

**APPENDIX C**  
**Technical Agencies Committee Consultation**

# Meeting Summary

<b>Project name:</b>	Uptown West Neighbourhood Transportation Study (UWNTS)	<b>Date:</b>	October 1, 2013
<b>Meeting name:</b>	Technical Agencies Committee (TAC) Meeting #1		
<b>Meeting location:</b>	Waterloo Memorial Recreation Complex, Room 200	<b>Time:</b>	10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
<b>Present:</b>	Jamie Zimmerman Adam Lauder Kris Schumacher Kristy Smith Richard Parent John Strik Ken Carmichael Virina Elgawly Donna Waring Pat Fennessy Barb Magee-Turner Melissa Durrell Jeff Klompus Teresa Dwyer Chris Hodgson Suzette Shiu Laurella Chadee	City of Waterloo – Fire Rescue City of Waterloo – Growth Management Waterloo Advisory Committee on Safe & Healthy Communities Waterloo Advisory Committee on Safe & Healthy Communities Region of Waterloo – Planning Region of Waterloo – Waste Management Services City of Kitchener – Transportation Services Waterloo Catholic District School Board Student Transportation Services of Waterloo Region Uptown West Neighbourhood Association Uptown Streetscape Improvement Project Task Force Waterloo City Council UWNTS Task Force UWNTS Task Force City of Waterloo – UWNTS Project Manager Consulting Team (Cole Engineering) Consulting Team (Cole Engineering)	
<b>Regrets:</b>	Philip Hewitson Christine Koehler Mark Dykstra Gordon Cummer Nancy Gehl Patti Brooks John Griffin Scott Diefenbaker Colleen Cooper Sean Strickland Dennis Cuomo Krista Mooney K. Wilkinson	City of Waterloo City of Waterloo City of Waterloo Grand River Accessibility Advisory Committee Uptown Vision Committee Uptown Waterloo BIA Waterloo Advisory Committee on Active Transportation Waterloo Region Police Service – Traffic Department Region of Waterloo – Public Health Region of Waterloo Council Waterloo Region District School Board Our Lady of Lourdes Empire Public School	

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION BY
1.	<b>INTRODUCTIONS</b> Suzette Shiu welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced the Study Team. All attendees introduced themselves and identified the agency/association that they represented.	

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION BY
2.	<p><b>OBJECTIVES OF THE TAC MEETING</b></p> <p>Suzette presented the objectives of the TAC meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To provide an overview of the scope of the UWNTS, as well as project timing and deliverables.</li> <li>• To allow technical agency representatives to seek clarity and to offer input to the process.</li> <li>• To collectively discuss the issues and opportunities.</li> <li>• To discuss next steps.</li> </ul>	
3.	<p><b>OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY</b></p> <p><b>Background</b></p> <p>The UWNTS was initiated by the City of Waterloo as a result of concerns raised by residents at the Uptown Transportation Summit in September 2012. This study is considered to be a follow up to the Residential Uptown Traffic Study (RUTS) which was completed in 2002.</p> <p><b>Study Objective</b></p> <p>The study objective for the UWNTS: <i>“To preserve the neighbourhood streets against potential traffic infiltration and safety issues due to growth, whilst recognizing the City’s strategic plans and approved policies on transportation.”</i></p> <p><b>Study Phases</b></p> <p>Suzette informed attendees that the UWNTS was being conducted in three phases:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phase 1: Data Collection &amp; Review           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Background, transportation data, field observations <i>[completed]</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Phase 2 – Concept Development           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Evaluation criteria <i>[completed]</i></li> <li>– Alternative solutions/costs</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Phase 3 – Design Development           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Evaluate alternatives</li> <li>– Review road classifications <i>[preliminary review conducted]</i></li> <li>– Analyze temporary layout</li> <li>– Provide recommendations</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Pat Fennessy asked if the public will be provided with the results of the analysis of the temporary layout in Phase 3. Suzette noted that findings will be documented in the final report for this study.</p>	
4.	<p><b>ISSUES</b></p> <p>Some of the issues previously identified by members of the public included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic infiltration through the neighbourhood</li> <li>• Speeding through the neighbourhood</li> <li>• Maintaining and improving a safe and walkable neighbourhood</li> <li>• Re-classification of roads (from local to minor collector) – Avondale Avenue, Allen</li> </ul>	

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION BY
	<p>Street, John Street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts due to future LRT</li> <li>• Impacts due to future development</li> </ul>	
5.	<p><b>REPORT #1 – DATA COLLECTION AND EXISTING CONDITIONS REVIEW</b></p> <p>A copy of Report #1 was circulated to attendees. The study team is seeking input from the TAC on the findings to date. The report is <u>not</u> intended for public review until all comments from the Study Team and TAC have been addressed. The Study Team requested any additional comments on Report #1 or any other issues by October 11, 2013.</p> <p>A summary of Report #1 was presented to the TAC.</p> <p><b>Transportation Network – Active Transportation</b>        Richard Parent asked if the Active Transportation map included any of the recent recommendations from the Region’s draft Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP) (2012). Chris Hodgson noted that the map was taken from the City’s TMP which used the information presented in the Region’s 2004 Cycling Master Plan. Richard said that a draft ATMP report is available for review on the Region’s website. The Study Team agreed to compare recommendations presented in the map with the recent draft ATMP report.</p> <p><b>Traffic Volumes</b>        Suzette presented a graphic showing existing traffic volumes. The traffic volumes used in the analysis were observed within the last three years. There was a question about the traffic volumes on the three roads which are under review for reclassification. Suzette said that the existing volumes are generally representative of a local road. It was asked if future traffic volumes will be analyzed as part of the study. Suzette noted that the Study Team will work to forecast traffic volumes as a result of new developments.</p> <p><b>Traffic Speeds</b>        Suzette presented a graphic showing 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds on roads within the study area. The observed speeds (85<sup>th</sup> percentile) ranged from 35 km/h to 55 km/h. Although speeds do not seem to be a major concern now, she indicated that residents are concerned that future development has the potential to increase speeding through the area.</p> <p>Ken Carmichael noted that the observed travel speeds in Uptown West are low compared to other neighbourhoods where 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds as high as 70 km/h have been documented. Also, Kitchener has received similar concerns on traffic issues around Union, Glasgow and Belmont, though like Uptown West, data shows speeds and volumes are low, with not much infiltration.</p> <p><b>Anticipated Growth</b>        Suzette discussed some of the future developments within the study area. She showed that the eastern section of Uptown West is located within the urban growth centre. There was discussion about an 800 m radius from the LRT and if the desired density targets could be achieved without impacting existing properties located west of the urban growth centre</p>	<p>TAC</p> <p>Cole Eng.</p> <p>Study Team</p>

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION BY
	<p>boundary. Adam Lauder noted that, from a planning perspective, there will be enough development density within the designated growth area to support the transit-oriented vision for the growth area.</p> <p><b>Walkability</b>            The advantages of short block lengths in relation to walkability were noted. Teresa Dwyer pointed out that the Uptown West area currently has a very high walk score.</p> <p><b>Collisions</b>            Very few intersections with Uptown West had more than 5 collisions over the last 5-year period. The surrounding Regional roads have a higher incidence of collisions. Jamie Zimmerman commented that the data and low frequency of collisions within Uptown West reflects his expectations of existing conditions.</p>	
	<p><b>OTHER ISSUES</b></p> <p>Additional comments/concerns were invited from TAC members:</p> <p><b>Fire Response</b>            Jaime Zimmerman identified his concern that it is not the single traffic calming measure that will significantly impact response times, but the cumulative effect of multiple traffic calming measures.</p> <p>He explained two critical performance measures for his emergency fire response, which are dictated by City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initial response (first truck to scene) – within 5 minutes</li> <li>• Effective fire ground force at the scene – within 8 minutes</li> </ul> <p>He also spoke to the difference in effective fire ground force for high rise buildings, which requires more resources, versus two storey houses. He also noted the differences in time to ignite for different types of buildings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legacy construction (older buildings, lathe and plaster) – 8 minutes</li> <li>• Newer buildings (lightweight construction) – 3 minutes</li> </ul> <p>The Fire Rescue department has designated primary and secondary routes for emergency response. It is critical to not impede travel time on these routes. One of his concerns is the impact of future LRT on King Street which is a primary route for fire response. Chris Hodgson will provide the City’s emergency response routes to the consulting team for information.</p> <p>Jamie also noted the possibility to reoccupy the Westmount Station, which is yet to be presented to Council. It was asked if the Westmount Station would help with the effective fire ground force. Jamie said that it could help, however, adding a fire truck and personnel would require more than \$1 million in annual operating costs, not including capital costs.</p> <p>It was asked if there is any agreement with City of Kitchener for fire response in City of</p>	<p>Chris Hodgson</p>

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION BY
	<p>Waterloo limits. Jamie said that there is no agreement in place for initial response across City boundaries.</p> <p><b>Garbage Collection</b>            In consideration of garbage collection, John Strik noted that on-street parking is not preferred as it can hinder collection operations. This would apply to parking on even one side of the street.</p> <p><b>Growth/Intensification</b>            There was a question about future developments and the traffic volumes which will be generated. Chris Hodgson said that developers had to produce traffic studies in line with applicable standards/procedures to have their applications approved. It was pointed out that each developer may have considered traffic generated from that development only, and not considered all the developments that are actually being implemented. Suzette noted that the Study Team will be working together to determine future traffic volumes as a result of cumulative development.</p> <p><b>General</b>            It was asked if the Study Team was aware of general origins/destinations of people travelling through the area. Suzette noted that no specific surveys have been conducted, as it is quite costly to conduct origin-destination surveys. Chris Hodgson added that roads are public right-of-ways and are accessible to everyone, as long as they obey the traffic regulations.</p> <p>There was discussion about Erb Street and the congestion which causes drivers to “cut-through” the neighbourhood. It was suggested that turn restriction signs could be placed at specific locations along Erb Street.</p> <p>It was pointed out that as traffic volumes increase, speeds generally decrease.</p> <p>Chris Hodgson noted that the City will monitor the effectiveness of the temporary solution. He noted that police enforcement can be costly and its effectiveness is temporary (i.e. only during the period that police are visible). Teresa Dwyer noted that residents are looking for a more permanent, long-term solution.</p>	<p>Study Team</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p><b>CONSULTATION</b></p> <p><b>Meetings</b>            Suzette informed the TAC of the meetings that are planned for the study, including meetings with the Study Team (6 meetings), Task Force (8 meetings), Technical Agencies Committee (2 meetings), and the public (2 meetings).</p> <p>Suzette noted that the first Public Engagement Session will be held on October 30 which is planned to be highly participatory, and invited all who are interested to attend.</p>	

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION BY
7.	<p><b>OTHER BUSINESS</b></p> <p>The Study Team requested any comments on Report #1 or any other issue by <b>October 11, 2013</b>.</p> <p>Suzette informed attendees of newsletters which have been distributed to the community. Copies of the newsletters will be sent to the TAC for information.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note:</b>  <i>Comments via email were received from the School Council Representatives for Our Lady of Lourdes School and Empire Public School, who were unable to attend the meeting. Main issues were identified on regional roads – Westmount Road and Erb Street (on the study boundary) and include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Safety issues at Westmount-Dietz and Erb-Roslin pedestrian crossings – Motorists have been observed to drive through the red light at these locations, and countless near misses have been experienced.</i></li> <li>• <i>Absence of school zone signs along Westmount and Erb – There are no school zone signs along Westmount Road or Erb Street near the pedestrian crossings, which are frequently used by children who walk to/from either Our Lady of Lourdes or Empire School.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>These concerns will be forwarded to the relevant regional departments.</i></p>	<p>TAC</p> <p>Cole Eng.</p>

Minutes Recorded By: Laurella Chadee / Suzette Shiu  
 Distribution: All invitees

# Meeting Summary

<b>Project name:</b>	Uptown West Neighbourhood Transportation Study (UWNTS)	<b>Date:</b>	March 13, 2014
<b>Meeting name:</b>	Technical Agencies Committee (TAC) Meeting #2		
<b>Meeting location:</b>	Beaupre Room Albert McCormick Community Centre, 500 Parkside Drive	<b>Time:</b>	10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
<b>Present:</b>	Ken Carmichael (KC) Philip Hewitson (PH) Chris Hodgson (CH) Jamie Zimmerman (JZ) Adam Lauder (AL) Christine Koehler (CK) Gordon Cummer (GC) Richard Parent (RP) Jeff Klompus (JK) Teresa Dwyer (TD) Kris Schumacher (KS) Virina Elgawly (VE) Melissa Durrell (MD) Gary Russell (GR) Laurella Chadee (LC) Suzette Shiu (SS)	City of Kitchener – Transportation Services City of Waterloo – Engineering Services City of Waterloo – Engineering Services (UWNTS Project Manager) City of Waterloo – Fire Rescue Services City of Waterloo – Growth Management City of Waterloo – Transportation Services Grand River Accessibility Advisory Committee Region of Waterloo – Planning UWNTS Task Force UWNTS Task Force Waterloo Advisory Committee on Safe & Healthy Communities Waterloo Catholic District School Board – Planning Waterloo City Council Waterloo Region Police Service Cole Engineering (Consulting Team) Cole Engineering (Consulting Team)	
<b>Regrets:</b>	K. Wilkinson Krista Mooney Colleen Cooper John Strik Sean Strickland Donna Waring Barb Magee-Turner Ryan Mounsey Patti Brooks Pat Fennessy John Griffin Kristy Smith Dennis Cuomo Fred Gregory	Empire Public School Our Lady of Lourdes Region of Waterloo – Public Health Region of Waterloo – Waste Management Services Region of Waterloo Council Student Transportation Services of Waterloo Region Uptown Streetscape Improvement Project Task Force Uptown Vision Committee Uptown Waterloo BIA Uptown West Neighbourhood Association Waterloo Advisory Committee on Active Transportation Waterloo Advisory Committee on Safe & Healthy Communities Waterloo Region District School Board Waterloo Region Police Service	

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION BY
1.	<p><b>INTRODUCTIONS</b></p> <p>CH welcomed everyone to the meeting. All attendees introduced themselves and identified the agency/association that they represented.</p> <p>CH provided a brief study update including PES#1, then asked for feedback on the draft scenarios which were circulated for review by the technical agencies. Some agency representatives identified issues and concerns which were noted.</p>	

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION BY
	<p>Issues/Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fire response times will be impacted by diverters and road closures but also the cumulative effect of any measures used</li> <li>• Give consideration to new and emerging technologies</li> <li>• More direct routes are preferred, even if these include measures that slow traffic, e.g. speed humps, raised intersections/crosswalks</li> <li>• Specific by-laws may be needed to exempt emergency services from restrictions</li> <li>• There is a level of support for sidewalks</li> </ul>	
2.	<p><b>STUDY UPDATE</b></p> <p>SS provided an update on the study, including what has been done since the last TAC meeting in October, including the PES, and meetings between the Task Force and the Study Team. She highlighted some of the main issues/concerns which were identified by residents at the PES, and explained that these were considered in the development of the alternative scenarios. SS reminded attendees of the evaluation criteria which were developed for assessing the various alternative scenarios. She noted that a preliminary evaluation of the three draft scenarios with respect to community, traffic operations, infiltration, and safety, was conducted. She also noted that the draft alternative scenarios were not evaluated against cost, since the study team wanted to obtain input from the technical agencies before costing individual measures.</p> <p>CH noted that other than a few isolated speeding issues, and some traffic volumes higher than what is intended for some streets, current data does not indicate any significant problem. He further noted that some residents are concerned due to future developments and corresponding increases in population. MD agreed, and noted that although current traffic conditions may be acceptable today, residents are concerned about the future.</p> <p>RP asked if the City had any origin-destination (OD) survey data which could be used to substantiate cut through traffic. SS noted that this was not conducted as part of this study since they are not easy to conduct, and are also expensive. She said that surveys conducted today would not be representative of future conditions. CK stated that OD survey data was collected for a 1999 Uptown study, and noted that traffic volumes have not changed substantially since then.</p> <p>KS asked for clarification about some measures which were shown in the package, including diverters, raised median islands, and one-way streets. SS explained the movements allowed and restricted by diverters and raised median islands, with the aid of some graphics. She also confirmed that one-way street segments were only intended for the sections shown by arrows on the various scenarios.</p>	

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION BY
3.	<p><b>DRAFT ALTERNATIVE SCENARIOS</b></p> <p>SS described each of the draft scenarios, and comments from attendees were invited.</p> <p><b>Draft Scenario 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JZ: Diverters can impact response times.</li> <li>• KC: Raised intersections may be redundant at all-way stop locations (B, C).</li> <li>• KC: Diverter at John Street / Belmont Avenue (E) may result in an increase in traffic volumes to Kitchener. He is concerned with increased volumes on Union Boulevard between Westmount Road and Belmont Avenue (minor neighbourhood collector street). Union Boulevard changes to a city arterial street from Belmont Avenue to King Street. PH asked if KC would prefer the traffic volumes increase along John Street and Allen Street, which are local roads.</li> <li>• KC: Turn restrictions (signage only) will require enforcement to be effective. CK noted that snow plows must obey turn restriction signage.</li> <li>• RP: The Region usually introduces turn restrictions from the regional road to prevent right-turning traffic since this usually slows traffic behind; however, left turn restrictions are more effective since they involve a more difficult manoeuvre.</li> <li>• RP/KC: An increased amount of traffic will be expected on Roslin Avenue and Euclid Avenue due to turn restrictions.</li> <li>• KS: Increased traffic along Roslin Avenue near the school can increase the possibilities of pedestrian-vehicle conflicts. SS indicated that this issue is a con, but the raised crosswalk (A) and intersection (B) are anticipated to slow traffic and discourage vehicles from driving along Roslin Avenue.</li> <li>• AL: Raised median island may force some future residents of a development (potentially 6 storeys) at Park Street / Allen Street (west side) to travel through the neighbourhood, depending on where future accesses are located, i.e. on Park Street only, or a primary access on Park Street with a secondary access on Allen Street. PH noted that two accesses may not be necessary, since it is not expected to be a large development, so one on Park Street should suffice. CH and SS explained that the raised median island will still accommodate right turns, and seems like a good measure to reduce conflicts and address the collision issue at this location, as well as to provide pedestrians with a refuge area when crossing Park Street.</li> <li>• VE: Raised crosswalks and intersections would help increase confidence of pedestrians as they cross the road. CH noted that physically raised measures can increase the chances of some drivers stopping (or significantly reducing their speeds) at all-way stop controlled intersections, and driving through the area more slowly.</li> <li>• CK: Snow plow operations will be impacted by one-way street segments, diverters, half road closures (in some cases, snow clearing could take up to 2-3 times longer).</li> </ul> <p><b>Draft Scenario 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments as per Draft Scenario 1.</li> <li>• KC: Mobile planters (E, F) may not be effective. These were introduced in Kitchener, but vehicles were observed to collide with them. CH noted that the mobile planters will need to be moved in winter, so maintenance costs as well as storage will need to be considered. KC suggested a concrete median. CH noted that the City will prefer an</li> </ul>	

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION BY
	<p>aesthetically pleasing planter, and is not just looking for a block of concrete.</p> <p><b>Draft Scenario 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CH: Half road closures may impact the ability of larger vehicles, such as fire trucks to make right turns onto regional roads, due to turning radius required. These half road closures will also impact the ability of the fire trucks to enter these streets. JZ has not experienced this situation before, so is unsure how the fire trucks would handle it.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other Comments</b></p> <p>TD commented that although valid contributions were made at the meeting, the City should start thinking about the future of the neighbourhood and planning accordingly for development, e.g. fire/emergency services could learn new routes, Westmount Fire Station could be reopened, etc. JZ noted the capital costs associated with opening a new station, as well as the operating and maintenance costs. JZ understands that traffic calming measures may be introduced, but he is responsible for ensuring public safety and responding effectively to emergencies. He noted that everyone needs to understand the impacts of certain measures on response times. SS added that everyone is aware of the growth that is planned for the urban growth centre, as well as the LRT line, and the neighbourhood needs to acknowledge these changes and recognize that the neighbourhood cannot be expected to remain unchanged due to the proximity of the developments and LRT.</p> <p>CH noted that in addition to previous comments, the City needs to find a solution that is feasible to construct/implement, manage, and afford.</p>	
4.	<p><b>Next Steps</b></p> <p><b>Public Engagement Session #2 – April 2014 (TBD)</b></p> <p>SS informed the TAC that a meeting with the public was being planned for April 2014. AL asked if another TAC meeting would be planned. SS noted that a third TAC meeting was not originally in the scope of the project, and the intention going forward is to consider the comments offered at today’s meeting and refine the alternative scenarios if necessary before presenting to the public in April. She noted that although different scenarios will be presented at the next PES, a technically preferred alternative will be identified, based on the evaluation process.</p>	

Minutes Recorded By: Laurella Chadee / Suzette Shiu  
 Distribution: All invitees