

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE,
HELD IN THE BOARD ROOM, 1ST FLOOR, SERVICE AND RESOURCE CENTRE,
411 DUNSMUIR STREET, ON TUESDAY, 2013-SEP-24, COMMENCING AT 4:00 P.M.

PRESENT: Councillor George Anderson, Chair
Councillor Ted Greves
Councillor Bill McKay
David Grey
David Murchie
Michele Patterson
Shelley Serebin (Guest)

Absent: Councillor Bill Bestwick
Jim Routledge
Amir Freund

Staff: Ted Swabey
Susan Clift
Bob Prokopenko
Andrew Tucker
Gordon Foy
Jodi Wilson

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order at 4:03 p.m.

2. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR:

No reports from the chair.

3. INTRODUCTIONS:

Round table introductions. A guest observer, Shelley Serebrin was in attendance. Shelley is with the School Board and is on the Advisory Committee for Environmental Sustainability.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND LATE ITEMS:

It was moved and seconded that the agenda be adopted. The motion carried unanimously.

5. ADOPTION OF MINUTES:

a) *It was moved and seconded that the 2013-May-29 minutes be adopted. The motion carried unanimously.*

6. DELEGATIONS:

No delegations were present.

7. PRESENTATIONS/REPORTS:

a) Transportation Master Plan Update Discussion Paper #3 – Transportation Possibilities – Chapters 1-5 – Gordon Foy

Discussion Paper #3 holds the content of what is being referred to as Transportation Possibilities in terms of possibilities for the future.

Gord provided a recap on the work that has already been done to this stage.

- Issues and Opportunities Phase last Fall
- Consultation
- 3 Open Houses
- Stakeholder Workshop
- Prepare Consultation Summary Document
- Discussion Paper #1 – Final April, 2013
- Additional Stakeholder Workshop
- Discussion Paper #2 – is now complete and will soon be posted on the website.

We want to work through the discussion paper with the TAC over two meetings. The Discussion Paper is still out for circulation and we are awaiting comments as this document is still a 'working draft'.

Once the TAC, staff and external agencies are comfortable with the document, we will take it to Council to get their approval for the start of another round of public consultation.

The Final document will be taken down to a shorter document that is more about the actions than the background. If you need the background information, you can refer back to the Discussion papers.

Today, we will be discussing Land Use, Walking, Cycling and Transit. Where did our goals and objectives come from? Our mission since the beginning of this process is to decrease the amount cars are used and increase transit, cycling and walking.

Earlier in the process, TAC agreed that our goal for sustainable transportation would be 24%, decreasing car traffic from 88% to 76%, increasing transit from 2.5% to 8%, cycling from 1.1% to 4% and walking from 8.3% to 12%. We currently have 250,000 trips/day with a future target in 2041 of 375,000 trips/day.

Andrew finds the Existing and Future Target Transportation Mix to be a very constructive slide in terms of what the plan is trying to achieve. He suggested that it would be a great slide to include in the Summary document.

When we consult with the public, what documents will they be referred to? Will they have all the Discussion papers? When the discussion boards are created it is important to go back through all the papers to provide some intro's about why we are doing what we are doing so it all ties together and is clear to those that haven't been involved in the process from the beginning.

Land Use

Vancouver is aiming, in their Green Plan, to meet 50% of all their trips by sustainable means by 2020; through the NTMP we're not getting close to as high of goal as they've set. Should we have a more ambitious target than a 4% increase in cycling? Could the current rate of 1% of cyclist trips being made be incorrect?

Estimating the current cycling mode split across all trips was undertaken by sampling the travel patterns of 3.5% percent of households within the City and Region.

Some areas of Europe do up to 50% of their daily trips by bicycle....our plan just doesn't seem very ambitious.

The NTMP is for 25+ years, but will be revisited every 5 to 10 years. If we are more successful than we expect, we may need to reassess our goals.

Shelley Serebrin feels that there is a learned behaviour in Nanaimo that could be addressed in a variety of ways. The Vancouver Island University (VIU) has two areas bikes can park and it provides a great encouragement for people to use transit and cycle.

Through Councillor McKay's research, he has found that to increase other mode shares, apart from the automobile, is all political will and money. If this is our goal, we need to figure out how to make it happen.

David Murchie suggests reworking the 3rd bullet in 2.0 Land Use to have 'densities' discussed at the front of the sentence. Move the disclaimer to the end of the sentence.

Why isn't Southgate Mall area on the map as a Mobility Hub? Southgate is already existing and providing basic services. The Sandstone Master Plan appears as though, over time, it will dominate Southgate and become the anchor for that area. If Sandstone doesn't proceed, then the logical back-up plan would be to go back to Southgate as that area develops.

What proportion of people would need to go into those additional areas to have the impact? Mobility hubs should be renamed to reflect 'neighbourhoods' rather than 'malls'. Suggestion to join the two on Wellington Road.

The size of a mobility hub is somewhat limited to a comfortable walking distance. The distance from Country Club to Wellington Rd is 1+km, you are now beyond a desirable walking distance. It may be best to create an additional Mobility Hub in the Wellington Road area, rather than extending the existing one.

When talking about targets, the TMP isn't a land use plan, it is a transportation plan. We've included that in the next OCP revision, we target a proportion of our growth into mobility hubs.

Councillor Anderson would like to know why land use targets won't be reflected in the TMP to indicate this is where we need to go to achieve those goals. We need to ensure that the growth is happening in the Mobility Hubs – how will you actually achieve the

24% that this TMP is trying to reach? We have the OCP in terms of land use policy as our fundamental overriding document and the TMP is underneath the OCP.

In terms of Land Use policy, the best place for land use targets is within the OCP. The TMP could include direction for the future OCP update "include within the OCP targets for population and employment growth". Andrew Tucker advised that the types of policies and actions that are being identified in this plan speak to changes that would be coming through an OCP. Example: Consider incentives to encourage greater population within mobility hubs within the review of DCC's; Council could consider expanding reduced/exempted DCC areas to include all the mobility hubs? Some of the land use tools that are in the OCP may be able to respond to this as a direction that comes out of transportation.

Councillor McKay feels it is important to give people and developers a reason to get excited. What we're currently doing isn't enough.

Michele would like to know, when we start consulting, what type of feedback we are going to get from people who live in some of the areas that aren't included in the plan for any future progress.

The NTMP does recommend concentrating services and improvements in mobility hubs, some residents may choose to relocate to hubs to have more convenient access to services, but for many they will travel to hubs.

David Murchie would like the report to highlight the fact that you want more people in the mobility hubs; this point gets lost. Would like to see more focus on high density residential around mobility hubs. It is important to keep the mobility hubs walkable and not too big, with desired destinations to walk to.

Andrew Tucker commented on the challenges of making a mobility hub work, such as the Costco block; where you have the Island Highway on one side, Portsmouth on the north and Applecross on the east. There is no road network within this super block. In order to make a mobility hub work, you need to create a pedestrian or cyclist experience. It lacks destinations to encourage people to walk to. Streets will need to be created in the future for that area to come together as a mobility hub.

David Grey commented on prioritizing investments for sidewalks around schools to ensure children have safe routes to travel. Ex: Meredith doesn't have a sidewalk and in the winter when it snows and the plows have pushed all the snow up onto the sidewalks, the kids are walking out onto the road with the traffic. As well as investing into the mobility hubs, ensure that children have safe routes to travel to school either by cycling or walking.

David Murchie spoke to 'cost per usage'. It's almost like how many feet are going to hit the sidewalk, which will determine what areas receive a sidewalk. Wellington area kids are expected to go to Dover High School. It is unreasonable to think that sidewalks would be provided for this whole distance. As the kids get closer to the school, there is more pedestrian congestion as they converge. It's more important to have sidewalks in areas such as these. Focus will really be put on the areas that need it the most.

Councillor Greves said that when new developments go in, it is part of the process that sidewalks will be installed in front of their property. Is there a possibility that we can collect the money that would normally have paid for a sidewalk and put it together with other monies and install a greater distance of sidewalk in a more needed area?

A discussion took place regarding the potential of setting up a fund for each parking variance and putting these funds towards cycling and pedestrian infrastructure. David Murchie is concerned that we may be more eager to allow variances if there is an incentive for revenue to accomplish other things. Money could be collected from a variance in one neighbourhood and then put towards something in a completely different location.

David Grey would like to know if there is going to be a shift in the spending towards sustainable transport for biking, walking and transit, away from the investment in cars. The language is there, we are deemphasizing car trips, but how is this going to translate into investment? We don't have enough money to build sidewalks or bike lanes, but we always seem to have enough money to invest in car infrastructure.

Councillor Anderson advised that Council is undertaking a new budget process and through that budget process, this conversation would arise about spending more capital dollars in alternative modes of transportation versus spending money on roads.

Cycling

Demographics of cyclists consist of a much larger group of young people up to about 21 years old and then there is another group between 40-50. How do we get the group of young people to continue cycling?

A lot of the existing bike symbols are very faded and need freshening up.

David Grey would like to know if we have any plans to use cycle tracks in Nanaimo. We are planning on establishing a test cycle track to review its success.

Andrew Tucker suggested that C2D be changed to "Implement a cycle track pilot project".

What is the smallest market where bike share currently operates?

Chattanooga is just below 200,000.

David Murchie asked about how bike shares address helmet requirements.

We suggest that we wait for Vancouver to address this issue in a BC context.

b) Road Rehab Cycling Opportunities – Councillor Anderson

Councillor Anderson asked for the two motions to be brought forward that were requested from staff at a previous TAC Meeting dated 2013-MAY-29.

The first motion is with regards to Road Rehab and incorporating cycling facilities as part of the Road Rehab.

It was moved and seconded that staff includes, within the Transportation Master Plan, policy that supports consideration of development of cycling, pedestrian and transit improvements in conjunction with road rehabilitation (repaving), land development and major capital projects where such coordination results in overall or long-term infrastructure cost reductions and/or expedites facility development.

It was moved and seconded that the motion for long-term maintenance of the E&N Railway as a continuous linear transportation corridor be moved to the floor for discussion.

Councillor Greves feels this is redundant as it is already in the Island Corridor Foundation (ICF) mandate and the OCP mandate; therefore he doesn't really feel that it needs to be in the TMP as well. Councillor Anderson feels that adding it to the TMP would provide extra weight.

The City recently amended their bylaw to allow for car sales to take place on the rail r-o-w at Wellington, which the dealerships are renting from the ICF. If you want to double the path, you could put the bikes on one side of the tracks and pedestrians on the other. Gord advised that Chapter 9 of DP#3 includes policy about the E&N which we will review at our next meeting on 2013-OCT-08. Current working encourages maximizing short-term benefits but preserve the corridor over the long-term; linear corridors are very difficult to recreate in urban areas once broken.

It was moved and seconded that staff includes, within the Transportation Master Plan, policy that supports the long-term maintenance of the E&N Railway as a continuous linear transportation corridor.

Councillor Greves was opposed to the motion.

8. NEW BUSINESS:

No new business.

9. CORRESPONDENCE:

No correspondence submitted.

10. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

a) Parking Update

Rod Davidson, Manager of Parking Services to provide an update to the Transportation Advisory Committee at a future date.

b) Newcastle Island

11. NEXT MEETING:

To be determined.

12. ADJOURNMENT:

It was moved and seconded at 6:00 p.m. that the meeting adjourn. The motion carried unanimously.

CHAIR