

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE,  
HELD IN THE BOARD ROOM, 1<sup>ST</sup> FLOOR, SERVICE AND RESOURCE CENTRE,  
411 DUNSMUIR STREET, ON TUESDAY, 2013-DEC-19, COMMENCING AT 1:00 P.M.

---

PRESENT: Councillor George Anderson, Chair  
Councillor Bill McKay  
David Murchie  
Michele Patterson  
David Grey  
Leo Boon, GNCC (Guest)

Absent: Councillor Ted Greves

Staff: Bob Prokopenko  
Andrew Tucker  
Gordon Foy  
Amir Freund  
Jodi Wilson

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order at 1:02 p.m.

2. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR:

No reports from the chair.

3. INTRODUCTIONS:

Round table introductions.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND LATE ITEMS:

*It was moved and seconded that the agenda be amended to include a briefing on Parkwood Drive. The motion carried unanimously.*

5. ADOPTION OF MINUTES:

*a) It was moved and seconded that the 2013-Sep-24 minutes be adopted. The motion carried unanimously.*

*b) It was moved and seconded that the 2013-Oct-08 minutes be adopted. The motion carried unanimously.*

6. DELEGATIONS:

No delegations were present.

7. PRESENTATION / REPORTS:

a) Introductions

Gordon Foy introduced Brian Patterson, Urban Systems, who will be presenting two major pieces of the DRAFT Nanaimo Transportation Master Plan.

The first point of discussion will cover the results of the public consultation process and the second will cover the game plan for preparing the Final Document in order to present it to Council with a March target.

b) Study Update

Brian provided a review of consultation findings on Discussion Paper (DP)#3 / Phase 2 Consultation including recommended changes for the final Transportation Master Plan.

A sample final document template will be handed out and staff is looking for direction on the language and graphic style of the document.

We have a work plan in place that will take us through to the end of March, when we are hoping to take the document forward to Council.

Three Discussion Papers completed as part of the NTMP process, DP#1 (Fall 2013) examined existing conditions in Nanaimo, DP#2 provided a vision and objectives for the Plan and the most recent, DP#3 explored future transportation possibilities.

For the final plan we take the key themes from all three discussion papers and compress them down to a summary level document. The initial three documents will continue to serve as technical, stand alone documents that cover more of the background work. Our target is to keep the summary document around 70 – 80 pages and improve the readability/accessibility of the final document.

c) Phase 2 Consultation Summary

Events that were held during the Phase 2 Consultation included:

- Stakeholder Workshop, November, 2013 – discussion with community groups on each chapter of the plan. Identified what was missing, changes and priorities.
- Online Survey and information loaded onto the website, including Council presentation from October, 2013, a draft of the discussion paper and a draft of the Open House display boards. There were approximately 800 website hits; 41 surveys that were completed.
- Open Houses November 2013 – there were five Open Houses across the City, focusing on times and locations that were accessible to the public. Open Houses were effective to raise awareness about the process and having contact with a broader cross-section of the population. Over 400 people attended the five Open Houses. Staff encouraged Open House participants to provide their comments either by completing the online survey or addressing their concerns at the Open House by placing 'notes' on the display boards.

Staff noted that the survey requires significant effort to complete, so the 'leave a sticky note' system worked better for the Open Houses. Participants were also encouraged to send an email to staff where issues were specific.

David Grey asked if there was any consideration given to doing a more rigorous survey. Possibly a mail-out or perhaps a phone survey to collect samples.

*This form of survey can be very expensive and only works well if you are asking 'how aware they are of the plan' or 'what's your opinion', but if you're looking for feedback, you need the participant to take the time to go through the material and then do a follow-up call and this multi-step transaction gets more difficult to follow through.*

Phase 2 Consultation Summary Report provides an overall summary of all consultation events.

Overall, through all the input, we did find that there was general support for the plan. One area that there was a lot of discussion about was targets and if they were ambitious enough? We need to consider how we present targets in the plan and position those and really emphasize that these are minimum targets that the City should aspire to exceed them. It may be a good idea to show interim milestones along the way to help monitor progress. Also, explain what the targets mean when they are compared to historic trends.

- Recommendation to pull out the short-term priorities and projects as well as the short-term outcomes. Looking at a five year horizon.
- Suggestion to have regular reporting to Council.
- Improving the readability of the document. Keeping it concise.
- Have an increased focus on land use.

#### *Walking/Cycling*

David Grey expressed a consensus from the Greater Nanaimo Cycling Coalition (GNCC) that the targets for mode share for cycling are too modest. Would like to see more ambitious targets and set more robust short-term goals. The research supports, that if you invest in the infrastructure early on, you will get a corresponding increase in cyclists. Why not invest now and gain the benefits for a longer period, rather than doing smaller portions at a time. Take the argument to the Provincial Government and ask for their support.

David Murchie would like to see the plan better communicate what a mobility hub means. *We will look to see if there are graphics that we can create to make it clearer. Specific densities are all spelled out in the Official Community Plan (OCP). We may need to have a closer link between the OCP and the Nanaimo Transportation Master Plan (NTMP).* Would like it to say what our goal is and the required level of density. If the OCP isn't willing to change it then we may need to question if it really should be in the NTMP?

Councillor McKay would like to see the Transportation Master Plan Committee assess where there is a high foot traffic area and figure out if there is a way that sidewalks can be established if not already done. e.g. Boxwood area and Co-Op application. *We may need to revisit our Building Bylaw. As a City, if funds are available, we could put*

*sidewalks in, but we're just not asking the Developer's to be responsible for doing it. This topic could be discussed at the Development Process Review Committee (DPRC).*

Andrew Tucker suggested that if your application is within a mobility hub, through community contributions, maybe what we could be doing within our community contributions is drawing the developer to contribute toward sidewalk and cycling infrastructure so that we start getting those mobility hubs. In other parts of the community, Parks and Housing Legacy funds still make sense, but start tying the community contributions together with the NTMP so the two plans can build on each other.

David Murchie feels that if Industrial is in Residential or Commercial areas, or adjoining them, a sidewalk should be required.

David Grey asked if there is a willingness on the part of Council to earmark more funds to get a more comprehensive network of sidewalks and bike network put in place. Councillor Anderson answered that *there is a desire by some members of Council to promote alternative modes of transportation, which in turn increases the life of the roads. There would have to be a debate to determine whether the funds are available or not. Councillor McKay expressed that some cities build infrastructure without the assistance of City funds, but rather funding from other sources. Gordon Foy advised that once you have your seed money in place, there are areas where you can branch out to Senior Government to apply for grants.*

The Consultation Summary Report talks about alternatives to works and services on isolated development and local improvements. Gordon Foy reminded the committee of a previous discussion that included the possibility of cash in lieu for frontage, or whether the resources can be pooled in a neighbourhood, so that after several lots subdivide, you would have enough funds to build a sidewalk along the most important street in the neighbourhood.

It was addressed that a potential online Gateway might be best delivered by another source than the City. The GNCC might be a great fit for a project such as this. Leo Boon feels that the Gateway would be a cycling community driven project that would partner with the City. Project would cover all the arts of cycling, from BMX, Mountain Biking, through to the average cyclist. Tourism could also have a role in this project.

Andrew Tucker advised that the IT Department has gathered cultural resources as part of the Cultural Plan. There is a template that is already established and ready to use.

#### *Transit*

Primary objective of transit component of the Plan is to make transit desirable and competitive for choice riders.

Michele Patterson asked if the RDN Transit participated in all of the different consultation options. *The RDN did participate in the consultation process.*

To achieve the RDN/City Transit mode split goal of 8% we will require more transit resources, however, by being strategic about where we apply new service, so that you maximize the number of new riders per service hour added, we can reduce the

resources required to meet our goal. This will require the RDN to collect better, more specific data on riders.

#### *Major Roads*

- Ensure that the report is clear that future road projects will focus on improving conditions for all modes of transportation, not just vehicles. This includes the concept of complete streets that accommodate pedestrians, cyclists, vehicles and transit comprehensively.
- Identify that for long-term projects, they will only be undertaken if and when they are required.
- Received some negative feedback on the Street Network Improvements map. The map has more detail than other maps in the plan. We believe the detail is important by may relocate it to an Appendix. Michele suggested that something could be added to identify that it is more than just a road project, that there are links to other modes. All of the elements fit within a road right of way, but we've broken it out in the plan as walking, cycling and road sections, but ultimately, it all takes place within the road section. One of the icons being used is a picture of a vehicle, perhaps a different icon could be shown that displays a more complete street theme.

#### *Parking*

Andrew Tucker is surprised that NRGH didn't show up as a concern. At the stakeholder workshops, NRGH representation provided a lot of discussion around the parking issue around the hospital. *The four areas that were identified in the plan are still in the plan, one being the hospital area.* VIU, one of the four areas identified, has had some of their parking concerns dealt with but NRGH still remains unresolved.

#### *Transportation Master Plan - Document Template Review*

We want to create a more concise, user friendly document that is easier to understand for various purposes and multiple audiences. Different audiences have different purposes for the plan, so we need a plan that provides the public and stakeholders with a clear vision about where the City is going and to get them excited about the possibilities for transportation and knowledgeable about what is in the plan. The Final document needs to have enough detail so that staff can use it to support their day to day functions.

A portion of a sample document was distributed for the committee to review.

The overall proposed structure of the document is laid out into 4 sections:

- Setting the Stage
- The Overall Directions
- Strategies, Policies and Actions
- Priorities

The overall feel for the document is positive. A few of the comments are:

- Very good job
- A good amount of white space for easier reading
- Increase the font size
- Attractive document

David Murchie would like a better definition than 'mobility hub'. Important to articulate what the goal is using words.

Michele Patterson suggested the process portion of the report be relocated to the back of the plan. Important for the Overall Directions to be up front. Also suggested that Priorities be moved closer to the front.

Roundtable comment review:

Michele Patterson: Make the font larger and move the Process portion to the back of the document.

David Grey: More emphasis on active transportation in terms of the photos.

Councillor McKay: Would like to see a forum, rather than read an 80 page document. Have speakers address remotely what is going on in other parts of the world....something to excite people. Have an internet based document with live links. e.g.: [streetfilms.org](http://streetfilms.org)

David Murchie: The document is clean. Agrees that the Process should be moved to the back of the document. Would like to see the document around 30 – 40 pages. Is there an opportunity to have an Executive Summary followed by Recommendations?

Leo Boon: The cycling community is already sharing a lot of videos. He has a lot of information on cycling infrastructure that can be shared. He is already working with Parks and Recreation; they are including cycling information in their Youth programs.

Councillor Anderson: Would like a new photo for the front cover, one that has more people. Agrees that the font should be larger.

## 8. NEW BUSINESS:

### a) Parkwood Neighbourhood

As part of DP#3 – Major Roads (Map 7), Enterprise Way is proposed to be extended east to Uplands Drive and Uplands Drive completed to four lanes if the Green Thumb site redevelops. Both projects are identified as long-term and dependent on future development.

The adjacent Parkwood neighbourhood is concerned that Parkwood Drive is being used as a short-cut between Uplands Drive and Turner Road and is concerned that a proposed connection to Enterprise Way will exaggerate this behaviour.

The City has responded to several emails from the neighbourhood advising that the City does not have any intentions of changing Parkwood Drive or its function as a neighbourhood street. The only change in the plan specific to Parkwood Drive is to identify it as a potential local street bikeway.

If at the time development occurs on the Green Thumb site, the City would consider whether mitigation is required on Parkwood Drive in the form of traffic calming, or if the neighbourhood supports it, disconnection of Parkwood Drive.

The best time to address these issues is if or when a development is proposed. Wording to clarify these positions could be added to the Plan to address neighbourhood concerns.

David Murchie would like to see more generic wording used, rather than naming a specific street. Feels it is appropriate to add "in the event that a road is being used inappropriately due to congestion of other routes, we will do traffic calming".

9. CORRESPONDENCE:

No correspondence submitted.

10. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

11. NEXT MEETING:

To be determined.

12. ADJOURNMENT:

*It was moved and seconded at 3:04 p.m. that the meeting adjourn. The motion carried unanimously.*

---

CHAIR