



# Transportation Master Plan Infrastructure Requirement Study

**Final Report: Phase III Consultations  
October 14, 2008**

**Submitted to:**

Colin Simpson  
Planning, Transit and the Environment  
City of Ottawa

**Submitted by:**

PACE Public Affairs & Community Engagement

**Contact Information:**

Grégoire Jodouin  
Partner  
Suite 302  
370 Churchill Avenue  
Ottawa, ON K1Z 5C2

T: 613.860.1685 ext. 202 / F: 613.792.1349  
[gjodouin@paceconsulting.ca](mailto:gjodouin@paceconsulting.ca)  
[www.paceconsulting.ca](http://www.paceconsulting.ca)

**Pace**



Public Affairs & Community Engagement



# Table of Contents

---

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Consultation Program ~ Objective.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Consultation Program ~ Overview.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Consultation Program ~ Outcomes .....</b>	<b>14</b>
APPENDIX ‘A’ - COMMENT SHEET .....	33
APPENDIX ‘B’ - COMMENTS RELATED TO CHANGES TO ROAD PROJECTS: ALL SOURCES.....	35
APPENDIX ‘C’ - COMMENTS RELATED TO SUPPLEMENTARY NETWORKS: ALL SOURCES .....	48
APPENDIX ‘D’ - COMMENTS ON PROPOSED POLICY DIRECTIONS: ALL SOURCES.....	57
APPENDIX ‘E’ - REGISTERED DISCUSSION GROUPS — FLIP CHART NOTES .....	68
APPENDIX ‘F’ - STAKEHOLDER FOCUS GROUP NOTES .....	86
APPENDIX ‘G’ - ADVISORY COMMITTEES NOTES.....	96
APPENDIX ‘H’ - INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AGENCY MEETING MINUTES .....	99





# Executive Summary

---

## Introduction

The mandate of the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) Study Consultation Program is to engage, in a meaningful way, a broad range of citizens and stakeholders in a dialogue around Ottawa's long-term transportation planning. In this third and final phase of consultation, the objective was to inform and gather feedback on four potential implementation scenarios for the 2031 rapid transit network that council approved May 28, 2008. This effort included soliciting feedback on the evaluation criteria to assess the different implementation scenarios and the proposed supplementary transit networks, as well as the proposed road infrastructure projects and the overall policy direction of the TMP.

Consultations began on September 11, and concluded on September 30, 2008. A number of activities were developed to provide flexible and convenient opportunities for citizens to provide input to the City. These included:

- Open Houses
- Registered Discussion Groups
- Online materials and consultation forums
- Stakeholder Focus Group Sessions
- Advisory Committees Discussion Groups
- Internal and External Agency Group Meetings
- Mail, fax and email correspondence.

Over 900 written submissions (911) were received during the month of September as a result of the above-mentioned activities, including numerous discussions and meetings as documented in this report. Overall, the majority of the public and stakeholders prefer Rapid Transit Implementation Scenario 4 (58 per cent of all comments support Scenario 4) followed by Scenario 3 (22 per cent), Scenario 1 (10 per cent) and Scenario 2 (five per cent) with a small number not favouring any of the proposed transit scenarios (five per cent).

Most people selected 'Ridership' (21 per cent) as the most important evaluation criterion to assess the transit scenarios, closely followed by 'Benefits to the Customers' (19 per cent), 'Benefits to the Environment' (18 per cent), 'Cost Effectiveness' (17 per cent) and 'Reduces Downtown Bus Congestion' (15 per cent).



A majority of people stated that they agree with the proposed Supplementary Rapid Transit Network (51 per cent). Approximately 25 per cent said they disagree with it while 24 per cent indicated that they “Don’t know”.

The most frequently articulated comment with respect to the road infrastructure projects was that the city should spend less on road infrastructure and instead redirect money towards mass transit. Several people noted the need to complete the Strandherd-Armstrong Bridge while several other roads projects generated mixed comments and discussions, including the Airport Parkway, the Alta Vista Transportation Corridor and Ottawa Road 174.

Significantly fewer people commented on the proposed TMP policies compared to the infrastructure components. The majority of the policy-related comments favoured promoting sustainable transportation through enhancing cycling and walking infrastructure and applying parking policies to influence travel behaviour.

## **Activities and Outcomes**

**Comments Sent Directly to the City:** Citizens were encouraged to participate and provide feedback through a multitude of channels: by emailing City staff at [plan@ottawa.ca](mailto:plan@ottawa.ca); submitting online comments on the City’s website; participating in OttawaTALKS; or mailing and faxing comments to the City.

In total, 836 comments were received via these different mediums: 546 via OttawaTALKS; 173 submitted online; 102 were emailed or mailed; six were faxed; and nine were hand-delivered.

The results from the 546 OttawaTALKs submissions can be found in a separate report provided by Nanos Research. The analysis outlined below is based on the 290 submissions that were submitted online, emailed or mailed, faxed, and hand-delivered:

*Evaluation Criteria:* Of the 290 remaining submissions, the top two evaluation criteria selected were ‘Ridership’ (97 times) and ‘Benefits to the Environment’ (96 times). This was followed closely by ‘Benefits to the Customer’, cited 94 times by respondents.

*Preferred Scenario:* Of the 174 answers received for this question, the majority selected Scenario #4 (116 responses), distantly followed by 27 responses for Scenario #3. Fourteen selected Scenario #1 while eight selected Scenario #2.

*Road Infrastructure:* Of the 150 comments received regarding the recommended changes to the proposed road projects, several suggested focusing on transit rather than road infrastructure and creating arterial road infrastructure that supported multi-modal transit use. Comments on the specific road projects focused on the need for commercial by-passes (e.g., a ring-road) and inter-provincial bridge access. Those projects that elicited more diverse opinions included the Airport Parkway, Prince of Wales, Island Park Drive, Byron/Richmond Road, and the Alta Vista Corridor.



*Supplementary Transit Network:* One hundred and sixty (160) individuals provided their opinion on the level of support for the supplementary rapid transit network. Of these, nearly half indicated that they agreed (44%) with the networks (16% 'fully agreed' and 28% 'somewhat agreed'). Just over a quarter disagreed (10% 'somewhat' and 16% 'completely').

*TMP Policies:* A predominant theme that emerged from the 92 comments received was the continued support for effective walking and cycling paths. Other comments included recommendations for how the City could encourage sustainable transportation choices and leverage policy to encourage behavioural change.

**Open Houses:** Five Public Open House sessions were held during the period of September 11, to September 22, 2008, in locations in the East, West, South, South-West and Centre of Ottawa. Approximately 376 individuals attended the various events. Engineering and planning experts from the Study Team were available to answer any technical questions that residents had.

*Evaluation Criteria:* In total, 75 Comment Sheets were completed and submitted at the events. The top three cited evaluation criteria were 'Ridership' (35 times); 'Cost Effectiveness' (26 times); and 'Benefits to the Customer' (22 times).

*Preferred Scenario:* Fifty-eight Comment Sheets provided input regarding a preferred transit implementation scenario. The one selected most often was Scenario #4 (39.7%). The second most selected was Scenario #3 (29.4%).

*Road Infrastructure:* Of the 75 comment sheets received, 50 provided input on the proposed road projects. A variety of recommendations were made to increase road capacity in areas that provided access to the City's core while still maintaining a transit focus.

*Supplementary Transit Network:* Forty-six individuals provided their opinion on the level of support for the Supplementary Rapid Transit Network. Of the responses to this question, 60 per cent indicated that they agreed with the proposed Network (47.83% 'somewhat agreed' and 13.04% 'fully agreed').

*TMP Policies:* Of the 75 Comment Sheets submitted, 45 provided comments specific to the proposed policy changes. There was support for an increased and continued maintenance of cycling and walking infrastructure, including the interconnection between various areas of the city (including rural villages).

**Discussion Groups:** Registered Discussion Groups were conducted between 7:00 and 8:00 p.m. at each of the Public Open Houses. Over 100 people participated at the various sessions, where technical facilitators led the discussions at each table and comments and input was collected on flip charts.

*Evaluation Criteria:* 'Ridership', 'Cost Effectiveness', and 'Reduction of the Downtown Bus Congestion' were cited most often as the three most important criteria.



*Preferred Scenario:* Scenario #4 was cited most frequently as the preferred choice, closely followed by Scenario #3. There was only minor support expressed for Scenario #2 and none for #1.

*Road Infrastructure:* There was diversity in the comments regarding proposed road projects. These ranged from recommendations and questions about inter-provincial bridges to critique around the widening of the Airport Parkway.

*Supplementary Transit Network:* As interest in the evaluation criteria and implementation scenarios was generally quite high amongst participants, and therefore represented the majority of the discussions, the question of supplementary rapid transit networks was not always raised. Of the comments received, the Carling network and Browning Avenue generated a significant amount of interest at almost all Registered Discussion Groups.

*TMP Policies:* Few comments were received in the Registered Discussion Groups regarding the proposed policy changes. However, the importance of cycling and walking was raised in many of the discussions.

**Stakeholder Focus Group Sessions:** Three stakeholder Focus Group sessions were held at City Hall and Confederation High School, between September 11, and September 17, 2008. They were designed to allow key stakeholders to provide their input into all elements of the evaluation criteria, implementation scenarios, supplementary transit networks, and road infrastructure projects.

Participants at the sessions were grouped according to their various interests and areas of expertise, and represented the City's Industry, Economic, and Downtown sectors. Facilitators were encouraged to carry the conversation wherever participants felt it needed to go.

*Evaluation Criteria:* 'Benefits to Customers' was cited most frequently as the most important criteria, followed by equal weighting for 'Cost Effectiveness', 'Reduction of Downtown Congestion' and 'Ridership'.

*Preferred Scenario:* The majority of attendees indicated Scenario #4 as their preferred choice. The remaining participants expressed an equal amount of support for Scenarios #3, #1, and 'None'.

*Road Infrastructure:* In the Downtown and Industry Voices session, the Road Projects were not discussed. In the Economic Voices session, the discussion focused around the need to emphasize transit over roads, and to ensure that road and transit work is implemented in a synchronized fashion to minimise disruption. The Rural Voices group provided many more comments on road infrastructure and maintenance and in particular the need to improve existing roads.

*Supplementary Transit Network:* In all three Stakeholder sessions, there was general support for the proposed supplementary networks. The Carling Avenue proposal generated the most discussion, generally around the need to do it successfully.



*TMP Policies:* Due to amount of time spent discussing the evaluation criteria, scenarios, and road improvements, the discussion about policy changes was very limited. Participants were invited to submit their input on policy changes via the Comment Sheets (See Appendix 'D'). As with the other consultation activities, the majority of comments emphasized the importance of cycling and pedestrian commuting and encouraged transit use.

**City Advisory Committee Briefings:** Members of each of the City of Ottawa's Advisory Committees were invited to participate in a group meeting. The session was held at City Hall on September 30, 2008, and consisted of a presentation on the TMP followed by a question and answer period.

*Evaluation Criteria:* While participants were asked to submit individual Comment Sheets, the group identified the following as their top three evaluation criteria: 'Benefits to the Environment'; 'Supports a Compact City'; and 'Benefits to Customers'.

*Preferred Scenario:* Most participants selected Scenario #3 as their preferred choice, followed closely by Scenario #4.

*Road Infrastructure:* Concern was raised about the amount of proposed road infrastructure. Although it was noted that the City should plan for people, not cars, it was also noted that roads still need to be improved because people will never totally eliminate their need for cars.

*Supplementary Transit Network:* A comment was made regarding Carling Avenue, that it should not be part of the supplementary network.

*TMP Policies:* Comments about the TMP policy changes included diverse thoughts on the value of cycling and pedestrian walk-ways. Some participants indicated that there should not be an increased commitment to these modes while others supported them. Transportation Demand Management was also considered an effective policy direction.

**Internal and External Agency Group Meetings:** Internal and External Agency meetings were held at City Hall on September 12, and September 15, 2008. Both meetings consisted of a 45 minute presentation, updating participants on the TMP and the four implementation scenarios, followed by an open discussion. Participants were asked to submit comments directly to the City.





## Consultation Program ~ Objective

---

The mandate of the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) Study Consultation Program is to engage, in a meaningful way, a broad range of citizens and stakeholders in a dialogue around Ottawa's long-term transportation planning.

Since July 2007, extensive public consultation, updated travel patterns and population and employment projections, as well as several planning exercises shed new light on current transportation and transit issues, residents' priorities and possible solutions.

During the first phase of consultation in the Fall of 2007, a variety of engagement tools (including focus groups, 'street' surveys, technology-assisted consultation events, and online consultation) were used to update the transportation vision for Ottawa and assist in the development of four rapid transit network options.

After the release of the four options, a second phase of consultation ensued between March and April 2008 resulting in the Council adoption of rapid transit Option 4. Council voted 19 - 4 in favour of a rapid transit network designed to solve Ottawa's congestion from the core out, incorporating a downtown tunnel and increased rapid transit service to communities in the city's east, west and south.

In this third and final phase of consultation, the City of Ottawa presented the public with four scenarios for the staging and construction of the complete Rapid Transit Network. Specifically, consultation activities were developed to provide members of the public and stakeholders the opportunity to learn and comment on the following:

- The most important evaluation criteria for assessing the transit implementation scenarios
- The preferred implementation scenario based on the evaluation criteria
- The proposed supplementary transit corridors
- Roadway needs and phasing
- Walking, cycling, parking and transportation demand management.

The public feedback will help inform the Consulting Team, City Staff, and notably Council, in their determination of the completed Transportation Master Plan, which will include the most appropriate implementation scenario that considers time, planning, financial and construction constraints.

For more detailed review of the information presented for consultation (i.e. maps of transit implementation scenarios, supplementary networks, road networks, and evaluation criteria, etc.), visit [www.ottawa.ca/tmp](http://www.ottawa.ca/tmp).







## Consultation Program ~ Overview

---

The Phase III Consultation activities were designed to provide members of the public and stakeholders with the technical information necessary to comprehensively and meaningfully assess the infrastructure requirements for the TMP update.

**Promotion and Recruitment:** A significant push was made to promote this final phase of consultation. All opportunities and mediums to provide comments were communicated to the public and to stakeholders through a variety of methods, including widely disseminated promotional materials and information notices posted on the City's website and distributed through the City's email lists. Participants from Phases I and II of the consultations were also re-invited via e-mail.

Newspaper advertisements were inserted in *The Citizen*, *Le Droit* and various *EMC* community papers over a course of three weeks beginning Friday, September 5<sup>th</sup>. A radio campaign, featuring an invite to participate from the Mayor, ran between September 2<sup>nd</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> on Majic 100, Hot 89.9, CFRA, and 104.1 CMIF. As well, over 60,000 promotional postcards were distributed on all OC Transpo buses, and made available at public libraries, City kiosks and recreation facilities.

An update newsletter was also drafted and widely distributed, outlining what decisions had been taken to date as part of the first two phases of consultation, and what areas of the TMP Update Study were still open to public input. The newsletter was provided with a covering memo to all councillor offices, for ease of distribution to constituents or for publishing in community papers, and was also emailed to all Beyond Ottawa 20/20 registered participants.

Members of the public were also invited to call 3-1-1, go online on the City's website, or contact Colin Simpson of the City's Planning Branch, to obtain more information on the events.

**Opportunities for Input:** Citizens were encouraged to provide their input through a variety of forums. Below is a description of the consultation programs that were initiated on September 11, and concluded on September 30, 2008. The variety in the mediums and activities were designed to provide flexibility and convenience for citizens to provide their input to the City. These included:

- Open Houses
- Registered Discussion Groups
- Online materials and consultation forums
- Stakeholder Focus Group Sessions



- Advisory Committees Discussion Groups
- Internal and External Agency Group Meetings
- Mail, fax and email correspondence.

At each of the consultation events, members of the public and stakeholders were provided with the opportunity to consult directly with the technical experts responsible for developing the scenarios, supplementary networks and roadway infrastructure needs. The comments collected throughout this last phase of consultation have been summarized in the main body of this Report to highlight areas of common interest and concern. Full comments can be found in the appendices. Databases of compiled comments have been submitted to the City of Ottawa's Planning, Transit and Environment Department.

### **Comments Sent Directly to the City: Online, OttawaTALKS, By Hand/Email/Mail/Fax**

To provide the utmost flexibility in the consultation opportunities, citizens were encouraged to participate and provide feedback through a multitude of channels.

A website designed specifically to allow for online consultation (<http://ottawa.econsultation.ca>), was used to both inform citizens of the proposed implementation scenarios, evaluation criteria, supplementary networks and roadway infrastructure needs, and solicit their feedback on the various proposals. Through OttawaTALKS, forums were created to allow for online discussions on a number of related topics – each moderated by Nik Nanos, President of Nanos Research. A separate report on the OttawaTALKS comments will be submitted by Nanos Research.

Members of the public were also able to provide comments directly online (through [www.ottawa.ca/tmp](http://www.ottawa.ca/tmp)) via an electronic version of the Comment Sheet that was distributed at all public events.

In total, 836 comments were received via these different mediums: 546 via OttawaTALKS; 173 submitted online; 102 were emailed or mailed; six were faxed; and nine were hand-delivered.

### **Public Open Houses**

Five Public Open House sessions were held during the period of September 11, to September 22, 2008, in locations in the East, West, South, South West and Centre of Ottawa. Approximately 376 individuals attended the various events.

Attendees were given an information package that included a comment sheet. If requested, 8 ½ x 11 packages of all display boards were also available. Eighteen bilingual project boards on the TMP, supplementary networks and proposed road infrastructure projects were on display. Engineering and planning experts from the TMP Consulting Team (McCormick Rankin, Delcan and the City of Ottawa's Planning Department) were on hand to answer technical questions.



The project boards were arranged around the perimeter of the event rooms to allow for facilitated Discussion Group sessions to be held concurrently with the Open Houses. More information on these follow below.

In addition, a table was arranged to provide access to bilingual resource materials such as the Official Plan (2003), Transportation Master Plan (2003), *Environmental Assessment Act*, Rapid Transit Expansion Study and Right of Way Protection Policy and Guidelines. Extra space and tables were provided to allow attendees to peruse the material and provide detailed comments.

The Mayor and several members of council participated at the various events.

## Discussion Groups

Discussion Groups were held concurrently at the public open house locations. This form of public engagement is highly participatory and was designed to provide citizens with the opportunity to engage in in-depth discussions around the evaluation criteria, implementation scenarios and other topics under review.

While the majority of participants were pre-registered there were also additional spaces available at the tables for those Open House attendees who wanted to join a group — in total, 102 individuals participated in the Discussion Group sessions. The discussion tables were located in the same room as the Open House, and gave citizens, the Mayor, and City Councillors, the opportunity to listen-in.

Participants were seated at tables and supplied with colour versions of the display boards along with an additional comment sheet. Technical facilitators led the discussions at each table, while a scribe captured the proceedings on a flip chart. The Discussion Groups were facilitated in French/English as required.

The technical facilitators opened the discussions by introducing the TMP and summarizing the differences between the four implementation scenarios. Among the key topics of discussion, participants discussed their top three selection criteria and preferred implementation scenario. Every participant had equal opportunity to explain their likes and dislikes, and could ask the technical facilitator to clarify or address any questions or concerns.

### *Public Open House and Discussion Group Location and Registration*

<b>Dates and Times</b>	<b>Open House and Discussion Group Location</b>	<b># of Open House Participants (approximate)</b>	<b># of Discussion Group Participants (approximate)</b>
<b>September 11, 2008</b> 6:00 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.	<b>Central</b> City Hall 100 Laurier Avenue West	88	36
<b>September 15, 2008</b> 6:00 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.	<b>South</b> Jim Durrell Recreation Centre 1265 Walkley Road	62	20



<b>September 16, 2008</b> 6:00 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.	<b>East</b> Bob MacQuarrie Recreation Complex 1490 Youville Drive, Orleans	54	12
<b>September 18, 2008</b> 6:00 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.	<b>West</b> Glenn Cairn Community Center 190 Morrena Drive, Kanata	50	8
<b>September 22, 2008</b> 6:00 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.	<b>South-West</b> Nepean Sportsplex 1701 Woodroffe Avenue	122	26
<b>Total Attendance</b>		<b>376</b>	<b>102</b>

## Stakeholder Focus Groups

Three stakeholder Focus Group sessions were held at City Hall and Confederation High School, between September 11 and September 17, 2008. They were designed to allow key stakeholders to provide their input into all elements of the evaluation criteria, implementation scenarios, supplementary transit networks, and road infrastructure projects.

Attendance for the Focus Groups was drawn from existing City of Ottawa stakeholder lists and from participant lists for previous focus groups held during the first two phases of consultation. The existing lists were supplemented by additional research to create a broad-based pool of participants. Stakeholders were sent email invitations and received follow-up phone calls to confirm their interest and availability.

Participants were grouped according to their various interests and areas of expertise, namely: Industry and Downtown Voices; Economic Voices; and Rural Voices.

The two hour sessions consisted of a 25 minute presentation by City of Ottawa staff introducing the TMP project, potential evaluation criteria and the four implementation scenarios. This was followed by an open discussion on the weighting of the evaluation criteria, the benefits and disadvantages of the four scenarios, and comments on the proposed supplementary and road corridors.

The Focus Group sessions were facilitated by a member of PACE Public Affairs & Community Engagement. Two technical experts from McCormick Rankin and Delcan Corporation were also present at all the sessions to provide detailed answers to technical questions. The feedback generated at each of the Stakeholder Focus Group sessions was recorded by a scribe via notes and flip-charts.



### Stakeholder Focus Group Schedule

Date	'Voices'	Participants (#)	Representation
September 11 1:30 – 3:30 p.m.	Downtown & Industry Voices	11	Stakeholders that rely on the transportation system including other transportation operators, downtown commuters, commercial real estate owners and managers, post-secondary institutions, non-profit housing operators, community associations and businesses.
September 15 1:30 – 3:30 p.m.	Economic Voices	8	Businesses, business associations, major employers, and other representatives that are interested in transportation from an economic perspective.
September 17 6:30 – 8:30 p.m.	Rural Voices	6	Rural Professionals, business owners, community representatives and concerned citizens from rural areas of the city.

### Advisory Committee Discussion Group

A number of the City of Ottawa's Advisory Committees with an interest in transit and transportation were invited to participate in a group meeting. The session was held at City Hall on September 30, 2008, and consisted of a presentation on the TMP and its four implementation scenarios.

Invitations were sent to each of the Advisory Committees by the Planning Department at the City of Ottawa. The meeting was led by a City of Ottawa staff representative and comments were recorded by a scribe.

Representatives from the following Advisory Committees attended:

- Environmental Advisory Committee
- Ottawa Forests and Greenspace Advisory Committee
- Equity and Diversity Advisory Committee
- Business Advisory Committee
- Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee
- Arts, Heritage and Culture Advisory Committee
- Accessibility Advisory Committee.

### Internal and External Agency Meetings

Internal and External Agency meetings were held at City Hall on September 12, and September 15, 2008. The primary objective of the meetings was to provide attendees with information on the four scenarios, evaluation criteria, and supplementary and road networks.

Invitations were sent to the various agency representatives by the City's Planning department. Both meetings consisted of a 45 minute presentation, updating participants on the TMP and the four implementation scenarios, followed by an open discussion.



Participants at the September 12 session included representatives from the following agencies:

<b>Level</b>	<b>Organization</b>
City of Ottawa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rural Affairs Office</li> <li>• Traffic and Parking</li> <li>• City Planning</li> <li>• Surface Operations, Technical Services Division</li> <li>• Transit Services</li> <li>• Environmental Sustainability</li> </ul>
Federal Government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public Works and Government Services Canada</li> </ul>
Government of Ontario	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ontario Ministry of Transportation</li> </ul>

Participants at the September 15 meeting represented the following agencies:

<b>Level</b>	<b>Organization</b>
City of Ottawa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transportation Planning</li> <li>• Planning and Infrastructure Approvals</li> <li>• Real Property Asset Management Branch</li> </ul>
Federal Government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Capital Commission</li> </ul>
Government of Ontario	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal</li> </ul>
Government of Quebec	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transports Québec</li> </ul>
Advisory Agencies and Private Interest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FOTENN Consultants</li> </ul>





## Consultation Program ~ Outcomes

---

In total, over 900 written submissions (911) were received through the Public Open Houses and Online Consultation events in addition to numerous comments captured through the Stakeholder Focus Group Sessions, Registered Discussion Groups, Agency and Advisory Committee Group meetings.

Most of the written submissions received were captured through the structured Comment Sheet format, which was made available at each public event and online, and which comprised of seven questions related to the evaluation criteria, roads projects, policy directions, and other topics. A copy of the Comment Sheet can be found at Appendix 'A'.

Several comments obtained from the public were sent directly to City staff, and did not necessarily follow the structured format of the Comment Sheet questions. These were reviewed, and, where applicable, the data was added to the overall analysis provided below. Copies of this correspondence can be accessed by contacting the City of Ottawa.

In keeping with the Comment Sheet questions, summary and analysis of public feedback in this section of the Report are categorized as follows:

1. Preferred Evaluation Criteria
2. Preferred Implementation Scenario
3. Proposed Changes to Road Projects
4. Agreement on the Supplementary Rapid Transit Network
5. Comments on the Proposed Policy Changes.

### **Comments Sent Directly to the City: Online, OttawaTALKS, By Hand/Email/Mail/Fax**

Citizens were encouraged to participate and provide feedback through a multitude of channels: by emailing City staff at [plan@ottawa.ca](mailto:plan@ottawa.ca); submitting online comments on the City's website; participating in OttawaTALKS; or mailing and faxing comments to the City.

In total, 836 comments were received via these different mediums: 546 via OttawaTALKS; 173 submitted online; 102 were emailed or mailed; six were faxed; and nine were hand-delivered.

As noted earlier, the results from the 546 OttawaTALKs submissions can be found in a separate report provided by Nanos Research. The analysis outlined below is based on the 290 submissions that were submitted online, emailed or mailed, faxed, and hand-delivered.



Note that some of the comments provided did not necessarily follow the Comment Sheet question structure. In these instances, they were analyzed and results were added to the analysis below.

## I) Evaluation Criteria

The Comment Sheet was structured for individuals to list their top three evaluation criteria from a list of eight, in terms of level of importance for assessing the rapid transit implementation scenarios. They were: Ridership; Cost Effectiveness; Benefits to the Customer; Benefits to the Environment; Reduction of the Downtown Bus Congestion; Support for a Compact Transit City; Ease of Implementation; and Adherence to Council Direction. Participants were also asked to add to this list if they deemed it insufficient or incomplete.

As demonstrated in the table below, the top two evaluation criteria were Ridership (97 times) and Benefits to the Environment (96 times). This was followed closely by Benefits to the Customer, cited 94 times by respondents.

*Question 2 ~ “Please indicate what you think are the three most important evaluation criteria for assessing the rapid transit implementation scenarios.”*

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Total Choices Made</b>
<b>Ridership</b>	<b>97</b>
Benefits to the Environment	96
Benefits to the Customer	94
Cost Effectiveness	81
Reduces Downtown Bus Congestion	81
Supports a Compact Transit City	25
Ease of Implementation	18
Adherence to Council Direction	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>492</b>

## II) Implementation Scenario

Of the 174 answers received for this question, the majority selected Scenario 4 (116 responses), distantly followed by 27 responses for Scenario 3. Fourteen answers were provided for Scenario 1 and eight were given for Scenario 2.

*Question 3 ~ “Please indicate what rapid transit implementation scenario you prefer”*

<b>Preferred Scenario</b>	<b>Total Choices Made</b>
1	14
2	8
3	27
<b>4</b>	<b>116</b>
Do not prefer any of the Scenarios	9
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>158</b>





### III) Recommended Changes to the Road Projects

150 comments were received with regards to recommended changes to the proposed road projects. A summary of the key comments is provided in the table below. Full comments are available at Appendix ‘B’.

*Question # 4 ~ “Please indicate any changes that you would like to see regarding the road projects. Specify if your comments pertain to roads in the East, Southeast, Southwest of West.”*

<b><i>Key Comments – East</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be a ring-road to connect the entire city</li> <li>• “No” to the Kettle Island Bridge proposal</li> <li>• The truck congestion on roads is worrisome. It should be reduced</li> <li>• Less money should be spent on constructing and widening roads. More investments should be made in transit and supplementary networks</li> </ul>
<b><i>Key Comments – Southeast</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build Alta Vista Transportation Corridor from Conroy Rd to Smythe Road first. Start at 2 lanes first and then expand</li> <li>• Accelerate the improvements to the Airport Parkway</li> <li>• completion of the ring road is a must</li> <li>• Delay Hunt Club, Aviation Parkway and Airport Parkway widening</li> </ul>
<b><i>Key Comments – Southwest</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build a highway South of the 417 to remove all traffic passing through downtown Ottawa</li> <li>• Widen Bank Street to Findlay Creek sooner</li> <li>• Do not 4-lane Prince of Wales until more engineering studies are done</li> <li>• Opposition to the widening of the Airport Parkway. Questioning of Limebank widening</li> </ul>
<b><i>Key Comments – West</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hasten the completion of the Terry Fox extension</li> <li>• Hasten the completion of the Hazeldean improvements</li> <li>• LRT along Carling Avenue, and/or Byron/Richmond Road</li> <li>• With the developments occurring in Kanata, it is necessary to have proper traffic-flows in the area</li> </ul>
<b><i>Key Comments – General</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The idea of a Ring-Road should be reassessed for the city</li> <li>• Less money should be spent on widening and constructing roads, as opposed to providing transit options for people</li> <li>• New arterials should be designed to encourage transit use</li> </ul>

### IV) Level of Agreement on Supplementary Rapid Transit Network

One hundred and sixty (160) individuals provided their opinion on the level of support for the supplementary rapid transit network. Of these, nearly half indicated that they agreed (44%) with the networks (16% ‘fully agreed’ and 28% ‘somewhat agreed’). Just over a quarter disagreed (10% ‘somewhat’ and 16% ‘completely’).

Notably, the most frequent answer to this question was ‘don’t know,’ representing nearly one third (29%) of the responses. Full comments are available at Appendix ‘C’.



Question #5 ~ 'Please indicate your level of agreement with the proposed supplementary rapid transit network.'

Level of Agreement	Total Choices Made
Fully Agree	26
Somewhat Agree	45
<b>Don't Know</b>	<b>47</b>
Somewhat Disagree	16
Completely Disagree	26
TOTAL	160

### Key Comments

Fully Agree – Key Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As many areas of the city will not be covered by LRT, and easy access to the LRT is highly desirable - the Supp Rapid Transit network would assist in this regard</li> <li>• A specific plan is required connecting bike paths with LRT stations</li> <li>• Carling Avenue provides access to a great number of rapid transit riders. It is also better situated to develop high density mixed use nodes to support rapid transit</li> <li>• Rapid transit on the parkway seems to be an easy choice for implementation, but does little to generate a compact urban area (unless high density mixed use developments are anticipated along the parkway)</li> <li>• Preserve the Western Parkway</li> <li>• We need a good transportation system to compete with other cities with respect to tourism, businesses, industries, foreign investments, etc</li> </ul>
Somewhat Agree – Key Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep light rail off the Western Parkway! Preserve the river</li> <li>• Byron Avenue is a viable alternative for light rail. Streetcars used to go out to Britannia: Can this be revisited?</li> <li>• LRT along Carling should be extended to Bronson Ave. to provide the most North/South connectivity</li> <li>• The Carling corridor is an excellent idea though a streetcar system may not be necessary - could be implemented in near term with buses</li> <li>• Baseline /Heron Walkley is another excellent idea, crosstown traffic can bypass the downtown if necessary</li> <li>• Some of the supplementary routes if implemented in phase 1 would provide necessary relief/detours during construction of LRT</li> <li>• The current plan does not encourage transit use for West end unless travelling downtown or those parts along western Transitway</li> <li>• Fine as a stopgap. The LRT along Carling is great, but it has to go further west</li> <li>• A Ring Road by-passing the centre core would diminish accidents and traffic</li> <li>• LRT along Carling and not on the parkway. Carling is where all the businesses are</li> <li>• Need to ensure that a "Transit Priority" be included between Kanata Centrum all the way to downtown</li> <li>• The needs of South Kanata (Bridlewood) are not being met. There is no rapid transit available</li> <li>• We need more public transit and less roadwork</li> <li>• We should go with VIA and OVR rail lines</li> </ul>
Somewhat Disagree – Key Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There's no value in LRT along Carling</li> <li>• How much faster would service be with an LRT along Carling versus the current bus system?</li> <li>• LRT along Carling will not be an economical choice</li> <li>• West end residents would not benefit from a rapid LRT line along Carling</li> <li>• LRT along the parkway and transitway to downtown is faster than LRT along Carling, unless you go</li> </ul>



<p>underground (which also would be expensive)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The best alternative to the parkway in the west end is the Byron corridor strip from west of Westboro to where it would meet Lincoln Fields</li> <li>• The Hospital corridor absolutely should be considered as an alternative to the transitway in the east end</li> <li>• Look at a rapid transit route that includes crossing the Ottawa River to downtown Gatineau on the Prince of Wales Rail Bridge. This could cut down on the number of bus and automobile crossings in the urban core</li> </ul>
<p><b>Completely Disagree – Key Comments</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LRT along Carling is unnecessary</li> <li>• A street car is the same as bus, so it won't make a difference</li> <li>• Considering the potential growth in the West area and the existing infrastructure, an east-west Light Rail with the O-Train extending to the South will be the most judicial option</li> <li>• No rapid transit on Carling Avenue through Crystal Beach</li> <li>• Downtown congestion and east west congestion must take priority</li> <li>• More transit routes need to service the West (Kanata). The proposed plan needs to extend further than Carling</li> <li>• The plan is not in line with the current growth pattern of Ottawa</li> <li>• LRT along Carling would still not carry enough passengers to be effective. THEN, once it gets to the end of Carling, it has nowhere to go</li> <li>• LRT would more easily be placed along the parkway and could be done aesthetically with some effort</li> <li>• The plan does not contemplate the construction of a by-pass to take heavy through traffic out of the city</li> <li>• The train should not go along Carling - it should be on the NCC property near the river</li> <li>• East west routes should be on the Queensway/417/174</li> </ul>

## V) Comments on the Proposed Policy Changes

Of the 290 submissions analyzed, 92 provided comments specific to the proposed policy changes. A summary of the key comments are found in the table below. Full comments are available at Appendix 'D'.

*Question # 6 ~ “Please comment on the proposed policy directions associated with walking, cycling, transportation demand management, transportation system management and parking.”*

<p><b>Proposed Policy Directions - Key Comments</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be more dedicated cycling lanes for commuters who cycle to work</li> <li>• Bike and walking paths should be built along ALL transitway routes</li> <li>• Need for safe cycle lock-up at transit stations. Improve cycle routes and the number of them</li> <li>• Safety for cyclists and pedestrians is a big issue</li> <li>• Improve sidewalk maintenance (including winter snow clearing)</li> <li>• A u-pass should be implemented into all post-secondary institutions in order to increase transit ridership</li> <li>• Agree with policy directions for more cycling/walking paths-pedestrian friendly</li> <li>• Not enough focus on facilitating walking, cycling and transit options</li> <li>• Find and eliminate bike lane and path "dead-ends" – there are many of them on city approved bicycle routes</li> <li>• The parking policy could be even stronger in order to influence behaviour</li> <li>• Consider bike-rental initiatives being touted in other cities (most recently, Bixi in Montreal)</li> <li>• Parking increases and hours-of-parking adjustments may have serious impacts on the financial viability of residents and businesses</li> <li>• More money put towards walking and biking infrastructure</li> <li>• Ottawa should cater first and foremost to green modes of transportation</li> <li>• The cycling plan is very weak. It doesn't appropriately deal with increasing the number of people who could commute to work on bikes</li> <li>• Walking and cycling need more encouragement, safer and more numerous pathways</li> <li>• These plans are excellent but can go further</li> </ul>



## Public Open Houses

Approximately 376 individuals attended the five Public Open Houses, held between September 11 and September 22, 2008, and 75 comment sheets were submitted.

### 1) Evaluation Criteria

The Comment Sheet was structured for individuals to list their top three evaluation criteria from a list of eight, in terms of level of importance for assessing the rapid transit implementation scenarios. They were: Ridership; Cost Effectiveness; Benefits to the Customer; Benefits to the Environment; Reduction of the Downtown Bus Congestion; Support for a Compact Transit City; Ease of Implementation; and Adherence to Council Direction. Participants were also asked to add to this list if they deemed it insufficient or incomplete.

As demonstrated in the table below, the top three cited evaluation criteria were Ridership (35 times); Cost Effectiveness (26 times); and Benefits to the Customer (22 times):

*Question 2 ~ “Please indicate what you think are the three most important evaluation criteria for assessing the rapid transit implementation scenarios.”*

Evaluation Criteria	Total Choices Made
<b>Ridership</b>	<b>35</b>
Cost Effectiveness	26
Benefits to the Customer	22
Benefits to the Environment	20
Reduces Downtown Bus Congestion	19
Supports a Compact Transit City	11
Ease of Implementation	5
Adherence to Council Direction	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>138</b>

### II) Implementation Scenario

Of the 75 Comment Sheet submissions, 58 provided input regarding a preferred transit implementation scenario. The one selected most often was Scenario 4 with 39.7% of responses. The second most often selected was Scenario 3 with 29.4%. See the table below for a full listing of preferences:

*Question 3 ~ “Please indicate what rapid transit implementation scenario you prefer”*

Preferred Scenario	Total Choices Made	Percentage
1	7	12.07%
2	3	5.17%
3	17	29.31%
<b>4</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>39.36%</b>
Do not prefer any	8	13.79%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>100%</b>



### **III) Recommended Changes to the Road Projects**

Of the Comment Sheets received, 50 provided recommended changes to the proposed road projects. A summary of the key comments is found in the table below. Full comments are available at Appendix 'B'.

*Question 4 ~ “Please indicate any changes that you would like to see regarding the road projects. Specify if your comments pertain to roads in the East, Southeast, Southwest or West.”*

<b><i>Key Comments – East</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add a bus lane to Innes</li> <li>• Improve the 174</li> </ul>
<b><i>Key Comments – Southeast</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finish the Alta Vista Corridor</li> <li>• Alta Vista corridor project is unnecessary</li> <li>• Improve connection to Innes</li> <li>• Implement additional transit and transitway to the South</li> <li>• Move faster on building the Strandherd-Earl Armstrong bridge</li> </ul>
<b><i>Key Comments – Southwest</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Widen Bank Street to Findlay Creek</li> <li>• Widen Hunt Club in conjunction with improved transit</li> <li>• Why widen Limebank if the line is going South?</li> </ul>
<b><i>Key Comments – West</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why widen roads?</li> <li>• LRT along Carling, Byron or Baseline</li> <li>• Why does widening Hazeldean stop short of going all the way to Carp Road?</li> <li>• Increase numbers of Park &amp; Rides</li> <li>• Need to lessen congestion on the 417</li> <li>• With the huge developments coming to Kanata, the roads need to be improved there</li> </ul>
<b><i>Key Comments – General</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LRT along Carling: It's an existing transportation corridor</li> <li>• No widening - Freeways have no place within a city</li> <li>• It is a big oversight of the city to ignore the widening of Bank Street to Greely until 2016-2022</li> <li>• Intensification</li> <li>• Don't build any roads until transit network is complete</li> <li>• New arterials must include transit</li> <li>• North/South needs improvement</li> </ul>

### **IV) Level of Agreement on Supplementary Rapid Transit Network**

Forty-six individuals provided their opinion on the level of support for the Supplementary Rapid Transit Network. Of the responses to this question, 60 per cent indicated that they agreed with the proposed Network (47.83% 'somewhat agreed' and 13.04% 'fully agreed'). Full comments can be found at Appendix 'C'.



Question 5 ~ “Please indicate your level of agreement with the proposed supplementary rapid transit network”

Supplementary Network	Total Choices Made	Percentage
Fully Agree	6	13.04%
<b>Somewhat Agree</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>47.83%</b>
Don't Know	7	15.22%
Somewhat Disagree	7	15.22%
Completely Disagree	4	8.70%
TOTAL	46	100%

### Key Comments

<b>Fully Agree – Key Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use Carling Avenue where preferable: Not the Ottawa River parkway</li> <li>• Carling LRT supplementary line good for the area. Why not also Montreal road?</li> <li>• The road network should be shrunk because cars will become non-viable for most</li> </ul>
<b>Somewhat Agree – Key Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add Hurdman and Carling, provide service to the stadium</li> <li>• Carling Ave should be first choice for West route. Implement LRT to Tunney's but run South to Carling and along median</li> <li>• East/West with trains on Byron</li> <li>• Better transit link needed cross-town South of the Queensway - Use of existing rail between Kanata and Via Rail station might be a possibility</li> <li>• Carling LRT should run from Bayshore to downtown to minimize transfers</li> <li>• Like the airport link and LRT but not BRT network</li> <li>• Use Prince of Wales Bridge for Ottawa River cross-connections</li> <li>• The Carling streetcar is a good idea and in the future there should be a second tunnel from Carling/Bronson to Hurdman either through the Glebe or along the canal via Landsdowne Park</li> </ul>
<b>Somewhat Disagree – Key Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Given that LRT is not extended to West and East beyond what is proposed in Scenario 4, no train should be provided on Carling</li> <li>• Why aren't we using more of the existing rail lines?</li> <li>• Let's not start all over again</li> <li>• Not convinced that all arguments have been objectively evaluated, e.g. vast impact of increasing energy cost</li> <li>• Not sure LRT is needed along Carling. More bus lanes are a good idea</li> </ul>
<b>Completely Disagree – Key Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Go where the people exist. Anything else is a waste of effort and money</li> <li>• Disagree with LRT along Carling Avenue. Carling shouldn't be a 'through-route' across the downtown portion of the city between Kanata and Orleans</li> <li>• It is not worth the cost to build LRT along Carling just to save less than 5 minutes</li> <li>• Ideally, these roads will be used to divert buses during conversion of the Transitway to LRT</li> </ul>

### V) Comments on the Proposed Policy Changes

Of the 75 Comment Sheets submitted, 45 provided comments specific to the proposed policy changes. A summary of the key comments are provided in the table below. Full comments are available at Appendix 'D'.



Question # 6 ~ “Please comment on the proposed policy directions associated with walking, cycling, transportation demand management, transportation system management and parking.”

<b>Proposed Policy Directions – Key Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Greatly in favour - We need more paths, safe cycling lanes, more closures of intersections to motorists with community agreement. We need a city-wide alternative</li><li>• Cyclists aren't choosing bikeways now – don't waste money on this, as what we have is sufficient</li><li>• Downtown, especially the Market area should be more pedestrian friendly</li><li>• There should be more/cheaper parking</li><li>• Add biking paths/walkways to the hydro corridors, interconnecting Stittsville, Fernbank, CDP, Kanata South and West</li><li>• More money should be put towards cycling infrastructure - pathways should be PLOWED</li><li>• Once again, nothing for Rural South cyclists</li><li>• Create pedestrian only zones in the downtown</li><li>• Make the Market area a car free zone! Create dedicated bike paths with concrete barriers</li><li>• References to walking and cycling facilities are extremely weak. There is nothing in this plan that illustrates a vision for how the downtown core will become more walkable and cycle-able</li><li>• It is almost pointless to continue to have superior bike lanes heading into the city when the downtown core is relatively hostile to cyclists</li><li>• There needs to be a serious investment in downtown cycling facilities</li><li>• The cycling plan needs revisiting to ensure there are no 'dead ends' where obvious connections are missing</li><li>• Parking - something has to be done about the massive parking lots allowed in the suburbs: this is terrible urban planning</li><li>• The words are nice, want to see the results</li><li>• A properly integrated bike-pedestrian pathway is essential for a modern city</li><li>• Cycling should be integrated with transit better - cycling trails should follow rapid transit lines</li><li>• Secure lock-ups should be available at major Rapid transit transfer stations</li><li>• The municipal parking management strategy is very vague and needs clarification</li><li>• Support for alternative modes of transport should not burden taxpayers financially</li><li>• Need to collaborate with the NCC</li><li>• In order to succeed, must involve all employers but also need to provide incentives to get people to change minds/attitudes about commuting and public transit. Students need to be targeted</li><li>• Emissions and adverse health effects are erroneously not included. Bike paths are erroneously placed besides toxic roads and bus routes</li></ul>

## **Registered Discussion Groups**

Over 100 people registered for the various Discussion Groups that were held concurrently with the Public Open Houses. While discussions at each table were designed to reflect the questions provided in the Comment Sheets, some led to other related topics. Facilitators were encouraged to carry the conversation wherever participants felt it needed to go.

Due to this flexibility in the structure, the content of the discussions varied somewhat for each table, resulting in diverse outcomes and reporting.

A summary of key comments captured at each of the Discussion Group tables is provided below. For in-depth notes captured on flip charts, please see Appendix 'E'.



## 1) Evaluation Criteria

Question 2 ~ “Please indicate what you think are the three most important evaluation criteria for assessing the rapid transit implementation scenarios.”

<b>Central</b>	<b>Top Three Criteria</b>
Group 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ridership</li> <li>• Ease of implementation</li> <li>• Cost effectiveness</li> </ul>
Group 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ridership</li> <li>• Compact transit city</li> <li>• Benefits to the environment</li> </ul>
Group 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benefits to customers/Ease of implementation</li> <li>• Cost effectiveness</li> <li>• Ease of implementation</li> </ul>
Group 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Evaluation Criteria recorded</li> </ul>
Group 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Evaluation Criteria recorded</li> </ul>
<b>South</b>	<b>Top Three Criteria</b>
Group 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost effectiveness</li> <li>• Reduction in downtown congestion</li> <li>• Benefits to environment</li> </ul>
Group 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Evaluation Criteria recorded</li> </ul>
Group 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Evaluation Criteria recorded</li> </ul>
<b>East</b>	<b>Top Three Criteria</b>
Group 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost effectiveness</li> <li>• Ridership</li> <li>• Compact transit city</li> </ul>
Group 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost effectiveness</li> <li>• Ridership</li> <li>• Compact transit city</li> </ul>
<b>West</b>	<b>Top Three Criteria</b>
Group 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ridership</li> <li>• Reducing downtown congestion</li> </ul>
Group 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Evaluation Criteria recorded</li> </ul>
<b>South-West</b>	<b>Top Three Criteria</b>
Group 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reducing Downtown congestion</li> <li>• Ridership/Benefits to customers/Downtown congestion /Benefits to the environment</li> <li>• Benefits to customers</li> </ul>
Group 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ridership</li> <li>• Cost effectiveness</li> <li>• Benefit to customers/Supports a compact city/Downtown congestion</li> </ul>
Group 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Evaluation Criteria recorded</li> </ul>
Group 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Evaluation Criteria recorded</li> </ul>
Group 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Evaluation Criteria recorded</li> </ul>





## II) Implementation Scenario

Question 3 ~ “Please indicate what rapid transit implementation scenario you prefer”

<b>Central</b>	<b>Implementation Scenario</b>
Group 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scenario #3 preferred by group</li> </ul>
Group 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scenario #4 preferred by group</li> </ul>
Group 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scenario #3 preferred by some in the group. Scenario #4 by others</li> </ul>
Group 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Implementation Scenario selected</li> </ul>
Group 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Implementation Scenario selected</li> </ul>
<b>South</b>	<b>Implementation Scenario</b>
Group 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three attendees preferred Scenario #2</li> <li>• Two attendees preferred Scenario #4</li> </ul>
Group 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Implementation Scenario selected</li> </ul>
Group 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scenario #4 preferred by group</li> </ul>
<b>East</b>	<b>Implementation Scenario</b>
Group 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Four attendees preferred Scenario #4</li> <li>• Two attendees preferred Scenario #3</li> </ul>
Group 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Four attendees preferred Scenario #4</li> <li>• Two attendees preferred Scenario #3</li> </ul>
<b>West</b>	<b>Implementation Scenario</b>
Group 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two attendees preferred Scenario #4</li> <li>• Three attendees disagreed with all scenarios and had no preferred option</li> </ul>
Group 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Implementation Scenario selected</li> </ul>
<b>South-West</b>	<b>Implementation Scenario</b>
Group 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Implementation Scenario selected</li> </ul>
Group 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Implementation Scenario selected</li> </ul>
Group 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three attendees preferred Scenario #3, one preferred scenario 4</li> </ul>
Group 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Implementation Scenario selected</li> </ul>
Group 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All attendees preferred Scenario 4. Additional comment that attendees like the O-Train extension in Scenario 3</li> </ul>

## III) Recommended Changes to the Road Projects

A summary of the key comments is found in the table below. Full comments, which were vast and diverse, are available at Appendix ‘B’.

Question 4 ~ “Please indicate any changes that you would like to see regarding the road projects. Specify if your comments pertain to roads in the East, Southeast, Southwest or West.”

<b>Key Comments – Central</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hunt Club congestion is an issue</li> <li>• Bridges should be built over both rivers for cars/pedestrians</li> <li>• Walkley to 417 is a good idea</li> </ul>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Widening of Airport Parkway is in competition with rail</li> <li>• Carling and Woodroffe – will there be enough room for pedestrians?</li> <li>• Modify Hunt Club – remove some traffic lights to improve flow</li> <li>• Consider circles or roundabouts to improve flow</li> <li>• Accommodate cyclists and pedestrians on the roadways</li> <li>• There are issues with Scott Street because it is already congested</li> </ul>
<b>Key Comments – South</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Browning Road – People believe there are enough roads there to serve the neighbourhood</li> <li>• Too much traffic at Nicholas/Laurier already</li> <li>• Too much traffic flow to Riverside/Hunt Club intersection if more traffic is put onto Limebank. A new bridge will alleviate this problem</li> </ul>
<b>Key Comments – East</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will there be car-pooling lanes on the roads?</li> <li>• Some transit routes are too unreliable: People would prefer to drive</li> <li>• Has the growth of the East end beyond Jeanne d’Arc been factored in?</li> </ul>
<b>Key Comments – South-West</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Carling is a good back-up if the Queensway is backed up</li> <li>• Carling should be left alone for road widening</li> <li>• The roadway to the airport needs to be widened</li> </ul>
<b>Key Comments – West</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At Carling Ave. keep it to two lanes but fix bridge</li> <li>• What about Hope Sideroad?</li> <li>• March Road is clogged in both directions</li> <li>• Don’t build extra road lanes – force transit ridership</li> </ul>

#### **IV) Level of Agreement on Supplementary Rapid Transit Network**

As interest in the evaluation criteria and implementation scenarios was generally quite high amongst participants, and therefore represented the majority of the discussions, the question of supplementary rapid transit networks was not always raised. However, several related comments were made at many of the sessions. The most relevant are captured in the table below. Full comments can be found at Appendix ‘C’.

*Question 5 ~ “Please indicate your level of agreement with the proposed supplementary rapid transit network”*

<b>Key Comments – Central</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study the Carling issue more and consider running it down the boulevard</li> <li>• Buses should remain an integral part of the transit system</li> <li>• Use the Richmond/Byron corridor</li> <li>• Carling makes sense if it was underground. Streetcars would be too similar to buses and a tunnel is too expensive</li> <li>• Going downtown on LRT will still be faster than any Bypass supplementary network such as Carling</li> <li>• Some would support a dedicated rail on Carling if it replaced buses</li> <li>• Carling Ave. and Woodroffe – will their be enough room for pedestrians</li> <li>• How much distance between stops on Carling near Seniors condos</li> <li>• How will Paratranspo fit into the scenario</li> </ul>
<b>Key Comments – South</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Browning Road: People believe there are enough roads there to serve the neighbourhood. Rapid transit would not be beneficial for all</li> <li>• Provide better access to the airport</li> </ul>



<b><i>Key Comments – East</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lay down all the tracks possible</li> <li>• Cycling paths should be build along transit routes</li> <li>• Is removing more buses and adding more LRT be more cost-effective?</li> </ul>
<b><i>Key Comments – South-West</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How are they preparing the corridors – pumping/trenching?</li> <li>• Carling? – What type of ridership is there?</li> <li>• Use the VIA rail and O-Train corridors instead of building new track</li> <li>• Proposed rout for Kanata North – between March Road and existing buildings there might not be enough room</li> <li>• Can we run buses in both directions? Through Greenbelt during peak hours and reverse during peak hours</li> <li>• Stagger trams through Dows Lake tunnel</li> <li>• Why is the Byron Corridor not being used?</li> <li>• Why aren't buses enough on Carling?</li> <li>• Old street cars run on Byron Avenue would be better</li> <li>• The O-Train should be extended to the Via Rail station</li> <li>• Would using the Experimental farm along Baseline be beneficial</li> <li>• Would it be beneficial to have a spur train reach out to Bayshore</li> <li>• College standpoint and Centrepoint – Citizens would prefer to see the Baseline station addressed earlier rather than later</li> </ul>
<b><i>Key Comments – West</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A park &amp; ride should be built at Fernbank at the end of Eden Line</li> <li>• The local bus service does not run frequently enough</li> <li>• Have a transit option from the West to bypass the core</li> <li>• Need better transit to the hospitals</li> </ul>

## V) Comments on the Proposed Policy Changes

As interest in the evaluation criteria and implementation scenarios was generally quite high amongst participants, and therefore represented the majority of the discussions, the matter of the proposed policy directions was not always raised. However, several related comments were made at many of the sessions. The most relevant are captured in the table below. Full comments can be found at Appendix 'D'.

*Question 6 ~ “Please comment on the proposed policy directions associated with walking, cycling, transportation demand management, transportation system management, and parking”*

<b><i>Key Comments – Central</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cycling Paths throughout the city are important</li> <li>• LRT cars need to accommodate bikes</li> <li>• Need policy to create enforcement and awareness of pedestrian rights</li> </ul>
<b><i>Key Comments – South</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments specific to policy changes</li> </ul>
<b><i>Key Comments – East</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments specific to policy changes</li> </ul>
<b><i>Key Comments – South-West</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments specific to policy changes</li> </ul>
<b><i>Key Comments – West</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments specific to policy changes</li> </ul>



## Stakeholder Focus Groups

Overall, attendees at the three Stakeholder Focus Group sessions provided very positive feedback on the focus group structure. They were pleased with the opportunity to provide input into the four implementation scenarios, the supplementary networks and other related issues.

In each of the three Focus Group sessions, common themes and elements emerged. The three criteria that were identified as a top priority were ‘Benefits to the Environment’, ‘Benefits to the Customer’ and ‘Reducing Downtown Congestion’. ‘Cost Effectiveness’ and ‘Ridership’ were also rated very highly.

In some of the sessions, participants collectively voted on criteria, whereas in other sessions, comments were recorded individually. In the latter, votes were tallied and added to the following analysis:

### I) Evaluation Criteria

The following table provides an overview of the top criteria selected at each of the three Stakeholder sessions. For full notes, please see Appendix ‘F’.

*Question 2 ~ “Please indicate what you think are the three most important evaluation criteria for assessing the rapid transit implementation scenarios.”*

<i>Downtown and Industry Voices</i>	<i>Top Three Criteria</i>
Group 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benefits to customers</li> <li>• Cost effectiveness</li> <li>• Ridership</li> </ul>
Group 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environment</li> <li>• Benefits to customers</li> <li>• Cost effectiveness</li> </ul>
<i>Economic Voices</i>	<i>Top Three Criteria</i>
Group 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benefits to customers</li> <li>• Ease of Implementation</li> <li>• Reducing downtown congestion/Compact city</li> </ul>
Group 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduces downtown congestion</li> <li>• Ridership</li> <li>• Benefits to customers</li> </ul>
<i>Rural Voices</i>	<i>Top Three Criteria</i>
All	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost effectiveness</li> <li>• Ridership</li> <li>• Reducing downtown congestion</li> </ul>
Key Comments:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify what the environmental criteria are, versus smart/compact city</li> </ul>



## II) Implementation Scenario

The following table provides an overview of the preferred scenarios and related key comments provided at each of the three Stakeholder sessions. For full notes, please see Appendix 'F'.

*Question 3 ~ “Please indicate what rapid transit implementation scenario you prefer”*

<b><i>Implementation Scenario – Key Comments from the Downtown and Industry Voices</i></b>	
Group 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The group was evenly divided between Scenarios 1 and 4</li> </ul>
Group 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scenario 4 obtained the most amount of votes within this group, although it was very closely followed by Scenario 3</li> </ul>
Other Comments:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was thought that Scenario 1 could be workable if Ottawa was a compact city with population intensity in the greenbelt</li> <li>• Scenario 4 was thought to serve the traditional growth patterns</li> <li>• It was suggested that the LRT be extended to the airport in Scenario 4</li> <li>• Ensure there is connectivity with Quebec</li> <li>• Good reaction to Carling plans. Expand Trim-Innes during phase 1 instead of phase 2</li> </ul>
<b><i>Implementation Scenario – Key Comments from the Economic Voices</i></b>	
Group 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While Scenarios 3 and 4 were minutely debated, the group eventually settled on Scenario 4</li> </ul>
Group 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scenarios 3 and 4 were minutely debated but the group could not agree on any</li> </ul>
Other Comments:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was thought that Scenario 4 alleviated downtown congestion the most whilst serving the high Eastern ridership well</li> <li>• It was thought that Scenario 4 might be difficult to implement because of Parkway issues</li> <li>• Only Scenario 3 serves the South and it caters to the high Eastern ridership. In 10-15 years, it may be necessary</li> <li>• There should be more inter-provincial linkages with Quebec to facilitate greater planning and the resolution of downtown congestion</li> </ul>
<b><i>Implementation Scenario – Key Comments from the Rural Voices</i></b>	
Group 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no consensus on which Scenario should be implemented. A Scenario 5 was created, which was based upon Scenario 4</li> </ul>
Other Comments:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scenario ‘5’ would include a rail transitway along Cumberland, extending the O-Train to Leitrim and developing Hurdman to Trim as BRT, with the LRT conversion taking place later on</li> <li>• It was thought that as much as possible should be done in phase 1, in case funding for later phases was not readily available. Also, if taxpayers/transit users saw improvements, they would be keener on the later phases</li> <li>• Include a connection to Gatineau to ensure that there is no traffic through Riverside South. Extend rapid transit into the Hull Core to reduce downtown congestion. The Prince of Wales Bridge can be used since the city owns it now</li> </ul>



### **III) Recommended Changes to the Road Projects**

The following table provides an overview of the key comments made with regard to the proposed road projects. For full notes, please see Appendix ‘B’.

*Question # 4 ~ “Please indicate any changes that you would like to see regarding the road projects. Specify if your comments pertain to roads in the East, Southeast, Southwest of West.”*

<b><i>Road Projects – Key Comments from the Downtown and Industry Voices</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments provided</li> </ul>
<b><i>Road Projects – Key Comments from the Economic Voices</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road plans and transit plan timelines should be synchronized for better implementation</li> <li>• HOV lanes might be a good option for roads</li> <li>• There was concern about the widening of roads such as the Airport Parkway and Prince of Wales. It was felt that people needed to be induced to use transit, and that eventually, bottlenecks would be the result of widenings</li> </ul>
<b><i>Road Projects – Key Comments from the Rural Voices</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most of the rural people live outside of the transit area. Therefore, most of their commuting is done within their areas. Therefore, better roads are needed within and between those communities. Improve the conditions of existing roads as a priority and then increase road capacity</li> <li>• It should not be forgotten that the South is also a corridor for out-of-town traffic. This should be a consideration when determining/planning road-works</li> <li>• A commercial-only part of Byron should be explored</li> </ul>

### **IV) Level of Agreement on Supplementary Rapid Transit Network**

The following table provides an overview of the key comments made with regard to the supplementary rapid transit networks. For full notes, please see Appendix ‘C’.

*Question #5 ~ ‘Please indicate your level of agreement with the proposed supplementary rapid transit network.’*

<b><i>Supplementary Rapid Transit Network – Key Comments from the Downtown and Industry Voices</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was general agreement on the proposed supplementary networks</li> <li>• Add bike paths to them all</li> <li>• Ensure there is secure bike parking</li> <li>• Make sure there are sufficient park and rides, also near downtown stations</li> <li>• Allow bikes on the train</li> <li>• Support for Carling development</li> </ul>
<b><i>Supplementary Rapid Transit Network – Key Comments from the Economic Voices</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why does the route from Prince of Wales feed into Downtown Congestion, instead of going away from it, through a changeover hub?</li> <li>• Is a streetcar necessary for Carling? Who does this serve better—tourists or residents? Carling would need to be more pedestrian friendly, for a streetcar to be useful. The idea is nice and romantic, but is it practical?</li> <li>• Buses might be a good alternative to the Carling Streetcar. Easier to maintain just buses/light-rail, instead of a third type of transportation</li> <li>• Carling line should be studied as a Rapid Transit Corridor. How Fast/Slow given signal priority?</li> <li>• Baseline is a good choice to avoid the core</li> <li>• Hunt Club Transit Priority good</li> </ul>



***Supplementary Rapid Transit Network – Key Comments from the Rural Voices***

- Completely disagree if access to the parkway/river is lost to pedestrians/cyclists
- I agree supplementary transit is needed during peak hours

**V) Comments on the Proposed Policy Changes**

Due to amount of time used to discuss the evaluation criteria, scenarios, and road improvements, the discussion surrounding policy changes was very limited. Participants were invited to submit their input on policy changes via the Comment Sheets (See Appendix ‘D’). The limited comments collected at the Stakeholder Focus Groups are captured below:

*Question # 6 ~ “Please comment on the proposed policy directions associated with walking, cycling, transportation demand management, transportation system management and parking.”*

***Proposed Policy Directions – Key Comments from the Downtown and Industry Voices***

- It was noted that car-users needed to be targeted for transit use. Hence, a number of proposals were developed for this:
  1. Ensure there are a number of tangible benefits for using transit. E.g. faster, cheaper, more convenient travel
  2. Lessen the number of parking spaces downtown, and charge more for parking at peak commuting times. Keep parking costs reasonable on evenings to not penalize downtown business owners
  3. Spend less money widening roads to make drivers more uncomfortable
- Make Ottawa more bike-friendly by paving shoulders on the roads, allowing bikes on transit vehicles and providing for secure bike lock-ups at transit stations
- Ensure that there are parallel bike and pedestrian paths along the transitway

***Proposed Policy Directions – Key Comments from the Economic Voices***

- Parking rates should favour short-term versus all day parking. That is, higher parking rates for shorter hours, as opposed to cheaper parking rates for longer hours. This would significantly reduce downtown congestion

***Proposed Policy Directions – Key Comments from the Rural Voices***

- Overall, too little is spent developing cycling paths within the TMP. The rural aspect is not factored in at all. As it stands, there are no physical inducements for people to use bikes as a commuting option within rural areas. Safe, well thought-out networks should be provided

**Advisory Committee Meeting**

The Advisory Committee meeting included a general discussion on the various aspects of the TMP Update. Full meeting minutes can be found at Appendix ‘G’.

**I) Evaluation Criteria**

While participants were asked to submit individual comment sheets, the group also identified the top three evaluation criteria that they recommended:



Question 2 ~ “Please indicate what you think are the three most important evaluation criteria for assessing the rapid transit implementation scenarios.”

<i>Advisory Committee Meeting</i>	<i>Top Three Criteria</i>
Group 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benefits to the environment</li> <li>• Supports compact city</li> <li>• Benefits to customers</li> </ul>

## **II) Implementation Scenario**

Question 3 ~ “Please indicate what rapid transit implementation scenario you prefer”

<i>Implementation Scenario – Key Comments</i>
<p>Scenario:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Four (4) participants selected Scenario 3 as their preferred transit implementation scenario, followed by three (3) for Scenario 4. Two (2) chose none of the above</li> </ul> <p>Key Comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More environmental analyses of the scenarios should be undertaken, before and during implementation. The definition of environment should be expanded to not just include air quality. It should be changed to life and environment, to encompass habitats and animals</li> </ul>

## **III) Recommended Changes to the Road Projects**

Question # 4 ~ “Please indicate any changes that you would like to see regarding the road projects. Specify if your comments pertain to roads in the East, Southeast, Southwest of West.”

<i>Road Projects – Key Comments</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern was raised about the amount of proposed road infrastructure. Although it was noted that the City should plan for people, not cars, it was also noted that roads still need to be improved because people will never totally eliminate their need for cars</li> <li>• The southern parts of the City were identified as experiencing rapid urbanization and in need of improved roads</li> <li>• It was noted that the transit cost projections might be misleading since they do not account for road building costs that may be required in the absence of transit infrastructure</li> <li>• The idea of a Ring Road was discussed and some people expressed interest in having the City pursue this idea</li> </ul>

## **IV) Level of Agreement on Supplementary Rapid Transit Network**

Question #5 ~ ‘Please indicate your level of agreement with the proposed supplementary rapid transit network.’

<i>Supplementary Rapid Transit Network – Key Comments</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Carling does not make sense</li> </ul>





## V) Comments on the Proposed Policy Changes

*Question # 6 ~ “Please comment on the proposed policy directions associated with walking, cycling, transportation demand management, transportation system management and parking.”*

<i>Proposed Policy Directions – Key Comments</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• More care should be taken to address pedestrian infrastructure, particularly issues for disabled pedestrians</li><li>• I don't see a ton of cycling and walking paths as a good policy direction</li><li>• Use TDM</li><li>• We have land for some real growth. Build ring road, bridges and determine the intensification goals. THEN build transportation system</li><li>• Walking/Cycling/miscellaneous pathways are NOT supported in the rural areas and specifically within the villages. Do not use street parking as a cash-grab. Controlled parking only. No tax levy for Park and Rides.</li></ul>

### **Internal and External Agency Meetings**

Feedback was not collected at either the Internal or External Agency Meetings, as participants were asked to submit comments directly to Steven Boyle at the City of Ottawa, by September 30, 2008. Meeting minutes can be found at Appendix ‘H’.





# Comment Sheet

## Transportation Master Plan Update

### 1. Which area of the city do you live in?

West  South  Rural  East  Centre  Other \_\_\_\_\_

### 2. Please indicate what you think are the three most important evaluation criteria for assessing the rapid transit implementation scenarios.

(i.e. Ridership, Cost Effectiveness, Benefits to Customers, Benefits to the Environment, Reduction of Downtown Bus Congestion, Supports a compact Transit City, Ease of implementation, Adherence to Council direction)

Please explain your choice.

### 3. Please indicate what rapid transit implementation scenario you prefer?

Scenario 1  Scenario 2  Scenario 3  Scenario 4

Please indicate the elements you like most, and any changes that you would like to see made to your preferred scenario.

### 4. Please indicate any changes that you would like to see regarding the road projects. Specify if your comments pertain to roads in the East, Southeast, Southwest or West.

East  Southeast  Southwest  West



**5. Please indicate your level of agreement with the proposed supplementary rapid transit network?** *(The proposed Supplementary Rapid Transit network is shown on exhibit 9 and primarily consists of LRT along Carling, and bus lanes on the existing road network with priority at signalized intersections, either all-day or during peak periods)*

Fully agree    Somewhat agree    Don't know    Somewhat disagree    Completely disagree

Please explain your choice.

**6. Please comment on the proposed policy directions associated with walking, cycling, transportation demand management, transportation system management, and parking.**

**7. Are there any other comments you would like to make?**

*Optional*

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Please leave this comment sheet in the designated envelope.**

You may also send it to Colin Simpson, Planning Branch, by September 30, 2008, by fax to 613-580-2578, email (colin.simpson@ottawa.ca) or by mail to the Planning, Transit and Environment Department, City of Ottawa, 110 Laurier Avenue West, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Ottawa, Ontario K1P 1J1



## Appendix 'B' – Comments Related to Changes to Road Projects: All Sources

NOTE: The following tables contain a compilation of all public and stakeholder comments related to proposed road changes, as recorded in the submitted Comment Sheets, or by the Consultation Team during the Stakeholder Focus Groups, Advisory Committee Discussion Group session, and the various public Discussion Groups. Comments are presented below 'as heard' or 'as submitted' and have not been edited.

### Road Projects in the East

#### Comments Sent Directly to City: Online, By Hand/Email/Mail/Fax

- A ring road around Ottawa from a Lower Duck bridge going south, crossing the 417 and connecting to the 416.
- A strong link and ring road must connect the east sector. Cumberland must be able to connect to this ring road area and other communities should have the same consideration.
- All require a ring road around the City.
- All new rapid transit roads should absolutely include cycling in the plans.
- All roads in Ottawa must be much simpler. Driving is becoming dangerously complicated by complicated signs, lights, advertising. Roads on the surface must have all traffic lights, special lane markings, crosswalks, speed signs, and parking signs removed. Also, all advertising signs must be removed. Drivers are supposed to be driving, not buying. Traffic that wants to move fast must be in underground tunnels, so that children are not threatened by it. The surface where the sun shines should be a pleasant place for mothers and children, not a truck raceway covered with ugly billboards.
- Continue widening 417 from Bayshore going east
- Ease congestion, make travel to downtown easier, benefit the communities in terms of easy travel and therefore easy spending of money.
- East West tracks should run along the bus lanes of the Queensway/417/174. Buses should only be used for local routes.
- For all four, a ringroad should be added to ease congestion on the 417. For the southeast(?) the airport parkway should be expanded as soon as possible, and for the west the 417 expansion should go past Stittsville as soon as possible. Hazeldean road should be expanded to 4 lanes in the west at least as far as Stittsville.
- Forget the Kettle Island Bridge decision. The consultants had the wrong mandate and gave weighting to trucks before the effects on the community, people, environment and health care ( ie the Montfort). Is this wise?
- Get big trucks out of the city. Build a ring road away from the city center, including bridges, and divert heavy traffic away from the core. Also, why put bicycle paths on a busy roadway? For example, why not build bike paths via quiet neighbourhoods away from high volume roads? For example, why have bikes on Ogilvie road when you can cut through



Carson village, la Cité collégiale, Vanier down to the bike path? Much less chance of bike/car collisions. Just a thought.

- Hunt Club West from the hwy 416 to Richmond Road and Richmond Rd from Hunt Club to Hope Side Road need to be widened to accommodate peak hour traffic, especially since there is no rapid transit available in South Kanata!
- I agree with the road proposals for the West
- I am in favour of road plans that encourage development in the south and east ends of the city, for a more rounded and sustainable urban footprint.
- I am very upset about the idea of a bridge at Kettle Island. This seems to be a strange decision in that it would divert heavy traffic close to or through a built-up residential area, past schools and a hospital. I strongly favour moving this proposed bridge to one of the options slightly eastward. In addition to avoiding a residential area, this would facilitate the linkage of the bridge to a future ring-road scheme. Indeed, I am quite surprised and annoyed that you do not seem to have a ring-road idea as part of your master plan. I believe this should be corrected.
- I believe there should be a moratorium on the construction of new roads or widening of existing roads and that the focus should be on public transportation and maintaining the existing roads.
- I moved to Ottawa almost 25 years ago. The number of bridges across the Ottawa River has not changed, save the addition of one lane on Champlain. Yet trucks continue to grind through, and clog, downtown, as they did then. We need several more bridges. You start by banning trucks from King Edward (NOW); unless they can prove they have a downtown delivery to make, let them find another way. Then you build one bridge in the far east and the far west. Then a couple in the near east (the Aviation Parkway to the Queensway is fine) and the near west (say around Parkdale). On the topic of King Edward, are you going to be putting in pedestrian bridges or tunnels? If not, why not? And, using King Edward to comment on construction projects in Ottawa in general, I have to ask (coming from elsewhere) why they take so long here? In other parts of Canada, roads are closed, work proceeds around the clock on weekends, and a remarkable amount can be achieved between Friday evening and Monday morning. We put a railway across this country in ten years - why does it take two years to refurbish one bridge or intersection here? Please don't think I am being facetious here. The difference in approach is absolutely stark, and Ottawa does not fare well in comparison with other Canadian cities. The Clyde bridge replacement was great. But it should be standard procedure, not a major spectator event that was televised live! Did I see a ring road? If not, why not? We need a 407-style highway south of the airport, linking the 417 to the 416 (and eventually continuing northwest) somewhere in the area between Leitrim and Mitch Owens.
- I would like to see a ring road implemented and at the VERY LEAST considered in the medium term transportation development plan of this city. It would be advisable to consider it for the short term as well.
- I would like to see improvements made on March Road. This road is becoming dangerous, especially in the intersections of Klondike, Old Carp Road.
- I'd like a moratorium on all new roads for at least 5 years - in order to redirect the funds to upgrades to cycling paths and pedestrian walkways, bridges etc. There is also a desperate need for adequate shelters at bus stops etc.



- If the lightrail does not use plan #4 then the bottleneck at Bayshore for east bound traffic needs to be a priority. It slows the bus and car traffic during rush hour - even at 6:30 am!
- I'm disappointed that there is no improvement proposed for the Centre of Ottawa. Why the great focus on expanding road capacity to more quickly funnel people to downtown bottlenecks? As a downtown property owner who pays as much property tax for a small condo as someone with a large house in the suburbs (requiring new roads and sewers, etc.) I find it unfair that I have to subsidize the construction of all these new roads that will do nothing to encourage transit use.
- Remove the Alta Vista Transportation Corridor from the TMP. Why the need to feed into the Nicolas Street bottleneck? Why destroy parks – including the field on Lees Avenue that currently benefits the residents of the nearby apartment towers. Rather build a transit line along the route starting from Conroy and terminate it at Hurdman station. This approach eliminates the need for a new car bridge over the Rideau River and a new bridge over Lees Avenue as well as costly work to connect to Nicolas Street.
- Get the trucks off of King Edward. Build a tunnel from the Macdonald-Cartier Bridge to the 417. Send the tunnel under the Rideau River to the Vanier Parkway; bury the Vanier Parkway to mitigate the impact on the surrounding neighbourhoods. This will cost a lot of money but the mistake of destroying King Edward must be corrected.
- Reduce the size of King Edward from four to six lanes immediately north of Rideau Street.
- Improvements are needed to Carling from Moodie to March. Adding of left and right turning lanes at intersections would greatly improve traffic flow. Currently, cars get stuck behind any car wanting to turn left. Many cars are driving on gravel shoulder to get around turning cars which is dangerous, especially given the number of cyclists using Carling. This stretch of road is very busy and is a direct connection from Kanata North to the Parkway and downtown, so improving it would reduce traffic on the Queensway. Buses could even be run along Carling for a direct connection from Kanata North through Bayshore to downtown. Widening to 4 lanes would be the best option in the long term of course.
- Invest in upgrading cycling and walking paths all over the city and not focus on what would be best for drivers
- Is rail conversion of the West transitway to Kanata not an option? What does overlaying gray-coloured routing on your phase maps represent? I would think that people would like to be able to take the LRT from Orleans all the way to Kanata (or vice versa).
- It seems the congestion in the East is more severe.
- Limit to resurfacing, fixing existing roads. Stop widening and addition of roads. This would influence the use of other modes of transportation, i.e., public, walking, cycling, etc.
- Make Huntclub Rd the ring road (without lights/intersections) that it was meant to be.
- Maximizing LRT in the highest population areas, will lead to a delay in road improvement cost requirements.
- I would like to comment on the Transportation Master Plan proposals that I have recently received. Firstly, I was pleased to see the plans for improved mass transportation. In reviewing the document however, I was most disappointed in the absence of any mention of studying an Ottawa By-Pass (Ring Road). The Ministry of Transportation of Ontario has included such a study in its vision of “Future Highway Expansion” needs for the province, yet the Ring Road is absent from the City of Ottawa’s future plans. While the Transportation Master Plan proposals address new or widened road corridors, this should



have included the Ring Road in this plan. In my view, the Ring Road Concept is a key element of managing the traffic congestion in the downtown areas and essential for the removal of unwanted trucks from our communities. It is time to incorporate the Ring Road concept in the City's future plans.

- More lanes, pot-hole and road-repairs. Bike lanes on side roads
- More rail systems
- Need effective light rail transit to reduce congestion on the 417 and encourage less use of vehicles on our roads.
- Need to include the concept of moving vehicular traffic around and away from the area within the greenbelt, where the majority of the population lives and where we want to encourage intensification to occur. This requires some detailing of a ring-road or similar option, linked to a new bridge outside the greenbelt to carry truck and other vehicles.
- No changes
- No kettle island, ring road implementation
- No new roads. No widening roads. Maintain what we have, expand green infrastructure.
- Phase 3 provides for the widening of Katimavik Road to 4 lanes: Concerns with respect to the loss of park land / green space and effect on nearby homes.
- Place a moratorium on all new road construction, with the possible short term exception made for a rapid and unexpected increase in the population in the south.
- Please include the notion/study of a Ring Road in this plan. As things currently stand, the ring road is absent from the City's future plans.
- Re the Southeast, eliminate widening of: the Airport Parkway, the Alta Vista Transportation corridor, Limebank, all those roads south of us that will eventually come to a screeching halt as they approach downtown. The AVTC and the Airport parkway widening are particularly stupid as re AVTC, its connection to the 417 means bringing vehicles to a road that is already beyond capacity; re the Airport - perfect example of the dinosaur mentality: instead of pushing for a light rail extension ASAP in to the airport (and more light rail as quickly as possible south of it, let's just keep building roads so everything can come to a screeching halt on Bronson.
- Roads should be well maintained, but not expanded or new roads added (unless other roads are "retired" to encourage wildlife and parks)
- Stop the bridge planning for the Kettle Island project. As seen just this week, a tractor trailer collided with a van and caused 500 litres of toxic fuel to be dumped. In an area that is already heavily populated, the Kettle Island choice makes no sense to the taxpayers that will be paying for it and living beside it. Duck Island is close to the highway and will disrupt less communities. It is time for the NCC to think about how to make this city look better (i.e Aviation Parkway is currently identified, by the use of road signs, as a "Scenic Route" for tourists). If the Kettle Island project continues to move forward, the NCC will have destroyed many rich and historic features in this beautiful city. It is time for the Mayor of this city to step-in and stop the Kettle Island bridge in it's tracks.
- The entire region must have a ring road to reduce commuter and truck traffic in the inner city. I am shocked that this concept has been removed from the plan. With the largest and most spread out geographically distributed city in Canada, a ring road is imperative to future transportation. It would ameliorate a percentage of the truck disruption to existing communities as well as reduce traffic on the Queensway and reduce the smog impact of



transportation on the heaviest centres of the population.

- The investment in roads compared to cycling infrastructure and transit is excessive. The widening of Hwy 174 will only lead to more road demands further on. Wherever consideration is given to building new roads or widening existing ones, the first thought should be how could it be postponed or avoided, by developing cycling and transit options to reduce the automobile demand? e.g. Traffic jams along 174 means that there should be more transit services out that way. Likewise for Richmond road. Currently you are choosing transit options that ostensibly do not promote urban sprawl beyond the greenbelt. That would only make sense if there was an outright refusal to enhance or expand road services to those areas. We need a vision for the future of Ottawa with a firm view to reduce cars, not accommodate more of them. I fear a transit tunnel downtown is merely a way to give car drivers more space.
- The projects totally omit the possibility of constructing a by-pass (ring road) to keep heavy traffic out of residential communities. The current plan seems to seek simply to shift heavy traffic from one residential community to another. Truck traffic should not be routed (as present) or re-routed (as proposed) through the city. Instead, it should be routed around the city. The city should therefore intervene with the Province to ensure that a by-pass is constructed and make this part of the transportation plan.
- There aren't enough people in this area to make it worth the money to invest in it. East/West and South to Barrhaven should be priority. It should be built where the people need it are.
- There does not seem to be any allowance for a ring road that would connect via a bridge to Gatineau. For completeness, there should be a similar ring road arterial in the West. I believe the ring road should be placed well outside of the city core, to ensure that truck traffic remains out of the city center.
- There needs to be an Ottawa bypass transportation corridor mentioned as a priority in the Ontario Ministry of Transport's document "Southern Ontario Highways Program 2006-2010". The Ottawa Bypass Transportation Corridor Study is essential to begin long-term planning for an effective ring road system to serve the Ottawa area including interprovincial bridges. Bridges and roads are required in the far east and west of Ottawa-Gatineau to benefit the public.
- there should be a ring road connecting the 417 to a bridge to Quebec on both the east and west
- There should be consideration for a Ring road that would permit truck traffic to bypass the Ottawa region.
- Through across City traffic ability, but key that the Albert Street tunnel be addressed.
- Under no circumstances should any planning time be wasted based upon the incredibly bad and short-sighted premise of a new interprovincial bridge at Kettle island.
- West will have to do something with Carling and it should be considered along with Baseline as an alternative to the parkway. As well once all these phases are done than Montreal Road is going to need to be deal with. Maybe in a similar way to Toronto with a second light rail line joining to the other.
- What about a ring road to deal with the trucking problem?
- Where is the ring road to avoid heavy trucks through residential neighbourhood.
- Where is the Ring Road? This is worrisome, in particular, as result of the reference to "little change from the 2003 MTP". In 2003 Council decided to NOT pursue a joint study





with MTO - but that does not mean that the concept of a Ring Road is inappropriate. Staff has made reference to an "inner ring road" concept. If this is part of the plan, that should be clearly so-stated. A reader should not have to infer such a concept from "reading the entrails" of a map of planned roadwork. And surely the incorporation/non-incorporation of a Ring Road is going to have significant impact on zoning and future land use. How do we ensure the logical integration of the new NCR River Crossing, the terminuses of the LRT, and a method of avoiding congestion on the Queensway [ particularly after accidents] if there is no Ring Road?

- why is the Ring Road no longer mentioned in the plan - it is important to remove truck traffic from downtown and residential areas
- Widening projects are only encouraging development and sprawl beyond the Greenbelt. It serves a limited population (only those who live immediately nearby) while degrading the regional environment. Cars pollute. More/wider roads beget more cars. So more roads pollute more irrespective of what any environmental assessment says. Lastly, what would the combined cost for all municipal road projects be? How could that money better be spent on a fully comprehensive transit system that allows all citizens to access all parts of the city?
- Redirect 1/3 of funds from roads to cycling and transit
- Alta Vista and Prince of Wales Corridor should be removed from plan
- Hunt Club extension

#### **Public Open Houses ~ Comment Sheets**

- Remove the AVTC from the TMP. A quiet community will be revived. Putting more cars into the core is silly. The cost of the thing won't be recovered.
- Add bus-only lanes to Innes Road, 174 (Orleans and Trim) and Trim (174-Millennium Station)

## **Road Projects in the Southeast**

#### **Public Open Houses ~ Comment Sheets**

- AltaVista corridor project is unnecessary and will help take potential riders away from LRT. Why is link from Riverside to Nicolas Street still mentioned as Phase 2 Priority? Why dump additional cars on the 417 at the busiest point? There is no chance for improvement of traffic flow. Reduction of effectiveness of LRT since more roads encourage more car culture which goes against plan.
- Implement additional transit and transitway to the South. Move faster on building the Earl Armstrong bridge. Move faster on expanding Lime Bank (Spratt-Hunt Club) What is the point of the New Rideau River Bridge? Low Priority.
- Airport and Stop there. When people in the South start to pay transit taxes then we can look at transit into Mr. Thompson's ward.
- Finish AVTC (South) now. The problem of traffic through Alta Vista and Elmvale has not



been addressed. AVTC may also lighten load on Bank Street light rail.

- Innes-Walkley-Hunt Club Link (Phase 1, 2009-2015) With the large number of trucks that will use this 417 Interchange instead of Walkley, I suggest that the Hawthorne road to HWY 417 portion be 4 lanes to avoid traffic congestion East of the current exit to Hunt Club Road.
- South: It is a big oversight of the city to ignore the widening of Bank Street to Greely until 2016-2022. Once again, our few voices mean nothing. Truck traffic is so incredibly heavy, travel speeds are usually 50 km/hr. Widening Bank Street to Findley Creek only amounts to 1.5 KM of Roadway--Not a big advantage. 2023 is designated as the year for 4 lanes to Mitch Owens: Too long a wait. (25 years)

### Stakeholder Focus Groups ~ Comments

- Accelerate the improvements to the Airport Parkway. Accelerate the improvements to Lester Road. Build AVTC from Couroy Rd to Smythe Road first. Start at 2 lanes first and then expand.
- Direct connection between Albion Rd and Airport Parkway. 2) Widening Airport Parkway and Bronson.
- Re: roads in the South End. Bank Street should be made 4 lanes to the city limits, or at least to Greely (Mitchowens or Parkway). Current speeds are 50km/hr from 6:30am to 6PM. There is a lot of truck congestion. Housing is intensifying a lot in that area, so if people are to be induced to use transit, people will need a Park and Ride quickly.

## Road Projects in the Southwest

### Comments Sent Directly to City: Online, By Hand/Email/Mail/Fax

- Highway South of 417 to remove all traffic passing through downtown Ottawa.
- Roads in South: some roads are very rough (Limebank, Parkway, etc); top of Albion, close to Bank, is very slow.
- Acknowledge the growth South of the City. Kemptville has become a satellite bedroom community that needs to be serviced by some sort of rail system. This would include communities in North Gower, Manotick and Barrhaven. Traffic from these areas is insane from 6:30-9:30AM and again starting at 3PM until 7PM.

### Public Open Houses ~ Comments Sheets

- Central Experimental Farm traffic circle on Prince of Wales: Please give very serious and immediate attention to have this circle function as any other circle. i.e. Traffic in the circle MUST have right of way. Clear out the high shrubbery in the centre (put in low vegetation) so that visibility across the circle is open.
- Widen Bank Street to Findlay Creek sooner. Integrate light rail on Strandherd bridge to get bridge funding sooner. Widen Hunt Club in conjunction with improved transit.
- Why widen Limebank if the line is going South?



### Advisory Committee Discussion Group ~ Comments

- Do not 4 lane Prince of Wales until (engineering?) studies have been called out on certain areas.
- No airport Parkway widening.

## Road Projects in the West

### Comments Sent Directly to City: Online, By Hand/Email/Mail/Fax

- Support completion of Terry Fox to March Road - do not support Terry Fox to Moodie/Hunt Club - add traffic signal at Eagleson and Trans Canada Trail - widen train bridge underpass Carling (near 19th hole) for cyclists - add four lane richmond road Carling.
- Carling between Moodie and March rd is often bumper to bumper. it might be worth it to expend it to 3-4 lanes.
- Complete Terry Fox!!!
- The East/West corridor rail line will reduce bus traffic on the parkway.
- The proposed Goulbourn Force road arteries to Kanata Lakes and (at one time/still?) plan for access indirectly to March road requires a traffic study as it presents concerns regarding the impact to the traffic volume in the residential area of Kanata Lakes. It may be done as it was part of the development plans for the 'Beaver Pond' area. Please make publicly available.
- There seems to be little need for a new North-South Arterial in Stittsville. Priority should be given instead to widening Hazledean between Terry Fox and Carp Rd.
- Terry Fox extension must be moved up in priority
- The piece on Kanata Ave between Goulbourn and Richardson Side Road should be a priority so it's good to see it in the earliest phase. I'm not sure how I feel about the improvement of Goulbourn. If there was any way to discourage traffic (by providing viable alternative routes) it would be great to keep the road more rural. Many skiers, cyclists and runners cross that road, and it would be visionary to maintain a rural setting in the city. Lastly, I would be OK with a significant push and investment on public transportation at the expense of road improvements.
- West: Widening Richmond Road to four lanes up to Golden makes no sense since traffic would be bottlenecked on reaching Westboro. Also, adding lanes will bring more traffic to that bottleneck which will result in a parking lot of four lanes.
- With Hightech & Scotiabank Place in the Kanata it is even more congested with car traffic. Currently if you do take a bus you are on the Queensway which takes too long with all of the traffic.
- With new developments in North Kanata Lakes along Terry Fox/Kanata Ave and the catholic high school on a road with no side walk, someone is going to get injured along the road. It is very dangerous and I am very surprised that people were allowed to build a large community on a road with no sidewalks.



## Public Open Houses ~ Comment Sheets

- Look at all the alternative routes before making final choice between Dominion and Lincoln Fields. A) Make use of the existing rail network. B) Put LRT on Carling Avenue. C) Put LRT on the Byron/Richmond Road. D) Put LRT on Baseline Road.
- Provided LRT is extended to Kanata and Scotiabank Centre, Roads are okay.
- Scenario 1
- Take the line through Preston where people actually live. Stop building in abandoned fields.
- LRT along Carling or Byron.
- Need to lessen congestion on the 417. Widen lanes or make changes to widen streets that parallel the 417 to provide quicker commuter/transit times.
- Increased park and ride capacity and access (Terry Fox accessibility) Go West/East before going South. Strong supporter for Hope Side and Terry Fox expansions.
- Let Hazeldean be finished by 2011. Carp Road finished by 2011. Reconstruct John Woods street to full urban standards at the time of plan of subdivision, at 33 John Woods.
- Speed up construction on Terry Fox Drive, Richardson to Goulbourn, Hazeldean Road, Hope side road and Crown Ridge.
- When extending Eagleson South towards Fernbank, Eagleson should be widened to a safe width, with 4 lanes to Fallowfield. Eagleson is currently very narrow and dangerous, with heavy traffic from Fallowfield to Hope/Terry Fox.
- Why does widening Hazeldean stop short of going all the way to Carp Road?
- With the huge developments coming to Kanata, the roads need to be improved there.

## Road Projects in General

### Comments Sent Directly to City: Online, By Hand/Email/Mail/Fax

- A ring road is a critical inclusion in the plan. Get trucks out of the city
- Four lane roads on either side of the Rideau River
- I think you are building way too many roads!
- Need a ring road with eastern connection to a bridge to Gatineau.
- no further roads should be built. Focus spending should be towards LTR
- no more roads until we start building rail and have reconsidered how we move people around.
- None of the scenarios appear to address the need for a quicker and more extensive network of LRT. Please step away from the bus paradigm and look at moving as fast as possible to an LRT solution that will save the City and the taxpayers in the long run.
- None of these are entirely adequate for any area. I would like to see a ring road around the Capital, no heavy trucks in the city except between 1am and 5am, a central city subway and no Kettle Island bridge. I live in New Edinburgh and will oppose the Kettle Island bridge.
- What about a ring road? Perhaps a study should be done to assess the benefits.



- I do not own a car by choice, therefore my knowledge of the outer roadways is cycling based. Dedicated bus lanes on main routes are important. Dedicated cycling lanes are important. Ensure there are sidewalks for pedestrians.
- Interesting to note that total road widenings (no road narrowings?) will cost 2 billion, in addition to Rapid Transit plan's 4.7 billion. I have not heard or read of any objections from the public or politicians on the cost of road-works. Why is this not controversial? What would road costs be if the rapid transit plan is not built?
- No tunnel. Turn Albert street into a combination transitway for the LRT with wide pedestrian walkways. Cross-streets can remain e.g Elgin, Metcalfe, O-Connor etc and will continue to provide easy car/taxi access to businesses. If it can be done on Spark street then it can be done on Albert street. The LRT would have more frequent stops downtown but that is okay since most passengers would be getting off or on in this area.
- Re: Roads in any location: No new routes should have to be created in order to lay down track. I prefer that tracks be laid down on existing roads and make use of existing rail lines and rail routes.

### Public Open Houses ~ Comment Sheets

- All new arterials should have transit functions in mind and be closely integrated with the rapid transit network.
- Cancel EA for Prince of Wales drive. Proposal is to ease peak traffic congestion but this is not possible. Congestion will still occur through Carleton Heights residential area, Experimental Farm, Hunt Club Bridge, Baseline and Heron to Riverside Drive and on Hog's Back Road to Colonel-By-Drive and to Riverside Drive.
- Extending O-Train across POW bridge. Use VIA corridor to run DLRT service from Barrhaven to Ottawa station with transfer of North-South Line.
- I would like to see the airport extension of the LRT line prioritized. Build the tunnel downtown. Let no hurdles or opposition stop it.
- It seems that most of the road projects being suggested assume that the city will continue to be built similar to neighbourhoods from the 1960s and 1970s, thus resulting in more demand for road capacity. Why not consider retro-fitting neighbourhoods in the outer-core to reflect more traditional/walkable communities? Perhaps this would help stop urban sprawl and increasing capacity demand. Any roads widened beyond 4 lanes are "highways" plain and simple: Freeways have no place within a city.
- LRT along Carling: It's an existing transportation corridor.
- Don't build any roads until transit network is complete.
- It looks like most of the roads lead to the core: Why spend money widening roads that are already jam-packed? This will lead to more traffic jams.
- No East-West plan South of downtown. How do I get to Algonquin college or Blair Road? Is downtown only option?
- No objections to any of the road projects. Implement the Strandherd-Armstrong Bridge as soon as possible.
- Tunnel from Leitrim to Limebank under the airport runway to the Airport Parkway. Airport will say 'no.' Too bad it's done in every major city.
- Use new alignment at Railway track on Industrial.



- Would like to see greater use of roundabouts and perhaps synchronized stoplights. Need to find more efficient capacity solutions on our roadways to reduce fuel consumption and pollution.
- Do not increase lanes on highway. Spend money on mass transit.
- East-West: Above the 417. South: Above 416 and Airport Parkway. Not sure about the loop downtown.
- Make the LRT system into a corridor, stretching from East-West through Central Ottawa. Overhead rail superimposed on the 417 route.
- North/South needs improvement.
- Run trains on existing road networks and existing rail networks.
- Electric rail system to be extended to Trim, Scotiabank place, Barrhaven and Riverside South as soon as possible. This should be done instead of catering to roads.
- No more road. Let them use public transit.
- Once the transitway is sorted out the rest will follow.

### **Stakeholder Focus Groups ~ Comments**

- Good philosophy behind decreasing the amount of funds to be spent on roads.
- Ensure that shoulders are paved in the new roads, to facilitate biking. (Make it priority)
- Rehabilitate existing roads to provide biking priority (e.g Richmond)
- Cut down on space for car drivers, but aggressively promote more space for cyclists etc.
- 174-Innes Road: Any thought of expanding Trim all the way to Innes during Phase 1? Bump it up from Phase 2.
- Are road networks an afterthought? 70% of people will still be driving.
- Don't get drivers too comfortable on the roads. (Nix the 6 lane plans) Induce them to take transit.
- HOV lanes might be a good option.
- Synchronize timing from a planning perspective. Presently, the transit plans and road-work plans are not in consonance.
- Bridge at Fallowfield: Is it needed for/by 2031?
- Why does the route from Prince of Wales feed into Downtown Congestion, instead of going away from it, through a changeover hub?
- Bottleneck increases with the widening of roads going in.
- Airport parkway widening a concern.
- ATVC a concern.
- 174 a concern.
- 30% transit modal split not ambitious enough.
- POW widening a concern: Bottlenecks, and it competes with the LRT.
- Don't use Parkway. Put LRT on Carling.
- Most of the rural people live outside of the transit area. Most of their commuting is done within their areas. Hence, the need for better roads is there. 1) Improve the conditions of existing roads. (Priority) 2) Increase capacity.
- If roadworks aren't an option for South, extend the LRT to service the South. Southerners either need improved roads, or improved transit.



- Reconsider widening Leicester and Albion roads.
- Why is no work being done on Bank Street? The city has jurisdiction over it now, so they can afford to develop it for residents.
- Why aren't the road/transit planning merged better?
- The ring road: Where and what is it? One councillor said a ring-road was built into the plan, but this is erroneous. Manotick Bridge and Metcalfe too heavily used.
- What can be done to solve the failing arterial road issue? Widening roads as a counter-traffic measure should be reconsidered. It has totally failed in the past.
- Scrap AVTC and Airport Parkway
- Where is the ring road?

### **Advisory Committee Discussion Group ~ Comments**

- Concern was raised about the amount of proposed road infrastructure. Although it was noted that the City should plan for people, not cars, it was also noted that roads still need to be improved because people will never totally eliminate their need for cars.
- The southern parts of the City was identified as an area experiencing rapid urbanization and in need of improved roads. In particular, the Strandherd bridge was suggested to be required as soon as possible to relieve traffic congestion.
- It was mentioned that the Airport Parkway and Alta Vista Transportation Corridor should not be needed.
- Concern was raised about the closing of the Woodroffe Avenue at Prince of Wales Drive as this will significantly inconvenience drivers.
- It was noted that the transit cost projections might be misleading since they do not account for road-building costs that may be required in the absence of transit infrastructure.
- The idea of a Ring Road was discussed and some people expressed interest in having the City pursue this idea.
- All new projects should be 'parked' until a comprehensive analysis of transit and all alternative options are considered. Start making this a city for people, not cars. Look at carpooling lanes for Airport Parkway and other roads. Enforce 2 or more persons per car.
- Costing does not include roads. Required if scenario 3 is not chosen.

### **Open House Discussion Groups ~ Comments**

- The roads are being developed beyond the planning horizon.
- AV corridor is objected to.
- Hunt club congestion is an issue.
- Bridges should be built over both rivers for cars/pedestrians.
- East: Walkley to 417. Good idea
- Centre: Getting on to Nicholas without using the Highway. From Main Street? From Alta Vista?
- Airport Parkway: Widening is in competition with Rail. Doesn't agree. Speaks to need to have airport spur now, regardless of implementation scenario.
- Park and Ride near airport



- Carling Avenue and Woodroffe: Will there be enough room for pedestrians?
- Modify Hunt Club: Remove some traffic lights to improve traffic flow.
- Traffic circles or roundabouts: More in the city to improve intersection flow.
- Prioritise option 4: East/West to increase ridership. North-South has O-Train in place.
- Concern that concrete curbs that keep out traffic will be unpleasant to look at.
- Ottawa River Parkway: High speeds. Motorcyclists find it intimidating. OC transpo going over a 90KM passing. Traffic calming needed.
- Maps should show roads, transit, Park and Rides, Cycling and Pathways to understand how they relate to each other.
- There are issues with using Scott street during T-way conversion. It is already congested. Safety issues for adjacent residential community.
- Browning Road: People believe there are enough roads there to serve the neighbourhood. Rapid transit would not be beneficial for all.
- Too much traffic at Nicholas/Laurier already.
- Too much traffic flow to Riverside/Hunt Club intersection if more traffic is put onto Limebank Road.
- New bridge will alleviate this problem.
- Atlanta Georgia: No more money is to be spent on widening roads. All funds go to transit and maintenance of existing roads.
- Widening roads slows traffic down.
- Will there be a car-pooling lane on the roadways?
- Implement transit on existing arterial roads. (417, 416, Aviation Parkway and Vanier Parkway)
- In option 4, support work in the West. Without work on Terry Fox, there is no completion of the network.
- Hope Sideroad?
- March road is clogged in both directions.
- Don't build extra road lanes: Force ridership.
- What about diamond crossings?
- Is there enough space for road widening etc east of Bayshore? (EA projections)
- How will the trucking during the construction period be managed? (To provide minimal discomfort to residents)
- The roadway to the airport needs to be widened
- Are emergency vehicles going to be allowed to use the transitway? Would this mean road upgrades?
- Widening the airport Parkway is very important and necessary. Trying to get to the airport at Peak times is now very difficult.





## Appendix 'C' - Comments Related to Supplementary Networks: All Sources

NOTE: The following tables contain a compilation of all public and stakeholder comments related to the Supplementary Networks, as recorded in the submitted Comment Sheets, or by the Consultation Team during the Stakeholder Focus Groups, Advisory Committee Discussion Group session, and the various public Discussion Groups. Comments are presented below 'as heard' or 'as submitted' and have not been edited.

### Fully Agree

#### Comments Sent Directly to City: Online, By Hand/Email/Mail/Fax

- Again, this might influence peoples' choice to either, walk, bike, or ride.
- Allowing people the option of easily taking LRT along Carling lets them travel through a corridor that contains business etc rather than a rural route. Making transit cheaper and easier than taking a car is the best way to get people to come on board.
- As many areas of the city will not be covered by LRT, and easy access to the LRT is highly desirable, the Supp Rapid Transit network would assist in this regard. Also, I would like to see a specific plan to include bike paths connect with LRT stations. I see the subject included in the cycling plan, but not in the LRT system plan, and far from detailed. This would be my preferred way of transport and would increase ridership during the transition period between the start of LRT and the addition of the supplementary network because it would allow riders who are not in close proximity to the LRT to still access it easily using bikes, and ideally even in winter.
- Carling Avenue provides access to a great number of rapid transit riders. It is also better situated to develop high density mixed use nodes to support rapid transit. Rapid transit on the parkway seems to be an easy choice for implementation, but does little to generate a compact urban area (unless high density mixed use developments are anticipated along the parkway).
- carling is where the people are and this route avoids the need for a line along the parkway
- I fully agree with having LRT along Carling and Baseline/Heron.
- I would like to see the Western Parkway preserved in keeping with Ottawa's image.
- It seems to me like a great idea, I would like to see more tunnels which would be great during the winter and would not disturb traffic.
- Looks sensible.
- More transit, sooner, is better.
- These steps can help to improve existing networks at relatively low cost.
- We need a good transportation system to compete with other cities with respect to tourism, businesses, industries, foreign investments ...etc.



## Public Open Houses ~ Comments Sheets

- The only plan that makes some sense. Given that the O-Trains are in disrepair, the corridors for adding shops of maintenance facilities for rail eludes use. If we took to a single mode (double-decker hybrid buses) we would be better off.
- Use Carling avenue where preferable: Not the Ottawa River parkway.
- Carling LRT supplementary line good for the area. Why not also Montreal road? Bus lanes on existing roads also useful.
- The road network should be shrunk because cars will become non-viable for most.

## Somewhat Agree

### Comments Sent Directly to City: Online, By Hand/Email/Mail/Fax

- (1) The Carling corridor is an excellent idea however I am not convinced a streetcar system is necessary. I believe this corridor could be implemented in near term with buses (possibly with low tail-pipe emission buses to eliminate some of the aesthetic downsides associated with diesel buses) This should be relatively easy to implement with current road infrastructure and readily available rolling stock. I believe this would provide a better cost benefit ratio than capital cost of laying track and purchasing a unique rolling stock for this short route not to mention the greater O&M costs for the streetcars. 2) Baseline /Heron Walkley is another excellent idea, crosstown traffic can bypass the downtown if necessary. 3) Some of the supplementary routes if implemented in phase 1 would provide necessary relief/detours during construction of LRT. 4) Being from South Kanata I believe a supplementary transit/transit priority route should be investigated along Frenbank/Hope/West Hunt Club to encourage ridership for Stittsville, future Fernbank Lands, South Kanata. The current plan does not encourage transit use for West end unless travelling downtown or those parts along western transitway. Given the number of cars travelling West Hunt Club and travelling to "Merivale" per TRANS I believe this provides a golden opportunity and could delay proposed West Hunt Club widening or be incorporated into widening.
- Difficult to predict 2031 population.
- Fine as a stopgap. The LRT along Carling is great. But it has to go further west. When I first saw the roadworks on the 417 before Kanata, I dared to hope that it was going to be a European-style rail line along the median. But apparently, it's just more road, and that will just move the congestion to a different place along the 417. I do like the idea of buses being able to control lights. I regularly ride buses around the Hurdman area, and see absolutely no reason why a bus should have to wait to leave the Transitway at, for example, Industrial (the #3) or just east of Lees station (the #101).
- However a Ring Road by-passing the centre core would diminish accidents and traffic this in my view is essential.
- I am against the idea of a tunnel
- I don't fully understand the substance of this proposal. However, the use of Carling Ave.



and bus priority everywhere sounds good.

- i dont think carling as it is now can handle bus and lrt together without major widening/straightening first
- I like the idea of LRT along carling and not on the parkway. Carling is where all the businesses are.
- It can help to solve the current congestion in short term. In long term, we should have other option.
- Looks good. Need to make sure the west end is well served. Its been underserved for years.
- need more information to tell you more
- Need to ensure that a "Transit Priority" be included between Kanata Centrum all the way to down town.
- No consideration given to ring road concept.
- Seems like it will just create more congestion on the public roads
- The needs of South Kanata (Bridlewood) are not being met. There is no rapid transit available in our area.
- This work will probably have more of a direct impact on getting more people using transit than the proposed conversion of the existing BRT to LRT. A subway underneath Bank Street north of the Rideau Canal should be considered. The overall traffic congestion might justify complete grade separation. (This would also serve to connect Lansdowne Park to the dedicated transit routes.)
- We need more public transit and less roadwork!
- We should go with VIA and OVR rail lines

### **Public Open Houses ~ Comments Sheets**

- Add Hurdman and Carling, Provide service to the stadium
- Carling Ave should be first choice for West route. Implement LRT to Tunney's but run South to Carling and along median; Much more population base there. Signal priority good especially for pedestrians.
- Concerned somewhat about how taxes might increase.
- East/West with trains on Byron.
- Good in theory. Would like to see better planning prior to building in more remote areas to avoid the distance public transit needs to core.
- I agree with most of the supplementary rapid transit network proposal. However, I think this proposal from on Carling should be further extended; Up North (ideally on Bank Street) to Montreal Road, then down Montreal Road until Blair, ending at Blair station. Though very costly, this tram would serve many customers along these large volume corridors in both West and East.
- I like the idea of fixing DT core, but I would like to see alternatives in the meantime: i.e. Implement 'DT express' w/o the regional buses running through it. (Bayview to Hurdman express route)
- I need more details to have a final position.
- I would like to see a better transit link cross-town South of the Queensway. A fast link, not one held up by numerous traffic signals. Use of existing rail between Kanata and Via Rail



station might be a possibility. Carling LRT should run from Bayshore to downtown to minimize transfers.

- Like the airport link and LRT but not BRT network.
- Looks pretty good but too far out.
- More consideration to reserved HOV lanes on some arterials should be considered. Keep the bus lanes noted, but add HOV on other roads to speed up buses and HOVs.
- Option 4 is not bad but I want to see use of Prince of Wales Bridge used for Ottawa River cross-connections.
- The Carling streetcar is a good idea and in the future there should be a second tunnel from Carling/Bronson to Hurdman either through the Glebe or along the canal via Landsdowne Park.
- The routes are not frequented by me: I live downtown

## Somewhat Disagree

### Comments Sent Directly to City: Online, By Hand/Email/Mail/Fax

- At this time I don't see any value in LRT along Carling. A dedicated bus lane during peak periods with articulated buses would be a significantly less costly solution providing nearly as much value.
- Agree with priority at signalized intersections where there is currently a large amount of bus traffic. Future heavy bus routes and LRT needs need more study to compare using existing rail lines instead of Carling. This may avoid the need for heavy bus traffic along March Rd. for example.
- I am curious to know how much faster service would be in a LRT along Carling versus the current bus system? Unless the LRT can be raised to go above the current intersections and thus not be slowed by the traffic lights.
- I do not believe LRT along Carling will at all be an economical choice. Those of us who live in the west end and take public transit would not benefit from a rapid LRT line along Carling. Those who will agree to LRT on Carling are from the east and southeast ends of the city, or drive a car. It remains a fact that LRT along the parkway and transitway to downtown is faster than LRT would provide along Carling, unless you go underground (which also would be expensive). The best alternative to the parkway in the west end is the Byron corridor strip from west of Westboro to where it would meet Lincoln Fields - this would not reduce trip time for public transit. In the east end, I'd say the Hospital corridor absolutely should be considered as an alternative to the transitway in the east end. Many of the express buses in the city come from the east end, and would see slow public transit in the process of converting the transitway to LRT. If the Hospital corridor were instead used as the LRT option heading east, we will see no interruptions in the already excellent bus service in the east end (except going into downtown from Hurdman). What I've said about the east end does not apply in the same manner as in the west end, as buses already on Sunday Alcatel Bike Days are required to take a detour between Westboro and Lincoln Fields, where they go off on Churchill to Richmond, Richmond to Woodroffe, Woodroffe to



Carling, and Carling to Lincoln Fields (and vice versa). If there remains any issue, it will be with the express buses.

- I would look at a rapid transit route that includes crossing the Ottawa River to downtown Gatineau on the Prince of Wales Rail Bridge. This could cut down on the number of bus and automobile crossings in the urban core.
- LRT along Carling will be no different than buses - rail must be on dedicated corridors to be effective.
- No LRT to the west
- We need a central city subway and I will consistently oppose the Kettle Island bridge until a new plan is drafted and approved that does not include the bridge.

**Public Open Houses ~ Comments Sheets**

- Given that LRT is not extended to West and East beyond what is proposed in Scenario 4, no train should be provided on Carling. Why not continue with buses with priority at intersections?
- If you think it's needed, plan for it now. Incorporating it now will be cheaper than trying to fix it or incorporate it later. Why aren't we using more of the existing rail lines?
- Let's not start all over again.
- Not convinced that all arguments have been objectively evaluated e.g. vast impact of increasing energy cost
- Not sure LRT is needed along Carling. More bus lanes is a good idea though.

**Stakeholder Focus Groups ~ Comments**

- Currently use East end of Carling where bus lanes do exist. Hate it! Cars are always passing on RHS and cutting into traffic. Buses already have right of way and traffic already yields to merging buses. Watch Carling avenue West of Bronson during Rush hour: Scary.

**Completely Disagree**

**Comments Sent Directly to City: Online, By Hand/Email/Mail/Fax**

- LRT along Carling Unnecessary

**Public Open Houses ~ Comments Sheets**

- Go where the people exist. 1) Airport 411 million people and you can't go directly? 16 mins from Greenboro to airport. 2) Kanata-Orleans. Anything else is a waste of effort and money.
- I am happy to see a transportation corridor that is moving to where people actually live. Something needs to be done because the current situation on these major streets is unacceptable on the trajectory of the 85.
- I disagree with LRT along Carling avenue. I do not envision Carling being part of a



'through-route' across the downtown portion of the city between Kanata and Orleans. If you want rail transit on Carling, operate the O-Train between Lincoln Fields and Carling station 10 years after LRT is implemented South to the airport. This will avoid having to sell/retire the O-Train equipment.

- It is not worth the cost to build LRT along Carling just to save less than 5 minutes of commuting.
- These are mostly long-term plans and they seem necessary to serve local communities and bring people to track lines. Ideally, these roads will be used to divert buses during conversion of the Transitway to LRT.
- A street car is the same as bus, so it won't make a difference.
- Considering the potential growth in the West area and the existing infrastructure an east-west Light Rail with the O-Train extending to the South will be the most judicial option. The cost of the extension of East-West Light Rail is estimated \$20-30 million which compares favorably against the gigantic \$500+ million cost to install light rail to Riverside South.
- Do not want rapid transit on Carling Avenue through Crystal Beach.
- Downtown congestion and east west congestion must take priority.
- I don't see how a street car line along Carling is any improvement over a bus.
- I feel more transit routes need to service the West end like Kanata. The proposed plan needs to extend further than Carling.
- It does not make long-term sense. We need to not only think of immediate benefit, but also to consider the long-term goals and effect of the current plan which is not in line with the current growth pattern of Ottawa.
- It has NO SUBWAY !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
- Light rail only moves people along the surface but in a different vehicle. It does nothing to attract ridership or to get people off the roads and to their destinations quickly and efficiently as a subway would do. Spend the money now and it will pay off for Ottawa in the long term.
- LRT along Carling would still not carry enough passengers to be effective. THEN, once it gets to the end of Carling, it has nowhere to go! This is hard to answer in detail, as I could not find "exhibit 9".
- LRT would more easily be placed along the parkway and could be done asthetically with some effort.
- My concern with priority signaling is although it is needed for cars how will it work in conjunction with pedestrian walking signals. Will it cut pedestrian signals too short and those not able to "run" once they have started to cross will get hit. Or will you then need to put in under ground pedestrian walk ways.
- Running trains on existing roads is a bad idea since it removes any benefits of using a train (will not be any faster then a bus)
- The LRT is to service existing needs, only when the ned is totally serviced, then to redirect the growth of a city in any intended direction direction.
- The plan does not contemplate the construction of a by-pass to take heavy through traffic out of the city. This would make it safer within the city for bicycle and pedestrian traffic and hence reduce the demand for vehicle parking in the city core.



- The proposal of supplementary LRT on only Carling is not good enough. Bus lanes are out of date, congestive and this means of public transit adds a lot of pollution. I support a plan that puts in the most extensive LRT and reduces bus coverage and the building of new roads for cars or buses.
- The train should not go along Carling it should be on the NCC property near the river. If access to the parkway pathways is a problem then make some pedestrian over/under passes. The western parkway has lots of cleared space for an express train that will serve customers going to the bridge, Woodroffe, Pinecrest, Britannia, Bayshore mall, and beyond. Carling is already congested and the businesses are designed for the current methods of travel (bus and car) no such access/business history is found on the western parkway.
- There is no need for a tunnel. East west routes should be on the Queensway/417/174
- we can not rely on petroleum based transportation until 2031! This is fantasy.

### Focus Groups ~ Comments

- I completely disagree if access to the parkway/river is lost to pedestrians/cyclists.

## General Comments

### Advisory Committee Discussion Group ~ Comments

- It was noted that more care should be taken to address pedestrian infrastructure, particularly issues for disabled pedestrians, over and above what is provincially mandated.
- Transit should be designed with accessibility features. The proposed Carling streetcars should be wheelchair accessible.

### Stakeholder Focus Groups ~ Comments

- There was a general agreement on the proposed supplementary networks.
- Add bike paths to them all.
- Ensure there is secure bike parking.
- Make sure there are sufficient park and rides, also near downtown stations.
- Allow bikes on the train.
- There was a positive reaction to the proposed developments on Carling.
- Is a streetcar necessary for Carling? Who does this serve better—tourists or residents? Carling would need to be more pedestrian friendly, for a streetcar to be useful. The idea is nice, and romantic, but is it practical?
- Buses might be a good alternative to the Carling Streetcar. Easier to maintain just buses/light-rail, instead of a third type of transportation.
- Would the Carling Streetcar be adding another system within transit? Or is the technology similar enough to light-rail?
- Carling line should be studied as a Rapid Transit Corridor. How Fast/Slow given signal



priority?

- Baseline is a good choice to avoid the core.
- Hunt Club Transit Priority good.

### **Open House Discussion Group ~ Comments**

- Some stops removed. Too few stations. More stations needed on the surface.
- Study the Carling issue more, re: streetcar. Run it in the middle, down the boulevard.
- Will the new transit system reduce service for people in Kanata and Barrhaven?
- Buses should remain an integral part of the transit system.
- Running the trains every couple of minutes, will ensure that there is an alternative for people who miss their buses. They won't have to worry about being too delayed.
- It won't be rapid transit if there are a lot of stops.
- Use the Richmond/Byron corridor.
- Carling makes sense if it was underground. Streetcars would be too similar to buses and a tunnel is too expensive.
- Going downtown on LRT will still be faster than any Bypass supplementary network such as Carling.
- Would support a dedicated rail on Carling if it replaced buses. (Somewhat agree: 3, Agree: 1, Fully agree: 2)
- Carling Avenue and Woodroffe: Will there be enough room for pedestrians?
- Will condos on Carling be too close to transit?
- How much distance between stops on Carling near Seniors' condos.
- Will property values go down on Carling avenue?
- Are streetcars cleaner environmentally?
- Have non-peak hours transit options been sufficiently addressed?
- There is too much fixation on the downtown core and tunnel.
- Would removing more buses (and replacing with light rail?) be more cost-effective?
- Should look into running (LRT/Buses?) to Bayview, then into Carling.
- Local bus networks need improvement.
- At Carling Avenue, keep to 2 lanes but fix the bridge.
- Why is the Byron corridor not being used?
- Carling: What type of ridership is there?
- Use the VIA rail and O-Train corridors instead of building new track.
- Proposed route for Kanata North: Between March and existing buildings there might not be enough room.
- Will there be short-turning trains?
- Why is the Byron Corridor not being used?
- Will the bus size fleet stay the same in 2031? The frequencies would be reduced.
- Why aren't the buses enough on Carling?
- Old street cars run on Byron Avenue would be better.
- Carling is a good back-up if the Queensway is backed up.
- Are the streetcars noisy?
- Carling should be left alone for roadway widening, because there will be increased traffic





later on.

- Don't take the buses off Carling, but no fast routes/express.

## Don't Know

### Comments Sent Directly to City: Online, By Hand/Email/Mail/Fax

- Value for money hasn't been demonstrated for this proposal.
- can't find info on exhibit 9
- I am not intimately familiar with the project.
- I am not sure I fully understand all of the benefits
- i do not understand the concepts and differences between purple and blue lines. if you tell me that living on kanata drive and walden i can get downtown in less than 40 minutes i will be happy.
- I dont know what is proposed, but it seems blindingly obvious that an underground train service should be installed along Carling Avenue and along Montreal Road.
- I need more information about this before I give an opinion
- Information is somewhat short and difficult to grasp in terms of significance.
- looks far too complicated.
- PDF map is too small to read.
- Sorry, don't really understand it.
- The attached graphical map of the city was impossible to read. The bullet details did not provide any context so it was impossible to understand what supplementary elements are proposed.
- the more rail, the better...also should have low emission buses and look at routes to reduce left turns to reduce idling time among other measures (see studies performed by courier companies such as UPS, fedex, etc..)
- Too many choices to adequately comment on without considerable study.
- Your network map does not show any current street names.

### Public Open Houses ~ Comments Sheets

- Need to move people from outside areas into the core quickly.
- Not enough details available
- The plan was quite vague. My only comment is regarding Carling and similar corridors. While I would like to see more LRT or other transit, I would hope that car lanes are sacrificed rather than greenspace. Try to remember the aesthetic appeal of the street. The old street-car right-of-Way in Winnipeg on Broadway street is a good example of urban beautification along a car and transit intensive row: Check the history books.

### Stakeholder Focus Groups ~ Comments

- Don't have enough information yet to decide.



## Appendix 'D' - Comments on Proposed Policy Directions: All Sources

NOTE: The following tables contain a compilation of all public and stakeholder comments related to proposed Policy Directions, as recorded in the submitted Comment Sheets, or by the Consultation Team during the Stakeholder Focus Groups, Advisory Committee Discussion Group session, and the various public Discussion Groups. Comments are presented below 'as heard' or 'as submitted' and have not been edited.

### Comments Sent Directly to City: Online, By Hand/Email/Mail/Fax

- I don't like the plan to please the car drivers by building more or bigger park and rides near the bus terminals. The city should allow for buses outside of Ottawa to bring in people to our own transit system: In other words, private owners of buses. This way, we don't lose more green space. The existing park and ride locations should increase the cost of parking a vehicle there so that space is not a problem and more money is generated for repair.
- Please include more dedicated cycling lanes for commuters who cycle to work. Install no 'U-turn' signs throughout the city on busy roads (eg Innes) anywhere where there isn't a dedicated left-turn lane.
- Bike path should be built along ALL transitway routes. LRT should be restricted to within the greenbelt unless suburban communities agree to higher density. Regional rail like GO transit should be studied as an alternative to LRT extensions outside the greenbelt. City should implement policies requiring higher parking densities in the centre: More underground and multi-level parking.
- Need for safe cycle lock-up at transit stations. Improve cycle routes and the number of them. . Pedestrian corridors need better lighting. All rapid transit areas should have a parallel cycling/walking route and all stops and stations require good sidewalk access all year round. Improve winter maintainence.
- I am car dependent and have a disability pass. I also have a para-transpo number but I have not used this service. Please ensure that metered parking is available for those who have difficulty walking short distances.
- Pedestrian environment downtown is currently abysmal. Sidewalks broken, too narrow. In most cases, no more than 2 people can walk side-by-side. Where sidewalks are wider, they are cluttered with parking meters, newspaper boxes, A-frame advertising and just recently on Queen street I noticed new galvanise bike racks blocking half of the sidewalk. The new side-walk design featuring steel auto ramps are not an improvement in my opinion. (In the Glebe, eg. Patterson) Only one person can walk continuously. I have to walk in the street for the ramp is too steep to walk across the slope.
- rapid expansion of cycling bike lanes on roads over 60 km/hr - add park and ride at Fernbank and Transit Way when extended.
- A common activity in Calgary which has a great LRT system is to provide large park-n-rides at most stations and 'kiss'-n-ride drop-off points. We used these many times when visiting the in-laws in Calgary.
- A ring road in to divert commercial traffic from Downtown areas in Ottawa is simply the



most ESSENTIAL item to be dealt with.

- A u-pass should be implemented into all post-secondary institutions in order to increase transit ridership. This would be an easy and economical program to run.
- agree with policy directions for more cycling/walking paths-pedestrian friendly
- All great and necessary part of broad approach to solving transportation needs of the city. I am particularly interested in having using more technology (TSM) to squeeze more out of the existing infrastructure.
- All this area is very fragile: walking, cycling, transportation demand management, transportation system management, and parking as for the capital of so big country as is Canada and need to be improved as soon as possible.
- Any new rapid transit plan should include cycling alongside the LRT lines or busways. In Orleans, there should be a new parking lot along the Innes corridor. New walking paths should be included with cycling.
- Any new transport plan should encourage the use of cycling during the appropriate months.
- Both walking and cycling are beneficial to the health of the city's citizens and need to be made priorities. In particular, heavy traffic has to be taken out of the city, especially out of established residential areas, in order to promote both walking and cycling. Building a ring road (by-pass) to route through traffic around the city would be one way to do this.
- By far not enough focus on facilitating walking, cycling and transit options.
- Cars could be disposable, somewhat like Virtu-Car car clubs, or the communal bike system just set up in Montreal. Access to cars should be fairly easy, but forget about owning them. Car-share should be simple and give a different kind of status to its users. Bikes are the most efficient of course, but there is a lot of winter in Ottawa. Cabs could be given exemptions; cab-riders also. A car sharing network could be set up via the internet for different neighbourhoods. People could post how many spaces available in their cars when they are going downtown.
- Consider bridge tolls for trucks. Consider East/West first, then links to other areas, via ring road. Bridge in the east must be linked to the ring road and away from the core.
- Cycling- not sure what Smart Bike program is. Perhaps we need to take a look at what Paris is doing with regard to bike availability in the core and the idea of registering to use the bikes and drop them off at identified locations. If it is working in Paris why can't we look at a similar project in Ottawa. Of course, time of year would have some bearing in Ottawa (i.e. winter months not available). Walking- sounds like a good start.
- Cycling: Find and eliminate bike lane and path "dead-ends", there are many of them on city approved bicycle routes. Consider the placement of concrete barriers between bicycle lanes and traffic in high traffic areas. Walking and cycling: More red light cameras but trained on catching not only red light violations but near misses of pedestrians and cyclists. Photo-radar should be fully integrated with the red light cameras - speeding is a big problem that is largely unchecked and leads to fatalities - the police can't be everywhere with radar guns. TDM & TSM: Emphasis must be on reducing the number of single occupant vehicles first and then on reducing or eliminating the use of private automobiles in the city core entirely.
- Cycling: I think Safety should be improved. From where I live, how about a ped/cycling bridge from Srathcona park and Riverain park (there used to be a bridge there). Also, put cycling paths through residential areas away from busy roads. Example: Carson village through la Cité Collégiale, via Vanier to the bike path - as opposed to Ogilvie drive.



- Don't know all the policies relating to the above, but would like to see a rationalization of all neighborhood bus service since in my opinion they are over serviced. savings could be applied to express service
- First priority is to get cyclists off the sidewalks. This summer I was hit 3 times by cyclists and once by a car. All four times I was on the side walk and not in an intersection. They were coming in and out of strip malls or cutting accross the sidewalk to avoid being in the traffic with the cars.
- Fully agree. The parking policy could be even stronger in order to influence behaviour.
- Fully support parking strategy associated with intensification.
- Given the extensive bicycle path network in the city, we should look to some of the bike-rental initiatives being touted in other cities (most recently, Bixi in Montreal).
- How about a traffic-free downtown? It's great in places like Bergen and Copenhagen. It was a pleasure being a pedestrian tourist in central London a couple of years ago. You make adequate provision for people to (a) park and (b) get into the central area by free public shuttles (or on foot or by bike), and the whining will soon subside. Parking rates should be on a three-level "per person" scale, with the highest rate for cars with one person, a reasonable normal rate for two per car, and free for more than two.
- How about opening daycares along major transit routes for parents who ride the bus or carpool? Most people cannot carpool or ride the bus for this very reason. Daycares are not strategically placed in easily accessible areas for parents who want the choice to ride the bus.
- I am very keen of improved walking and cycling. For walking the focus should be improved sidewalks and more of them. For cycling, we need more places to attach bikes (see downtown Toronto, for example, every street has lots of bike posts), analysis of bike impediments and elimination of such (for example, when you bike along Colonel By bikeway and want to get onto Bank at the evening rush hour, there is no safe way to do so)and lots of bike lanes.
- I believe there should be better bicycle routes linking the existing paths. An effort should be made to separate pedestrians, cyclists and cars as they do in Copenhagen.
- I cycle to Kanata from Downtown for work so I am a strong proponent of bicycle paths. I avoid roads, they are just too dangerous and all you need is an idiot or someone to loose driving attention for a split second. Please build more bicycle paths and faster. However, I recognize that in winter cycling is not practical. I think we need to also find a social solution to the traffic problem. It is utterly stupid teh amount of time we spend in traffic jams (I see the QEW every morning with people driving downtown). Do we really need all to start at the same time? Do all need to go downtown? It is insane! I think that Quebec should take more responsibility for some of the traffic problems in Ottawa. For instance they should have a number of parking lots and buses that take people downtown. Maybe an LRT also. If we solve the problems here all we get is more housing construction in Aylmer and East of Gatineau (land is cheap there). The problem cannot be solved by more roads
- I don't know enough of each scenario to comment, however, I want to let my views be known that we have to support whichever plan makes the wisest decisions in terms of offering varied and user-friendly options for walking and cycling and clean mass transit.
- I feel that any transportation master plan is incomplete without a program to bring us in line with other major cities across North America - a U-Pass. Bringing postsecondary students



onto the bus system in greater numbers will create a culture of ridership that will benefit us in the decades to come.

- I find the cycling policy a good direction but too many uses of soft words. I would like to it firmed up a little. I see the use of the term "cycling routes", but I would prefer see the use of the term "dedicated cycling routes". I often don't feel safe on the roads, as bike lanes are often shared with parked cars, sewer grates and debris, and are not consistently identified. Also, I may have missed it, but winter bike use is, in my opinion, dangerous on the road. I wondered if the bike paths were seriously considered for winter use by bikes. I do, however, understand the challenges. The Transportation Demand Management (TDM) proposes a developers TDM Toolkit. This is good, but it would be nice if the TDM plan would specifically mention better urban development practices. I am referring to addressing urban sprawl with specific and explicit requirements to force the minimization of motor vehicle dependence.
- I like the cycling ideas.
- I realize that after the last winter, we have encountered serious shortfalls in revenue. However, attacking sustainable initiatives such as public transportation (by way of scheduled fare increases) is a troubling fund-raising strategy. Similarly, the parking increases and hours-of-parking adjustments may have serious impacts on the financial viability of residents and businesses.
- I support any plan that would discourage the use of cars, especially in the downtown area.
- I suspect that the north/south version is being driven by developers or some group that has a special interest in having the north/south line implemented. It may be less expensive but it will prove to be useless.
- I think that the plan is going in the proper direction..for example involvement of the employers, improvment to cicling path network,
- i think there should be more money put towards walking and biking infrastructure. City planners need to create more funtional neiborhoods that it is safe to access using a bike. Too many commercial properties now are nightmares for a bike (4 to 6 lane roads, giant parking lots)
- I would recommend more bike-capable buses throughout the entire city.
- If you make it rapid, comfortable, reliable and frequent people will use it. Unreliable infrequent bus service made me buy a car.
- In general all the proposals seem reasonable and should be implemented where practicable. One item: sidewalks, for easy and safe walking should be a priority as we have a good proportion of older folks that need to walk and need easily negotiated surfaces which will allow safe operation of assist "tools", like walkers. Ottawa has a lot of second rate sidewalks that are either poor in surface condition, are too narrow, or do not provide sufficient grade separation from adjacent roadways (a safety hazard as motor vehicles can more easily mount the walk).
- In many countries across the world. Trucks are not allowed in the city until 8PM in the evening. This needs to be looked at seriously.
- It is imperative that the City of Ottawa include an Ottawa By-Pass (Ring Road)in the Transportation Master Plan proposals.
- It seems all of the bus and car transportation routes have already been agreed upon and are in progress. The walking and cycling plans "could include" a certain number of things that



are supposed to have already been started and are supposed to be finished by 2009. Going through the city I see plenty of lanes being widened and parking lots being paved but no such improvements for people trying to improve the quality of environment.

- It's good
- I've probably missed it, but does this version of a TMP give priority FIRST to walking, SECOND to cycling, THIRD to Transit and definitely LAST to other vehicles? Certainly from the abundance of road projects, it seems to cater to the reverse order (which is what happened with the old TMP despite the 'green' modes of transportation having been given priority in theory - actual practice was a different matter.) I'd like to see Ottawa actually cater first and foremost to the green modes of transportation, at the very least make an honest attempt to.
- Let's start by being sensible in our mandates for committees. We should encourage people to use mass transit, off the roads, in as green a mode of transportation is available. As the national capital, we should be the cutting edge and the envy of other cities and capitals around the world. So far, I have only seen evidence of backwards thinking.
- Love the bike/walking paths available in Ottawa. We live in Kanata and my 8 year old son and I easily cycled down to Parliament Hill this summer along the Western parkway. However, once one reaches the locks by the Chateau Laurier it is very difficult to get to the canal or more importantly the bike paths along the Eastern Parkway. Connecting bike paths West to East should be a priority for residents and tourists that want to visit museum/Parliament via bicycle (War, Gallery, Mint, and Aircraft
- Make more bike 'transit' pathways
- Many gaps exist between sections of bike lanes often forcing bikers to compete for road space with cars. When I bike to work I get honked at for being legally to the side of my lane about once a week.
- More effort to encourage local businesses to promote public transit to their employees. Outside the Federal Public Service, not enough people are using public transit to travel to and from work. This is quite true of the company I work for.
- More pedestrian, bicycle-friendly networks.
- Move transit traffic UNDERGROUND!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
- Must match the transportation elements with Planning and development plans. Eg. No point in having a walking or cycling policy if the commercial development is focused on having a car to get to; a strong public transit system matched with walking, cycling AND development.
- Need more specifics in cycling plan (I found it very vague on this) for dedicated bike corridors from east of City to downtown. Beechwood for example has a bike lane that simply disappears at the west end of the cemetery - what is the point of marking a lane which simply disappears into nowhere? Budget should be found for roadworks, as they occur, to incorporate a bike commuter network that is as extensive as any rapid transit system. Bikers are tax payers as well and place a much more modest load on roads in terms of maintenance etc!!! We should be encouraging cycling not discouraging it, with these "bike lanes to nowhere"! I know many people who refuse to cycle commute due to perceived danger of cycling in traffic. More dedicated bike commuter lanes would take many many cars off the road. Thank you.
- See nothing for walking, almost nothing for cycling. Traffic light cycles are already to slow



to change leading to frustrated pedestrians and motorists

- Seem generally sensible but stress on 'intensification' exaggerated
- seems to be in good order, except for lacking a strategy to allow freeway truck and vehicle traffic to bypass us via a Ring Road
- Sounds good, I have nothing to add.
- Speaking of walking, cycling and transportation management immediately bring to mind the disastrous contemplation of a Kettle Island bridge. Why would ESTABLISHED neighbourhoods not matter? We are the voters, we are the taxpayers, we are the Citizens. Walking and cycling will definitely be out of the question along the Aviation Parkway if it is allowed to go from NO COMMERCIAL TRAFFIC to a 4/6-lane, 18 wheeler roadway. Why damage the greenspace, wildlife, lifestyle and take away walking and cycling routes currently being used all day, every day of the week. Why lose tourist attractions like the RCMP Stables, the NEW Aviation Museum, the historical Rockliffe Airport?? It's time to speak with and pay attention to the voters. This is our City.
- System management - needs an overhaul. There are too many bus routes in the city. For instance, why are there 5 bus routes going down Holland at one point? The complexity of the different routes "feed on each other" and are hard to administer. For instance, there are 91 bus routes through the Hurdman Station.
- The 174 and Innes Road are packed full of cars. The LRT to Blair does not solve this problem. It seems like a completion of the ring road idea would help this problem. Orleans was allowed to be poorly designed and grows more to this day. It affects the people who live on the East side of Ottawa. You must continue with the ring road.
- The City must start now to plan for the long term health and happiness of the citizens. More walking, more cycling, more transit and fewer automobiles. We must keep the air clean and the streets friendly (cars kill people and cyclists).
- The cycling plan is very weak. It doesn't appropriately deal with increasing the number of people who could commute to work on bikes. I would like to see statements that any road improvement/widening will automatically consider adding usable bike lanes. For e.g. why are there no bike lanes on eagleson? That's a north-south corridor into the hi-tech area. The areas where there are bike lanes there are drain grates which are extremely unsafe. Also, Downtown core cycling routes need to be improved. There is no effective way to get from the Museum of Civilization up to offices in the downtown core. It's very dangerous.
- The plan needs to place high priority on preserving greenspace and community access to and enjoyment of this greenspace - particularly within the city core.
- There needs to be a serious commitment to pedestrian and cycling access within the city. The city is meant for people, cars are secondary.
- Upgrading current cycling paths, addition of bike "parking" areas (especially secure ones downtown), bike rentals etc should all help towards getting more people to bike. Having cycling routes along transit routes is also a great idea.
- Walking ' while the basic infrastructure for a walkable city is much needed, especially in the suburbs, pedestrian safety through increased law enforcement is essential. As a pedestrian commuter, I have 2-3 "near misses" per day from vehicles (including a few OC Transpo and STO busses!) that cut off pedestrians at crosswalks, run red lights, and peel out of parking lots. Protecting the most vulnerable and environmentally-friendly commuters



should be the City of Ottawa's top policing priority when it comes to transportationâ€™ not the revenue-generating easy-pickings of catching cars making illegal but harmless moves (like ignoring "no right turn signs, rolling slowly through stops on quiet streets). Rather, they should be on guard against the worst offending intersections, where drivers ignore any right-of-way pedestrians legally have, and even honk and swear at them for daring to cross on their own damn light! This situation must change if we are going to take seriously any City plan to encourage walking as the best option for short-haul urban commutes.

- Walking and cycling is not an option for those that live in Kanata. Given how crowded my bus currently is (66), encouraging more people to take the bus is not a solution unless more buses are added to the schedule. My personal preference given my geography is an express bus that stops within walking distance of both home and work (downtown). It means I can avoid taking my car out for the day (including struggling to find a parking spot at the Park & Ride and worrying about scraping / snow removal / getting the car started in the winter). Where the system currently provides a bit of failure is that the city seems unwilling to put up new bus shelters, and there are not enough buses on the route (buses overcrowded).
- Walking and cycling need more encouragement, safer and more numerous pathways. Parking should encourage electric vehicles.
- Walking is the most damaging form of transportation. The fuel needed to allow people to walk has to be grown on land where trees are cut down. It has to be transported, stored, consumed, and removed at horrendous expense. Walking should be encouraged as a means of exercise and enjoyment, but not as a means of transportation. Similarly, bicycles are almost as bad as walking. Their use should be encouraged as entertainment, but not as transport. Cars are the least damaging transport means that we have. So anything built as new transit services should be faster, safer, quieter, prettier, and cleaner than cars. Electric powered vehicles on rails in underground tunnels are a good start.
- We need to dramatically increase the SAFE walking and biking opportunities in the city. These plans are excellent but can go further to make these real alternatives to driving the car. Also, taxis should be allowed to use rapid transit lanes and transitway to encourage people to leave their cars at home, even when they are in a hurry. We need to STOP building new roads or widening existing roads completely. This needs to stop now, until all new public transit, taxi, walking and biking alternatives are in place. This moratorium is needed to allow officials to assess how much traffic can be diverted from existing roads before determining if any new or widened ones are needed. This is pure common sense. All transportation investment should go into public transit and alternatives to rebalance years of inadequate investment. The environment is the critical factor to take into consideration but people's health will also benefit from developing the alternatives.
- we should not have to pay for parking anywhere in the city, transit costs are too high (\$202 for two adult express passes), we need a cycling route from kanata to downtown.
- We will need more walking and cycling paths, as well as expanding parking spaces particularly at park-and-ride.
- Cars very important, used mostly when not going to work.





## Public Open Houses ~ Comments Sheets

- Greatly in favour: We need more paths, safe cycling lanes, more closures of intersections to motorists with community agreement. We need a city-wide alternative. Biking/Walking network with no stop-signs.
- I have a problem with this: Cyclists aren't choosing the bikeways as it is. I'm constantly passing bikes when a bikepath is 30ft away. I wouldn't waste money on this, as what we have is sufficient. Downtown, especially the Market area should be more pedestrian friendly. Pedestrians should have right of way in the Market. There should be more/cheaper parking. (especially cheaper).
- I would add biking paths/walkways to the hydro corridors. Interconnect Stittsville, Fernbank, CDP, Kanata South and West. Hydro corridors are safe for kids away from traffic.
- It's good we're doing something on these fronts
- More emphasis re:pedestrians and cycling
- More money should be put towards cycling infrastructure . Pathways should be PLOWED.
- Once again, nothing for Rural South cyclists. I have personally been involved in the Metcalfe/Greely Pathways for over 8 years with zero headway. Parkway road is currently being accommodated with watermain to Embrun: Perfect for off-road pathway.
- Not bad
- Pedestrian plan: Create pedestrian only zones in the downtown. Invest in a proper pedestrian mall on Sparks street. Needs more bars, restaurants, book and coffee shops. Solicit to business and invest more in that area. We do not need more souvenir shops or clothing stores in the mall. Attract higher quality restaurants, visit Burlington/Vermont to see an actual functioning pedestrian mall. Make the Market area a car free zone! Create dedicated bike paths with concrete barriers so that cars cannot pull over on to them. (Particularly on major roads like King Edward. See Montreal for the types of Barricades)
- Positive.
- References to walking and cycling facilities are extremely weak. There is nothing in this plan that illustrates a vision for how the downtown core will become more walkable and cycleable. I'd like to see 1)priority pedestrian spaces: Areas like the Byward Market should have less traffic from vehicles and be more pedestrian friendly. 2) A comprehensive and definitive plan for cycling in the downtown core and an action plan. It is almost pointless to continue to have superior bike lanes heading into the city when the downtown core is relatively hostile to cyclists. e.g It is uncomfortable to cycle from Centretown to Lowertown. Like the need for a 2-transit tunnel to ease LRT/bus movement through the core. There needs to be a serious investment in downtown cycling facilities.
- The cycling plan needs revisiting to ensure there are no 'dead ends' where obvious connections are missing.
- The walking plans are a good start. Will you consider how long pedestrians have to wait at downtown crossings after pressing the signal button? Will the lack of crosswalks in cases where vehicles have been given priority (e.g. Rideau/Waller) be looked at? Cycling looks good, except has adding lanes to dangerous corridors (such as King Edward Ave.) been considered? The TMP seems like it may be severely lacking: The London congestion system is just one idea to incorporate. On Parking, you need to do something about the



massive parking lots allowed in the suburbs: This is terrible urban planning.

- The words are nice, want to see the results. Re: parking, the words about it's benefits sound good. But it means non-core councillors must stop thinking of it as a cash-cow. (Just not in my ward)
- This section seems a little fluffy-Not that it isn't important. A properly integrated bike-pedestrian pathway is essential for a modern city. I'd like to see dedicated bike lanes separated by a barrier so cyclists feel safe. People will commute if they feel safe..
- Walking access to Rapid transit is very important. Cycling should be integrated with transit better. Cycling trails should follow rapid transit lines. Secure lock-ups should be available at major Rapid transit transfer stations. We need segregated bike routes on certain streets in Centretown like what has been implemented in downtown Montreal. A little curbside space is not enough and does not provide a safe environment for cycling,
- We need more emphasis on rebuilding the infrastructure we already own for cycling paths. Lines for bike lanes but no need to woden right-of way. Cars will just have a narrower passage. Safety increases for cyclists, cars and pedestrians sincer cars travel slower on a narrower ROW and lines give impression of this, while providing a safer environment for cycling. All cars speed: Why? Because roads are too wide and there is no photo radar: This affects mortality on our roads.
- Walking and cycling are mostly recreational activities and don't need city promotion. Bike parking should be handled by vehicle parking lot owners, if there is a need. I support an intelligent 5 YR transportation strategy. The municipal parking management strategy is very vague and needs clarification. Support for alternative modes of transport should not burden taxpayers financially.
- Need to integrate cycling and pedestrian plans with transit and roadway plans. Will need to deal with scooters and motorised bicycles. Need to collaborate with the NCC.
- More emphasis on cycling routes. Separate lanes: Don't abandon lanes in middle of route.
- I walk a lot and support increased examination of pedestrian facilities: Like the Somerset Bridge. Winter maintenance and missing links are important.
- I am relatively neutral regarding these proposals
- Cycle through the greenbelt instead of the passage on the airport Parkways.
- Walking/Cycling to be encouraged
- Regarding cycling, there should be bus lanes also at intersections. Now they don't have and cars often disregard cyclists, putting them in danger.
- Need to review on basis of alternative scenarios
- More trails, create trails to take the load off transit. Build it and users will come.
- Must expect much higher transit use.
- It's good we're doing something on these fronts
- Like TMP proposal. In order to succeed, must involve all employers but also need to provide incentives to get people to change minds/attitudes about commuting and public transit. Discounts/value added services from communities and cities could help induce riders. Students need to be targetted.
- More bias to pedestrians and improve accessibility
- Trains on Parkway have major impacts on recreation/health/walking
- The sooner the buses are removed from the Parkway, the cleaner the air would be while



cycling along one of the 2 bike paths. If light rail will never be built on the Parkway then a feeding route could be built for buses from Lincoln Fields to Richmond Road and from Dominion Station to Richmond Road West of Westboro community.

- Park and Ride is a key issue. Can't really see it as a problem though.
- I would be more interested to see urban raised pedestrian ways and greenspace added to the downtown core.
- I would like to see paths be connected. More awareness programs that we as cyclists are entitled to the whole lane. Bike lanes are difficult to ride in when there are potholes. I would like to see more continuity with paths. They seem to end with no direction to the next path.
- Greenspace must be maintained
- Cycling to be accelerated versus current pace to follow the will of council i.e completion within 5 years (approved) of the 10 year old proposal.
- Emissions and adverse health effects are erroneously not included. Bike paths are erroneously placed besides toxic roads and bus routes.
- Get cars out of downtown

#### **Advisory Committee Discussion Group ~ Comments**

- The definition of 'smart growth' was discussed and generally accepted as a concept for compact sustainable growth.
- To have people living, working, and shopping all in the same areas to limit travel was expressed as an ideal.
- Transportation infrastructure should ultimately be convenient and accessible for all people and that it should not fragment communities and destroy habitats.
- A discussion about what transit scenario facilitates intensification the most ensued — no clear consensus was reached. It was mentioned that bits and pieces of the different scenarios may be combined.

#### **Stakeholder Focus Groups ~ Comments**

- LRT gets people off buses, but not necessarily cars.
- Gains in ridership will mainly be realised if car users switch. Not necessarily pedestrians/bikers.
- It is important to take lifestyle considerations into question, when projecting ridership: Not all projected persons will actually take transit. It is important to forecast WHO actually would, by considering their values.
- Ensure there are travel-time savings for users to be induced. (Timed against car commuter travel)
- Promote de-incentives to car-use e.g. Limited parking in Downtown (Test project underway in Montreal)
- Remember what the impact of increased parking-fees could do to retailers.
- The economic growth in the West could also mean that Western residents live close to work, and therefore would utilise transit/the LRT less.
- Commencing construction in the East gives the city more time to negotiate with the NCC,



(for the parkway) and can also help facilitate finding a new option.

- Cycling vs. Road funding: Too little is spent on developing cycling paths overall, but the rural aspect is not factored into the bike pathways. As it stands, there are no physical inducements for people to use bikes for commuting in rural areas. (No special pathways away from major roadways/traffic) Spending should be done to develop this, so not just urbanites have this option. Approve a budget and be committed to the ideal.
- I don't see a ton of cycling and walking paths as a good policy direction.
- Walking/Cycling/miscellaneous pathways are NOT supported in the rural areas and specifically within the villages. Do not use street parking as a cash-grab. Controlled parking only. No tax levy for Park and Rides.
- These issues were not addressed and it was the main reason I attended this session.

### **Discussion Groups ~ Comments**

- Cycling/walking should be paid more attention to. Rapid transit corridor should have room for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Cycle lock-up in every transit station
- Cycling paths throughout the city: Good but too much focus on cars. The paths make it longer (distance) to get somewhere as priority is always given to cars/roads.
- New LRT cars need to accommodate bikes on them. (Rack etc)
- Bike exchanges, such as in Paris, Amsterdam. Free service required.
- Police need to crack down on cars that don't give right-of-way to pedestrians.
- Enforcement and awareness of pedestrian rights.
- Gap: Lincoln Fields: 1) No way to cross to apartments. Need crosswalk. 2) Downtown by Good Companion Station. Sidewalk ends, Nowhere to go. (Near Bronson)
- How will Paratranspo fit into the scenarios?
- If 2 billion dollars is to be spent on roads, this should be offset by subsidized transit, more park and rides and extending cycling paths further out. In essence, transit/biking should be made more attractive.
- Accommodate cyclists and pedestrians along roadways.
- Better to plan in small phases and look at specific areas.
- Cycling/walking: Need more information.



**Central Public Open House –Thursday September 11, 2008  
Location: Ottawa City Hall**

**Table 1:**

<b>Facilitator</b>	<b>Scribe</b>
Peter Steacy, (McCormick Rankin)	Cathie Lytle (Delcan)

Number of persons: 8

**Evaluation Criteria**

- 1) Ridership
- 2) Ease of implementation
- 3) Cost effectiveness

**Implementation Scenario**

Scenario 3 emerged as the preferred implementation plan.

**Comments**

- The different scenarios don't involve significant monetary changes. What's needed is ridership (to make transit worthwhile) and quick implementation, to get the project off the ground. The East and West need to be serviced more, because of the high concentration of ridership needs. Frequency of service should also be a key factor in determining which plan should be implemented.
- The tunnel is not a priority.
- Previously, they were told that no changes were needed to the transitway. There is a level of objection to the Council approved plan.
- Some stops removed. Too few stations. More stations needed on the surface.
- The roads are being developed beyond the planning horizon.
- AV corridor is objected to.
- Hunt club congestion is an issue.
- Bridges should be built over both rivers for cars/pedestrians.
- Cycling/walking should be paid more attention to. Rapid transit corridor should have room for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Cycle lock-up in every transit station.



## Questions

- Does 2031 reflect the highest future growth potential?

## **Table 2:**

<b>Facilitator</b>	<b>Scribe</b>
Colin Simpson (City of Ottawa)	Cori Lytle (Delcan)

## Evaluation Criteria

There were many linkages amongst the criteria. What emerged as the top criteria were:

- 1) Ridership (Induces cost effectiveness and smart growth)
- 2) Compact transit city (Provides benefits to the environment and customers)
- 3) Environmental benefits (Serves the East and West well)
- 4) Reduce downtown congestion (Creates ridership, which induces cost effectiveness)
- 5) Reduces West congestion (Guaranteeing ridership and benefits to customers)

## Implementation Scenario

Scenario 4 emerged as the favoured implementation plan.

## Comments

- Scenario 1 wasn't ambitious enough. The good thing about scenario 3 was that the South was served. Also, the traffic would be freed up on Bronson. However, there was no justification for going to Riverside South, although there are advantages to providing rail service to a growing area. St. Laurent is already industrial: No problem in getting approval. #4 was chosen because it was the best environmentally, it relieved the downtown congestion and it could be implemented quickly. However, tweaking is needed re the Cumberland transitway or Western transitway.
- Break down scenario 4 into more phases.
- The Ottawa River Parkway issue needs to be resolved before DOTT.
- Study the Carling issue more, re: streetcar. Run it in the middle, down the boulevard.
- Buses should remain an integral part of the transit system.
- With ridership increases there will be frequency increases and vice-versa.
- Running the trains every couple of minutes, will ensure that there is an alternative for people who miss their buses. They won't have to worry about being too delayed.
- It won't be rapid transit if there are a lot of stops.
- Use the Richmond/Byron corridor.
- LRT should go across the Ottawa River.



### Questions

- Will the new transit system reduce service for people in Kanata and Barrhaven?
- In scenario 1, do the buses terminate at Tunney's Pasture? Will there be enough space? Are there too many riders?
- Do the buses terminate at Bayview?
- Will buses run at the same time as LRT? Yes, but minimally.
- With ridership increases there will be frequency increases and vice-versa.
- What kind of station spacing would there in scenario 3? Are there any new stations?
- In scenario 3, would cars stop/start or reach cruising speed?

**Table 3:**

<b>Facilitator</b>	<b>Scribe</b>
Ron Fournier (Delcan)	Greg Jodouin (PACE)

### Evaluation Criteria

Benefits to customers. (1,1,2,2,3)

Rationale: That's the whole point. People need to use it.

Reduce downtown congestion. (1,2,3)

Rationale: Will help the whole system and the environment.

Ease of implementation. (1,1,2, 3, 3)

Rationale: System must still be useable during construction. Can't shut down the city.

Cost effective. (2,2)

Rationale: Must be able to afford what we build. It's long-term.

Ridership. (3)

Comment: There are saturation points no matter what you build.

Compact transit city. (3,1)

Rationale: No to urban sprawl.

Benefit to environment. (4)

### Implementation scenario

Scenario 4 (Discussion/Rationale)

- City is pushing for Scenario 3 because some plans are done, but it's not the priority.
- Parkway issue needs to be dealt with.



- Doubles congestion reduction. (Versus option 3)
- East is biggest priority. Then West, then South.
- Scenario 4 has the most criteria achieved.
- Concerns: He wants action NOW.
- Option 3 is a developers' dream: Infiltration in the South. But, to fill in the transitway you need users first.
- Queensway is a nightmare now.
- Should try to intensify infiltration within the greenbelt. (Compact Transit City)
- Should have airport link now.
- Should have airport spur now.
- Not Parkway. Consider Byron. Push a solution on this.
- Doesn't make sense to end at Tunney's: Not a great transfer point.
- East/West is the priority. Do the whole system.

#### Scenario 3 (Discussion/Rationale):

- 2 is silly because it doesn't ensure the East gets service.
- There is good service going West now.
- Least problems going South. (Ease of implementation) More complicated starting with the West.
- Needs airport link.

#### **Changes for Roads**

- East: Walkley to 417. Good idea
- Centre: Getting on to Nicholas without using the Highway. From Main Street? From Alta Vista?
- Airport Parkway: Widening is in competition with Rail. Doesn't agree. Speaks to need to have airport spur now, regardless of implementation scenario.
- Park and Ride near airport.

#### **Agreement with supplementary Network**

- Carling makes sense if it was underground. Streetcars would be too similar to buses and a tunnel is too expensive.
- Going downtown on LRT will still be faster than any Bypass supplementary network such as Carling.
- Would support a dedicated rail on Carling if it replaced buses. (Somewhat agree: 3, Agree: 1, Fully agree: 2)

#### **Policy directions**

- Cycling paths throughout the city: Good but too much focus on cars. The paths make it longer (distance) to get somewhere as priority is always given to cars/roads.





- New LRT cars need to accommodate bikes on them. (Rack etc)
- Bike exchanges, such as in Paris, Amsterdam. Free service required.
- Police need to crack down on cars that don't give right-of-way to pedestrians.
- Enforcement and awareness of pedestrian rights.
- Gap: Lincoln Fields: 1) No way to cross to apartments. Need crosswalk. 2) Downtown by Good Companion Station. Sidewalk ends, Nowhere to go. (Near Bronson)

**Final Comments**

- In Washington D.C, smart cards changed based on zones. Encourages walking/biking/playing.
- Service airport, Landsdowne Park and major centres.
- Focus on Bank Street, Wellington and other downtown hubs.
- Don't end at Tunney's.
- Transitway solution needs to be addressed, or will grow into a big problem.
- South beyond airport: Rail is not necessary. Extending the O-Train to the airport is a simple solution.
- Extend the LRT to Gatineau in 3 steps: Place du Portage, Gatineau, one other stop.
- Start implementing the new plan as soon as possible.

**Table 4:**

<b>Facilitator</b>	<b>Scribe</b>
Stephen Boyle (City of Ottawa)	Cathy Burden (Delcan)

**Comments**

- Modify Hunt Club: Remove some traffic lights to improve traffic flow.
- Traffic circles or roundabouts: More in the city to improve intersection flow.
- Prioritise option 4: East/West to increase ridership. North-South has O-Train in place.
- Concern that concrete curbs that keep out traffic will be unpleasant to look at.
- Need easy/fast transportation to the airport. That way, they can leave their cars at home.
- No heavy trucks in the downtown core.
- If 2 billion dollars is to be spent on roads, this should be offset by subsidized transit, more park and rides and extending cycling paths further out. In essence, transit/biking should be made more attractive.
- Accommodate cyclists and pedestrians along roadways.
- Ottawa River Parkway: High speeds. Motorcyclists find it intimidating. OC transpo going over a 90KM passing. Traffic calming needed



### Questions

- Carling Avenue and Woodroffe: Will there be enough room for pedestrians?
- Will condos on Carling be too close to transit?
- How much distance between stops on Carling near Seniors' condos?
- How will Paratranspo fit into the scenarios?
- Will property values go down on Carling avenue?

**Table 5:**

<b>Facilitator</b>	<b>Scribe</b>
Ian Borsuk (McCormick Rankin)	Lorraine Harrilal (PACE)

### Comments

- Maps should show roads, transit, Park and Rides, Cycling and Pathways to understand how they relate to each other.
- O-Train or LRT should be used on VIA from Fallowfield.
- There are issues with using Scott street during T-way conversion. It is already congested. Safety issues for adjacent residential community.
- Byron corridor should be considered to evaluate its costs/benefits.
- Not enough information is provided to make a sound judgement.

### Questions

- Why does LRT go to Riverside when the O-Train extension does not?
- Was Bayview considered for a rail yard?
- Can buses transfer at Bayview/Lebreton instead of travelling through downtown?
- Can LRT be operated as a loop through Riverside South/Barrhaven?



**South Public Open House –Monday, September 15, 2008**  
**Location: Jim Durrell Recreation Centre**

**Table 1:**

<b>Facilitator</b>	<b>Scribe</b>
Colin Simpson (City of Ottawa)	Katie Pedlee (Delcan)

**Evaluation Criteria**

No clear results re: the importance of evaluation criteria.

**Implementation Scenario**

Three people chose Scenario 2 and two people scenario 4. Some were undecided.

**Comments**

- Better to plan in small phases and look at specific areas.
- Political risks should also be taken into consideration, and a political risk assessment done.
- Browning Road: People believe there are enough roads there to serve the neighbourhood. Rapid transit would not be beneficial for all.

**Questions**

- Are streetcars cleaner environmentally?
- What are the legal implications for development in the West, if they are serious about developing it?
- Risk: Could be linked to cost-effectiveness. What happens if assumptions fall through?

**Table 2:**

<b>Facilitator</b>	<b>Scribe</b>
Peter Steacy (McCormick Rankin)	Cathy Burden (Delcan)

**Comments**

- Controversy involved in different scenarios.
- Positive response for better access to the airport.
- NCC slow to decide on options presented to them.
- Cycling/walking: Need more information.



- Too much traffic at Nicholas/Laurier already.
- Too much traffic flow to Riverside/Hunt Club intersection if more traffic is put onto Limebank Road.
- New bridge will alleviate this problem.

**Questions**

- Why does the O-Train stop at Leitrim but the LRT does not?
- Why is the hospital included when the LRT goes East but not when it goes West?
- Will NCC agree with EA results?

**Table 3:**

<b>Facilitator</b>	<b>Scribe</b>
Stephen Boyle (City of Ottawa)	Cory Lytle (Delcan)

**Evaluation Criteria**

- 1) Cost effectiveness
- 2) Reduction in Downtown Congestion
- 3) Benefit to environment.

**Implementation Scenario**

Scenario 4 was the preferred implementation scenario.

**Comments**

- Reduce transit costs. (Drivers, making better use of buses)
- Replace existing transitways with light rail lines.
- Atlanta Georgia: No more money is to be spent on widening roads. All funds go to transit and maintenance of existing roads.
- Widening roads slows traffic down.



**East Public Open House – Tuesday, September 16, 2008**  
**Location: Bob MacQuarrie Recreation Centre**

**Table 1:**

<b>Facilitator</b>	<b>Scribe</b>
Peter Steacy (McCormick Rankin)	Cori Lytle (Delcan)

Number of persons: 6

**Evaluation Criteria**

Cost	1
Ridership	1, 1
Ease of implementation	1
Promoting smart growth	1

**Preferred Scenario**

*Scenario 4*

Scenario 4: 4 votes

Scenario 3: 2 votes

**Comments**

- Lay down all the tracks possible. (Start with the tunnel and core)
- The pricing is done in present day analysis. The price gap will continue to grow over the years.
- Cycling paths should be built along transit routes.
- Scenario 4 will generate more ridership than Scenario 3.
- The number of transfers might be problematic: People would prefer to drive as opposed to taking too many transfers.
- Some transit routes are too unreliable: People would prefer to drive.
- Provide high frequency, high value transit system, to get people out of cars.

**Questions**

- There are dual mode vehicles in Europe with diesel engines on top. (lower platform) Can this be implemented here?
- Would the use of the dual mode technology allow more network to be implemented earlier? Would it facilitate speedier construction of the light rail system?



- Will there be additional park and rides at the completion of phase 1?
- Will there be a car-pooling lane on the roadways?
- Would park and rides discourage ridership on local bus routes?
- Have non-peak hours transit options been sufficiently addressed?
- Has the growth of the East end beyond Jeanne d'Arc been factored in?

**Table 2:**

<b>Facilitator</b>	<b>Scribe</b>
Colin Simpson (City of Ottawa)	Katie Pedlee (Delcan)

Number of persons: 6

**Evaluation Criteria**

Benefits to Customers	2
Benefits to environment	2
Supports Compact City	2
Cost effectiveness	3
Reduce DT congestion (inc. Hurdman)	1
Ridership	1

**Preferred Scenario**

*Scenario 4*

Scenario 4: 4 votes

Scenario 3: 2 votes

**Comments**

- Quality of life issues, operating costs and demographics (growth areas and job locations) were factored into the evaluation criteria.
- All the evaluation criteria should always go back to the customers, since it is why the system is being built in the first place.
- Projections are necessary, but the current situation must also be paid attention to.
- There is too much fixation on the downtown core and tunnel.
- The O-Train should be extended to the airport, but not past it.
- Ridership should include truck congestion as well: Not just people.
- Should look into running (LRT/Buses?) to Bayview, then into Carling.
- Hurdman should be transformed from a single platform into a multilevel one. Too much congestion. (Bus route #34?)
- Remedy downtown bus congestion quickly.



- Review the LRT network in Calgary. It started off smaller, and ended up having a larger system. Edmonton ended up with a much shorter system.
- Steps should also be taken to increase local ridership.

**Questions**

- Is the future system being compared to what we have now? Or upgrades?
- Would removing more buses (and replacing with light rail?) be more cost-effective?
- Would it be beneficial to have several platforms for all bus stations?
- How small are the geographical areas that people are assigned to? How are they going to (maximize benefits?) to communities?
- There are some concerns regarding the future economic situation: If all the money goes into the first phase, option 1, there might not be enough for Orleans/Kanata. Would transit fares then be raised highly to compensate?

**West Public Open House – Thursday, September 18, 2008**  
**Location: Glenn Cairn Community Centre**

**Table 1:**

<b>Facilitator</b>	<b>Scribe</b>
Peter Steacy (McCormick Rankin)	Cathie Lytle (Delcan)

Number of persons: 5

**Criteria**

- 1) Ridership
- 2) Reducing congestion in the core

**Preferred Scenario**

2 persons preferred scenario 4  
 3 disagreed with all of the scenarios.  
 There was no preferred option.

**Comments**

- The Kanata Park and Ride is full all the time. The Terry Fox one is hard to get to and not being used.
- Local bus networks need improvement.
- Infrastructure is not being matched to development.



- Implement transit on existing arterial roads. (417, 416, Aviation Parkway and Vanier Parkway)
- In option 3, build the West before the South to facilitate E/W ridership. Stop delaying its building.
- In option 4, support work in the West. Without work on Terry Fox, there is no completion of the network.
- At Carling Avenue, keep to 2 lanes but fix the bridge.
- Express service from West to East: Baseline and Hurdman become hubs.
- A park and ride should be built at Fernbank at the end of Eden Line.

**Questions**

- Energy depletion down to 90% by 2021. (Based on a 2006 study done by the city): Why is this not being taken into consideration in this study?
- Hope Sideroad?

**Table 2:**

<b>Facilitator</b>	<b>Scribe</b>
David Hopper (McCormick Rankin)	Cori Lytle (Delcan)

Number of persons: 3

**Comments**

- March road is clogged in both directions.
- Centrum is the centre of Kanata: Not the town centre.
- The local bus system does not run frequently enough.
- Use dual track for Express trains with frequent crossovers.
- Jitney buses
- Need a fast route from Kanata to core, without many stops.
- Couple trains together to have more riders at once.
- Build dual track by using existing line and building beside it.
- Go to Bayshore before Baseline.
- Transit is not good to hospitals.
- Kanata and the West in general, pay too many taxes for the services offered.
- Don't build extra road lanes: Force ridership.
- Minimize the amount of transfers: 2 is too many for a long trip.
- Have a transit option from the West to bypass the core.
- The transit system is too infrequent after business hours.





### Questions

- What is the system going to look like in the longer term?
- All the developments are in the West: Why is there no rail being proposed? Existing rail-lines could be used.
- What about Kanata North?
- Kanata can widen lanes on highway, why not have justification for rail?
- What about pollution and noise? There are too many buses.
- What about diamond crossings?
- Can a passing siding be built, while building the new tracks?
- Why are there fancy stations?
- Why not build the LRT out to Bayshore?

## **South-West Public Open House – Monday, September 22, 2008 Location: Nepean Sportsplex**

**Table 1:**

<b>Facilitator</b>	<b>Scribe</b>
Rob Hunton (McCormick Rankin)	Lorraine Harrilal (PACE)

Number of persons: 7

### Comments

- In its TMP planning, the City is ignoring a CDN Medical Association report entitled ‘No Breathing Room.’ The city is currently the largest user of diesel because of OC Transpo. 2000 deaths a year are recorded from air-pollution related illnesses. The city might be in contravention of the ‘Duty of Care’ legislation.
- North/South buses only in downtown are a suggestion.
- Lighting on the rail system: Every 60 m.

### Questions

- There are attempts to reduce diesel pollution, with electric rail being pursued and the city researching using hybrid fuels. However, how effective will this be, if OC Transpo has already pre-bought 2006 buses, not equipped with emission-reducing technology?
- Perhaps the city should delay implementation until the health costs have been factored in.
- Are overhead wires dangerous? (On the rail system)
- Are overhead wires absolutely necessary? Why no sky-train like Vancouver?
- What would be the impact of ice-storms on the rail/electric rail system?
- Are the wires near routes for migratory birds?



- Why is the Byron corridor not being used?
- How are they preparing the corridors: Pumping/trenching?
- Timing concerns: How much faster is the rapid transit? (In minutes from destination A to destination B) A lot would depend on the number of stations in-between.
- Why is there no stop at Woodroffe? (No demand for it)
- How exactly will the tunnel alleviate the problem of too many buses in the downtown core?
- The tunnel should encourage buses to leave the downtown area as soon as possible. Furthermore, STO/local bus routes should not be congesting the core. Perhaps hubs at Lebreton and Hurdman can alleviate this?
- Is building the tunnel a priority?
- Are passengers allowed to walk from one end to the other of the new train? (On the LRT?)
- Is there a gap in the environmental assessments in the West End? Specifically Holly Acres and Moodie.
- Is there enough space for road widening etc east of Bayshore? (EA projections)
- How problematic is leaving the O-Train technology alone? (For the while at least)
- Is the transit system construction going to be in consonance with other city works? E.g. the sewage project? (Depends on the option)
- When can citizens expect work on the tunnel to be started?
- Where is the spoil from the tunnel going?
- How will the trucking during the construction period be managed? (To provide minimal discomfort to residents)
- Have the greenhouse gases emitted during the construction period been factored in? They should be.
- Is there a 3<sup>rd</sup> rail option?
- What are the distances between stations? How will security issues be addressed?

**Table 2:**

Facilitator	Scribe
Ian Borsuk (McCormick Rankin)	Cori Lytle (Delcan)

Number of people: 5

**Comments**

- Use the VIA rail and O-Train corridors instead of building new track.
- Proposed route for Kanata North: Between March and existing buildings there might not be enough room.
- (The time-savings component?) of the TMP proposes 2-3 minutes between trains, 5-6 minutes through the downtown core, the delays are shorter and the carrier vehicles bigger.
- Expand the Hurdman station.
- Extend to Montreal Road.
- Integrate the LRT with the STO buses.



- Double everything up, add signalization to increase capacity.

**Questions**

- Carling: What type of ridership is there?
- Is there a transfer penalty?
- Will there be short-turning trains?
- Would the frequency of buses increase to make-up for the lack of buses?
- Is the hospital link required now? Why not wait?
- How is downtown congestion in the core being fixed by the tunnel? The tunnel won't avoid traffic from the East/West/STO. It will be close to capacity when built.
- When will we know what will be hooked up to the tunnel?
- Why are we going South?
- Why does the South get LRT? Use the money to build East to West.
- Why are we catering to the developers? The South does not meet the criteria for LRT.
- Crossing over the Rideau River? How much is the cost? How long will the wait be? (4 years +) Will start as transit only.
- Why are we getting the old plan back? We're not looking at the whole city anymore and it's unfair/inappropriate.
- Will the bus size fleet stay the same in 2031? The frequencies would be reduced.
- Can we run buses in both directions? Through greenbelt during peak hours and reverse (during?) peak hours.
- Are there steps on the light rail? Level with the curb? Are people able to walk on to it with their bikes.
- Bike positions at peak hours?

**Table 3:**

<b>Facilitator</b>	<b>Scribe</b>
Colin Simpson (City of Ottawa)	Cathie Lytle (Delcan)

**Evaluation Criteria**

Reducing downtown Congestion	1,1,1,2
Ridership	2,3
Benefits to customers	1,2,3,3
Environment	1,1,2
Cost effectiveness	3

**Preferred Scenario**

Three people voted for scenario 3. One person voted for scenario 4.



**Comments**

- Hurdman and St. Laurent: Buses and rail on the same line.
- Stagger trams through Davis Lake tunnel.
- Community associations decide what projects are going to be implemented in their areas. However, they always seem to be cancelled instead of bringing benefits to the communities/surrounding communities.

**Questions**

- How long till the implementation of the preferred scenario?
- Why is the Byron Corridor not being used?
- Access to the waterfront on Parkway?

**Table 4:**

<b>Facilitator</b>	<b>Scribe</b>
David Hopper (McCormick Rankin)	Cathy Burden (Delcan)

**Comments**

- Old street cars run on Byron Avenue would be better.
- Carling is a good back-up if the Queensway is backed up.
- Carling should be left alone for roadway widening, because there will be increased traffic later on.
- Don't take the buses off Carling, but no fast routes/express.
- People will still need their cars for things around the city. (Errands after work etc)
- There are lots of fumes from buses.
- Most usage from Lincoln fields and Preston.
- The bridge to Quebec has long line-ups on the Parkway.
- Transfers could be problematic. (Too many)
- No current stops if Train is on Parkway.
- Too much extra equipment with trains on Parkway.
- If more businesses/job opportunities were in the outlying areas, people would find work closer to home and wouldn't need to commute downtown.
- The roadway to the airport needs to be widened.
- Transit not easily accessible.
- Park and rides are a good idea.
- The Lincoln Fields station isn't very well used.



**Questions**

- How will the Parkway be impacted by new systems?
- Where would the cars/bicycles go?
- It's very scenic near the water. Will there still be access to the lookout points?
- Why aren't the buses enough on Carling?
- Are the streetcars noisy?
- How do you get to the train on the Parkway?
- How much vegetation will be removed from the Parkway?
- Are electric trains more sensitive to weather conditions? (Snow/ice)
- Will people have input into all options as the decisions are made?
- What about subways?
- What kind of response are you getting from surveys asking if people will take transit or are currently taking transit?
- Will the system be accessible for people with disabilities?
- Will there be enough shelters for people waiting for transit?
- How much would the (rail tickets?) cost? Is this cheaper than bus costs for riders?
- How do you keep the tracks free from snow? How will the snow clearing work and where will they put the snow?
- When will construction actually start?
- Are soil conditions good for light rail construction and tunnel?
- What happens if there is a power outage? (Blackout) Buses would not be affected if there's a power cut.

**Table 5:**

Facilitator	Scribe
Peter Steacy (McCormick Rankin)	Katie Peake (Delcan)

Number of persons: 4

**Evaluation Criteria**

Ridership	1,1
Cost effectiveness	1,1,1
Compact City	1
Infrastructure	1
Downtown Congestion	1
Benefit to Customers	1

\*Additional: Get land now for future planning, 1.



## Preferred Scenario

All persons preferred Scenario 4. It had the best potential for ridership, but people liked the O-Train extension in Scenario 3.

## Comments

- The O-Train should at least be extended to VIA rail. The infrastructure is already there.
- Reliability plays an important role in getting students to use transit.
- Congestion affects travel times significantly: Transit becomes more appealing.
- The City is very slow in getting transportation plans off the ground: Time is an important factor.
- Widening the airport Parkway is very important and necessary. Trying to get to the airport at Peak times is now very difficult.
- A mass transit-way is needed from the airport to downtown. The bus system right now does not work well.
- Ottawa does not seem to think in a 'big city' fashion.
- College Standpoint and Centrepointe: Citizen would prefer to see the Baseline station addressed earlier rather than later.
- There should be 500 metres between transit stations at residential areas and near large employment areas. There are too many transit stations out in large fields.

## Questions

- How much of an increase in ridership would there be, if the O-Train is extended and/or new trains added?
- Would the O-Train have new equipment for quarter ridership of the tunnel? Was it selected?
- There are concerns over the long-term implications of buying too many hybrid-buses at once: Can they be maintained effectively over the long-term?
- There is currently a lot of bus congestion on Wellington: How would downtown be affected if STO buses were removed?
- Would using the Experimental farm along Baseline be beneficial? Some federal property would have to be purchased.
- Most agree that the Parkway could be used, and a lot of influence can be exerted to use the Parkway, if it is deemed necessary. If the NCC does not agree, is there a Plan B?
- Are the tracks going to be secured via fencing? How are these security concerns going to be addressed?
- Are emergency vehicles going to be allowed to use the transitway? Would this mean road upgrades?
- Would it be beneficial to have a spur train reach out to Bayshore? (Not a lot of capacity for transfers)



## Appendix 'F' - Stakeholder Focus Group Notes

### Downtown and Industry Voices

**Date:** Thursday, September 11, 2008

**Location:** City Hall, Richmond Room

**Time:** 1:30 – 3:30 p.m.

**Presenter:**

Mona Abouhenidy, City of Ottawa

**Facilitator:**

Monique Stone, PACE Public Affairs & Community Engagement

**Experts:**

Denis Callan, McCormick Rankin

Peter Steacy , McCormick Rankin

**Downtown and Industry Voices:**

Bank Street Business Improvement Area (BIA)

Centretown Citizens Ottawa Corporation

Citizens for Safe Cycling

Domicile

Greyhound Canada

Rideau Centre

University of Ottawa

VIARail

For the first two questions (evaluation criteria and preferred scenario, participants were divided into two groups. Group 1 consisted of six individuals, and Group 2 was made up of five.

### **Group 1 – Evaluation Criteria**

*Evaluation Criteria*

Benefits to Customers: 1,1,1,1

Cost Effectiveness: 1,2,2,3.

Ridership: 1,1,3,3

Reduce downtown congestion: 1,2,2

Supports Council rulings etc: 3



Benefits to the environment: 2,2,3

Compact city: 1, 2.

## **Group 2 - Evaluation Criteria**

### *Evaluation criteria*

- 1) Environment
- 2) Benefits to customers
- 3) Cost effectiveness

- It was felt that all other evaluation criteria were subsets of the aforementioned.
- The first three on the sheet needed to be bundled.
- Ridership by itself is meaningless.
- Creating cost-effectiveness is the key (especially to get funding).
- Council's direction should be adhered to when it's what the public wants.

## **Group 2 – Implementation Scenario**

Three people chose scenario 1. Three people chose scenario 4.

### *Comments*

- LRT gets people off buses, but not necessarily cars.
- Gains in ridership will mainly be realised if car users switch. Not necessarily pedestrians/bikers.
- It is important to take lifestyle considerations into question, when projecting ridership: Not all projected persons will actually take transit. It is important to forecast WHO actually would, by considering their values.
- Ensure there are travel-time savings for users to be induced. (Timed against car commuter travel)
- The evaluation criteria put forth encompassed linked concerns e.g reducing downtown congestion/benefits to the environment. However, emissions may increase or decrease, depending upon the frequency of buses along the routes. Ridership and cost-effectiveness were also thought to be linked.
- Population growth is also tied in to ridership/cost effectiveness. (It was factored into the 2031 plan)

### *Questions*

- What determines the importance of the evaluation criteria? (A ridership survey was done on 25,000 households. Ridership forecasting for the time-period was done on this basis.)





## **Group 2 – Implementation Scenario**

Scenario 4 elicited 3 votes from the participants, whilst scenario 3 obtained 2. One of the voters for Scenario 4 believed there should be a light-rail extension to the airport.

- It was felt that Scenario 4 serves the most traditional growth patterns, and the city should just ‘get on with it.’
- The environmental criteria should be clarified plus smart growth/compact city.
- If settlement intensity could be encouraged in the greenbelt, that would be the best for a compact city. If that occurred, then option 1 would be a workable option.

### **Changes**

- Make sure there is a pedestrian/cycling path parallel to the line.
- Extend to the airport in option 4.
- Connect to Quebec.

## **All – Recommended Changes to Roads Projects**

- Good philosophy behind decreasing the amount of funds to be spent on roads.
- Ensure that shoulders are paved in the new roads, to facilitate biking. (Make it priority)
- Rehabilitate existing roads to provide biking priority (e.g Richmond)
- Cut down on space for car drivers, but aggressively promote more space for cyclists etc.
- Promote de-incentives to car-use e.g. Limited parking in Downtown (Test project underway in Montreal)
- Remember what the impact of increased parking-fees could do to retailers.
- 174-Innes Road: Any thought of expanding Trim all the way to Innes during Phase 1? Bump it up from Phase 2.

## **All - Supplementary Rapid Transit Networks**

- There was a general agreement on the proposed supplementary networks.
- Add bike paths to them all.
- Ensure there is secure bike parking.
- Make sure there are sufficient park and rides, also near downtown stations.
- Allow bikes on the train.
- There was a positive reaction to the proposed developments on Carling.

## **Additional Comments**

- The economic growth in the West could also mean that Western residents live close to work, and therefore would utilise transit/the LRT less.
- It would be useful to see the regional modal split in the context of the total population.



- Commencing construction in the East gives the city more time to negotiate with the NCC, (for the parkway) and can also help facilitate finding a new option.
- The East provides a good option for yard space. (Under-utilised space)

## **Economic Voices**

**Date:** Wednesday, September 15, 2008

**Location:** City Hall, Honeywell Room

**Time:** 1:30 – 3:30 P.M.

**Presenter:**

Colin Simpson, City of Ottawa

**Facilitator:**

Monique Stone, PACE Public Affairs & Community Engagement

**Expert:**

Dennis Callan, McCormick Rankin

**Economic Voices:**

Cardel Homes

City Centre Coalition

David McManus Engineering

Morrison Hershfield

Novatech Engineering

Preston Street BIA

Richcraft Homes

For the first two questions (evaluation criteria and preferred scenario, participants were divided into two groups.

### **Group 1 - Evaluation Criteria**

*Evaluation Criteria*

- 1) Benefits to customers
- 2) Ease of implementation
- 3) Reducing Downtown Congestion/Compact City

*Rationale/ Things Considered*

- There are linkages between benefits to customers and ridership.
- Reducing downtown congestion would be an obvious indicator to people that their tax dollars are at work—both with reducing traffic and protecting the environment.



- Ease of implementation would be the speediest way of ensuring ridership.
- Costing: How important is this in Phase 1, if overall, the budget is already set? Might be, if private investment is to be a factor. Is there any danger of over-spending in the short term?

## **Group 2 - Evaluation Criteria**

### *Evaluation Criteria*

Reduces downtown congestion: 1,3,1,2.

Ridership: 2,2,3.

Benefit to customers: 3,2,1.

Supports a compact transit city: 1,1

Ease of implementation: 3

### *Rationale/Things Considered*

- It was thought there were interconnections between the evaluation criteria. For instance, d benefit to customers/compact transit city/ease of implementation were regarded as the same thing.
- The criteria with '1, 2 and 3', depending on the individual's inclination.

## **Group 1 - Implementation Scenario**

Scenario 4 emerged as the preferred implementation plan.

### *Rationale/ /Things Considered*

- Scenario 4 leaves out the South End, but is the only option to significantly reduce downtown Congestion.
- Sorting out the West is more difficult than starting construction in the East. East needs to be served first.
- Southern Constituents are best served by #3, which serves Easterners very well as well.
- Scenario 1 is 'cheaping out.' Mostly the East benefits.
- Scenario 4 may be problematic to implement. Also, in 10-15 years they may need construction in the South.
- Scenario 2 beneficial due to ridership/cost-effectiveness/ environmental/implementation implications.

### *Changes*

- Lessen emphasis on East/West to serve South better.
- Better Public Relations re: the Bus component. Too much emphasis is being placed on Light Rail, to the detriment of the improvements in the bus service.
- Residents who are not getting light-rail, feel they are being shafted.



## **Additional Comments**

- Are road networks an afterthought? 70% of people will still be driving.
- Don't get drivers too comfortable on the roads. (Nix the 6 lane plans) Induce them to take transit.
- HOV lanes might be a good option.
- Synchronize timing from a planning perspective. Presently, the transit plans and road-work plans are not in consonance.
- Bridge at Fallowfield: Is it needed for/by 2031?
- Why does the route from Prince of Wales feed into Downtown Congestion, instead of going away from it, through a changeover hub?
- Is a streetcar necessary for Carling? Who does this serve better—tourists or residents? Carling would need to be more pedestrian friendly, for a streetcar to be useful. The idea is nice, and romantic, but is it practical?
- Buses might be a good alternative to the Carling Streetcar. Easier to maintain just buses/light-rail, instead of a third type of transportation.
- Does this plan limit inter-provincial linkages with Quebec? It is being sorted out at the moment.

## **Group 2 - Implementation Scenario**

There was no consensus on which scenario should be implemented. There was a debate regarding 3 and 4.

### *Rationale/Things considered*

- #3 alleviates North-South arterial traffic.
- #4 accommodates the most trips through the core.
- LRT should be implemented in Gatineau, to help alleviate downtown congestion. (More LRT is the key to reduce bottleneck)
- High Eastern ridership needs to be supported.

## **All – Proposed Changes to Roads Projects**

- Bottleneck increases with the widening of roads going in.
- Airport parkway widening a concern.
- ATVC a concern.
- 174 a concern.
- 30% transit modal split not ambitious enough.
- POW widening a concern: Bottlenecks, and it competes with the LRT.



## **All - Supplementary Rapid Transit Corridors**

- Would the Carling Streetcar be adding another system within transit? Or is the technology similar enough to light-rail?
- Carling line should be studied as a Rapid Transit Corridor. How Fast/Slow given signal priority?
- Baseline is a good choice to avoid the core.
- Hunt Club Transit Priority good.

## **Other**

- TSM/TDM support.
- Parking rates should not favour all day over short term. I.E. \$3/half-hour vs all day. That way, people can commute at peak periods.

## **Overall Final Comments**

- Propose HOV and let council say 'no.' There is a need for public evaluation of this decision, and perhaps this will spur action on it.
- Don't allow political will to make the decisions.
- Need to connect the various plans: Cost-effectiveness with planning etc
- There is a real value in making sure you can avoid the core e.g Carling/Baseline.
- Ensure LRT becomes a reality.

## **Rural Voices**

**Date:** Wednesday, September 17, 2008

**Location:** Confederation High School, Room 107.

**Time:** 6:30 – 8:30 p.m.

**Presenter:**

Stephen Boyle, City of Ottawa

**Facilitator:**

Monique Stone, PACE Public Affairs & Community Engagement

**Experts:**

Dennis Callan, McCormick Rankin

Ronald Fournier, Delcan Corporation

**Rural Voices:**

Greely

Manotick

Richmond



### **Evaluation Criteria**

- 1) Return on Investment: Operational costs (55/45)
- 2) Expanding Ridership
- 3) Solving downtown congestion.

### **Comments**

One person felt that solving downtown congestion should be #1, and benefits to customers factored in as #4: People need to be induced to use transit. Advertise *faster, better and cheaper* very clearly.

### **Implementation Scenario**

One vote each for Scenarios 1, 3 and 4. Two people preferred a created Scenario 5, which augmented Scenario 4. It made use of the Cumberland transitway (with rail) and extended it to the hospitals. The O-Train was extended to Leitrim and Hurdman, first as BRT and then as rail. A commercial only part of Byron was pitched, and a connection to Gatineau included, to ensure no traffic through Riverside South.

### **Supplementary Rapid Transit Networks**

Cycling vs. Road funding: Too little is spent on developing cycling paths overall, but the rural aspect is not factored into the bike pathways. As it stands, there are no physical inducements for people to use bikes for commuting in rural areas. (No special pathways away from major roadways/traffic) Spending should be done to develop this, so not just urbanites have this option. Approve a budget and be committed to the ideal.

### **Informational Material**

- Highlight the things which have no council approval. (Else the plan tends to be misleading)
- Include the two missing Park and Rides at Fernbank and Leitrim.
- There seems to be no connectivity in the map. (Missing lines) Make it clearer.  
Reason: Underneath the red/blue rapid transit lines, there are grey lines denoting the regular roads. (For regular transit) This map deals specifically with rapid transit improvements.
- It would be better if centres like Leitrim were highlighted, so people could follow it easier.  
There should also be some discussion of it in the sidebars.
- The O-Train should be included under LRT, not 'other'. Are there costing implications with the O-Train, leading it to be categorised as 'Other'?
- There seems to be a systemic bias against the O-Train.
- What is the ridership of the South? Will it be viable for rapid transit?



## **Development Concerns**

- There was a sentiment expressed that rural areas are under threat from intense urbanization. Developers are coming in, but residents are not keen on the developments.
- Some rural residents do not want transit extending into their neighbourhoods: They chose the rural life for a reason. They have even said that they won't park and ride.
- In Greely, there are 13 developers and about 6 city staff-members assigned to development. However, there is no cohesion/holistic view to developing Greely.
- City staff/project managers should pay attention to the Rural Recreational Pathways Project .

## **Proposed Changes to Roads Projects**

- Improve roads to the South because Scenario 4 does not serve Southerners well. (They will be more reliant on their cars) The South is also a corridor for out-of-town traffic, so this should be considered as well.
- Most of the rural people live outside of the transit area. Most of their commuting is done within their areas. Hence, the need for better roads is there. 1) Improve the conditions of existing roads. (Priority) 2) Increase capacity.
- If roadworks aren't an option for South, extend the LRT to service the South. Southerners either need improved roads, or improved transit.
- Reconsider widening Leicester and Albion roads.
- Why is no work being done on Bank Street? The city has jurisdiction over it now, so they can afford to develop it for residents.
- Why aren't the road/transit planning merged better?
- The ring road: Where and what is it? One councillor said a ring-road was built into the plan, but this is erroneous. Manotick Bridge and Metcalfe too heavily used.
- What can be done to solve the failing arterial road issue? Widening roads as a counter-traffic measure should be reconsidered. It has totally failed in the past.

## **Other Comments**

- A single-track railway may not service residents properly. (Would residents from Barrhaven be willing to stand up for 45 minutes to get downtown? How often would the trains run?) It may also be financially unviable, depending upon the # of seats and ridership.
- Extend rapid transit into the Hull Core. STO buses are congesting Rideau Street. This may alleviate downtown congestion. The Prince of Wales bridge can be used since the city owns it now. (Similar concept to the Alexandria bridge) Extend the integrated light rail/bus system all the way to the casino. This is a better option than traffic through Riverside South.
- Buses in tunnels should be approached with caution due to safety issues. (Fires)
- Would extending the light rail to the airport/Leitrim not be effective? It would alleviate the traffic on the airport parkway. (Through the grapevine it was heard that the airport was opposed to a Park & Ride with the LRT, because it would diminish their earnings from airport parking)
- TRANSFERS vs Single rides: Will the transfers work better in this plan? Are there too many transfers? Would people be willing to get on and off buses in the cold? If people are



to be induced onto transit, they should be informed of HOW this system/the transfer system is better. One suggestion is that business activities be integrated into transfer stations/hubs. Coffee shops/cigarette shops etc, so that people aren't mad if they miss their ride. This could also alleviate safety concerns about people being in isolated places.

- Merging future city plans with the transit planning: Would the city plan not diminish the need for working/doing business in the downtown area? This transit system is built to ferry people easily through the outlying areas and the downtown core.
- In the worst-case scenario, with only phase 1 acquiring funding, much effort should be made to make that phase effective.
- At city hall voting, the rural residents are outnumbered by city-dwellers. EVEN on motions relating to rural development. Hence, the outcomes are not always tailored to improving things in the rural areas. (Sticks versus carrots. Rural people will not be induced to use transit if this continues)
- Where there's already railway, build on it. This will reduce costs and make implementation easier. You can get the people on to it afterwards. If it's already there people will use it.
- If returns aren't there in the first phase, they won't come in the later phases.
- Rapid transit: Is it serving communities? Or just commuters/workers?





## Appendix 'G' - Advisory Committees Notes

### Advisory Committees Voices

**Date:** Tuesday, September 30, 2008

**Location:** City Hall

**Time:** 7:00 – 9:30 P.M.

**Presenter/Facilitator:**

Colin Simpson, City of Ottawa

**Scribe:** Lorraine Harrilal, PACE Public Affairs & Community Engagement

**Advisory Committees Represented:**

- Accessibility Advisory Committee
- Arts Heritage and Culture Advisory Committee
- Business Advisory Committee
- Environmental Advisory Committee
- Equity and Diversity Advisory Committee
- Ottawa Forests and Greenspace Advisory Committee
- Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee
- Pedestrian and Transit Advisory Committee

**Evaluation Criteria**

Participants ranked the evaluation criteria in a group discussion format as follows, with 1 representing the criterion they deemed most important, 2 as second most important and 3 as third most important.

*Evaluation Criteria*

- Benefits to Customers/People: 1,2,3,3,3
- Benefits to Environment/Life: 1,1,1,2,2,3
- Ridership: 1,1,3
- Cost Effectiveness: 2,3,3
- Reduces Downtown Congestion: 1
- Supports Compact City: 1,1,2,2,2,3



### **Implementation Scenario**

- 4 people selected scenario 3 as their preferred transit implementation scenario
- 3 people selected scenario 4
- 2 people chose none of the above

Note: It was noted that the majority of participants made their choices based on personal preferences. This information should not be construed as the collective position of any particular Advisory Committee.

### **Supplementary Rapid Transit Networks**

- It was noted that more care should be taken to address pedestrian infrastructure, particularly issues for disabled pedestrians, over and above what is provincially mandated.
- Transit should be designed with accessibility features. The proposed Carling streetcars should be wheelchair accessible

### **Proposed Changes to Roads Projects**

- Concern was raised about the amount of proposed road infrastructure. Although it was noted that the City should plan for people, not cars, it was also noted that roads still need to be improved because people will never totally eliminate their need for cars.
- The southern parts of the City were identified as experiencing rapid urbanization and in need of improved roads. In particular, the Strandherd bridge was suggested to be required as soon as possible to relieve traffic congestion.
- It was mentioned that the Airport Parkway and Alta Vista Transportation Corridor should not be needed.
- Concern was raised about the closing of the Woodroffe Avenue at Prince of Wales Drive as this will significantly inconvenience drivers.
- It was noted that the transit cost projections might be misleading since they do not account for road-building costs that may be required in the absence of transit infrastructure.
- The idea of a Ring Road was discussed and some people expressed interest in having the City pursue this idea.

### **Other Comments**

- More environmental analyses of the scenarios should be undertaken, before and during implementation. The definition of environment should be expanded to not just include air quality. It should be changed to life and environment, to encompass habitats and animals.
- Questions were posed about the evaluation criteria for the environment. As a follow-up to the meeting, it was confirmed that the particulate matter estimates were PM10, tonnes being 1000 Kg.



- It was noted that impacts on Wetlands and habitats should be considered.
- The definition of ‘smart growth’ was discussed and generally accepted as a concept for compact sustainable growth.
- To have people living, working, and shopping all in the same areas to limit travel was expressed as an ideal.
- It was noted that transportation infrastructure should ultimately be convenient and accessible for all people and that it should not fragment communities and destroy habitats.
- Concerns were raised regarding the process to approve the TMP before the Official Plan is finalized. It was noted that Council directed a full review of the TMP in light of the failed North-South project and that the previous 2021 population and employment forecasts used in 2003 are very similar to the 2031 projections. As a result, not a lot of change, in terms of new growth areas and additional travel demands, is expected to the 2008 OP compared to the 2003 version.
- It was confirmed that additional consultations with respect to the Official Plan would occur which may influence transportation infrastructure.
- It was noted that no assumptions about future transit vehicle technologies have been made to ascertain whether or not the technology used today will still be relevant in 2031 (e.g. ethanol/hybrid fuels versus diesel versus electric). As a result, discussions revolved around corridor locations and ridership volumes rather than technology.
- Concerns about energy pricing and forecasts were noted. It was confirmed that economic variables such as gas prices and parking prices were included in the transportation modeling, however, further follow-up as how it was modelled is required.
- Concerns were noted about preserving and enhancing arts and heritage and council’s mandate to dedicate 1% of all city project funding to arts and heritage initiatives.
- A discussion about what transit scenario facilitates intensification the most ensued — no clear consensus was reached. It was mentioned that bits and pieces of the different scenarios may be combined.
- Concerns were raised about why LRT is not being first implemented from Orleans to Scotia Bank Place as the population is already there. It was explained that the transit scenarios represent a minimum LRT network to address the downtown transit congestion problem and that it is the will of council to eventually extend LRT service into these communities.



## Appendix 'H' - Internal and External Agency Meeting Minutes

### 1<sup>st</sup> Internal /External Agency Meeting

**Project:** Ottawa Transportation Master Plan Update

**Date:** September 12, 2008

**Location:** Ottawa City Hall

**Presenter:** Steven Boyle, City of Ottawa

**Experts:** Dennis Callan, McCormick Rankin  
Brandon Reid, Delcan Corporation

#### Participants:

##### *City of Ottawa*

John Smit	City Planning
Carol Christensen	Environmental Sustainability
Adam Brown	Rural Affairs Office
Greg Saarinen	Surface Operations, Technical Services Division
Bob Streicher	Traffic and Parking
Colleen Connelly	Transit Services
Heather Sanders	Transit Services

##### *External Agencies*

Hanako Cardinal	Ministere des Transports du Quebec
Phil Pawliuk	Ontario Ministry of Transportation
Scott Manning	Public Works and Government Services Canada

**Purpose:** Information session about proposed transit developments in Ottawa. Overviews of the rationale behind transit planning, the evaluation criteria created for ranking and the implementation scenarios/phasing of developments.

#### Discourse:

#### Assumptions

- TMP will prompt 70% car use, 30% transit use.
- Evidence over the past ten years shows growing transit use.
- Changes in the 2008 TMP reduce car occupancy from 1.3 to 1.2 persons per vehicle.
- Fewer people will have fewer jobs over time, hence less ridership in 2021. (Increase in unemployment/retirement levels)



## **Technical Planning**

- Official planning documents are not available online. (Re: road widening, right of way etc) They are presently being consolidated for cohesion/easiness. There are 14 diagrams and 66 pages. Attempts are being made to draft it onto 1 page. They are currently down to 21.
- The O-Train Stop at Confederation Heights is not the best location. Should be moved further North according to a Queen's University Study.
- No alteration of existing stations (bus or rail) in current scenarios—just additions.
- No park and ride plans developed for certain areas, but the spaces for them do exist.
- Transitway connections are constrained in the various scenarios due to funding allocations.

## **Roads**

- Road development plans were created using current/future rapid transit traffic conditions, community development plans and information from city staff re: current operational safety issues.
- 4 lanes/6 lane roads projected for beyond 2031, since the world doesn't end then.
- No road widening in Central/Downtown areas, because there is no room for it. People will have to put up with the traffic.
- Road considerations also based upon morning versus evening needs. In some areas, morning needs surpassed evening needs and vice-versa. Or, the difference was very close e.g. 30% morning vs. 29% evening use.
- Bridge constructions not confirmed.
- Roads not classified (local etc) due to possible dissent from residents.
- 2 new interchanges approved. (Barnsdale/Hunt Club Extension) Why? Future congestions would be avoided with the building of the interchanges. Barnsdale may not be necessary now, but around/after 2031, it may be very necessary.
- Widen the Queensway for buses or make a parallel bus lane next to it? (This will be worked out between 2015-2018)
- The 4 laning of Prince of Wales could result in additional traffic through Fisher/Baseline. The plan tries to divert this through Merivale if possible, to preserve the quality of life in the surrounding areas.
- No quick way to link Barrhaven/Fallowfield with the VIARAIL station. Operational difficulties with a straight line linkage. VIA is open to consultations re: shifting operations, but it may not materialise close to the implementation stage.



## 2<sup>nd</sup> Internal/External Agency Meeting

**Project:** Ottawa Transportation Master Plan Update

**Date:** September 15, 2008

**Location:** Ottawa City Hall

**Presenter:** Mona Abouhenidy City of Ottawa

**Expert:** Dennis Callan McCormick Rankin

### Participants:

Paul Baby	Transports Quebec
Arto Keklikian	NCC
Sandra Candon	NCC
Paul Jordan	City of Ottawa: Planning and Infrastructure Approvals
Andrew Miller	Min. of Energy & Infrastructure: Infrastructure Policy and Planning Division
Glen Edmond	City of Ottawa: RPAM-RESD
Andrew Sacret (for Sandy Schaffhauser)	FOTENN Consultants
Safinaz El-Solh	City of Ottawa: Transportation Planning
Joe Iannace	Min. of Public Infrastructure Renewal
Jeff Novak	Min. of Public Infrastructure Renewal

**Purpose:** Information session about proposed transit developments in Ottawa. Overviews of the rationale behind transit planning, the evaluation criteria created for ranking and the implementation scenarios/phasing of developments.

### Discourse:

#### The Plan

- The ultimate plan would include just rail transportation. In the interim, a rail/bus system must be coordinated. An environmental assessment would help trim the solutions on the table now, as well as risk assessment. In November, Council will meet regarding risk assessment findings.
- Some have argued that the outlying areas need Light rail connections to the city, but servicing central Ottawa is currently a priority for LRT. The outlying areas do not currently have the ridership to make this practical, hence they might prefer a bus every 15-20 minutes, as opposed to a train every 1-2 hours. LR success depends greatly upon demand. However, planning will not be done to stifle/prevent growth in the outlying areas.



- Integration with Quebec: Gatineau opted for a bus system, Ottawa, Light rail. Research is still being done re: integration.
- Right of way updates are being prepared for November 2008. They are 90% completed.
- Based upon the belief that if the infrastructure is there, ridership will increase, the system will be built to service more than the 30% projected ridership. However, the final figures regarding capacity need to be analysed.

### **Costing**

- Property prices are not included in the costing, except for suburban areas. Those costs will be minimal in comparison to others.
- The spending profile has not been finalised yet. It is proposed that 2/3 of the funds will come from the province and 1/3 from the city. The 1/3 from the city may involve public/private partnerships, debt financing, federal grants etc. By November, this information should be available.
- Road building costs are not included in the plan. They are projected to be an extra 2 billion, until 2031. Therefore, the entire plan will cost about 6.7 billion.
- Land acquisition research/Environmental assessments are being done commensurate to each other. These will help with cost projections.

### **Park and Rides**

- Research is being done into land use regulations/costing etc, to see if Park and Rides can be built in areas where there is a demand for it. Research is also being done into the effectiveness of P&Rs: That is, how many riders will be pulled off cars into the transit system.
- The underpinning rationale is that P&Rs need to be built in the outlying areas to pull people out of their cars. Parking spaces will be reduced in the urban P&Rs, but existing ones will remain. There is still a lot of work to be done on this subject.

### **Voyageur Bus Terminal**

- Voyageur has a choice of moving operations to get alongside rapid transit options. OC Transpo is having dialogue with them in regards to this, but the final decision remains theirs.

### **Supplementary Corridors**

- Supplementary networks may be included earlier, due to demand/other factors.
- Streetcars are proposed on Carling. The issue at hand is not speed, but the reduction of times at intersections. Planning will be done with the concerns of the residents in mind, to ensure minimum dislocation/discomfort.
- Carling is a priority in all 4 scenarios.

