City of Ottawa	
Darlene Conway	City of Ottawa	
Glen Emond	City of Ottawa	
Dean Aqiqi	City of Ottawa	
Fern Marcuccio	City of Ottawa	
Luc Marineau	City of Ottawa	
Jim Zimmerman	City of Ottawa	
Ron Gray	City of Ottawa	
Brian Millar	City of Ottawa	
Mario Peloquin	City of Ottawa	
Grace Strachan	National Capital Commission	
Arto Keklikian	National Capital Commission	
Rob McCallum	Transport Canada	
Don Pulciani	Transport Canada	
Lionel King	Transport Canada	
Glen McDonald	RVCA	
Phil Pawliuk	MTO – Eastern Region	
Rachel Houde	MTO – Downsview	
Greg Tokarz	MTO – Downsview	
Bill VanRyswyk	Ottawa Police	
Mike Krzyzanowski	National Research Council	
Vance Bedore	PWGSC	
David O'Toole	Public Infrastructure Renewal	
Carolyn Dunn	Health Canada	
Study Team		
Vivi Chi	City of Ottawa	
Peter Steacy	City of Ottawa	
Ken Gosselin	McCormick Rankin Corp.	
Dennis Callan	McCormick Rankin Corp.	
Mike Bricks	Ecoplans Limited	
Thom Budd	Hatch Mott Macdonald	
Judi Cohen	Hatch Mott Macdonald	
Robert Hunton	McCormick Rankin Corp.	

PURPOSE: To introduce the project and study team, and to discuss and solicit feedback on the draft Terms of Reference (ToR).

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

1.1 Following introduction of the Consultant Team and Agency Consultation Group Members, a PowerPoint presentation was given that outlines:

- Project Background
- Corridor Overview
- Study Schedule
- Ontario EA Process
- Definition of Terms of Reference
- Federal EA Process
- EA Co-ordination
- Next Steps

A copy of that presentation is attached to these notes of meeting.

1.2 Mr. Callan explained that the project schedule was 18 months in duration. This is an Individual Environmental Assessment Study and the Terms of Reference (ToR) is the first document that has to be submitted to the Ontario Ministry of Environment (MOE) for approval. Members of the group were emailed a copy of the draft ToR prior to the meeting for review.

1.3 M. Bricks described the Federal and Provincial EA process and how they would be coordinated during this study. Mr. Bricks explained there is a 12-week MOE approval period of the ToR and 30-week approval period for the EA document.

1.4 Mr. Callan indicated that future group meetings would be held prior to the upcoming Public Open House meetings at 3 additional phases of the project. Mr. Callan explained that the group's role would be further defined in a "Consultation Plan" which is being drafted.

H. Williamson

In general, the group is to act as a sounding board bringing specific technical knowledge to the study.

1.5 Following the presentation, comments on the draft ToR and questions were taken from the group. A summary of those are as follows:

- 1) The TOR should include above and below ground utility

infrastructure under “existing conditions section”.

Response: *The ToR will be revised to include both above and below ground infrastructure in the “existing conditions section”*

2) Consider more specific description of evaluation methodology.

Response: *The ToR is to be general, MOE’s latest direction is not to be specific with respect to the overall detail..*

3) The roles of the groups identified in the ToR should be defined in it.

Response: *The role of each group will be resolved as the study progresses. In general the groups are to be sounding boards and to bring specific knowledge to the study. They will not be an approvals group. The ACG is similar in capacity to a Technical Advisory Committee.*

4) The ToR should co-ordinate with the Interprovincial Study.

Response: *This study will be coordinated with NCC-led Interprovincial Rapid Transit Integration Study once it is underway.*

5) The text in the ToR Sections 4.5 to 4.7. could be streamlined, section 4.5 and 4.6 could be put together.

Response: *The text will be revisited.*

6) The ToR should include positive impacts in evaluation.

Response: *The ToR will be revised to include positive impacts in the evaluation process.*

7) How proscriptive is the ToR suppose to be?

Response: *The ToR should be general, so as to not preclude options or draw conclusions on the final results.*

8) Why has the approach to ToR changed?

Response: *As a result of a June 2003 Division Court of Ontario decision (Richmond Landfill) the MOE has directed proponents that the ToR must be a very general document.*

9) Will Tunney’s Pastures be considered in this study?

Response: *The impact of future development at Tunney’s Pasture will be considered as part of the ridership component of this study.*

10) What is going to be presented to the public at the upcoming POH?

Response: *The POH will provide the public the opportunity to*

review and comment on the draft TOR and the process that is to be applied. There will not be alignments or detail plans. Even though they will be asked to comment on the ToR, comments on other issues and alignments will be recorded if provided.

11) How will the late Federal triggers impact on the Provincial process?

Response: *The ToR are for the Provincial process only, if issues arise later in the study through the Federal triggers, they will be added to the study without impacting the Provincial process.*

12) Will the study include reviewing power sources for electrification?

Response: *Yes.*

The foregoing represents the writer's understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the undersigned within 48 hours of receiving these minutes at 613-736-7200.

Notes prepared by,

McCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION



Robert Hunton , P. Eng.

cc: All Attendees
Pat Scrimgeour – City of Ottawa – Transit Services
John Buck – City of Ottawa – TUPW Traffic and Safety Services
Alain Gonthier – City of Ottawa – TUPW Infrastructure Management
Greg Montcalm – City of Ottawa – RPAM
Perry McConnell – City of Ottawa – Emergency & Protective Services
Eric Advokaat – Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency
Rich Dobos – Environment Canada
Anjala Puvananathan – Health Canada
Samantha Tattersall – Infrastructure Canada
Peter Moore – National Capital Commission
Michael Harrison – Ontario Ministry of the Environment
John Howe – Ontario Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal
Dave Ballinger – Parks Canada

MRC/HMM

McCormick Rankin Corporation/
Hatch Mott MacDonald

McCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION

1145 Hunt Club Road, Suite 300
Ottawa, Ontario K1V 0Y3
Tel: (613) 736-7200
Fax: (613) 736-8710
E-mail: mrc-ott@mrc.ca
Website: www.mrc.ca

NOTES OF MEETING

PROJECT: North-South Corridor LRT Project EA
MEETING: Agency Consultation Group "Internal" #2
FILE NO.: D06-01 04-NSLRT (City of Ottawa) / 5648-7043 (MRC)
DATE: October 5, 2004 **TIME:** 9:00 a.m.
PLACE: Ottawa City Hall, Colonel By Room, 2nd Floor

PRESENT:

Agency Consultation Group		
Bob Spicer	City of Ottawa	
Darlene Conway	City of Ottawa	
Deborah Irwin	City of Ottawa	
Dean Aqiqi	City of Ottawa	
Dave Powers	City of Ottawa	
Pat Scrimgeour	City of Ottawa	
Rob Orchin	City of Ottawa	
Brian Millar	City of Ottawa	
Alain Gonthier	City of Ottawa	
Luc Marineau	City of Ottawa	
Claudio Colaiacovo	City of Ottawa	
Greg Montcalm	City of Ottawa	
Ron Gray	City of Ottawa	
Tanya Claus	City of Ottawa	
Chris Brouwer	City of Ottawa	
Nelson Edwards	City of Ottawa	
Marina Haufschild	City of Ottawa	
Study Team		
Peter Steacy	City of Ottawa	
Dennis Callan	McCormick Rankin Corp.	
Robert Hunton	McCormick Rankin Corp.	
Mike Bricks	Ecoplans Limited	
Thom Budd	Hatch Mott Macdonald	
Howard Williamson	Williamson Consulting Inc.	

PURPOSE: To update the group on the approval of the ToR and work completed to be presented at the upcoming POH (Oct. 19, 20, 21).

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

- 2.1 Following introductions, Mr. Steacy apologized for the lateness of the materials provided. He explained that although we had planned to provide the material earlier, that technical difficulties prevented that.

Mr. Steacy suggested that the material will be presented at this meeting and the Consultant will address any immediate questions

the group had. Formal response by the group could be submitted as late as October 28th.

Materials provided by email and available as hand-outs included:

- Members Roles and Responsibilities (PCG, ACG, BCG).
- Needs and Justification / Alternative Solutions (Sept. 27/04)
- Evaluation Process (Sept. 27/04 Discussion Paper)
- Core Area Cross Sections Alternatives (Draft paper Sept. 27/04)
- Consultation Plan (Sept./04)
- Information Package (Sept./04)

In addition, a plan “Alignment/Development through South Communities” which was too large to email was available as a handout.

2.2 Mr. Callan narrated a PowerPoint presentation of materials which outlined:

- Terms of Reference Approval
- Existing Conditions Data
- Problem Statement
- Alternative Solutions to the Problem
- Alternative Rapid Transit Modes
- Evaluation Criteria
- Next Steps

Copies of the presentation were provided to the group to follow along.

2.3 Mr. Callan informed the group that MOE approved the ToR on September 15th. A copy of the approved ToR will be translated then placed on the Web page.

Mr. Callan said there were no conditions set on the ToR.

2.4 Mr. Callan described the existing conditions panels that will be presented at the POH. The panels include existing conditions for:

- Natural Environment
- Geotechnical Conditions
- Heritage Features
- Built Environment

2.5 Mr. Callan explained the growth issues that resulted in the “Problem Statement” and “Purpose of the Undertaking”.

The problem statement was described as:

- 75% increase in population, 50% increase in employment
- Existing infrastructure will not accommodate this growth.

2.6 Mr. Callan presented the alternative solution as:

- Do Nothing
- Expand Arterial Road Network
- Expand Rapid Transit Service Outside the Study Corridor
- Expand Rapid Transit Service Inside the Study Corridor
- Combination of Expansion of Rapid Transit and Arterial Roads

2.7 The group was informed that the “Ridership Study” was not yet complete. Based on the work to-date, an estimate of 2021 ridership has been set at 60,000 between Rideau and Riverside South. Considering sensitivity analysis and connection to Barrhaven a range of 60,000 –70,000 riders was being proposed. Mr. Callan indicated that these number were under refinement at this time and may change a little.

2.8 A table showing comparable North American LRT networks was presented. That table indicated that for the projected ridership of 60,000 – 70,000 on a 31 km network, it was reasonable to consider a LRT network to service the transit needs.

Mr. Callan presented a table which illustrated the potential headways and number of vehicles required for LRT and BRT to accommodate the 60,000 – 70,000 demand. Mr. Callan informed the group that a relative cost comparison had been carried out for the BRT and LRT networks. The comparison included:

- capital
- annual operating
- life cycle replacement

2.9 Mr. Callan said that the study was recommending LRT Technology be used in this corridor because:

- used existing infrastructure
- higher capital but lower ongoing cost
- reduced exhaust emissions in corridor
- the central area is currently saturated with buses
- there is a perceived potential to attract more riders
- there is a perceived potential to attract development at stations.

- 2.10 Mr. Callan presented the corridors being considered, in the core area; Wellington, Sparks, Queen, Albert, Slater and Laurier Streets were identified as possible corridors. Various links to LeBreton Flats and Rideau Centre were also shown on the core area plan. Mr. Callan indicated that these were preliminary corridors and alignments and impacts would be assessed in the next stage of the study.

A plan of the southern area illustrated the development constraints to the alignment of rapid transit. Mr. Callan identified the studies and planning projects that have helped define the current corridor.

- 2.11 Mr. Callan presented several DRAFT typical sections that were being developed for further analysis. Copies of the sections were included in the pre-meeting package. ACG was asked to review and comment on these preliminary concepts by October 28th.

- 2.12 ACG had the following comments:

- Project should consider cycle and pedestrian network
- Meeting should be held with South Community Planner P. Steacy
- Bus saturation 180 not 200 vehicles
- Criteria should include improved streetscaping MRC
- Meeting should be held with Utility Coordinating P. Steacy Committee. They meet 1st Wednesday of the month.
- South Nepean Report to be finished in a month.
- Tunnel option or elevated LRT may resolve downtown issues.

The foregoing represents the writer's understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the undersigned within 48 hours of receiving these minutes at 613-736-7200.

Notes prepared by,

McCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION

Robert Hunton, P. Eng.

cc: All Attendees

Absent		
Mona Abouhenidy	City of Ottawa	
John Buck	City of Ottawa	
Mario Peloquin	City of Ottawa	
Ziad Ghadban	City of Ottawa	

Fern Marcuccio	City of Ottawa	
Jim Zimmerman	City of Ottawa	
Absent		
Glen Emond	City of Ottawa	
Joe Lavictoire	City of Ottawa	
Perry McConnell	City of Ottawa	
Bill VanRyswyk	Ottawa Police Services	

MRC/HMM

McCormick Rankin Corporation/
Hatch Mott MacDonald
Joint Venture

c/o McCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION

1145 Hunt Club Road, Suite 300
Ottawa, Ontario K1V 0Y3
Tel: (613) 736-7200
Fax: (613) 736-8710
E-mail: mrc-ottawa@mrc.ca
Website: www.mrc.ca

NOTES OF MEETING

PROJECT: North-South Corridor LRT Project EA Study

MEETING No. 3: Internal Agency Consultation Group

FILE NO.: D06-01 04 (City of Ottawa) / 5648-7047 (MRC)

DATE: March 8, 2005

TIME: 9:30 am

PLACE: Colonel By Board Room, 2nd Floor, 110 Lisgar Street

PRESENT:

City of Ottawa

Peter Steacy

Program Manager
Transportation – EA Program

Vivi Chi (Part Time)

Manager, Transportation
Infrastructure

Consultant Team

Dennis Callan

Senior Project Manager

Thom Budd

HMM Manager, Infrastructure

Robert Hunton

MRC Assistant Project
Manager

Internal Agency Consultation Group

Alan Gonthier

City of Ottawa

Bill VanRyswyk

Ottawa Police

Bob Spicer

City of Ottawa

Brian Millar

City of Ottawa

Claudio Colaiaacovo

City of Ottawa

Darlene Conway

City of Ottawa

Dean Aqiqi

City of Ottawa

Deborah Irwin

City of Ottawa

Glen Emond

City of Ottawa

Greg Montcalm

City of Ottawa

John Jensen

Transit Services

Lesley Paterson

City of Ottawa

Luc Marineau

City of Ottawa

Pat Scrimgeour

Transit Services

Rob Orchin

City of Ottawa

Ron Gray

City of Ottawa

Ziad Ghadban

City of Ottawa

PURPOSE: To update the group on the study progress and obtain comments with respect to the preliminary recommended plan to be presented at the upcoming Public Open Houses (21, 22, & 23 March 2005)

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

- 3.1 Following introductions of the attendees, the notes of the 05 October meeting were circulated.

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

Mr. Steacy informed the ACG that within the City there are two parallel LRT project 'streams' – one addressing the planning (EA) aspects and the other addressing future project implementation which are working in close concert. In its 01 March 2005 report to the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee concerning the proposed procurement approach, it was identified that Albert and Slater Streets were the preferred downtown LRT corridors. This information was subsequently presented in detail to Albert & Slater Street stakeholders at formal presentations on 07 March.

The ACG was advised this was the beginning of a consultation process to obtain feedback and hear the concerns of all stakeholders. Based upon the feedback received, the City shall be modifying/enhancing its plans to best address everyone's concerns.

3.2 Mr. Callan narrated a PowerPoint presentation of materials which outlined:

- Project Schedule
- Current Activities
- Development Issues
- Alternative Corridors Considered (South)
- Preferred Route
- Station Locations
- Park and Ride Lot Locations
- Grade Separations
- Maintenance Yard Locations
- Downtown Alignment Choices
- Screening of Downtown Alignment Choices
- Albert/Slater Options
- Next Steps in the Study

3.3 The schedule was described as:

- Project commencement April 2004
- Two POH's held to date (May/October)
- Third POH to be held March 21, 22, 23, 2005
- Fourth POH to be held June 2005
- EA recommendations to Council July 2005
- EA to MOE September 2005
- MOE approval late 2005

3.4 Mr. Callan described the material to be presented at the March POH as:

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

- Preliminary Alignment
- Station, Park and Ride and Maintenance Yard Locations
- Preliminary Downtown Options
- Staging elements

The meeting was advised that although staging was re-considered in the EA, the MOE would be approving only the ultimate project.

3.5 The community planning elements that contributed to the alignment choice were described as:

- Development potential of Le Breton Flats and Bayview Yard
- South Nepean Town Centre Community Design Plan
- City's Downtown Ottawa Urban Design Strategy

3.6 Plans of alternative alignments were presented. Some of the alignments were identified as being developed in previous studies for the development of Riverside South. The analysis of this alternative will be included in the EA documentation.

D.C.

3.7 Thirty-five station locations were identified on the key plan. The attending were informed that the station locations respected the development concept for Riverside South and South Nepean Town Centre. The attending were advised that the EA would identify and protect the property for all these potential locations, but would not compel the City to construct any of them until the city had determined a need.

City

3.8 Five park and ride lot locations along the corridor were identified:

- Existing lot at Greenboro Station
- Two alternative at Leitrim Road
- Future lot at Bowesville
- Interim lot at Limebank
- Lot at Woodroffe Road

3.9 Major grade separations were identified at:

- Two Rideau River crossings crossings (immediately south of Carleton University, and adjacent to the Strandherd/Earl Armstrong Bridge).
- Two rail to rail crossings (VIA Rail – Beachburg Subdivision, CNR – Walkley Subdivision).
- New tunnel to twin existing at Dow's Lake
- Existing structures along current O-train corridor.

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

Mr. Callan informed the attendees that as an interim solution the Southerly crossing of the Rideau River would be constructed on the proposed six-lane Strandherd Road structure for which an ESR was completed in 1993. The concept is for the rail to use 2 of the lanes resulting in a 4-lane road structure between River Road and Prince of Wales Drive.

- 3.10 Maintenance yard locations were identified at the existing Walkley yard site and South of the airport lands. The attendees were informed that the City was carrying out negotiations with the rail company for purchase of the Walkley yards, failing that negotiations with Transport Canada will be required to purchase these lands.

City

- 3.11 Downtown corridor options were identified as:

- Wellington Street
- Sparks Street
- Queens Street
- Albert Street
- Slater Street
- Laurier Avenue

The screening analysis was presented that led to the selection of Albert and Slater Streets as the preferred corridors.

The options for development of LRT on Albert and Slater were defined as:

- 2 way LRT on Albert with 2 way BRT on Slater
- 1 way LRT and BRT on Albert and Slater

The attendees were informed that the 1 way option was determined to be the preferred option. Renderings of the concept were presented.

- 3.12 Next steps in the project were described as:

- March 21, 22, 23 (POH's)
- Adjust plans to reflect comments
- Develop staging plan
- Present final option in June (POH's)
- Modify as required to reflect input
- Present EA recommendations to City Council in July
- Submit to MOE
- MOE approval late 2005

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

3.13 Q & A

- Q: Will the EA look at the detail traffic movements at the Prince of Wales and River Road LRT intersections to determine the feasibility of an “at grade” intersection and impact on traffic?
- A: Yes. The EA will model the intersection and discuss the options with the City. Consultant Team
- Q: Can additional sidings be added to the plan for flexibility in the operation of the LRT network?
- A: The consultant will work with the City of determine where the sidings can be placed. Even so it may be premature to define these until the City has determined an operational strategy. Consultant Team
- Q: Has the study considered a station at Preston to accommodate walk-in riders that currently access the lay by area, which is being relocated as part of the current concept?
- A: The EA will review this option as part of the updating following the POH. Consultant Team
- Q: NCC is currently reviewing transit options through Le Breton Flats. How can this be integrated into the EA?
- A: The EA team will meet with NCC and will then identify for the POH that alternative alignments through LeBreton Flats are being developed. Consultant Team
- Q: Has the EA determined where cyclist will be rerouted to since the environment on Albert/Slater will not be good for the average cyclist and the proposal is to ban cyclists from the Mackenzie King Bridge?
- A: The EA has not resolved that issue at this time. The EA team will work with City staff and the Advisory Committee to determine what options are available. Possibly the new pedestrian crossing of the canal at Somerset Street in conjunction with addition of cycle facilities to less congested roads may resolve the problem.
- Q: How will delivery and loading bay issues be addressed?
- A: The current plan retains or replaces most of the loading areas.

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

There are some exceptions which may be solved through peak hour restructure. Additional work will be undertaken following the POH to address these sites.

Consultant Team

Q: How will the EA address noise and lighting issues related to the yard and rail line?

A: A noise analysis will be carried out as part of the EA; in addition, site evaluation for lighting impacts will be considered.

Q: The current downtown plan shows most left turn movements on Albert/Slater being retained in some manner. Has an impact assessment been carried out?

A: A model is being run of the downtown to determine the impact of the turns and lane reduction. In addition the study will review turn options with respect to an appropriate lane configuration?

Consultant Team

The foregoing represents the writer's understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the undersigned within 48 hours of receiving these minutes at 613-736-7200.

Notes prepared by,

McCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION

Robert Hunton, P. Eng.

cc: All Attendees

MRC/HMM

McCormick Rankin Corporation/
Hatch Mott MacDonald
Joint Venture

c/o McCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION

1145 Hunt Club Road, Suite 300
Ottawa, Ontario K1V 0Y3
Tel: (613) 736-7200
Fax: (613) 736-8710
E-mail: mrc-ottawa@mrc.ca
Website: www.mrc.ca

NOTES OF MEETING

PROJECT: North-South Corridor LRT Project EA Study

MEETING No. 4: Internal Agency Consultation Group

FILE NO.: D06-01 04 (City of Ottawa) / 5648-70471 (MRC)

DATE: May 31, 2005

TIME: 9:00 am

PLACE: 110 Lisgar Street, Colonel By Boardroom, 2nd Floor

PRESENT:

City of Ottawa	
Peter Steacy	Program Manager Transportation – EA Program
Consultant Team	
Dennis Callan	Senior Project Manager
Thom Budd	HMM Manager, Infrastructure
Robert Hunton	MRC Assistant Project Manager
Howard Williamson	Williamson Consulting Inc.
Procurement Team	
Rob Wanless	MMM Ltd.
Guy Cormier	J. L. Richards & Assoc. Ltd.
Ron Cheek	J. L. Richards & Assoc. Ltd.
Internal Agency Consultation Group	
Perry McConnell	Ottawa Fire Services
Ron Gray	Fleet Services
Jean Lachance	P.G.M. Infrastructure Approvals Div.
Bruce Stansfield	LRT – Property
Bob Spicer	Area Planning Control
Linda Carkner	Infrastructure Management
Max Miner	Surface Operations
Peter McKay	Infrastructure Management
Alain Gonthier	Infrastructure Management
Catherine Miller	Comprehensive Asset Mgmt.
Brian Millar	Traffic Operations
John Jensen	Transit Services
Rob Orchin	Traffic & Parking Operations
Pat Scrimgeour	Transit Services

PURPOSE: To update the group on the study's progress, changes since the last meeting and obtain comments with respect to the recommendations/conclusions to be presented at the upcoming POH.

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

- 4.1 Following introductions of the attendees and circulation of the March meeting notes, Mr. Steacy explained that the main change to the preliminary plan since the last meeting was to the downtown concept to address concerns expressed by business and landowners.

4.2 Mr. Callan narrated a PowerPoint presentation of materials which outlined:

- Study progress / schedule;
- Recommended project;
- Staging elements;
- Next steps in the study.

4.3 Study progress / schedule was described as:

- Project commenced April 2004;
- Three public meetings to-date;
- Fourth public meeting to be held in June
- Presentation to Transportation Committee July 6th;
- Council – July 13th.

4.4 Changes to the recommended project were outlined as:

- Adjustment to Park and Ride Lot;
- Adjustment to Bayview alignment;
- Revisions to downtown concept plan.

4.5 Changes to Park and Ride lots were described as:

- Removal of the Limebank site (675 spaces);
- Addition of the River Road site (1,000 spaces);
- Leitrim lot on TC lands as provisional (1,500 – 2,000);
- Leitrim lot east side (1,200) choice location.

4.6 Changes to station locations were described as:

- River Road station moved to new Park and Ride lot;
- Leitrim station moved slightly south to match both lots;
- Gladstone station moved south of Gladstone.

4.7 There were no significant changes to the major structures presented in March.

4.8 Three maintained yard locations were presented:

- Walkley
- North of Leitrim
- South of Airport

Mr. Callan informed the meeting that the City has expressed concern regarding operation of a yard at Walkley for the north-south line. That location can only accommodate a northerly spur, requiring all operators of southbound trains to move to the other end of the train once on the main line.

The City had confirmed that operation at either of the other lots would better suit the north-south line.

The Consultant is preparing an evaluation of the sites to determine which is most suitable.

TB

- 4.9 Mr. Callan informed the meeting that the EA team and NCC have been working closely to resolve an alignment through the flats which would best service the redevelopment of those lands.

Mr. Callan told the meeting the current approach is an alignment closer to the open aqueduct. NCC is reviewing this internally with their design group.

- 4.10 Mr. Callan presented sections that illustrated the change in the downtown option to now have both LRT and BRT share a lane rather on the same side of the road.

Mr. Callan explained that the concerns of the downtown stakeholders were:

- Loss of parking, delivery zones, taxi stands;
- Cars trapped between BRT/LRT;
- Too many buses;
- Consideration of a tunnel;
- Impacts on Mackenzie King Bridge traffic;
- Impacts on cyclists;
- Construction impacts.

Mr. Callan informed the meeting that an extensive process of consultation with the downtown merchants and stakeholders had been undertaken.

- 4.11 Mr. Callan informed the meeting that in developing the new plan the EA team had investigated other transit sites. An example from Portland was reviewed but determined to have too much impact on the curb lane. From that example the current concept was generated that shared a transit travel land with bus bay stop and LRT on-line stops.

- 4.12 Mr. Callan presented a table which indicated that the off-peak parking restriction of the new concept resulted in only an 8% reduction, an improvement over the 59% reduction of the original concept.
- 4.13 Mr. Callan presented a VISSIM traffic simulation of the downtown Slater at Elgin Street which showed that the new concept will work.
- 4.14 Mr. Callan explained that to accommodate the volume of passengers projected the City needed both BRT and LRT through the downtown. Transferring all passengers to exclusively one mode or the other would result in extensive disruption to the user.
- 4.15 Mr. Callan informed the meeting that the EA team had reviewed the previous twin tunnel concept and updated the cost estimate. An estimated cost of \$720 M has been determined. That estimate did not include track work, signalling or power.
- 4.16 Mr. Callan informed the meeting that the staging options were under review. Once the updated cost estimate was completed the staging options could be finalized. Mr. Callan reminded the meeting that the EA did not seek approval of the strategy and that this work was being carried out for the City's interest.
- 4.17 Next steps were described as:
- Public Open Houses June 6, 7, 8 and 9;
 - Update costs;
 - Finalize staging;
 - Transportation Committee July 6th;
 - City Council – July 13th;
 - Post Notice of completion – Sept. 9th;
 - MOE approval Nov/Dec 2005;
 - CEAA approvals as required.

4.18 **Questions and Answers**

There were no questions from the ACG Group with respect to the presentation.

Emergency services confirmed that the removal of Mackenzie King Bridge from the transportation network would not affect their service.

OC Transpo requested a meeting to refine station slopes to reflect their developing operational strategy.

The City will meet with Transport Canada to discuss the impact of a yard on TC lands.

The foregoing represents the writer's understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the undersigned within 48 hours of receiving these minutes at 613-736-7200.

Notes prepared by,

McCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION

Robert Hunton, P. Eng.

cc: All Attendees
Absentees
B. Townsend

MRC/HMM

McCormick Rankin Corporation/
Hatch Mott MacDonald

McCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION

1145 Hunt Club Road, Suite 300
Ottawa, Ontario K1V 0Y3
Tel: (613) 736-7200
Fax: (613) 736-8710
E-mail: mrc-ott@mrc.ca
Website: www.mrc.ca

NOTES OF MEETING

PROJECT: North-South Corridor LRT Project EA
MEETING: Agency Consultation Group "External" #2
FILE NO.: D06-01 04-NSLRT (City of Ottawa) / 5648-7043 (MRC)
DATE: October 5, 2004 **TIME:** 1:00 p.m.
PLACE: Ottawa City Hall, Honeywell Room

PRESENT:

Agency Consultation Group		
Rachel Houde	Ministry of Transportation	
Vance Bedore	Public Works and Government Services Canada	
Mohamed Nouhi	Infrastructure Canada	
Phil Pawliuk	Ministry of Transportation	
Vivi Chi	City of Ottawa	
Arto Keklikian	National Capital Commission	
Mike Krzyzanowski	National Research Council	
Susanne Turcotte	Environment Canada	
Glen McDonald	Rideau Valley Conservation Authority	
Manuel Stevens	Parks Canada	
Andre Lalonde	Transport Canada	
Lionel J. King	Transport Canada	
Diane McClymont- Peace	Health Canada	
Rob McCallum	Transport Canada	
Grace Strachan	National Capital Commission	
Study Team		
Peter Steacy	City of Ottawa	
Dennis Callan	McCormick Rankin Corp.	
Robert Hunton	McCormick Rankin Corp.	
Mike Bricks	Ecoplans Limited	
Thom Budd	Hatch Mott Macdonald	
Howard Williamson	Williamson Consulting Inc.	

PURPOSE: To update the group on the approval of the ToR and work completed to be presented at the upcoming POH (Oct. 19, 20, 21).

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

- 2.1 Following introductions, Mr. Steacy apologized for the lateness of the materials provided. He explained that although we had planned to provide the material earlier, that technical difficulties prevented that.

Mr. Steacy suggested that the material will be presented at this meeting and the Consultant will address any immediate questions the group had. Formal response by the group could be submitted as late as October 28th.

Materials provided by email and available as hand-outs included:

- Members Roles and Responsibilities (PCG, ACG, BCG).
- Needs and Justification / Alternative Solutions (Sept. 27/04)
- Evaluation Process (Sept. 27/04 Discussion Paper)
- Core Area Cross Sections Alternatives (Draft paper Sept. 27/04)
- Consultation Plan (Sept./04)
- Information Package (Sept./04)

In addition, a plan “Alignment/Development through South Communities” which was too large to email was available as a handout.

2.2 Mr. Callan narrated a PowerPoint presentation of materials which outlined:

- Terms of Reference Approval
- Existing Conditions Data
- Problem Statement
- Alternative Solutions to the Problem
- Alternative Rapid Transit Modes
- Evaluation Criteria
- Next Steps

Copies of the presentation were provided to the group to follow along.

2.3 Mr. Callan informed the group that MOE approved the ToR on September 15th. A copy of the approved ToR will be translated then placed on the Web page.

Mr. Callan said there were no conditions set on the ToR.

2.4 Mr. Callan described the existing conditions panels that will be presented at the POH. The panels include existing conditions for:

- Natural Environment
- Geotechnical Conditions
- Heritage Features
- Built Environment

- 2.5 Mr. Callan explained the growth issues that resulted in the “Problem Statement” and “Purpose of the Undertaking”.

The problem statement was described as:

- 75% increase in population, 50% increase in employment
- Existing infrastructure will not accommodate this growth.

- 2.6 Mr. Callan presented the alternative solution as:

- Do Nothing
- Expand Arterial Road Network
- Expand Rapid Transit Service Outside the Study Corridor
- Expand Rapid Transit Service Inside the Study Corridor
- Combination of Expansion of Rapid Transit and Arterial Roads

- 2.7 The group was informed that the “Ridership Study” was not yet complete. Based on the work to-date, an estimate of 2021 ridership has been set at 60,000 between Rideau and Riverside South. Considering sensitivity analysis and connection to Barrhaven a range of 60,000 –70,000 riders was being proposed. Mr. Callan indicated that these number were under refinement at this time and may change a little.

- 2.8 A table showing comparable North American LRT networks was presented. That table indicated that for the projected ridership of 60,000 – 70,000 on a 31 km network, it was reasonable to consider a LRT network to service the transit needs.

Mr. Callan presented a table which illustrated the potential headways and number of vehicles required for LRT and BRT to accommodate the 60,000 – 70,000 demand. Mr. Callan informed the group that a relative cost comparison had been carried out for the BRT and LRT networks. The comparison included:

- capital
- annual operating
- life cycle replacement

- 2.9 Mr. Callan said that the study was recommending LRT Technology be used in this corridor because:

- used existing infrastructure
- higher capital but lower ongoing cost
- reduced exhaust emissions in corridor
- the central area is currently saturated with buses
- there is a perceived potential to attract more riders
- there is a perceived potential to attract development at stations.

- 2.10 Mr. Callan presented the corridors being considered, in the core area; Wellington, Sparks, Queen, Albert, Slater and Laurier Streets were identified as possible corridors. Various links to LeBreton Flats and Rideau Centre were also shown on the core area plan. Mr. Callan indicated that these were preliminary corridors and alignments and impacts would be assessed in the next stage of the study.

A plan of the southern area illustrated the development constraints to the alignment of rapid transit. Mr. Callan identified the studies and planning projects that have helped define the current corridor.

- 2.11 Mr. Callan presented several DRAFT typical sections that were being developed for further analysis. Copies of the sections were included in the pre-meeting package. ACG was asked to review and comment on these preliminary concepts by October 28th.

- 2.12 ACG had the following comments/questions:

Q: Has City undertaken an assignment to optimize BRT in the downtown?

A: Yes, the study has been initiated and will aid in optimizing the existing bus traffic.

Other Issues/Comments:

MRC

- ACG should be first in the consultation series.
- Circulate Ridership Study when complete.
- Submit BRT/LRT analysis for review.
- “Presumed” aspects of LRT/BRT evaluation is a weak unsupported position.
- Surprised LRT was being put forward though BRT was more economical. Documentation required.
- Do not preclude connections to Gatineau over Prince of Wales structure.
- Provide copies of other meeting notes.
- Provide copies of Needs & Justification Report.
- Provide copies of technology report.

MRC

P. Steacy

The foregoing represents the writer's understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the undersigned within 48 hours of receiving these minutes at 613-736-7200.

Notes prepared by,

McCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION

Robert Hunton, P. Eng.

cc: All Attendees

Absent		
Eric Advokaat	Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	
Rob Dobos	Environment Canada	
Debbie Miller	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	
Carolyn Dunn	Health Canada	
Anjala Puvananathan	Health Canada	
Samantha Tattersall	Infrastructure Canada	
Peter Moore	National Capital Commission	
Chris Andersen	Ontario Ministry of Culture	
Michael Harrison	Ontario Ministry of the Environment	
Gary McLaren	Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources	
Bill Fitzpatrick	Ontario Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal	
Greg Tokarz	Ministry of Transportation	
Dave Ballinger	Parks Canada	
Salah Barj	Société de Transport de l'Outaouais	
Don Pulciani	Transport Canada	

MRC/HMM

McCormick Rankin Corporation/
Hatch Mott MacDonald
Joint Venture

c/o McCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION

1145 Hunt Club Road, Suite 300
Ottawa, Ontario K1V 0Y3
Tel: (613) 736-7200
Fax: (613) 736-8710
E-mail: mrc-ottawa@mrc.ca
Website: www.mrc.ca

NOTES OF MEETING

PROJECT: North-South Corridor LRT Project EA Study

MEETING No. 3: External Agency Consultation Group

FILE NO.: D06-01 04 (City of Ottawa) / 5648-7047 (MRC)

DATE: March 8, 2005

TIME: 1:30 pm

PLACE: Colonel By Board Room, 2nd Floor, 110 Lisgar Street

PRESENT:

City of Ottawa		
Peter Steacy	Program Manager Transportation – EA Program	
Vivi Chi (Part Time)	Manager, Transportation Infrastructure	
Consultant Team		
Dennis Callan	Senior Project Manager	
Thom Budd	HMM Manager, Infrastructure	
Robert Hunton	Assistant Project Manager	
External Agency Consultation Group		
Anne Bendig	Department of Fisheries and Oceans	
Arto Keklikian	National Capital Commission	
Bill Aird	Canadian Transportation Agency	
Carolyn Dunn	Health Canada	
Gabrielle Simonyi	National Capital Commission	
Grace Strachan	National Capital Commission	
Lionel King	Transport Canada	
Luc-Alexandre Chayer	National Capital Commission	
Mike Krzyzanowski	National Research Council	
Phil Pawliuk	Ministry of Transportation Ontario	
Rachel Houde	Ministry of Transportation Ontario	
Roland Thériault	National Capital Commission	
Scott Manning	Public Works and Government Services Canada	
Tamara Taub	Public Works and Government Services	

PURPOSE: To update the group on the study progress and obtain comments with respect to the preliminary recommended plan to be presented at the upcoming Public Open Houses (21, 22, & 23 March 2005)

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

- 3.1 Following introductions of the attendees, the notes of the 05 October 2004 meeting were distributed.

Mr. Steacy informed the ACG that within the City there are two parallel LRT project ‘streams’ – one addressing the planning (EA) aspects and the other addressing future project implementation which are working in close concert. In its 01 March 2005 report to

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee concerning the proposed procurement approach, it was identified that Albert and Slater Streets were the preferred downtown LRT corridors. This information was subsequently presented in detail to Albert & Slater Street stakeholders at formal presentations on 07 March.

The ACG was advised this was the beginning of a consultation process to obtain feedback and hear the concerns of all stakeholders. Based upon the feedback received, the City shall be modifying/enhancing its plans to best address everyone's concerns.

3.2 Mr. Callan narrated a PowerPoint presentation of materials which outlined:

- Project Schedule
- Current Activities
- Development Issues
- Alternative Corridors Considered (South)
- Preferred Route
- Station Locations
- Park and Ride Lot Locations
- Grade Separations
- Maintenance Yard Locations
- Downtown Alignment Choices
- Screening of Downtown Alignment Choices
- Albert/Slater Options
- Next Steps in the Study

3.3 The schedule was described as:

- Project commencement April 2004
- Two POH's held to date (May/October)
- Third POH to be held March 21, 22, 23, 2005
- Fourth POH to be held June 2005
- EA recommendations to Council July 2005
- EA to MOE September 2005
- MOE approval late 2005

3.4 Mr. Callan described the material to be presented at the March POH as:

- Preliminary Alignment
- Station, Park and Ride and Maintenance Yard Locations
- Preliminary Downtown Options
- Staging elements

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

The meeting was advised that although staging was re-considered in the EA, the MOE would be approving only the ultimate project.

3.5 The community planning elements that contributed to the alignment choice were described as:

- Development potential of LeBreton Flats and Bayview Yard
- South Nepean Town Centre Community Design Plan
- City's Downtown Ottawa Urban Design Strategy
- Leitrim Community Design Plan
- Riverside South Community Design Plan

3.6 Plans of alternative alignments were presented. Some of the alignments were identified as being developed in previous studies for the development of Riverside South. The analysis of this alternative will be included in the EA documentation.

Consultant Team

3.7 Thirty-five station locations were identified on the key plan. The attending were informed that the station locations respected the development concept for Riverside South and South Nepean Town Centre. The attending were advised that the EA would identify and protect the property for all these potential locations, but would not compel the City to construct any of them until the city had determined a need.

City

3.8 Five park and ride lot locations along the corridor were identified:

- Existing lot at Greenboro Station
- Two alternative at Leitrim Road
- Future lot at Bowesville
- Interim lot at Limebank
- Lot at Woodroffe Road

3.9 Major grade separations were identified at

- Two Rideau River crossings (immediately south of Carleton University, and adjacent to the Strandherd/Earl Armstrong Bridge).
- Two rail to rail crossings (VIA Rail – Beachburg Subdivision, CNR – Walkley Subdivision).
- New tunnel to twin existing at Dow's Lake
- Existing structures along current O-train corridor.

Mr. Callan informed the attendees that as an interim solution the Southerly crossing of the Rideau River would be constructed on the

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

proposed six-lane Strandherd Road structure for which an ESR was completed in 1993. The concept is for the rail to use 2 of the lanes resulting in a 4-lane road structure between River Road and Prince of Wales Road.

- 3.10 Maintenance yard locations were identified at the existing Walkley yard site and South of the airport lands. The attendees were informed that the City was carrying out negotiations with the rail company for purchase of the Walkley yards, failing that; negotiations with Transport Canada will be required to purchase these lands.

City

- 3.11 Downtown corridor options were identified as:

- Wellington Street
- Sparks Street
- Queens Street
- Albert Street
- Slater Street
- Laurier Avenue

The screening analysis was presented that led to the selection of Albert and Slater Streets as the preferred corridors.

The options for development of LRT on Albert and Slater were defined as:

- 2 way LRT on Albert with 2 way BRT on Slater
- 1 way LRT and BRT on Albert and Slater

The attendees were informed that the 1 way option was determined to be the preferred option. Renderings of the concept were presented.

- 3.12 Next steps in the project were described as:

- March 21, 22, 23 (POH's)
- Adjust plans to reflect comments
- Develop staging plan
- Present final option in June (POH's)
- Modify as required to reflect input
- Present EA recommendations to City Council in July
- Submit to MOE
- MOE approval late 2005

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

3.13 Q & A

Q: How were alternative alignments developed and analyzed for the section through Riverside South?

A: Extensive alignment options were developed and the screening was carried out during the transportation studies for the development of the Riverside South Community Design Plan. This will be documented within the EA report.

Q: Is it necessary to continue to operate BRT downtown once the LRT is developed?

A: Yes. Both systems are required to provide for the capacity that is required through the core. It is anticipated that bus volumes will be reduced when the LRT is initiated.

Q: Has a life cycle analysis been carried out for a tunnel option to compare it to the current surface option being considered?

A: An update of the estimate for a BRT twin tunnel as envisioned in the 1988 Feasibility Study prepared for the former region is being prepared. A detailed life cycle analysis is not being considered as part of the LRT EA.

Q: When will the EA approval be achieved?

A: The Ontario and Canadian Environmental Assessment processes are being carried out in parallel with both approvals expected by early 2006.

Q: NCC has missed the previous CEAA meetings; can the consultant assist them in getting up to date with the process?

A: MRC will assist NCC.

Consultant Team

Q: Which of the 35 station locations will be recommended in the EA?

A: All 35 stations will be carried forward in the EA. This will allow the City to bring online stations as they determine the need. The initial phase will not include all of the stations. (See next question)

Q: Which stations will be built as part of the initial project?

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

A: The P3 group will determine the need for stations as part of the design construction assignment. The EA will document the potential station locations in such a way to provide the designer with maximum flexibility to achieve the goals of the design assignment.

Q: Will there be a park and ride lot located at Lester Road as indicated in earlier work?

A: A park and ride lot at Lester is not being proposed. Currently the plan to accommodate a lot at Leitrim and Bowesville makes the lot at Lester redundant.

Q: Why not build a larger park and ride lot at Limebank to accommodate local residents and out of town users?

A: The land available as part of the planned development is not sufficient for the lot size required. OC Transpo will run collector buses through the neighbourhoods to reduce local use of the lot.

Q: Has money been set aside for the construction of the Strandherd bridge which the LRT will use 2 lanes of?

A: The City's Long Range Financial Plan identifies the budget requirements for the bridge construction, which has already received an approved ESR.

Q: Is there a risk that the PPP group will do something other than what the EA has recommended?

A: The EA will provide maximum flexibility to the designer reducing the risk of major changes to the recommendations.

Q: Why are two Park and Ride sites being considered at Leitrim?

A: The Leitrim Park & Ride Lot is a vital component of this project. One site is the former Gloucester Land Fill which is now owned by Transport Canada. The other site, the former Gloucester Equestrian Park, is currently under private ownership. Identification of both sites provides the City with maximum flexibility with respect to securing the property required to proceed with the design and construction of a facility in the vicinity of Leitrim Road.

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

Q: Will the existing O-train stations be updated?

A: Yes, as the current platforms were constructed on an interim basis for the pilot project and are not designed for a low floor vehicle which will be required for the expansion.

Q: Has the determination that the vehicle is electric been assumed or has an analysis been conducted?

A: A screening has been carried out that has confirmed that an electric LRT is the appropriate vehicle for this project. This will be documented in the EA report.

Q: Has the budget estimate been completed?

A: A WBS estimate will be undertaken for the recommended alternative. The final estimate has not been completed at this time. T.B.

Q: Normally an EA will identify property requirements; it seems that the P3 group is carrying this out before the EA is complete. How is this being addressed in the EA?

A: The EA will identify the property requirements. Any work the P3 group undertakes is preliminary. The P3 group is initiating contacts at this time to provide for a quick turn around once the EA is approved.

The foregoing represents the writer's understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the undersigned within 48 hours of receiving these minutes at 613-736-7200.

Notes prepared by,

MCCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION

Robert Hunton , P. Eng.

cc: All Attendees
Barry Townsend, City of Ottawa

MRC/HMM

McCormick Rankin Corporation/
Hatch Mott MacDonald
Joint Venture

c/o McCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION

1145 Hunt Club Road, Suite 300
Ottawa, Ontario K1V 0Y3
Tel: (613) 736-7200
Fax: (613) 736-8710
E-mail: mrc-ottawa@mrc.ca
Website: www.mrc.ca

NOTES OF MEETING

PROJECT: North-South Corridor LRT Project EA Study

MEETING No. 4: External Agency Consultation Group

FILE NO.: D06-01 04 (City of Ottawa) / 5648-70472 (MRC)

DATE: May 31, 2005

TIME: 1:30 p.m.

PLACE: 110 Lisgar Street, Colonel By Boardroom, 2nd Floor

PRESENT:

City of Ottawa	
Peter Steacy	Program Manager Transportation – EA Program
Consultant Team	
Dennis Callan	Senior Project Manager
Thom Budd	HMM Manager, Infrastructure
Robert Hunton	MRC Assistant Project Manager
Howard Williamson	Williamson Consulting Inc.
External Agency Consultation Group	
Mike Krzyzanowski	NRC
Glen McDonald	RVCA
Roland Theriault	NCC
Luc-Alexandre Chayer	NCC
Grace Strachan	NCC
Arto Keklikian	NCC
Richard Roulx	TC
Tamara Taub	PWGSC
Scott Manning	PWGSC
Anik Guertin	HC
Bill Aird	CTA
Rachel Houde	MTO
Mona Abouhenidy	City of Ottawa

PURPOSE: To update the group on the study's progress, changes since the last meeting and obtain comments with respect to the recommendations/conclusions to be presented at the upcoming POH.

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

- 4.1 Following introductions of the attendees and circulation of the March meeting notes, Mr. Steacy explained that the main change to the preliminary plan since the last meeting was to the downtown concept to address concerns expressed by business and landowners.
- 4.2 Mr. Callan narrated a PowerPoint presentation of materials which outlined:

- Study progress / schedule;
- Recommended project;
- Staging elements;
- Next steps in the study.

4.3 Study progress / schedule was described as:

- Project commenced April 2004;
- Three public meetings to-date;
- Fourth public meeting to be held in June
- Presentation to Transportation Committee July 6th;
- Council – July 13th.

4.4 Changes to the recommended project were outlined as:

- Adjustment to Park and Ride Lot;
- Adjustment to Bayview alignment;
- Revisions to downtown concept plan.

4.5 Changes to Park and Ride lots were described as:

- Removal of the Limebank site (675 spaces);
- Addition of the River Road site (1,000 spaces);
- Leitrim lot on TC lands as provisional (1,500 – 2,000);
- Leitrim lot east side (1,200) choice location.

4.6 Changes to station locations were described as:

- River Road station moved to new Park and Ride lot;
- Leitrim station moved slightly south to match both lots;
- Gladstone station moved south of Gladstone.

4.7 There were no significant changes to the major structures presented in March.

4.8 Three maintained yard locations were presented:

- Walkley
- North of Leitrim
- South of Airport

Mr. Callan informed the meeting that the City has expressed concern regarding operation of a yard at Walkley for the north-south line. That location can only accommodate a northerly spur, requiring all

operators of southbound trains to move to the other end of the train once on the main line.

The City had confirmed that operation at either of the other lots would better suit the north-south line.

The Consultant is preparing an evaluation of the sites to determine which is most suitable.

TB

- 4.9 Mr. Callan informed the meeting that the EA team and NCC have been working closely to resolve an alignment through the flats which would best service the redevelopment of those lands.

Mr. Callan told the meeting the current approach is an alignment closer to the open aqueduct. NCC is reviewing this internally with their design group.

- 4.10 Mr. Callan presented sections that illustrated the change in the downtown option to now have both LRT and BRT share a lane rather on the same side of the road.

Mr. Callan explained that the concerns of the downtown stakeholders were:

- Loss of parking, delivery zones, taxi stands;
- Cars trapped between BRT/LRT;
- Too many buses;
- Consideration of a tunnel;
- Impacts on Mackenzie King Bridge traffic;
- Impacts on cyclists;
- Construction impacts;

Mr. Callan informed the meeting that an extensive process of consultation with the downtown merchants and stakeholders had been undertaken.

- 4.11 Mr. Callan informed the meeting that in developing the new plan the EA team had investigated other transit sites. An example from Portland was reviewed but determined to have too much impact on the curb lane. From that example the current concept was generated that shared a transit travel land with bus bay stop and LRT on-line stops.

- 4.12 Mr. Callan presented a table which indicated that the off-peak parking restriction of the new concept resulted in only an 8% reduction, an improvement over the 59% reduction of the original concept.
- 4.13 Mr. Callan presented a VISSIM traffic simulation of the downtown Slater at Elgin Street which showed that the new concept will work.
- 4.14 Mr. Callan explained that to accommodate the volume of passengers projected the City needed both BRT and LRT through the downtown. . Transferring all passengers to exclusively one mode or the other would result in extensive disruption to the user.
- 4.15 Mr. Callan informed the meeting that the EA team had reviewed the previous twin tunnel concept and updated the cost estimate. An estimated cost of \$720 M has been determined. That estimate did not include track work, signalling or power.
- 4.16 Mr. Callan informed the meeting that the staging options were under review. Once the updated cost estimate was completed the staging options could be finalized. Mr. Callan reminded the meeting that the EA did not seek approval of the strategy and that this work was being carried out for the City's interest.
- 4.17 Next steps were described as:
- Public Open Houses June 6, 7, 8 and 9;
 - Update costs;
 - Finalize staging;
 - Transportation Committee July 6th;
 - City Council – July 13th;
 - Post Notice of completion – Sept. 9th;
 - MOE approval Nov/Dec 2005;
 - CEAA approvals as required.

4.18 **Questions and Answers**

Mr. Roulx advised the meeting that there were several CEAA concerns including property, river crossing and funding.

It was suggested that the approval process would be easier if the process for abandoning the rail and becoming a transit authority was completed before the CEAA review.

The foregoing represents the writer's understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the undersigned within 48 hours of receiving these minutes at 613-736-7200.

Notes prepared by,

McCORMICK RANKIN CORPORATION

Robert Hunton, P. Eng.

cc: All Attendees
Absentees
B. Townsend